

Guidance for SGSSS-DTP 2019/20 Collaborative Award Competition

I. Introduction

The ESRC's expectation of all DTPs is that 30% of their studentships are collaborative. 'Collaborative' is defined broadly and covers collaboration with private sector companies, public sector bodies or third sector organisations. Up to 14 awards have been allocated to the collaborative studentship competition for 2019. Project proposals can come from any pathway and there is no limit on the number of proposals that a pathway may submit. There are no implications to pathway success in the Open Competition. Collaborative awards are thus *additional* studentships.

2. Requirements for Collaborative Awards

There is an expectation that collaborative studentships normally include an element of monetary co-funding. The target amount is 10% of the studentship package, which is £2,054 per annum for a standard studentship. In addition, The ESRC now requires co-funded studentships to include proportional costs of £400 for cohort-development building in the first year only.

Please note: *If the collaborative partner is the Scottish Government or a Scottish Public Body then we expect co-funding to be at the rate of one-third of the full studentship (c.£6,848 p.a.). In addition, The ESRC now requires co-funded studentships to include proportional costs of £1,320 for cohort-development building in the first year only. For more information on what constitutes a public body and to find a list of public bodies as provided by Scottish Government in 2016 please use the following links: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/public-bodies/about>
<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/public-bodies/about/Bodies>*

Full award	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Stipend	£15,015	£15,284	£15,559	£15,829
Fees	£4,328	£4,406	£4,485	£4,563
RTSG	£750	£750	£750	£750
OFW	£450	£450	£450	£450
Totals	£20,543	£20,890	£21,244	£21,592

SGSSS-DTP funding is limited to the standard ESRC studentship package: fees, maintenance, RTSG, overseas travel allowance. Additional funding requirements including further travel, subsistence, and accommodation in connection with visits to the collaborating partner, will *not* be funded by the SGSSS-DTP. A collaborative studentship should be advertised as a 1+3 or a +3 award.

The applicants should clearly identify how they plan to advertise and recruit a student to carry out the studentship. The expectation is that this would happen very soon after the award is confirmed by the SGSSS-DTP.

A good practice guidance document has been produced by the ESRC¹ to inform these kinds of competitions; applicants should familiarize themselves with these.

¹ <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/collaboration/good-practice-guide-for-setting-up-collaborative-studentship-opportunities/>

3. Application Procedure and timeline

Applications for collaborative awards can be submitted by prospective lead supervisors based within recognised SGSSS-DTP pathways. Supervisors must have undergone supervisor training within the last 5 years within their current institution. Liaison with the relevant Pathway Representative at your HEI is strongly encouraged.

Joint supervision is expressly encouraged by SGSSS-DTP and second /additional supervisors may be social scientists employed at any of the 16 institutions in Scotland. In these cases, funding is provided by the SGSSS-DTP to the lead institution and then secondary funding arrangements / reimbursement will be required to be taken by the lead institution if there is a joint supervision arrangement with another institution (current examples generally deploy a 70/30 split of fees).

The application form is available on GradHub for completion.

Deadline for applications – Thursday 1 November 2018

Decisions communicated to applicants – End of November 2018

4. Regulations on appointing students

Should your application be successful, we ask you to bear in mind the following:

SGSSS must approve all student appointments before they are confirmed.

ESRC continually monitors SGSSS processes and it is critical that students going directly onto doctoral programmes meet the required ESRC core training criteria.

Some awards have been hard to fill. Please ensure you give attention to advertising as widely as possible to ensure the best choice of well-qualified candidates. This may need to involve paying for advertising so please consider in advance the willingness of your HEI or funding partner to pay for this.

The Lead supervisor's HEI is responsible for ensuring that residency criteria are met in order for a student to receive the full studentship including stipend.²

² These criteria are available here: <https://esrc.ukri.org/files/skills-and-careers/studentships/postgraduate-funding-guide/>

5. Guidance on criteria for evaluating collaborative studentship applications

The same broad criteria for identifying good quality applications that are used in the Open competitions will be used in the Collaborative Competition, but modified in the light of the fact that these are applications for studentships in which a particular student is not identified (see Appendix 1). In addition to this, 5 points are allocated to an assessment of the quality of the collaborative element of the proposal (including the suitability of the proposed non-academic partner, the adequacy of the collaborating partner arrangements and agreement, and the adequacy of the arrangements for intellectual property rights).

SGSSS -DTP Supervisor-led Collaborative Competition Award Marking Framework (2019)

	Research Proposal (OUT OF 10) (Please note that the descriptors can be used with discretion where there is a good case to do so)	Supervision & Training (Please score out of 5 - this will then be double weighted)	Collaboration (OUT OF 5)
Marking Criteria	<p>Candidate can demonstrate:</p> <p>An excellent proposal scoring well in terms of both cogency and originality. All components – overview, context, methodology, and impact – will be well thought out and clearly expressed.</p> <p>Plus</p>		
10	<p>Proposal is exceptionally good in all of its components</p> <p>and</p> <p>fulfils criteria 7-9 below</p>		
9	<p>Proposal is highly original and innovative, at the cutting edge of developments substantively and methodologically,</p> <p>and</p> <p>fulfils criteria 7 and 8 below</p>		
8	<p>Proposal contains clear awareness of the potential impact of the research</p> <p>and</p> <p>fulfils criterion 7 below</p>		
7	<p>A well-defined proposal with researchable questions, appropriately identified sources, an awareness of the theoretical and empirical background to the research and an appropriate methodology. The proposal should display an awareness of the research for economic and societal relevance.</p>		

	<p>Candidate can demonstrate:</p> <p>A good and promising proposal but with identifiable weaknesses. Some, but not all, components of the proposal will be problematic, ill-expressed, or show a lack of knowledge.</p> <p>Plus</p>		
6	<p>A good proposal with only minor but still identifiable weaknesses. The research question will be clear, the methodology appropriate and clearly presented, and most of the appropriate literature identified.</p>		
5	<p>A promising proposal that suffers from several weaknesses. The methodology is appropriate but ill-expressed. The proposal is only weakly grounded in relevant literature.</p>	<p>Supervision arrangements represent a near-perfect fit with the proposed research in relation to methods, substantive topic area and academic/policy networks. The supervisory team includes an experienced supervisor with recognised expertise in the field. The supervision combination meets directly the student's training needs. The destination HEI offers high-quality specialist training. The research fits well with the wider department/school/faculty. The supervisory team demonstrates an excellent degree of preparedness for supervising PhD study</p>	<p>The proposed collaboration represents an ideal fit with the proposal, demonstrates significant and well resourced engagement of the collaborating partner planned throughout the PhD, and provides detailed consideration of ethics and intellectual property rights.</p>
4	<p>A proposal with one serious weakness or several minor ones, which suggests gaps in knowledge and a weak grasp of the proposed methodology and its suitability.</p>	<p>Supervision arrangements represent a very good fit with the proposed research in relation to methods, substantive topic area and academic/policy networks. The lead supervisor is an experienced supervisor with a strong reputation for research in this field, and the combination of supervisors offers the student good training in the field. There is provision of advanced and specialist training and a broadly supportive research environment at the destination HEI. The supervisory team demonstrates a very good degree of preparedness for supervising PhD study</p>	<p>The proposed collaboration represents a very good fit with the proposal, demonstrates very good and well resourced engagement of the collaborating partner planned throughout the PhD and provides detailed consideration of ethics and intellectual property rights.</p>

3	A proposal with significant weaknesses in multiple components, little appreciation of possible methodologies, and/or awareness of relevant literature.	Supervision arrangements represent a good fit with the proposed research in relation to methods, substantive topic area and academic/policy networks. The lead supervisor will be an expert in the field and the combination of supervisors will offer good support to the student. The HEI offers good general support and advanced training for the student. The supervisory team demonstrates a good degree of preparedness for supervising PhD study	The proposed collaboration represents a good fit with the proposal, demonstrates good, demonstrates adequately resourced engagement of the collaborating partner planned and resourced and with detailed consideration of ethics and intellectual property rights.
2	A problematic proposal that would need considerable additional work before being fundable. All components of the proposal will require further work and/or demonstrate little or no background or interest in their subject.	Supervision arrangements are appropriate and the supervisor has experience in the area of the proposed research in relation to methods, substantive topic area and academic/policy networks. . The supervisory team offers good general support and the HEI offers some advanced training for the student. The supervisory team demonstrates an adequate degree of preparedness for supervising PhD study	The proposed collaboration represents an adequate fit with the proposal but fails to demonstrate good engagement of the collaborating partner throughout the PhD and/or provides little detailed consideration of ethics and intellectual property rights.
1	A problematic proposal that would need considerable additional work before being fundable. All components of the proposal will require further work and/or demonstrate little or no background or interest in their subject.	Supervision arrangements and support offered by the HEI meet the threshold for ESRC recognised training on this pathway. Note: supervision arrangements below this threshold do not meet the ESRC training requirements and students should not be offered DTP funding on this basis.	The proposed collaboration represents a poor fit with the proposal, demonstrates weak or no evidence of the engagement of the collaborating partner throughout the PhD and/or little consideration of ethics and intellectual property rights.