Guidance for Pathways
2019 Student Led Open Competition

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this guidance document is to set out the process through which ESRC Student Led Open Competition Awards will be made in 2019.

Please note that this guidance should not be read in isolation. It is being issued by the SGSSS-DTP in parallel to guidance on the content of Supervisors' Statements of Support, References, and a guidance note for students applying for an ESRC studentship including guidance on whether applications meet the criteria for ESRC steers (Guidance on Steers and Targets). We also ask that you share this guidance with all prospective supervisors, in particular stressing that their role should be as support, not lead, in the development of a research proposal.

The Collaborative Competition, the Skills Development Scotland Collaborative Competition, and the 'Steers' Competition continue to run as supervisor led competitions and have separate guidance and processes. Proposals submitted to these competitions should not be submitted to the student-led competition.

1. THE PROCESS

This section details the process for Pathways. The Guidance for Students details specifically what materials and documents are required to apply for a studentship. Pathway Representatives and Convenors should familiarise themselves with this guidance and direct students to it. A further detailed timetable at the end of this document sets out key dates.

STAGE ONE – INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW
November 2018 till 7 February 2019

November to 11 January, Candidate Application Stage 1:

Applications may be submitted at any point from the competition opening until Friday, 11 January 2019. At this point Pathways Representatives and Convenors will be working with supervisors and HEI Admin Leads to assist in directing potential applicants to the appropriate processes within their HEI as well as ensuring that applicants are clear on the requirements of the application process and of relevant deadlines.

Student application process outline:

a. **Application Stage 1** – applicants must upload **a completed application form, existing transcripts where available and CV** to GradHub. Applicants must provide **contact details for one referee** - this reference should be from an academic unless the applicant has been out of academia for more than 5 years. The referee will be contacted automatically via GradHub for a reference.

   n.b. the reference at this stage **cannot** be from the proposed supervisor
   The referee will be asked to return the reference directly to the institution's HEI

Admin Lead (contact details will be provided to the referee).

It is vital that contact details are uploaded in good time for the referee to be contacted and reference to be submitted before the deadline.

Once students make a formal application through GradHub it will be immediately sent to the HEI Admin Lead who will then forward it to the Pathway Representative.

11 January to 25 January, Institutional Pathway review:

Following the deadline for first stage application, pathways will be able to nominate up to 4 applicants* to put forward to the cross-institutional stage of the competition.

Upon approval of the Dean, the nominations for each Pathway will be entered on GradHub by the HEI Admin Lead. The submission by the HEI Admin Leads will serve as confirmation of the Dean's approval.

*Please note this is a maximum number and the SGSSS-DTP would urge pathway representatives to put forward only the best applicants. We also encourage you to make it explicit to EU-resident candidates that they are eligible to receive their fees only. The Economics pathway should be mindful of the 35% on residential eligibility waiver that applies to this pathway only.

28 January to 7 February, Candidate Application Stage 2:

Nominated candidates will be informed that they are through to the next stage on Monday 28 January. They will have up until **12 noon on Thursday 7 February** to revise their application, add second referee contact details and ensure that the supervisory statement is uploaded to GradHub. They must ensure that their referee has provided a reference in time for the deadline.

It is expected that pathway representatives again work with supervisors and students to ensure that the final version of the proposal and the supervisory statement are in preparation and submitted by the deadline.

n.b The referee will be contacted automatically via GradHub for a reference and asked to return the reference directly to the institution's HEI Admin Lead (contact details will be provided to the referee).

Thursday, 7 February 2019, 12 noon: deadline for Application Stage 2 (shortlisted candidates only).

After the 7th February 2019 deadline, there are several rigorous review stages during which further shortlisting is undertaken before final awards are made as follows:

Pathway Review period – 7 February to 25 February 2019
Hub Review period – 25 February to 28 March 2019
Global Review period – 28 March to 24 April 2019

Unsuccessful candidates will be informed if they have not progressed to the next stage at the end of each review period.

STAGE TWO – PATHWAY REVIEW
7 February to 25 February 2019

The SGSSS-DTP recognises that pathways will vary in their practices at this stage. However, Annex A contains best practice guidance and this should be consulted before Pathway Convenors establish the process by which the pathway itself will assess and rank application

Access
Pathway Representatives and Convenors will be given access, on Thursday 7 February 2019, to the applications they require ahead of the assessment and ranking process. Applications are available to download as PDF forms.

Assessment, scores and rankings
Pathways will meet to assess and rank applications. Please be aware that the Pathway Hub Lead will expect to be involved in the pathway process (not as assessor but to ensure consistency across pathways). Pathway Convenors are then responsible for uploading candidate scores and rankings to GradHub. We expect pathways to nominate **a maximum of 6 applications** per pathway for cross-pathway review and subsequent allocation of the Open Studentships.
The Pathway Convenor will be given access to a marking sheet to enter in their ranking information, scores, and comments and will be required to allocate a unique rank and score to each application. **Please note: scores can be fractional.**

Each Pathway Convenor must upload the following information to GradHub by no later than 12 noon on 25 February 2019:

- Ranks, scores, award details, and comments for all applications for their pathway. Where two or more applicants have been ranked equally, pathway convenors, in consultation with pathway reps must decide on a merit-based ordering of applicants.
- Please specify in the comments section for each student whether their application is to be put forward for the Open Competition or not.

SGSSS-DTP has issued a marking framework in which three criteria are assessed on a 1-10 or a 1-5 scale. Thus, all applicants should receive a score out of 25. The marking framework is attached in Annex B.

Summary

Pathways are requested to provide a brief (<100 words) summary in support of each application shortlisted for consideration in the Open Competition and should include whether the application meets the requirements for an interdisciplinary steer. A collective pathway assessment of additional training needed to meet the core requirements can also be helpful. The summaries will be used to guide the cross-pathway reviewers and panel members on the significance of the application from a subject specific point of view. These summaries must be entered into the comments section for each student. Likewise, comments should be provided for all those who are not in the top 6 and who will therefore fall out of the competition at this stage. These comments will be fed back to students to summarise the reasons why they have not been successful.

Outline

Pathway Convenors are also asked upload a detailed outline of the process that was followed by the pathway to assess and rank applications to GradHub. This should identify any applicants who, for whatever reason, were deemed inappropriate by the pathway to hold an ESRC studentship.

Outcomes

Successful applications will progress to the Hub Review stage. Applicants will be kept informed about their position. Unsuccessful applicants at this stage will be notified through GradHub. **PLEASE NOTE:** if an applicant has been deemed unsuccessful for the Open Competitions at this stage (i.e. is not in the top ranked list in the Pathway), they will be directed to contact their pathway representative should they wish to request additional feedback.

<div align="center">

STAGE THREE – HUB REVIEW
25 February to 28 March 2019
</div>

Nominated applications at this stage will be considered by each hub, with Pathway Convenors and Hub Leads scoring and ranking across all applications outside their own pathway. Each convenor will get a maximum of 24 applications. Pathway Convenors and Hub Leads must upload all graded applications to GradHub by 12 noon on 22 March 2019.

Thematic Panels will meet on Wednesday 27 March/Thursday 28 March to rank hub applications and determine the top nominated applications to progress to the next stage.

The top 15 from each Hub will go forward to the Global Panel. Unsuccessful applicants will be informed at this stage via GradHub.

<div align="center">

STAGE FOUR – GLOBAL REVIEW
28 March to 24 April 2019
</div>

The Global Panel will rank the applications received by each hub – ensuring that individual hub rankings are not overturned. They will agree those studentships which should be awarded, identify a quality threshold and agree a reserve list.

<div align="center">

All applicants will be informed of whether they have been successful/unsuccessful or on a reserve list by Wednesday 1 May 2019.
</div>

ELIGIBILITY AND ENHANCED STIPENDS

ESRC student eligibility criteria can be found here

SGSSS reminds supervisors that the residency criteria must be met in order for a student to receive the full studentship including stipend. There is a partial exception to this within the Economics pathway where residential eligibility waivers are allowed for a maximum of 35% of offers made meaning that some EU resident and international students may be able to obtain full awards.

No enhanced stipends will be available from 2019 onward.

LENGTH OF AWARD

Students applying for a +3 studentship must meet the minimum ESRC training requirements. If a student does not meet these requirements but the pathway still wishes to consider him/her they may choose to appoint on a 1+3 basis. As pathway convenor/representative you should be familiar with ESRC training requirements so that you can best advice your student. Please see here for the guidance which students receive in relation to this. In addition, SGSSS conduct an audit of the training requirements of all applications nominated by pathways – this means that we will sometimes give a fractional award (such as a 3.3 or a 3.5) where we identify that applicants have some but not all of the required methods training. This will extend the award by a few months more than a +3 but will mean that the student doesn't need to do an additional Masters degree.

CROSS-INSTITUTIONAL SUPERVISION
The SGSSS-DTP wishes to encourage pathways, supervisors and applicants to consider supervisory arrangements across the 16 institutions of the SGSSS, if appropriate to the particular student project and with the support of both proposed supervisors. This will usually be within pathways but across institutions but we do not wish to rule out cross-pathway supervision if this is clearly in the interests of the student project. We therefore ask Pathway Representatives and Supervisors to let students know that while their main supervisor must be at a recognised SGSSS-DTP pathway institution a second supervisor may be attached to the project from a second institution either with or without pathway recognition. The rationale for this needs to be clearly stated within the supervisory statement. Where there are two institutions involved in the proposed supervisory team then the statement of support must be jointly written by both supervisors and refer to the research and training environment within each institution and specify the benefits to the student of cross-institutional supervision.

Students eligible for a 1+3 award, wishing to study in institutions without an ESRC accredited Masters program, may choose to complete their Masters in another accredited institution (within SGSSS-DTP) before completing their PhD programme at their chosen university. If this is the case then the applicant must upload a letter of support from the Deans' representative at the institution where the Masters will be undertaken using the template provided. Supervisors and students should work with their pathway representative to facilitate this.

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS

The ESRC welcomes interdisciplinary studentships since many of the most pressing research challenges are interdisciplinary in nature, both within the social sciences, and between the social sciences and other areas of research. For that reason the application form asks whether the proposed research is deemed interdisciplinary. To meet the criteria for this label (please see guidance here), the proposed research should include substantive interaction between relevant disciplines and the studentship should provide training that is not constrained to one discipline and supervision should straddle the different approaches. Please discuss this with your student and pathway representative where relevant and, if appropriate, ensure that your student indicates their proposal's potential applicability to be considered as interdisciplinary research on the application form. When they do so they will be required to specify which other research council Doctoral Training Partnership their proposed work aligns with and, within which, training might be sought. You should read closely the ESRC guidance on requirements for interdisciplinary awards.

ANNEX A
Best Practice for Assessment and Selection and Marking Scheme

Applicants for ESRC studentships with the SGSSS-DTP are required to submit a standard set of application materials as follows:

- Application form including lay summary, section on preparedness and research proposal
- Curriculum Vitae
- Degree transcripts (and translation, if not originally in English) – provisional transcripts are sufficient if the applicant has yet to complete his/her degree
- Supporting statement from the prospective supervisor. If a cross-institutional supervision arrangement is being proposed then a letter from EACH proposed supervisor is required
- Two references as follows,
  Reference One submitted at Application Stage One
  n.b. the reference at Stage One cannot be from the proposed supervisor
  Reference Two submitted at Application Stage Two (shortlisted candidates only)
  n.b. this reference may be from the supervisor
- Details of any overseas fieldwork the applicant proposes to undertake during his/her research
- Details of any difficult language training the applicant proposes to undertake during his/her research

When pathways assess and rank applicants for nomination for ESRC Open Competition the SGSSS-DTP asks that **at least one** of the following three mechanisms be used.
PLEASE NOTE THAT all pathway processes should involve the Pathway Hub Lead

1. Pathway representatives rank candidates from other Universities – for example in Politics & IR, St Andrews and Glasgow assess and rank Edinburgh candidates, Edinburgh and St Andrews assess and rank Glasgow, and Glasgow and Edinburgh assess and rank St Andrews, as a basic minimum standard. <u>Where possible</u>, each applicant should be assessed by at least 2 pathway representatives from 2 different Universities.

2. An external assessor ranks applicants – pathways secure an external assessor who will manage the assessment and ranking process. **Pathways using this approach must meet to discuss and confirm the external scores and ranks.**

3. Pathways conduct interviews with applicants – there is a strong expectation that interviews would be conducted via Skype or other means of video-conferencing as SGSSS-DTP does not have the funds to reimburse applicants travelling for interview.

Please note: Academics assessing/ranking applicants and/or voting on applicants from their home institution is not allowed at the cross pathway stage. Please note this rule applies after pathway representatives have put forward applicants from their University.

SGSSS-DTP Open Competition Award Marking Framework (2019)
Assessment for +3 Awards (note: pathways must be convinced that the candidate has met the training requirements for their pathway and are expected to go back to candidates that have applied for +3 and have not acquired at least 40 credits in the required core methods)

	Candidate Record (OUT OF 10) (Please note that the descriptors can be used with discretion where there is a good case to do so)	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 (OUT OF 5)
Marking Criteria	**Candidate can demonstrate:** The equivalent of a first class degree AND/OR an already achieved distinction at Masters level OR strong and relevant professional experience (All of the above must meet the ESRC training requirements), AND an excellent degree of preparedness for PhD study **Plus**	**Candidate can demonstrate:** 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. **Plus**	

10	Two exceptional references in which student is identified, for example, as amongst the very best ever encountered in terms of abilities and potential	Proposal is exceptionally good in all of its components and fulfils criteria 7-9 below
9	As (8), but with one clearly exceptional reference in which student is identified, for example, as amongst best ever encountered in terms of abilities and potential	Proposal is highly original and innovative, at the cutting edge of developments substantively and methodologically and fulfils criteria 7 and 8 below
8	Two very strong references in which student is, for example, singled out as amongst the best of a peer group encountered in terms of abilities and potential	Proposal contains clear awareness of the potential impact of the research and fulfils criterion 7 below

7	Two strong references in which student potential is communicated with clear examples	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.	
	Candidate can demonstrate: The equivalent of a 2:1 degree AND/OR an already achieved 60+ average at Masters level OR relevant professional experience (All of the above must meet the ESRC training requirements), AND a good/very good degree of preparedness for PhD study Plus	Candidate can demonstrate: 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. Plus	
6	Both references offer glimpses of strong potential but with little substance and few examples.	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.	
5	Two minimally satisfactory references which make it clear student is capable of conducting research but little more.	A promising proposal that suffers from several weaknesses. The methodology is appropriate but ill-expressed. The proposal is only weakly grounded in relevant literature.	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.

4	A mixture of weak and satisfactory references which leave questions to student's suitability to conduct research.	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.	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.
3	Two weak references in which student potential is not communicated.	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.
2	The equivalent of EITHER a 2:2 degree AND an already achieved pass at Masters level (average mark of 50) which does not necessarily meet the ESRC training requirements AND clear evidence of additional experience or training that would bring the candidate up to the required level DTP would be unlikely to consider applicants with academic scores below these levels.	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.

| 1 | The equivalent of EITHER a 2:2 degree AND an already achieved pass at Masters level (average mark of 50) which does not necessarily meet the ESRC training requirements AND clear evidence of additional experience or training that would bring the candidate up to the required level DTP would be unlikely to consider applicants with academic scores below these levels. | 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. |

SGSSS-DTP Open Competition Award Marking Framework (2019) Assessment for 1+3 Awards

SGSSS -DTP Open Competition Award Marking Framework (2019)
Assessment for 1+3 Awards

	Candidate Record (OUT OF 10) (Please note that the descriptors can be used with discretion where there is a good case to do so)	**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 (OUT OF 5)**
Marking Criteria	**Candidate can demonstrate:** The achievement or expectation of a first class degree or equivalent AND/OR a Master's degree which does not meet the ESRC training requirements **Plus**	**Candidate can demonstrate:** 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. **Plus**	
10	Two exceptional references in which student is identified, for example, as amongst the very best ever encountered in terms of abilities and potential	Proposal is exceptionally good in all of its components and fulfils criteria 7-9 below	

9	As (8), but with one clearly exceptional reference in which student is identified, for example, as amongst best ever encountered in terms of abilities and potential	Proposal is highly original and innovative, at the cutting edge of developments substantively and methodologically and fulfils criteria 7 and 8 below
8	Two very strong references in which student is, for example, singled out as amongst the best of a peer group encountered in terms of abilities and potential	Proposal contains clear awareness of the potential impact of the research and fulfils criterion 7 below
7	Two strong references in which student potential is communicated with clear examples.	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.
	Candidate can demonstrate: The equivalent of a 2:1 degree AND/OR an already achieved Masters which does not meet the ESRC training requirements Plus	Candidate can demonstrate: 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. Plus
6	Both references offer glimpses of strong potential but with little substance and few examples.	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.

5	Two minimally satisfactory references which make it clear student is capable of conducting research but little more.	A promising proposal that suffers from several weaknesses. The methodology is appropriate but ill-expressed. The proposal is only weakly grounded in relevant literature.	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.
4	A mixture of weak and satisfactory references which leave questions to student's suitability to conduct research.	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.	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.
3	Two weak references in which student potential is not communicated.	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.

2	The equivalent of EITHER a 2:2 degree AND an already achieved pass at Masters level (average mark of 50) which does not necessarily meet the ESRC training requirements AND clear evidence of additional experience or training that would bring the candidate up to the required level. DTP would be unlikely to consider applicants with academic scores below these levels.	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.
1	The equivalent of EITHER a 2:2 degree AND an already achieved pass at Masters level (average mark of 50) which does not necessarily meet the ESRC training requirements AND clear evidence of additional experience or training that would bring the candidate up to the required level. DTP would be unlikely to consider applicants with academic scores below these levels.	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.

Updated Timeline for the 2018 Studentship Competition

DATE	Open Competition	Responsibility
STAGE ONE – Institution Review		
October	Announce Competition with date open for entries in November	SGSSS
November	Applicants can access GradHub to upload EO and application (reference, transcripts, CV and proof of eligibility) for institutions to assess • Students will have to register their institution and pathway HEI Admins to have institutional access to GradHub, check pathway and distribute their applications to Pathway Reps.	SGSSS HEI Admins
November to Friday 11 January	HEI Admins to decline any applications that do not meet their institutional criteria, informing the candidate and recording this on GradHub Pathway Reps to work with Students and Supervisors to ensure that applicants are clear on the requirements of the application process and of relevant deadlines.	HEI Admins Pathway Reps
Friday 11 January at 12 noon	12 noon: Deadline for applications	Students
Friday 11 January till Friday 25 January	HEI Admins to verify applicants on GradHub and decline any outstanding students Institutions review and nominate up to 4 candidates per pathway (Dean to sign off nominations)	HEI Admins HEI Admins Pathway Reps Deans
Friday 25 January	Nominations deadline Rationale for declines to be submitted	HEI Admins Pathway Reps
Monday 28 January	Email to approved applicants congratulating them for getting to this stage and reminding them of final closing date for uploading final applications along with supervisor statement	SGSSS

Thursday 7 February	Applicants to upload final versions of their applications along with their supervisor statement by this date – 12 noon	Student Pathway Reps
	Final check applications complete	SGSSS
	STAGE TWO – Pathway Review	
Thursday 7 February	Pathway applications access to Pathway Reps and Convenors	SGSSS
	Email to Pathway Reps and Convenors with reminder of process and copy of criteria for marking	SGSSS
Thursday 7 February – Friday 22 February	Pathway Reps and Convenors meet to assess and rank applications.	Pathway Convenors
Monday 25 February at 12 noon	12 noon Pathway decisions on ranking to be uploaded to GradHub by Pathway Convenor by this date. Convenors should also provide a note detailing the process undertaken to select and rank pathway applications. Maximum of 6 nominations per pathway.	Pathway Convenors
	GradHub will communicate to applicants registered but not top-ranked by pathway that they have been unsuccessful.	SGSSS
	STAGE THREE – Hub Review	
Monday 25 February	Pathway Convenors access all hub applications – each convenor gets a maximum of 24 applications	SGSSS
Friday 22 March by 12 noon	Pathway Convenors upload all graded applications to SGSSS-DTP by 12 noon.	Pathway Convenors
Tuesday 26 March	Thematic Panel pre-meeting	SGSSS
Wednesday 27 March and Thursday 28 March	Thematic Panels meet to rank hub applications and top nominated applications send to global panel members	SGSSS/Pathway Convenors
	STAGE FOUR – Global Review	
Wednesday 24 April	Global panel meets to make final recommendations on rankings and awards	SGSSS
SGSSS-DTP will communicate with all candidates on the outcome of the competitions by Wednesday 1 May		SGSSS