

## Assessment Criteria for AEA Research Grants 2026

Please note that there are different criteria for the two different awards that the Association offers

### 1. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: £2000 AWARD

Criterion	Weight	Score (1-5)	Weighted Score
<b><i>Originality of research</i></b>	30%	____	____
Originality and significant innovation in approach			
Theoretical framework and engagement with literature			
<b><i>Impact &amp; Significance</i></b>	30%	____	____
Potential for substantial impact			
Contribution to methodological/theoretical advancement			
Broader implications for environmental archaeology			
Potential for knowledge transfer and application			
<b><i>Feasibility &amp; Project Design</i></b>	20%	____	____
Comprehensive and realistic methodology			
Well-structured timeline and milestones			
Appropriate resource allocation			
Risk assessment and mitigation strategies			
<b><i>Applicant Capability</i></b>	10%	____	____

Demonstrates expertise and track record			
Access to equipment/facilities			
<b><i>Sustainability &amp; Dissemination</i></b>	10%	___	___
Plans for publication and knowledge exchange			
Potential for follow-on funding or research			

## 2. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: £750 AWARD

Criterion	Weight	Score (1-5)	Weighted Score
<b><i>Originality of research</i></b>	25%	___	___
Originality and innovation in approach			
<b><i>Impact &amp; Significance</i></b>	25%	___	___
Potential for broaderl significance			
Contribution to methodological advancement			
Relevance to AEA/ environmental archaeology			
<b><i>Feasibility &amp; Project Design</i></b>	20%	___	___
Achievable timeline and methodology			
Appropriate budget allocation			
Clear project objectives and deliverables			

<b>Applicant Capability</b>	15%	___	___
Relevant experience and skills			
Access to necessary resources/facilities			
<b>Value for Money</b>	15%	___	___
Cost-effectiveness of proposed research			

#### SCORING NOTES

##### 5 - Excellent

Exceptional quality/innovation/impact potential

No identified weaknesses

Significant contribution to field

##### 4 - Very Good

High quality with clear strengths

Project with significantly more strengths than weaknesses

Solid contribution with good potential impact

##### 3 - Good

Acceptable quality meeting basic requirements

Some strengths but also areas for improvement

Moderate potential for impact

##### 2 - Fair

Below expectations with significant weaknesses

Limited potential for meaningful impact

Major concerns about feasibility or approach

##### 1 - Poor

Fails to meet basic requirements

Fundamental flaws in conception or methodology

Minimal or unclear potential for impact