WRDTP Pathway Awards Assessment: Guidance Notes 2020/21

Introduction

Studentship nominations to the WRDTP Pathway Awards competition will be assessed by WRDTP Pathway Directors, Deputies, and members of the WRDTP Academic Quality Committee.

This guide contains:

a. Key background information to help familiarise you with the range of WRDTP studentships on offer.
b. Key process and timelines information to ensure you are aware of the tasks required to successfully complete the Pathway Studentship Awards Assessment Panel assessment process.

a. <u>Key background information</u>

- **Thematic Interdisciplinary Training Pathways**
  The WRDTP is offering ESRC studentship awards in 7 Thematic Interdisciplinary Training Pathways. See Annex I for a Short Description of each Pathway.

- **Eligible Schools/Departments**
  The Schools/Departments across the 7 university partners which are eligible to submit candidates to the WRDTP studentship competitions for 2020/21 are listed in Annex II.

- **WRDTP ESRC Studentship Award Schemes**
  There are four studentship competitions running in 2020/21. The following table gives brief details of each type of award on offer:

Type of studentship	Min number of awards	Funding offered by DTP	Process Notes (all available across the 7 interdisciplinary themed pathways)
Pathway Awards	41	50%	Via an open competition for a maximum of 41 studentships. This incorporates the 2 x steered Interdisciplinary Research Awards.
Advanced Quantitative Methods Awards (AQM)	4	100%	Via an open competition. (4x ESRC steer)
Network Awards (open to White Rose Universities only – Leeds, Sheffield, York)	1 (3)	100%	3 x studentships (co-funded by the White Rose University Consortium) available in one White Rose DTP Network. Based on the ESRC Delivery Plan 2016-20 themes. Requires collaboration with a non-academic partner.
Collaborative Awards	11	100%	Via an open competition. Requires collaboration with a non-academic partner.

b. Process and Timelines

Pathway Awards

The following table summarises the process timelines for the Pathway Awards 2020/21 competition:

Date	Process
July 2019	DTP announces 2020/21 Studentship Competitions
1 November 2019	HEI systems go live for applications
29 January 2020 (5:00pm)	Closing deadline for student applications
29 January–26 February 2020	Depts/Schools shortlist, interview and complete DTP Nomination Form
26 February 2020 (5:00pm)	Deadline for DTP Nomination Form and Application Packs to be submitted to Scholarship/Administrative Officers
16 March – 27 March 2020	**Pathway Panel Scoring - members score nominations**
27 March 2020 (noon)	**Deadline for Pathway Panel members to submit assessment scores online**
7 April 2020	Academic Quality Committee Moderation Assessment Panel meets
w/c 13 April 2020	Scholarship/Administrative Officers notified of decisions by DTP Office
27 April 2020	Deadline for Scholarship/Administrative Officers to notify applicants of outcome

Pathway Awards Assessment Scoring process

The scoring process will take place between **16th March and 27nd March 2020**. The DTP Office will give you access to a Google Folder where you can assess each Application Pack submitted to your Pathway. You will also be given access to a Google Scoring Sheet and asked to enter scores in the tab showing your initials. Scoring must be completed independently in the first instance.

Allocation of candidates for scoring

Pathway Directors/Deputies and AQC members will be allocated to a group of candidates applying to their Pathway and asked to score the nominations. The WRDTP Director will score all candidates for moderation purposes.

Application Packs - the following information will be available for each nominated candidate in the Google Folder. It will be presented as **ONE** combined PDF in this order:

- WRDTP Nomination Form
- Scholarships Application Form
- 2 x academic references
- Full transcripts including grading system
- University Application Form for a PhD place
- Formal university offer letter
- IELTS/TOEFL (or equivalent) certificate if applicable

Scoring Criteria – the following six scoring criteria are to be used. Criteria 1,2,3 and 5 are to be scored on a 0 to 5 scale. See Annex III for further details.

1. **Student excellence:** qualifications, relevant work experience, prizes and awards.
2. **Project excellence:** significance, originality, how will this contribute to knowledge.
3. **Pathway excellence:** fit with, and development of, pathway research strategy.
4. **Supervisor excellence:** the suitability and experience of the supervisory team – only a Yes/No answer is required.
5. **Collaborative excellence:** demonstrates a collaborative element with the ability to make impact beyond academia.
6. **Training excellence:** for 1+3, suitable MA Social Research framework as proposed masters training; for +3, demonstrates at least 60 credits of M-level research methods in the social sciences and how training needs will be met, delivered, and monitored – only a Yes/No answer is required.

Weightings – note that weightings (x 2) are applied for *Student Excellence* and *Project Excellence*. Do not apply the weightings yourself, only score on the 0 to 5 scale.

Prior Training: +3 v 1+3 awards - to offer a +3 award the panel must be satisfied that the majority of the core training requirements set down by the ESRC in the Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines 2015 have already been met by the candidate, and that the training focus during the PhD will largely be on more advanced training.

Please familiarise yourself with the core training expectations in advance of the scoring process, see Section B, pp.7-15 of the ESRC PG Training & Development Guidelines: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/skills-and-careers/studentships/postgraduate-training-and-development-guidelines-2015/

WRDTP Pathway Awards Assessment processing

The results of the scoring exercise will be processed by the DTP Office who will compile a range of information prior to the WRDTP AQC Moderation Panel (8th April 2020). The WRDTP Director will be provided with a summary sheet of the scores, and the average score for each application. Where there is a marked difference in scores the WRDTP Director may ask you to undertake an additional review of the application, prior to the moderation panel meeting.

Confidentiality, Data Protection and Embargo

It is imperative that Panel members do not at any time share Application Packs or Scoring information with other colleagues within your Department or University, or across the DTP. The only discussions permitted are with the DTP Director, or for any operational matters, with the DTP Office team. Neither are you to discuss the outcome of the scoring exercise. The results of the competition will be embargoed until a date/time to be announced by the DTP Office, and there should be no communications whatsoever about outcomes until after that date.

Offers, reserves and unsuccessful candidates

- **Successful candidates**
  Candidates who are successful will be notified by the local HEI Scholarships Officers by 27 April 2020 and asked to confirm acceptance of the award within 10 working days.

- **Reserve candidates**
  Students on the reserve list will be informed by email of their reserve status by the local HEI Scholarships Officers by 27 April 2020.

- **Unsuccessful candidates**
  Unsuccessful students will also be informed by email by the local HEI Scholarships Officers by 27 April 2020.

Administration Contacts

If you have any queries during the Assessment Process, please contact:

Charlotte Massarella, c.l.massarella@sheffield.ac.uk, 0114 222 7132

Annex I - DTP Interdisciplinary Themed Pathways

Short Description

DTP Pathway	Discipline and Topic Coverage
Cities, Environment, and Liveability (CEL)	Understanding and managing socio-economic change in cities and urban-based responses through policy, governance, and the connecting of communities. An emphasis on environment recognises the growing importance of interactions between populations and climate/environmental/ecological changes, the politics of sustainability, and the importance of urban and rural dynamics and interconnections. Liveability provides a nexus by placing emphasis on infrastructures and their resilience (breadth of services, utilities, such as energy and water) and shifts within the built environment (spaces and places, mobilities, interaction, property, housing policy and practice).
Security, Conflict, and Justice (SCJ)	The Security, Conflict and Justice pathway engages with a range of broad societal challenges addressed within and across political science, international studies, criminology, law, socio-legal studies, and public policy. Climate change, social deprivation, public health, global development challenges, distributive justice, violent extremism and terrorism, egregious human rights abuse, changing patterns of conflict, the impact of new technologies on criminal justice, (forced) migration, and the evolving security agenda – amongst many others – are challenges which arguably defy narrow disciplinary approaches. They are also defined by the evolving social, technological and normative contexts in which they are found, and the blurring distinction between traditional academic categories. Debates about the nature and driving forces of conflict – and in particular the growing emphasis upon social and economic factors, identity, and environmental stresses – are relevant to the development, governance and security subject areas. In turn, security and conflict are both inherently linked to debates about justice. Injustice is a source of conflict, and the question of 'just security' – including the politics and governance of security in contemporary society – is highly topical and contested. Injustice and insecurity are experienced by people in different ways on an everyday basis, including the challenges of social deprivation, unequal access to legal justice, the denial of minority rights, and deficiencies in the rule of law. These challenges illustrate interlinkages across the security, conflict and justice theme, as well as links to broader societal debates. Many of the themes related to this pathway are also directly linked to pressing policy challenges which need to be approached with new and wider perspectives in order to develop better strategies for conflict resolution and securing justice locally/globally.
Education, Childhood, and Youth (ECY)	This pathway covers the fields of education, learning and development, including students and academic staff from Education, Psychology, Sociology and Language & Linguistics departments. Members have an interest in learning and education, from early childhood through to adulthood. As an interdisciplinary pathway, we look at ways in which the different disciplines concerned with education, learning and development,

	practice and research, learn from one another and collaborate to produce new findings. As such, we cover a wide range of research areas, from laboratory studies of learning and development, to educational interventions to improve children's outcomes in schools, to exploring ways in which children and young people are conceptualised and produced.
Data, Communication, and New Technologies (DCT)	Communications and interactions between social groups, society, and data, information and digital technologies. Cutting-edge frameworks and methods for understanding these interactions and novel applications to support them. How social actors can better make sense of and manage increasing volumes of data and information encountered ('datafication') in a variety of domains, and investigates how we experience and make sense of the changing data landscape and information environment.
Wellbeing, Health, and Communities (WHC)	This pathway concerns multi-disciplinary perspectives on health and wellbeing often in partnership with policy and practice networks, including local authorities, voluntary organisation and NHS trusts, and increasingly decentralisation and devolution to communities. The partnership has expertise on the following topics: inequalities, ageing, e-health, emergency care, obesity, modelling and economic evaluation, and cost-effectiveness of health policy interventions. In addition, inclusion and resilience connections are made between health, employment, employability and work psychology in this pathway.
Sustainable Growth, Management, and Economic Productivity (SMP)	Productivity and sustainable economic growth at multi-level scale, from firm, to sectoral, regional and national levels. Wages, finance, financialisation, skills and welfare. Macro-level economics and other levels of micro-analysis to capture complex systems of management, regulation, governance (covering marketing, work and employment relations, accounting and finance, public services). Economic development, business support, and the sustainability of economic policies and interventions.
Civil Society, Development, and Democracy (CDD)	Spans excellence in understanding the changing nature of civil and political society: governance, institutions, community, individuals, migration, and difference. Addresses political climate of devolution, constitutional change, patterns and processes of democracy, legitimacy, and citizenship. This is set within the broader context of crisis, inequality, processes and patterns of uneven international development, public policy, situated development studies, and dynamics of rising powers vis-à-vis area studies.

Annex II – List of eligible departments for studentship awards

Manchester Metropolitan University
Department of Social Care and Social Work – *Education, Childhood, and Youth Pathway; Wellbeing, Health, and Communities Pathway*
Faculty of Education – *Education, Childhood, and Youth Pathway*

Sheffield Hallam University
Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research – *Cities, Environment, and Liveability Pathway; Wellbeing, Health, and Communities Pathway; Civil Society, Development, and Democracy Pathway*
Sheffield Institute of Education – *Education, Childhood, and Youth Pathway*

University of Bradford
Faculty of Health Studies – *Wellbeing, Health and Communities Pathway*
School of Management - *Wellbeing, Health and Communities Pathway; Sustainable Growth, Management, and Economic Productivity Pathway*

University of Hull
Department of History – *Cities, Environment, and Liveability Pathway*
Department of Psychology – *Education, Childhood, and Youth Pathway; Wellbeing, Health and Communities Pathway*
Geography/Geology – *Cities, Environment, and Liveability Pathway; Sustainable Growth, Management, and Economic Productivity Pathway; Civil Society, Development, and Democracy Pathway*

University of Leeds (**ALL** 7 Thematic Interdisciplinary Pathways)
Leeds University Business School
Institute for Transport Studies
School of Computing
School of Earth and Environment
School of Education
School of Geography
School of Healthcare
Institute of Health Sciences
School of History
School of Languages, Cultures and Societies
School of Law
School of Media and Communications
School of Politics and International Studies
School of Psychology
School of Sociology and Social Policy

University of Sheffield (**ALL** 7 Thematic Interdisciplinary Pathways)
Department of Computer Science
Department of Economics
Department of Geography
Department of History
Department of Human Communication Sciences

Department of Journalism Studies
Department of Landscape
Department of Politics
Department of Psychology
Department of Sociological Studies
Department of Urban Studies and Planning
Information School
Management School
School of Architecture
School of East Asian Studies
School of Education
School of Health and Related Research
School of Law

University of York (**ALL** 7 Thematic Interdisciplinary Pathways)
Department of Economics
Department of Education
Department of Health Sciences
Department of History
Department of Language and Linguistic Science
Department of Politics
Department of Psychology
Department of Social Policy and Social Work
Department of Sociology
Environment Department
Law School
Management School

Annex III

Pathway Awards Assessment – Scoring criteria

PATHWAY AWARDS SCORING CRITERIA	Max Mark
1 Student excellence: academic success and qualifications, relevant work experience, prizes and awards **5: Outstanding** Candidates will be predicated to attain or have achieved *all* of the following: • Master's Degree with Distinction (for +3 candidates) • Bachelor's Degree with First Class Honours (for 1+3 candidates) • Distinction level mark in Masters dissertation (+3) or first class Undergraduate dissertation (1+3) • First class /Distinction marks for methods modules • Other significant indicators of distinction: these may include relevant work experience, prizes/awards for dissertations or for overall Masters or UG degree performance, publications, research assistant experience, etc **4: Excellent** Candidates will be predicated to attain or have achieved *most* of the following: • Master's Degree with Distinction (for +3 candidates) • Bachelor's Degree with First Class Honours (for 1+3 candidates) • Distinction level mark in Masters dissertation (+3) or first class Undergraduate dissertation (1+3) • First class /Distinction marks for methods modules • Other significant indicators of distinction: these may include relevant work experience, prizes/awards for dissertations or for overall Masters or UG degree performance, publications, research assistant experience, etc **3: Very Good** Candidates will be predicated to attain or have achieved all of the following: • Master's Degree with Merit or Distinction (for +3 candidates) • Bachelor's Degree with First Class or Upper Second Class Honours (for 1+3 candidates) • Distinction level mark in Masters dissertation (+3) or Upper Second Class mark in Undergraduate dissertation (1+3) • First class/Upper Second Class /Distinction/Merit marks for methods modules	**5 (weighted x2)**

	2: Good Candidates will be predicated to attain or have achieved all of the following: - Master's Degree with Merit (for +3 candidates) - Bachelor's Degree with Upper Second Class Honours (for 1+3 candidates) - Merit level mark in Masters dissertation (+3) or Upper Second Class mark in Undergraduate dissertation (1+3) - Upper Second Class/Merit marks for methods modules **1: Weak** Candidates will be predicated to attain or have achieved all of the following: - Master's Degree with Pass (for +3 candidates) - Bachelor's Degree with Upper Second Class Honours (for 1+3 candidates) - Pass mark in Masters dissertation (+3) or Lower Second Class mark in Undergraduate dissertation (1+3) - Pass/Lower Second class marks for methods modules **0: No Evidence** Candidates will fail to meet entry criteria and will demonstrate little evidence of capacity for postgraduate research.	
2	Project excellence: significance, originality the contribute to knowledge, well-articulated research question/s **5: Outstanding** Applications will demonstrate all of the following: - Very clear explanation of the originality of the project, the contribution it will make to advance knowledge, and the project's significance - Very clear articulation of the research design, methods and data sources - Very clear consideration of any research ethics issues **4: Excellent** Applications will demonstrate all of the following, but could be better developed in some of these areas: - Very clear explanation of the originality of the project, the contribution it will make to advance knowledge, and the project's significance - Very clear articulation of the research design, methods and data sources - Very clear consideration of any research ethics issues	**5 (weighted x2)**

	3: Very Good Applications will demonstrate all or most of the following, but could be better developed in some of these areas: • Very clear explanation of the originality of the project, the contribution it will make to advance knowledge, and the project's significance • Very clear articulation of the research design, methods and data sources • Very clear consideration of any research ethics issues **2: Good** Applications will demonstrate all or most of the following: • Reasonable explanation of the originality of the project, the contribution it will make to advance knowledge, and the project's significance • Reasonable articulation of the research design, methods and data sources • Reasonable consideration of any research ethics issues **1: Weak** Applications will fail to demonstrate all of the following, or may be weak in some areas: • Explanation of the originality of the project, the contribution it will make to advance knowledge, and the project's significance • Articulation of the research design, methods and data sources • Consideration of any research ethics issues **0: No Evidence** Applications will fail to demonstrate all of the following: • Explanation of the originality of the project, the contribution it will make to advance knowledge, and the project's significance • Articulation of the research design, methods and data sources • Consideration of any research ethics issues	
3	Pathway excellence: project fit with, and development of, pathway research strategy **5: Outstanding** Applications will demonstrate all of the following: • Very clear explanation of the fit of the project with the Pathway theme and 'grand challenges' identified by the Pathway • Very clear articulation of how the research will engage beyond a single discipline **4: Excellent** Applications will demonstrate all of the following, but could be better developed in some of these areas:	**5**

- Very clear explanation of the fit of the project with the Pathway theme and 'grand challenges' identified by the Pathway
- Very clear articulation of how the research will engage beyond a single discipline

3: Very Good
Applications will demonstrate the following, but will be slightly less developed in some of these areas than higher ranked applications:
- Very clear explanation of the fit of the project with the Pathway theme and 'grand challenges' identified by the Pathway
- Very clear articulation of how the research will engage beyond a single discipline

2: Good
Applications will demonstrate the following:
- Reasonable explanation of the fit of the project with the Pathway theme and 'grand challenges' identified by the Pathway
- Reasonable articulation of how the research will engage beyond a single discipline

1: Weak
Applications will fail to demonstrate one or both of the following, or may be weak in some areas:
- Explanation of the fit of the project with the Pathway theme and 'grand challenges' identified by the Pathway
- Articulation of how the research will engage beyond a single discipline

0: No Evidence
Applications will fail to demonstrate all of the following:
- Explanation of the fit of the project with the Pathway theme and 'grand challenges' identified by the Pathway
- Articulation of how the research will engage beyond a single discipline

4	Supervisor excellence: the suitability and experience of the supervisory team	**Yes/No**
5	Collaborative excellence: demonstrates a collaborative element through one or more of the following • Partnerships with a non-academic partner; • Potential for impact beyond academia; or • Well-developed plans for knowledge exchange with audiences beyond academia **5: Outstanding** In relation to **partnership** applications would include all of the following:	**5**

- Very clear explanation of the strategic benefits of the partnership to both student and partner
- Very clear programme of work and engagement between student and partner
- Very clear explanation of in-kind contributions
- Very clear account of role partner will play in supervision
- Very clear account of the likely societal impacts of the project

In relation to **impact**, applications would include all of the following:
- Very clear explanation of the likely impacts of the research;
- Very clear explanation of the groups or organisations in the policy, private, or third sectors that would be impacted by the research;
- Very clear articulation of the pathways to achieving the impact.

In relation to **knowledge exchange** applications would include all of the following:
- Very clear explanation of the plans for disseminating research findings to audiences beyond academia;
- Very clear explanation of the key audiences to be targeted;
- Very clear account of the tools and methods that would be used to disseminate research findings beyond academia.

4: Excellent
In relation to **partnership**, applications would include most of the following:
- Very clear explanation of the strategic benefits of the partnership to both student and partner;
- Very clear programme of work and engagement between student and partner
- Very clear explanation of in-kind contributions
- Very clear account of role partner will play in supervision
- Very clear account of the likely societal impacts of the project

In relation to **impact**, applications would include most of the following:
- Very clear explanation of the likely impacts of the research;
- Very clear explanation of the groups or organisations in the policy, private, or third sectors that would be impacted by the research;
- Very clear articulation of the pathways to achieving the impact.

In relation to **knowledge exchange** applications would include most of the following:
- Very clear explanation of the plans for disseminating research findings to audiences beyond academia;
- Very clear explanation of the key audiences to be targeted;
- Very clear account of the tools and methods that would be used to disseminate research findings beyond academia.

3: Very Good
In relation to **partnership**, applications would include most of the following: but could be better developed in some of these areas:

- Very clear explanation of the strategic benefits of the partnership to both student and partner
- Very clear programme of work and engagement between student and partner
- Very clear explanation of in-kind contributions
- Very clear account of role partner will play in supervision
- Very clear account of the likely societal impacts of the project

In relation to **impact**, applications would include most of the following but could be better developed in some of these areas:
- Very clear explanation of the likely impacts of the research;
- Very clear explanation of the groups or organisations in the policy, private, or third sectors that would be impacted by the research;
- Very clear articulation of the pathways to achieving the impact.

In relation to **knowledge exchange** applications would include most of the following but could be better developed in some of these areas:
- Very clear explanation of the plans for disseminating research findings to audiences beyond academia;
- Very clear explanation of the key audiences to be targeted;
- Very clear account of the tools and methods that would be used to disseminate research findings beyond academia.

2: Good
In relation to **partnership**, applications would include all or most of the following, but could be better developed in some areas:
- Good explanation of the strategic benefits of the partnership to both student and partner
- Good programme of work and engagement between student and partner
- Some explanation of in-kind contributions
- Good account of role partner will play in supervision
- Good account of the likely societal impacts of the project

In relation to **impact**, applications would include most of the following but could be better developed in some of these areas:
- Good explanation of the likely impacts of the research;
- Good explanation of the groups or organisations in the policy, private, or third sectors that would be impacted by the research;
- Good articulation of the pathways to achieving the impact.

In relation to **knowledge exchange** applications would include most of the following but could be better developed in some of these areas:
- Good explanation of the plans for disseminating research findings to audiences beyond academia;
- Good explanation of the key audiences to be targeted;
- Good account of the tools and methods that would be used to disseminate research findings beyond academia.

1: Weak

In relation to **partnership**, applications would lack clarity in some or all of the following areas:
- Explanation of the strategic benefits of the partnership to both student and partner
- Programme of work and engagement between student and partner
- Explanation of in-kind contributions
- Account of role partner will play in supervision
- Account of the likely societal impacts of the project

In relation to **impact**, applications would lack clarity in some or all of the following areas:
- Explanation of the likely impacts of the research;
- Explanation of the groups or organisations in the policy, private, or third sectors that would be impacted by the research;
- Articulation of the pathways to achieving the impact.

In relation to **knowledge exchange** applications would lack clarity in some or all of the following areas:
- Explanation of the plans for disseminating research findings to audiences beyond academia;
- Explanation of the key audiences to be targeted;
- Account of the tools and methods that would be used to disseminate research findings beyond academia.

0: No Evidence

Applications would fail to provide evidence of some or all of the following:
- partnership with a non-academic partner;
- potential for impact beyond academia; or
- well-developed plans for knowledge exchange with audiences beyond academia.

6	Training excellence: for 1+3, suitable MA Social Research framework as proposed masters training; for +3, demonstrates candidate has previously accumulated at least 60 credits (not including dissertation) of M-level research methods in the social sciences and how training needs will be met, delivered, and monitored	**Yes/No**

DTP Office, updated 17 July 2019.