**WRDTP AQM Assessment Panel: Guidance Notes**

**Introduction**

Studentship nominations to the WRDTP AQM Awards competition will be assessed by representatives from the University of Sheffield, University of Leeds, Sheffield Hallam University and Manchester Metropolitan University.

This guide contains the key process and timelines information to ensure you are aware of the tasks required to successfully complete the WRDTP AQM Panel assessment process.

1. **Key background information**

**WRDTP ESRC Studentship Award Schemes**

There are four studentship competitions running in 2021/22. 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** | To be confirmed | 50% | Via an open competition. This incorporates the 2 x steered Interdisciplinary Research Awards and 2 x Ring-fenced awards for Black British students. |
| **Advanced Quantitative Methods Awards** (AQM) | 4 | 100% | Via an open competition (ESRC steer). |
| **Collaborative Awards** | 8 | 100% | Via open competition. Requires collaboration with a non-academic partner.  |

1. **Process and Timelines**

**AQM Awards**

The following table summarises the process timelines for the AQM Awards 2021/22 competition:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date** | **Who** | **Process** |
| 1. | July 2020 | DTP Office | DTP announces 2021/22 Studentship Competitions |
| 2. | Late Autumn 2020 | HEIs | HEI systems go live for applications |
| 3. | Autumn Semester 2020 - dates to be confirmed | Applicants and potential supervisors | Information sessions providing application guidance for the ring-fenced Pathway Awards for Black British students\*  |
| 4. | 17:00hrs, 27 January 2021 | Candidates | Closing deadline for student applications |
| 5. | 28 January – 24 February 2021 | Units of Delivery (Depts/Schools) | Shortlist, interview and complete DTP Nomination Form |
| 6. | 17:00hrs, 24 February 2021 | Units of Delivery (Depts/Schools) | Deadline for DTP Nomination Form and Application Packs to be submitted to Scholarship/Administrative Officers |
| 7. | 26 February – 12 March 2021 | DTP Office | Prepare Assessment scoring sheets for Assessors |
| 8. | 15 March – 26 March 2021 | Assessors | Assessors to score nominations |
| 9.  | 29 March – 6 April 2021 | DTP Office | Processing scores and preparing for Panel meetings |
| 10. | 7 April 2021 | Academic Quality Committee | Academic Quality Committee Moderation Assessment Panel meets  |
| **11.** | **8 April 2021** | **Advanced Quantitative Methods Group** | **Advanced Quantitative Methods Moderation Assessment Panel meets**  |
| 12. | w/c 12 April 2021 | DTP Office | Scholarship/Administrative Officers notified of decisions |
| 13. | 21 April 2020 | HEI Admin Officers | Deadline for Scholarship/Administrative Officers to notify applicants of outcome |

**AQM Assessment Panel**

The WRDTP AQM Assessment Panel will be comprised of the WRDTP Director (Chair) AQM Director and AQM specialists from the University of Sheffield, University of Leeds, Sheffield Hallam University and Manchester Metropolitan University. Administrative support will also be provided. The members are responsible for the following:

* Scoring each nomination against a set criteria (see Annex III) prior to the panel meeting, and by the deadline of 26 March 2021 (12pm)
* Discussing, moderating and agreeing an overall ranked list of candidates at the Panel meeting (8 April 2021).

**Scoring process**

The scoring process takes place between 15 March and 26 March 2021. The DTP Office will give you access to a Google Folder where you can access each Application Pack submitted to the competition. 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**

Where possible, Panel members will be paired up as 1st and 2nd Reviewer (but you will not be asked to score applications from your own institution).

The WRDTP Director (Charlie Burns) is asked to score all nominations.

**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. **AQM Project excellence:** the quality as an AQM research proposal, beyond standard quantitative methods in the discipline, evidence of cutting edge statistical/mathematical analyses, 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 *AQM Project Excellence*. Do not apply the weightings yourself, only score on the 0 to 5 scale. The sheet will automatically calculate the total with the weightings added.

**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/>

**NB: +3 Candidates who cannot demonstrate at least 60 credits of M-level research methods in the social sciences will not automatically be considered for a 1+3 Award.**

**Panel processing**

The DTP Office will compile a range of information based on the scoring exercise prior to the AQM Assessment Panel taking place.

**WRDTP Academic Quality Committee Moderation Panel**

This WRDTP AQC Moderation Panel will receive one combined ranked list based on the recommendations of the AQM Panel. The AQC Panel are responsible for approving the recommendations made by the AQM Panel.

**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 panel members, with the DTP Director, or for any operational matters, with the DTP Office team. Neither are you to discuss the outcome of the meeting. 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 week commencing 12 April 2021 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 21 April 2021.

* **Unsuccessful candidates**

Unsuccessful students will also be informed by email by the local HEI Scholarships Officers by 21 April 2021.

**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)** | The focus of attention in the Education, Childhood and Youth (ECY) pathway is a range of societal challenges within and across the fields that include: Critical ‘Race’ and whiteness scholarship, Cultural Studies, Disability, Education, Language and Linguistics, Psychology and Sociology. These challenges include the realities and demands of learning (and teaching) for an unknown future, both nationally and globally; the ethics and changing nature of social justice in education; shifting notions of activism in civic society; inequalities in educational provision, access and attainment; wellbeing, and the cognitive and social-emotional development of learners. Pathway members have an interest in formal and informal learning and development across the lifespan: from perinatal, to babies and early childhood through to adulthood.As the world is rapidly changing and becoming increasingly precarious for many people, research in education, childhood and youth that draws on a range of disciplines is ever-more vital in the study of complex physical, social, political, economic and environmental issues. In this interdisciplinary pathway, we encourage and support a wide range of research topics, for example: • global and national critical education policy studies; • laboratory studies of cognitive and social-emotional development of learners;• the development and evaluation of educational interventions; • arts-based methods for engaging with communities;• the role of play in learning;• educational knowledge production; • practitioner research, including action research, exploratory practice, and reflective practice;• critical investigations into curriculum, pedagogy and assessment; and• professional development for practitioners negotiating competing priorities and uncertain futures. We also support and promote the use of innovative methodologies, both qualitative and quantitative, to respond to key challenges in the field of education, childhood and youth, such as critical policy discourse analysis, visual and multimodal methodologies, digital teaching and learning, narrative inquiry, co-production (including learners and teachers as co-researchers) and experimental, quasi experimental and, feasibility studies, such as the neuroscience of learning and development. |
| **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)** | The Civil Society, Development and Democracy (CDD) pathway seeks to comprehend the ways in which our systems and institutions of governance – in both the richer and poorer parts of the world – are evolving in a period marked by pronounced forms of contestation and crisis. Within that, we seek to locate and better understand the nature of contemporary civil society: i.e. how individuals, families, communities and societies as a whole shape and are shaped by broad processes of power and global political change.This compels us to ask questions about the nature and resilience of democracy, the extent to which particular forms of governance are legitimate, and how citizenship is exercised in different places in the modern world. In turn, these issues are fundamentally mediated by pronounced forms of inequality, both within and between societies; patterns of uneven development, as countries and regions experience contrasting patterns of growth and decay; and the kinds of policies and agendas that shape development policy at the national and global levels.In sum, this pathway offers excellent training for PhD students across the social science disciplines whose work relates, in some way or another, to how groups and communities navigate different structures of power through their systems of governance, and processes of development, in any part of the world. |

**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**

Centre for Applied Dementia Studies, Faculty of Health Studies – *Wellbeing, Health and Communities Pathway*

Faculty of Health Studies – *Wellbeing, Health and Communities Pathway*

School of Pharmacy and Medical Sciences, Faculty of Life Sciences – *Wellbeing, Health and Communities Pathway*

School of Archaeological and Forensic Sciences, Faculty of Life Sciences – *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**

**AQM Assessment Panels – Scoring criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AQM AWARDS SCORING CRITERIA** | **Max Mark** |
| 1 | Student excellence: qualifications, relevant work experience, prizes and awards**5: Outstanding**Candidates will 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 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 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 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 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

They may also demonstrate evidence of:* 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

**2: Good**Candidates will 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

They may also demonstrate evidence of:* 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

**1: Weak**Candidates will 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.  | **5 (weighted x2)** |
| 2 | AQM Project excellence: the quality as an AQM research proposal, beyond standard quantitative methods in the discipline, evidence of cutting edge statistical/mathematical analyses, significance, originality, how will this contribute to knowledge**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 AQM methodology, methods and data sources
* Very clear consideration of any research ethics issues

**4: Excellent**Applications will demonstrate all of the following, but might be slightly less developed in some of these areas than higher ranked applications: * 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 AQM methodology, methods and data sources
* Very clear consideration of any research ethics issues

**3: Very Good**Applications will demonstrate all or most of the following, but might be slightly less developed in some of these areas than higher ranked applications: * 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 AQM methodology, 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 AQM methodology, 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 AQM methodology, 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 AQM methodology, methods and data sources
* Consideration of any research ethics issues
 | **5 (weighted x2)** |
| 3 | Pathway excellence: 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 might 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

**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
 | **5** |
| 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: * 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.
 | **5** |
| 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  | **Yes/No** |

DTP Office, updated 29 July 2020.