



**Economic and Social Research Council**  
**North West Social Science Doctoral Training Partnership**



## **NWSSDTP Pathway Representatives Handbook**

The North West Social Science Doctoral Training Partnership ([NWSSDTP](#)) is an Economic and Social Research Centre ([ESRC](#)) funded postgraduate training consortium.

The NWSSDTP is one of 14 DTPs in the UK and brings together the Universities of [Keele](#), [Lancaster](#), [Liverpool](#) and [Manchester](#). The University of Liverpool leads on the management and administration of the consortium. Studentships are available across the full range of social science disciplines, and students have access to research expertise and training across the four constituent Universities.

This document is for academic staff appointed as a Pathway Representative or Lead, to outline the key responsibilities of the role. The document may also be useful to other members of academic and administrative staff involved in the NWSSDTP.

The NWSSDTP is governed by the regulations of the ESRC and its Postgraduate Funding Guide, the full version of which can be found at: <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/skills-and-careers/studentships/esrc-students/>

## Handbook Contents

<b>Support Roles and Key Contacts</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Appointment of Pathway Representatives and Leads</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Studentship Competitions</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Introduction.....	4
Eligibility criteria.....	5
Residential Eligibility.....	5
Academic Eligibility.....	5
ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines.....	6
Financial basis of the awards.....	7
Priority Areas and Specialised Training Routes.....	8
Selection Process.....	8
Roles and Responsibilities of Institutional Pathway Panel Members.....	9
Roles and Responsibilities of NWSSDTP Pathway Panel Members.....	9
Conflict of Interest.....	10
Assessment Procedure.....	10
Assessment Criteria for the Standard Studentship Competition.....	11
Assessment Criteria for the CASE Studentship Competition.....	13
Pathway Leads attending the CASE Studentship Allocation Committee.....	14
Pathway Leads attending the Standard Studentship Allocation Committee.....	14
Equality and Diversity.....	15
Studentship Schedules for 2018-19.....	16
<b>Postdoctoral Fellowships</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Pathway Fora</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Pathway Events</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Methods North West</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Module Exchange</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Recognition of New Programmes</b> .....	<b>20</b>

## Supporting Roles and Key Contacts

### **Institutional Administrative Contacts and Academic Leads**

Each institution within the NWSSDTP has its own academic lead, nominated administrative contact and senior Strategy Board member.

#### ***Keele University***

Academic Institutional Lead: Professor Steve Cropper

Administrative Contact: TBC

Strategy Board Member: Professor David Amigoni - Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Enterprise)

#### ***Lancaster University***

Academic Institutional Lead: Dr Julia Gillen

Administrative Contact: James Heard

Strategy Board Member: Professor Steve Decent - Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)

#### ***University of Liverpool***

Administrative Contact: TBC

Academic Institutional Lead: Professor Barry Goldson

Strategy Board Member: Professor Fiona Beveridge - Executive Pro-Vice Chancellor, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences

#### ***University of Manchester***

Administrative Contact: Nichola Ellis

Academic Institutional Lead: Professor Stuart Jones

Strategy Board Representative: Professor Keith Brown - Vice-President & Dean, Faculty of Humanities

### **NWSSDTP Office**

The University of Liverpool leads the management and administration of the consortium, and the central NWSSDTP office is based at Liverpool. The NWSSDTP team are:

NWSSDTP Director: [Professor Gabe Mythen](#)

NWSSDTP Manager: [Hayley Meloy](#)

NWSSDTP Coordinator (Impact and Collaboration): TBC

NWSSDTP Administrator: [Julie McColl](#)

Email address: [nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk](mailto:nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk)

Postal address:

Room G62

1-7 Abercromby Square

University of Liverpool

L69 7WY

## Appointment of Pathway Representatives and Lead

Each pathway at each institution will nominate a named contact, the “Pathway Representative”. The Pathway Representative will be responsible for disseminating information within their local departments, working with students and colleagues on studentship competition applications and supporting further NWSSDTP activity as appropriate. The Pathway Representative will be appointed by the appropriate Head of Department/School for the discipline, in consultation with the outgoing Pathway Representative and the Institutional Academic Lead. It would normally be expected that only one person per pathway at each institution will undertake the role, but it is advisable to pre-arrange cover in the event of an illness or sabbatical leave.

One Pathway Representative from across the institutions will be identified as the “Pathway Lead” for each pathway. Pathway Leads will be responsible for coordinating pathway activity and for representing their pathway at Studentship Allocation Committees any cross-institutional Pathway Fora. Pathway Leads will be selected by the Pathway Representatives themselves, in consultation with the NWSSDTP Manager or Director if necessary. It is expected that the role of Pathway Lead will normally rotate between institutions every two to three years.

Pathway Representatives and Pathway Leads will not be employed through the NWSSDTP, but will remain employees of nominating institution. Any adjustment to pay and conditions and/or additional access to resource are subject to negotiation between the individual and the employing institution. Expenses associated NWSSDTP activity and events should be covered by the employing institution.

## Studentship Competitions

### Introduction

The NWSSDTP allocates between 65-75 postgraduate studentships each year, to prospective candidates at the four NWSSDTP Institutions. These studentships are allocated through two annual competitions: a Supervisor-led CASE Competition in November - December, and a Student-led Standard Competition in March - April.

The **CASE Studentship Competition** considers applications from supervisors who are proposing projects to be co-supervised with a non-HEI Partner. The ESRC expects 30% of the NWSSDTP's Studentships to include a collaborative element with private, public or third sector organisations.

CASE Studentship Application paperwork: <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/collaboration/>

The **Standard Studentship Competition** considers applications from postgraduate candidates who are proposing their own research projects, to be undertake as a +3 studentship (PhD only) or a 1+3 / 2+2 studentship (master's + PhD).

Standard Studentship Application paperwork: <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/how-to-apply/>

Pathway Representatives and Leads are integral to the recruitment and selection process for both competitions.

### **Eligibility criteria**

Students applying to the Standard Studentship Competition, or students recruited to successful CASE Studentship projects, must meet the academic and residential eligibility criteria outlined by the ESRC.

#### ***Residential eligibility:***

The legal basis for defining residential eligibility for postgraduate training awards is set down in the Education (Fees and Awards) Regulations 1991. The guidance below is based on the Regulations and on guidance produced by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES):

Candidates for awards must have a relevant connection with the United Kingdom. A relevant connection may be established if, at the start of the course:

- The student has been ordinarily resident in the UK throughout the 3-year period preceding the date of application for an award, *and*
- Has not been resident in the UK, during any part of that 3-year period wholly or mainly for the purposes of full-time education (EU students – see below) *and*
- Has settled status in the UK within the meaning of the Immigration Act 1971 (i.e. is not subject to any restriction on the period for which he/she may stay).

Candidates who meet all three of the above criteria may apply for a full award.

A relevant connection may be established for an EU student if the student has been resident in the UK throughout the 3-year period preceding the start of the course, even if for purposes of full-time education. EU students in this situation may apply for a full award. EU Students who have not been ordinarily resident in the UK for the last three years may apply for a fees only award.

Non-EU students who have not been ordinarily resident in the UK for the last three years are not eligible to apply.

The above criteria does not apply to applicants to the Economics pathway or those whose project is deemed to employ Advanced Quantitative Methods - such candidates are eligible to apply for a full award whatever their residential status.

For more information on residential eligibility please see: <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/skills-and-careers/studentships/esrc-students/>

#### ***Academic eligibility:***

For 1+3 and 2+2 studentships, candidates must have qualifications of the standard of a good undergraduate honours degree at first or upper second class level. Current undergraduate students can apply during the third year of their degree, prior to completion, and will need to provide interim transcripts to support their application. For +2 and +3 studentship applications, candidates must have qualifications of the standard of a good undergraduate honours degree at first or upper second class level and a suitable master's degree.

In the majority of cases, candidates will have undertaken an undergraduate course at a recognised UK higher education institution. However, some may have qualifications from outside the UK, or be able to offer a combination of qualifications and/or experience. It will be necessary to ascertain whether

these qualifications can be equated to an honours degree, and at what level. The ESRC bases its assessments of qualifications attained outside the UK on the British Council's NARIC guide. For non-UK qualifications transcripts in English as well as details in the original language must be provided with the application form.

Candidates must be planning to study on an eligible programme and within an NWSSDTP recognised pathway. A list of eligible programmes can be found on our website: <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/how-to-apply/pathways/>. The supervisory fit of the prospective supervision team will be taken into consideration when the application is assessed during the competition.

For the Standard Studentship Competition, candidates should have submitted an admissions application to the University of their choice prior to submitting their funding application to the NWSSDTP. For the CASE Studentship Competition, recruited candidates will not receive formal notification of their funding award until their admissions application is successful.

***ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines:***

The ESRC have specific expectations regarding the training a candidate should have received prior to undertaking an ESRC funded +3 (or +2) studentship, as outlined in the [ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines 2015](#).

The purpose of this is to raise the general level of skills and knowledge amongst social scientists by ensuring that they develop, and can apply, basic and advanced quantitative and qualitative research skills that are responsive to the needs of social science subject areas and disciplines, the broader science base and a wide range of users.

The manner in which the learning outcomes are achieved is expected to vary for different subject areas and disciplines and for students with varying levels of prior knowledge and experience. Pathway Representatives are expected to check that sufficient levels of training have been achieved for each +3 or +2 Studentship application which is to be put forward to the Studentship Allocation Committee. As a guide, it is expected that roughly 70% of the below expectations are met prior to a +3 studentship commencing, with the understanding that the remaining 30% can be achieved through additional training during the first year of the PhD. A +2 applicant would be expected to meet all of the below expectations.

Excellent applicants who do not have sufficient research training in line with expectations outlined below can be encouraged to retroactively apply for a 1+3 studentship instead. If successful, they would then have an additional funded year to complete an approved research training master's course prior to commencing their PhD, ensuring they can fulfil all the below expectations.

*1. Principles of research design*

Students must be able to understand the connection between research questions or hypotheses and the tools required to address them, and gain practical experience of applying some of those tools.

*2. Data collection, analysis and management*

Students must have a good understanding of both the practice and philosophies of social science research which enables them to understand the advantages and disadvantages of core research methods and apply appropriate methods to different types of research questions. Students should be

made aware of the basic approaches to both qualitative and quantitative data analysis, including different ontological and epistemological perspectives.

### 3. *Core subject-specific training*

Core subject-specific training refers to compulsory training within a subject area. It remains a fundamental element of training for social science researchers.

### 4. *General research skills*

These include:

- Bibliographic and computing skills
- Teaching and other work experience
- Language skills
- Ethical and legal issues

### 5. *Transferable skills*

These include:

- Communication and networking skills
- Leadership, research management and relationship management
- Personal and career development

## **Financial basis of the awards**

An NWSSDTP Studentship consists of:

- Payment of academic fees, at the standard RCUK rate
- Maintenance Stipend (£14,777 in 2018, exact rate for 2019 subject to confirmation from UKRI)
- Access to a Research Training Support Grant (RTSG) for reimbursement of research related expenses including - but not limited to - conference attendance, training courses and UK fieldwork.
- Opportunity to apply for additional funding towards:
  - Overseas Fieldwork (only if the need for overseas fieldwork has been detailed at the application stage) and Difficult Language Training,
  - Overseas Institutional Visits
  - Internships

Students opting to study part time will receive a pro rata maintenance grant of the equivalent of a full time award.

CASE Students may receive additional funding from the non-HEI Partner.

Fees Only Awards for eligible EU students constitute the payment of tuition fees and eligibility to apply for RTSG, Fieldwork, OIV and Internship funding.

Students will receive additional Disabled Student Allowance where appropriate.

## **Priority Areas and Specialised Training Routes**

The ESRC have awarded the NWSSDTP 12 steered awards each year in the following Priority Areas:

- Advanced Quantitative Methods (4 awards)
- Use of ESRC data sets (4 awards)
- Interdisciplinary research, which straddles other research council remits (4 awards)

It is important that the NWSSDTP takes up the full complement of awards made in Priority Areas each year. To encourage full take up of these awards, the NWSSDTP is able to offer enhanced stipends of £3000 per annum to students whose projects align with the following Specialised Training Routes identified by the ESRC as strengths within the consortium, which fit within the Priority Areas above:

- AQM
- Longitudinal Data Analysis (for Use of ESRC Data sets)
- Data Science (for Interdisciplinary research, which straddles other research council remits)

Applicants are encouraged to identify if their proposed project fits into a Priority Area, even if it does not fall in one of the Specialised Training Routes. If the candidate is successful an enhanced stipend will not be payable, but the application will be considered positively in terms of fit with a priority area.

## **Selection Process**

Pathway Representatives and Leads are responsible for assessing all eligible applications submitted to either the CASE or Standard Studentship competitions.

Applications will initially be assessed by an ***Institutional Pathway Panel***. This stage can be omitted in the CASE Competition for any pathways which receive a small number of applications, as long as all Pathway Representatives agree to this. The Institutional Pathway Panel should be convened by the Pathway Representative, and should consist of at least three senior academics from within the relevant subject pathway within the institution. Each application should be judged on its own merits based on the information provided in the application form and supporting documents. The panel should agree a score for each application and then rank the applications.

The Institutional Pathway Panel should then present their top applicants to an ***NWSSDTP Pathway Panel***. This should be convened by the Pathway Lead and should consist of all the Pathway Representatives for that pathway. It is expected that the pathway panel will be constituted by a face-to-face meeting. In exceptional circumstances remote electronic meetings are acceptable provided that all pathway representatives are in prior agreement with this course of action. This panel will review the applications, agree which applications will go through the final stage, and agree a ranking for those applications. The internal scores awarded at the Institutional Pathway Panel and the academic merit of shortlisted applications should be discussed. The panel should avoid 'joint' ranks, even when two or more candidates have the same score, as these are very likely to be queried - and the Pathway Lead asked to differentiate - at the final stage.

Finally, the applications which pass the previous two stages will be presented to the ***NWSSDTP Studentship Allocation Committee*** by the Pathway Lead. The Studentship Allocation Committee will then decide on studentship allocation across the NWSSDTP.

## **Roles and Responsibilities of Institutional Pathway Panel Members**

Institutional Pathway Panels should be organised by the Pathway Representative in each institution. These panels will usually consist of a Panel Chair (the Pathway Representative) and at least two further Panel Members (senior academic colleagues from within the relevant pathway). This stage may be omitted during the CASE Competition, if all Pathway Representatives agree, when only a small number of applications are received (i.e. where there are so few applications for the pathway, it is feasible for the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel to review them all without prior filtering being necessary).

### ***Panel Chair (usually the Pathway Representative in the institution)***

The role of the Pathway Panel Chair is to preside over the institutional pathway panel, ensuring that it completes the assessment according to the ESRC NWSSDTP awards assessment criteria (see page 9 below), whilst ensuring that the universities are compliant with ESRC rules and regulations. The chair must try to ensure that the overall, strategic aims of the pathway, schools and universities are considered when making the final judgement on selection. In addition to this role, Panel Chairs also function as panel assessors (see below).

### ***Panel Members (academic colleagues from within the pathway)***

The role of a panel member is to use their professional judgement to assess the quality of an applicant's submission according to the ESRC NWSSDTP assessment criteria (see page 9 below). They should reach a collective decision, and award a single score for each submission received by their pathway panel.

## **Roles and Responsibilities of NWSSDTP Pathway Panel Members**

NWSSDTP Pathway Panels should be organised by the Pathway Lead. These panels should consist of one representative from each institution, usually the Pathway Representatives.

### ***Panel Chair (usually the Pathway Lead)***

The role of the Pathway Lead is to act as chair, presiding over the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel and ensuring that it comes to a unanimous decision regarding the candidates that are to be put forward, and the order in which they are ranked. The Pathway Lead will also be responsible for:

- ensuring a cover sheet is completed for each candidate who is to be put forward to the final committee,
- forwarding all documents for final candidates to the NWSSDTP central office,
- presenting the chosen applications at the NWSSDTP Studentship Allocation Committee and answering any questions the committee has about the individual candidates.

In addition to this role, the Chair will also function as a Panel Member (see below).

### ***Panel Members (usually the Pathway Representatives from each institution)***

The role of the Pathway Representative is to present the applications brought forward from their own Institutional Pathway Panel, assess these objectively in conjunction with the applications brought forward from the other institutions, and co-operate with other panel members to produce a list of ranked applications, to be taken forward to the NWSSDTP Studentship Allocation Committee.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

Where a Pathway Representative or Lead is the primary applicant on a CASE Studentship Application within their pathway, they should excuse themselves from the selection process entirely and arrange for a colleague to cover the role. Pathway Representatives and Leads do not need to excuse themselves when they are the primary supervisor on a Standard Studentship Application.

If a Pathway Representative or Lead has another potential conflict of interest (e.g. a personal or familial relationship with an applicant) they should declare this to their fellow Pathway Representatives at the outset of the allocation process, to agree how best to proceed. Advice can be sought from NWSSDTP Institutional Academic Leads, the NWSSDTP Director or the NWSSDTP Manager if needed.

## **Assessment Procedure**

The panels will assess the application paperwork, adhering to the below criteria. Panel Members and Chairs will be asked to complete a coversheet for each application received by their pathway panel. For the Standard Competition, this will require scoring each candidate from 1-10 (10 being the highest) on both the applicant's track record and proposal. For the CASE Competition, this will only require a ranking to be agreed.

The Institutional Pathway Panel should decide which candidates will be taken forward to the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel. It is the responsibility of the Pathway Representatives to ensure that all documentation regarding the candidates going forward (coversheets, applications etc.) is circulated to other panel members prior to the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel. If an Institutional Pathway Panel doesn't take place during the CASE Competition, it is still the responsibility of the Pathway Representative to ensure that all documentation regarding the candidates going forward is circulated to other panel members prior to the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel.

**Please note that the deadlines for both the Standard and Open Competitions should be strictly adhered to by Pathway Representatives and Leads, and any applications that come in after the deadlines regretfully cannot be accepted. Similarly, no changes should be made to applications after the deadline by Pathway Representatives/Leads or applicants.**

On the basis of the Institutional Pathway Panel guidance, the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel should decide upon their potential allocation of ESRC awards, as well as agreeing a reserve list. It is the responsibility of the Panel Chair to take note of the meeting, ensure that the final ranked list is collectively agreed by the panel and subsequently report the outcome to the NWSSDTP Manager ([nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk](mailto:nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk)) by the relevant deadline. A new cover sheet should be completed for the applications going forward, which records the NWSSDTP Pathway Panel scores, ranks and reflections.

Professional Services colleagues will check independently that all successful applications meet ESRC and universities' residential and academic criteria before compiling rankings and applications to forward to the overall NWSSDTP Studentship Allocation Committee.

The members of the NWSSDTP Studentship Allocation Committee (NWSSDTP Director plus the four Institutional Academic Leads) will review all the forwarded applications prior to the Allocation Committee. Pathway Leads will attend the Allocation Committee to present the applications and

answer any questions from the committee. The committee will then reach a decision regarding the allocation of funding on the basis of the application paperwork, supporting documents and the additional information provided by the Pathway Leads.

### **Assessment Criteria for the Standard Studentship Competition**

Pathways will score each candidate a mark on a scale of 1-10 (10 being the highest, 1 the lowest) on each of two criteria:

- a. The candidate's track record (evidence of quality of the applicant), based on (i) career information provided in the application, including information on marks achieved so far as reported in the references and/or transcripts; (ii) the quality of the references themselves. The score will also reflect the applicant's description of how his/her previous experience (academic and professional) has prepared him/her for postgraduate study, and the applicant's description of how the programme of study will contribute to his/her long-term career plans.
- b. The quality of the research proposal, judged in terms of (i) cogency of exposition - i.e. does the proposal make sense and seem feasible; (ii) originality. This should be judged relative to the stage of the applicant. Subject panel members should be aware that +3 applicants may have more detailed and cohesive proposals than 1+3 applicants. Likewise, +2 applicants may have a more developed proposal than +3, as a result of commencing the programme.

In deciding on borderline candidates, panels may wish to make a judgement on pathway 'fit' – i.e. is this the sort of work that belongs in this particular pathway, in terms of library/archival resources, supervisory expertise, etc.

Detailed criteria are given below, to ensure that panels use approximately the same spread of marks. These criteria should be used flexibly: for example, if a PhD candidate has performed well at MA level but much less well at UG, but the latter is explained by referees as the result of unusual circumstances, more weight should be given to the former, and indeed the latter might be set aside altogether.

#### ***Detailed criteria: +3/+2 Applications***

##### **Track-record**

- 7-10 Scores in this range will require EITHER a first class degree OR an already achieved distinction at mater's level (or overseas equivalents) OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. A mark of 7 would correspond to a marginal first/distinction (i.e. a combination of high 60s and very low 70s); a mark of 8 would correspond to a secure first/distinction, predominantly in the range 70-5; a mark of 9 would correspond to a high first/distinction, with marks in the range 75-80; and a mark of 10 to an exceptional distinction, predominantly at 80+. Where these academic grades are not met, a candidate would have strong relevant professional experience in order to achieve a rank score of 7-10.
- 3-6 Scores in this range will require a 2.1 OR an already achieved Merit at master's level OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. A mark of 6 should correspond to a very high 2.1/Merit, just short of a first/distinction - this should typically include some marks of 70+; a mark of 5 should correspond to a good 2.1/Merit, with marks in the mid-60s but rarely if at all reaching 70; a 4 should correspond to a middling 2.1/Merit, and a 3 to a low 2.1/Merit.

- 1-2 A Pass at master's level - i.e. marks typically in the high 50s (2) or low 50s (1) OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. We would be very unlikely to support candidates with 2.2s, unless the first degree result was an aberration explained by the referees, or if they have high graded master's to enhance this.

#### Quality of the Research Proposal

The assessors will look for evidence of an ability to articulate a research project, a coherent and well thought-out plan for doctoral study, and a good awareness of the place of their research within the current field whilst bearing in mind the current stage of the applicant in their research program:

- 7-10 Coherent proposal scoring well in terms of both cogency and originality. The proposal evaluates and succeeds in the following areas: quality and feasibility of the research question, engagement with the field, methodology and critical appreciation of sources. A mark of 10 should be reserved for an exceptionally eye-catching and original proposal, but marks of 7-9 will indicate strongly supportable projects.
- 3-6 A promising proposal with some limited weaknesses that need to be addressed. Projects in this range are potentially supportable.
- 1-2 Problematic proposal – would need further work before it could be firmly supported.

#### ***Detailed criteria: 1+3/2+2 applicants***

##### Track-record

- 7-10 Scores in this range will require an already achieved first or clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. Typically a score of 10 will indicate a student regularly achieving marks of 80+; a score of 9 will correspond to marks in the range 75-80; a score of 8 to a secure first with marks predominantly in the low 70s; and a score of 7 to a marginal first, with marks in the high 60s and low 70s. Where these academic grades are not met, a candidate would have very strong compensatory relevant professional experience in order to achieve a rank score of 7-10.
- 3-6 Scores in this range will require an already achieved 2.1 OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. A score of 6 should typically include some marks touching 70+; a mark of 5 should correspond to a good 2.1, with marks in the mid-60s but rarely if at all reaching 70; a 4 should correspond to a middling 2.1; and a 3 to a low 2.1. Where these academic grades are not met, a candidate would be expected to have strong compensatory relevant professional experience.
- 1-2 A candidate who seems unlikely to achieve a 2.1. We would be very unlikely to support candidates who have already been awarded 2.2s, unless the first degree result was an aberration explained by the referees, or if they have high graded master's to enhance this and/or strong compensatory relevant professional experience to enhance this.

#### Quality of the Research Proposal

The assessors will look for evidence of an ability to articulate a research project, a coherent and well thought-out plan for future doctoral study, and a good awareness of the place of their research within the current field whilst bearing in mind the current stage of the applicant in their research program. The assessors should also consider the applicant's choice of master's and their comments on how this will prepare them for their proposed doctoral project:

- 7-10 Coherent proposal scoring well in terms of both cogency and originality. The proposal evaluates and succeeds in the following areas: quality and feasibility of the research question, engagement with the field, methodology and critical appreciation of sources. A mark of 10 should be reserved for an exceptionally eye-catching and original proposal, but marks of 7-9 will indicate strongly supportable projects. The candidate shows strong awareness of the training they will require to undertake the project, and how the chosen master's will provide this.
- 3-6 A promising proposal with some limited weaknesses that need to be addressed. Projects in this range are potentially supportable. The candidate shows some awareness of the training they will require to undertake the project, and how the chosen master's will provide this.
- 1-2 Problematic proposal – would need further work before it could be firmly supported.

### **Assessment Criteria for the CASE Studentship Competition**

Pathways are not required to 'score' CASE Studentship Applications, and as such there is no detailed scoring criteria. However, the applications do need to be assessed and ranked.

There is often no candidate associated with a CASE Studentship Application, so it is not possible to take account of track record. It is possible to take account of quality of the relationship with, and contribution from, the non-HEI Project Partner. Pathways should take account of the *demonstrable* quality of the relationship with, and contribution from, the non-HEI Partner including (but not necessarily limited to):

- evidence of reciprocal benefits for the Department/University - student - supervisor - non-HEI partner;
- a strong track-record of previous collaboration between the Academic Lead and the non-HEI Partner;
- evidence of existing relations and/or collaboration between the Academic Lead and the non-HEI Partner;
- the nature and quality of the contribution being offered by the non-HEI Partner (to the proposed research, supervision, training);
- evidence of the non-HEI Partner's involvement in and contribution to the conception, design and planning of the proposed research.

The Letter of Support from the non-HEI Partner should contain evidence of the above but Pathways should also look for corroborating evidence across the entire proposal.

The quality of the research proposal should be assessed along similar lines as the discussed above, for the Standard Studentship Competition.

### **Pathway Leads attending the CASE Studentship Allocation Committee**

Each Pathway Lead will be asked to speak about the applications put forward by their pathway. They will have ten minutes at most. The members of the CASE Studentship Allocation Committee will have read the cover sheets provided and the applications in full. As such, there is no need to reiterate the details of the research proposal itself. However, it will help the committee to know (as relevant):

- How the pathway approached the review of the applications, and how they arrived at the ranking;
- Were there any clear distinctions between the rankings i.e. is there a significant gap in quality between the second and third ranked applications, or was the quality of the applications largely consistent;
- Comments on supervisory/departmental arrangements and fit of the individual applications;
- Timeliness / relevance of the project within the specific field;
- Fit with [ESRC Priorities](#);
- Strength of the partnership with the non-HEI organisation
  - Does this tie in to any wider university strategies or projects?;
  - Is this an existing partnership, or the development of a new initiative?;
- Is the financial contribution appropriate, for the type of partner organisation and the project?
  - A third sector partner would not necessarily be expected to provide funding, but is the in-kind contribution sufficient?;
  - If a large private sector company isn't providing any cash contributions, is there a good reason?
- If a student has already been identified, why are they the right student for the project and how involved have they been in the development of the project?

This is not an exhaustive list, but provides an indication of the kind of information that will be helpful to the CASE Studentship Allocation Committee.

### **Pathway Leads attending the Standard Studentship Allocation Committee**

Each Pathway Lead will be asked to speak about the applications put forward by their pathway. They will have ten minutes at most. The members of the Standard Studentship Allocation Committee will have read the cover sheets provided and the applications in full. As such, there is no need to reiterate the details of the research proposal itself. However, it will help the committee to know (as relevant):

- How the pathway approached the review of the applications, and how they arrived at the ranking;
- Were there any clear distinctions between the rankings i.e. is there a significant gap in quality between the second and third ranked applications, or was the quality of the applications largely consistent;
- Comments on supervisory/departmental arrangements and fit of the individual applications;
- Timeliness / relevance of the project within the specific field;
- Fit with [ESRC Priorities](#);
- Any mitigating circumstances/relevant background information for candidates whose academic track record does not appear 'excellent' on paper.

This is not an exhaustive list, but provides an indication of the kind of information that will be helpful to the Standard Studentship Allocation Committee.

## **Equality and Diversity**

Both the ESRC and the North West Social Science Doctoral Training Partnership are committed to a policy of equal opportunities for all applicants for funding.

The NWSSDTP carries out equalities monitoring so that we can survey equality and diversity of applicants and our funded students, and encourage widening participation. Every applicant is required to complete an Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form to this end. These EO forms should not be forwarded to Pathway Representatives, but should be compiled by School PGR Administrators and forwarded to the NWSSDTP Office.

It is expected that Pathway Representatives and Leads will actively consider matters of Equality and Diversity while undertaking the ranking and selection processes. In practice, this should include (but is not limited to) taking account of mitigating circumstances noted in application paperwork, and giving due weighting in track record scores to candidates who have relevant experience alongside less-than-excellent academic grades. Pathway Representatives and Leads are also expected to contribute to the wider discussion of E&D matters across the NWSSDTP.

The potential rewards of diversity are highlighted in the Research Councils' [Statement of Expectations for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion \(UKRI website\)](#) which sets out the commitment required from institutions to ensure that the best potential researchers from a diverse population are attracted into research careers.

## CASE Studentship Schedule for 2018-19

9th Nov  
2018

- Deadline for applicants to submit completed CASE Studentship Applications to **Institutional Pathway Representatives** for consideration

- Pathways must undertake a review and (where relevant) selection process which involves **all** institutional pathway representatives. The nature of this review is at the discretion of the pathway, although a similar process to the standard studentship competition (institutional pathway panels followed by an overall NWSSDTP pathway panel) is recommended

26th Nov  
2018

- Deadline for Overall Pathway Leads to forward their pathway's CASE Studentship Applications to **nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk**

- **Institutional Pathway Representatives** (or supporting School administrators) should notify applicants who are not put forward to the NWSSDTP CASE Studentship Allocation Committee

12th Dec  
2018

- NWSSDTP CASE Studentship Allocation Committee in Lancaster (**Overall Pathway Leads** to attend)

by 17th  
Dec 2018

- Communication of results of CASE Allocation Committee to Institutional Pathway Representatives and individual applicants

- Successful applicants - whose projects do not already have a nominated student - to undertake recruitment, with support from the **Institutional Pathway Representatives**. Advertising should be supported by local School and Faculty offices.

- The **Overall Pathway Lead** should formally sign their approval of the choice of candidate on the CASE Student Nomination Form prior to submission. This form should be completed in all cases, including when a student was nominated on the original CASE Application Form.

8th March  
2019

- Deadline to notify NWSSDTP of chosen candidates by submitting the CASE Student Nomination Form to **nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk**

by 29th  
Sept 2019

- Formal agreements between project partners, recruited students and the University to be produced in liaison with relevant University's Research Support Office, prior to the candidate commencing their programme, and sent to **nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk**

## Standard Studentship Schedule for 2018-19

4th Feb 2019  
5pm

- Deadline for applicants (both +3 and 1+3) to submit applications to **School Administrators**

- Once student eligibility and University application status have been checked, School Administrators to forward all applications to **Institutional Pathway Representatives**

- Institutional Pathway Panel (suggested w/c 18th February)

- Overall NWDTTC Pathway Panel (suggested w/c 25th February)

1st March  
2019

- Deadline for **Overall Pathway Leads** to forward final candidates' full applications, cover sheets and rankings to **nwssdtp@liv.ac.uk**
- **Institutional Pathway Representatives** (or their supporting School Administrators) should notify those applicants who are not being put forward to the Allocation Committee.

w/c 4th  
March 2019

- Specialised Training Routes Panel to consider STR Applications

13th March  
2019

- NWSSDTP Standard Studentship Allocation Committee in Manchester

by 22rd  
March 2019

- Successful, Reserve and Unsuccessful candidates informed of outcome

12th April  
2019

- Deadline for successful candidates to confirm acceptance of award. NWDTTC reserves the right to re-allocate awards after this date, if acceptance is not confirmed.

## Postdoctoral Fellowships

The NWSSDTP has been awarded funding by the ESRC to support seven Postdoctoral Fellowships per annum, which must take place at one of the four NWSSDTP Institutions.

The Postdoctoral Fellowship (PDF) Scheme is aimed at providing a career development opportunity for those in the immediately postdoctoral stage of their career, to provide the opportunity to consolidate their PhD through developing publications, their networks, and their research and professional skills.

The call is open to applicants who have completed their PhD at a research organisation that is part of a DTP or CDT (not necessarily the NWSSDTP) and who are within 12 months of completing their PhD. At the submission deadline, the applicant must either have been awarded a PhD or have submitted their thesis and passed their viva voce with minor corrections, with the expectation that the PhD will be awarded by the fellowship start date.

PDF Guidance, FAQs and Application Forms can be found here: <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/pdf-scheme/>

The call for October 2019 entry is now live, with a deadline of the **16:00 on the 22nd March 2019**. Pathway Representatives and Leads will be asked to assist with reviewing and ranking (if necessary) the applications received to their pathway after this date, and completing a cover sheet for each application. Pathway Leads will not be required to attend the PDF Allocation Committee. Further information on reviewing and ranking will be provided in early 2019.

## Pathway Fora

There will be meetings of all Pathway Representatives at each institution at least twice a year - once in the Autumn, and once again in the Spring. This will be organised by Institutional Academic Leads and Nominated Administrative Contacts. Updates from the central NWSSDTP team will be presented, as well as there being an opportunity for discussion of local institutional matters. Pathway Representatives should attend both of these fora, or arrange for a suitable colleague to attend to represent the pathway.

## Pathway Events

Pathway Representatives and Leads can apply for funding from the NWSSDTP for the organisation of pathway events and training. The NWSSDTP encourages each pathway to hold at least one event a year for its students, either solo or jointly with another pathway.

A solo pathway can apply for up to £500 towards an event. The NWSSDTP encourages cross-pathway events, so an event which incorporates two pathways (in the organisation and in attendance at the event) can apply for up to £750, and three or more can claim for £1000.

The NWSSDTP also encourages the involvement of non-HEI Partners in training and events, so any event which incorporates a non-HEI Partner in the delivery can apply for an additional £250 on top of the standard maximum claim amount.

Pathway events (solo or joint) should incorporate students from across the consortium. Pathway events can be opened to students who are not funded by the NWSSDTP, as long as NWSSDTP-funded students are also in attendance.

For application paperwork and full details, please see <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/guidance-for-staff/>

## Methods North West

Methods North West highlights the depth and breadth of methodological expertise in the social sciences within the Universities of Manchester, Liverpool, Lancaster and Keele. It promotes and facilitates methodological excellence, innovation and interdisciplinarity – within and beyond the social sciences. Methods North West run events aimed primarily at doctoral students throughout the year.

All NWSSDTP-funded students are expected to be involved in one of the four Methods North West Methods Exchange ('MethodsX') themes:

- Archives, Collections and Documents of Life
- Fieldwork
- New Forms of Data/Digital Methods
- Quantitative Methods

Involvement in the themes consists of attendance at three events a year – two theme meetings and one conference, which brings together everyone involved in all four themes.

Further information can be found here: <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/current-students/methodsx-programme/>

## Module Exchange

The NWSSDTP supports a Module Exchange scheme, which allows postgraduates from across the four DTP Institutions to access modules at the other institutions. These can be accredited or just auditing. This is open to all PGTs and PGRs within the DTP Institutions, not only NWSSDTP-funded students. The process for module exchange was introduced to facilitate the exchange of training and expertise between institutions.

A list of eligible modules can be found on the NWSSDTP website, under individual pathway pages.

There is a limit on how many modules master's student may take at partner universities. Master's students must take a minimum of 50% of the taught element at their Home Institution plus their

dissertation, unless other arrangements apply (e.g. on a 2+2 programme). All compulsory modules must be taken at the Home Institution.

Where there are limited spaces on a given course, the Partner Institution will reserve the right to offer places to its own students above those requesting a module exchange.

For further information on the module exchange process, please see: <https://nwssdtp.ac.uk/current-students/module-exchange/>

## Recognition of New Programmes

The NWSSDTP acknowledges that master's and PhD Programme provision in the four institutions will naturally evolve over the course of the DTP, and that this needs to be recognised and captured.

When changes to master's or doctoral provision occur in any of the pathways, a report should be produced by the relevant institutional Pathway Representative and submitted to NWSSDTP for review, if they wish the course to be considered as eligible for funding from the NWSSDTP. All programmes must align with the ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines, which can be found here: <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/skills-and-careers/studentships/postgraduate-training-and-development-guidelines-2015/>

Please send all documentation to the NWSSDTP Manager Hayley Meloy at [hmeloy@liv.ac.uk](mailto:hmeloy@liv.ac.uk). Please note that it may take up to four weeks to review, confirm the programmes and update our website.

It is expected that any reports will be circulated amongst all pathway representatives within the relevant pathway for comment before submission to the NWSSDTP.

### **Master's Programmes**

A recognition request should be submitted in any of the following cases:

1. Masters programmes that were previously approved which have undergone **substantial** changes (i.e. for which the compulsory modules or research training modules have been changed).

The details provided will be used to assess whether the programme is still eligible as the '1' of a 1+3 studentship and as sufficient research training for a student applying to a +3 studentship.

Please detail all changes that have been made to previously approved programmes – detail each module that has been changed, explain the change and why this has enhanced the programme, with reference to the ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines. Any changes to additional research training in the programme and/or the dissertation component should also be detailed.

2. New Masters programmes which have been developed since the NWSSDTP bid was submitted, which should be considered as sufficient research training for the 1 of a 1+3 ESRC funded Studentship.

The details provided will then be used to assess whether the programme is eligible as the '1' of a 1+3 studentship and as sufficient research training for a student applying to a +3 studentship.

Please give all details of each programme: the name, course structure, compulsory and optional modules and credits. Particular attention should be paid to the research training modules of the programme. Please send the programme specification, and confirm that it has been through any relevant institutional programme approval processes prior to submission of this report. Explain why this course should be deemed eligible for ESRC funding, with explicit reference to the ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines.

3. Master's programmes that have been previously approved which have now been discontinued/are no longer deemed eligible due to programme changes.

A list of discontinued programmes will suffice.

If a pathway has several changes to report on, these can all be included in the same report, but should be under clear separate headings.

### **PhD Programmes**

Pathways should also report on new PhD programmes which have been developed since the NWSSDTP bid was submitted, which should be considered as eligible for ESRC funding. The details provided will then be used to assess whether the programme is eligible as a +3 studentship, or the +3 element of a 1+3 studentship.

Please give full details of each programme: the name, structure and training requirements. Please send the programme specification, and confirm that it has been through any relevant institutional programme approval processes prior to submission of this report. Explain why this course should be deemed eligible, with explicit reference to the ESRC Postgraduate Training and Development Guidelines, and detail why the programme first within the ESRC remit.