

# WHITE ROSE DOCTORAL TRAINING PARTNERSHIP POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS COMPETITION 2018

## ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The deadline for submitting Expressions of Interest (EOIs) to WRDTP is **5pm, Friday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2018**.

EOIs will be reviewed by the White Rose Doctoral Training Partnership (WRDTP) institutions and decisions made and notified to applicants by **16 February 2018**. A shortlist will be established and shortlisted candidates will develop full proposals (with the support of the White Rose institution) to be submitted to WRDTP Office by the ESRC deadline of **23 March 2018**. Full proposals will then be reviewed by two peer reviewers and the full proposals and peer reviews will be assessed by a WRDTP academic panel. The panel will make the final decision on the four fellowships to be confirmed by **mid-May 2018** and decisions will be submitted to ESRC by 27 July 2018. Expected start date is **1 October 2018**.

In assessing applications, reviewers and panel members will follow the full ESRC criteria (to which applicants should refer) the key elements of which are set out below, with further WRDTP explanatory notes in *italics*.

**1. Quality of work programme** : Is the workload clearly defined and specified objectives achievable and realistic within the time allocated? Are the proposed activities clearly justified in terms of supporting longer term career aspirations?

*Reviewers will look for evidence of a publications strategy that targets appropriate field journals or academic presses in the applicant's field of study. Time frames for preparation of materials for submission to journals/academic presses will need to be realistic. Applicants should explain how the publications strategy fits with longer term career aims.*

**2. Value for money** : Are costs clearly and adequately justified?

*With regard to justifying costs, applicants will need to make a clear case for any travel costs, whether for conferences, collaborative activities with non-academic partners, or for engagement and dissemination. Salary costs do not need to be justified.*

**3. Impact and outputs** : Is the planned output during the fellowship appropriate and attainable? Are there adequate plans to share the results and engage with academic and non-academic audiences?

*Applicants are encouraged to identify specific non-academic stakeholders that might be engaged by the programme of work, and to set out how the applicant would go about engaging them. Such engagements may be with already existing relationships with non-academic partners, or with new potential stakeholders.*

**4. Consideration of ethical issues** : Does the proposal show sufficient awareness of any ethical issues that may be raised by the proposed fellowship, and how might these be addressed?

*In outlining the ethical issues relating to the programme of work, applicants should engage explicitly with the research ethics frameworks of the host institution and the ESRC.*

**5. Link to WRDTP Training Pathway**: Applicants will be expected to identify the appropriate [training pathway](#) for their proposed programme of work, and to show how it connects to the pathway's core themes.

### **6. Selection of institution**

*Applicants must select the institution in which they will undertake the fellowship. Applicants should consider fit of the fellowship with the research group and expertise within that institution, and the potential for appropriate mentoring. Links to institution and research groups may inform selection of WRDTP pathway.*