Foundation Dentists Research Competition
Assessment Criteria and Scoring Guide

This guide supports consistent and transparent assessment of submissions across all competition categories. Judges should score each criterion from 0–5 and consider the descriptors as indicators of performance quality.

Scoring Guidance:

5 = Exceptional

4 = Strong

3 = Satisfactory

2 = Limited

1 = Poor

0 = Not addressed

Category 1: Quality Improvement Projects (QIP)

Criterion	High Score (4–5)	Mid Score (2–3)	Low Score (0–1)
Framework and methodology	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Definition of the issue	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Impact of the issue	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Root cause analysis	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Rationale for solutions	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Implementation of solutions	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Evaluation of impact	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Dissemination and influence	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Overall presentation	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.

Category 2: Practice-based Research

Criterion	High Score (4–5)	Mid Score (2–3)	Low Score (0–1)
Research question	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Literature review	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Aims and objectives	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Methodology	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Data management and analysis	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Results	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Discussion	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Conclusions	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Dissemination of findings	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Overall presentation	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.

Category 3: Case Presentation

Criterion	High Score (4–5)	Mid Score (2–3)	Low Score (0–1)
Critical appraisal of literature	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Description of case challenges	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Evidence-informed clinical management	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Outcomes achieved	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Reflection and learning	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.
Overall presentation	Clear, evidence-informed, comprehensive and well communicated.	Adequate but lacking depth, evidence or consistency.	Insufficiently described, unsupported or unclear.