

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

Demonstrates expertise and track record			
Access to equipment/facilities			
<i>Sustainability & Dissemination</i>	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
<i>Originality of research</i>	25%	____	____
Originality and innovation in approach			
<i>Impact & Significance</i>	25%	____	____
Potential for broader significance			
Contribution to methodological advancement			
Relevance to AEA/ environmental archaeology			
<i>Feasibility & Project Design</i>	20%	____	____
Achievable timeline and methodology			
Appropriate budget allocation			
Clear project objectives and deliverables			

Applicant Capability	15%	_____	_____
Relevant experience and skills			
Access to necessary resources/facilities			
Value for Money	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