2020/21 RAEng Industrial Fellowships:
Guidance notes for Reviewers

Introduction

The Royal Academy of Engineering Industrial Fellowships (IF) scheme enables mid-career academics and industrialists to undertake a collaborative research project in either an industrial or academic environment, where one party would host the other. The scheme aims to strengthen the strategic relationship between industry and academia by providing an opportunity to establish or enhance collaborative research between the two parties. Upon their return to the university, academics will use their industrial experience and knowledge of current industry practices to enhance both their teaching and student learning. It is expected that the fellowship will allow industrialists to establish and strengthen corporate and personal links and enhance knowledge transfer in engineering with academia.

This Academy scheme has a one stage assessment process:

- **Peer Review**
- **Selection Panel**

Each application will be assessed by two reviewers who should provide commentary against each assessment criteria (see below), an overall score out of 7, and a YES / NO recommendation on whether the applicant should be funded. Applicants will then be ranked and considered at the Selection Panel.

Confidentiality

Applications and reviews are submitted to the Academy in confidence. The identity of reviewers will not be made known to applicants but may be revealed to other members of the assessment process. Panel Members should not act upon any of the information they obtain through the applications and should not engage with applicants if approached about their review.

Conflict of Interest

Reviewers should inform the Academy if they believe they have any conflict of interest, or could be perceived by others to have a conflict of interest, however small, which may affect their ability to provide a fair and independent review of an application. The Academy will then decide on the appropriate course of action. Conflicts include but are not limited to knowing the applicant outside of or through work, having a working relationship with their organization, or having a commercial interest relevant to the
application.

Diversity

Reviewers are reminded that the Royal Academy of Engineering is committed to diversity and inclusion and welcomes applications from all under-represented groups across engineering. It is the Academy's policy to ensure that no applicant is disadvantaged or receives less favourable treatment because of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation.

For more information on our Academy policies please visit our website: https://www.raeng.org.uk/grants-and-prizes/grants/programme-policy-documents

The Assessment Criteria

Reviewers should provide comments against each of the following assessment criteria, the overall quality of the application, a score out of seven and a YES / NO recommendation on whether they should be awarded.

Important:

- Reviews will be completed via the grants management system (GMS). On GMS reviewers will be presented with 14 questions, however reviewers must only complete questions related to the type of fellowship that they are reviewing.

- For “academia to industry” fellowships, reviewers must only complete questions 1-5 and questions 12-14. Questions 6-11 should be left blank

- For “industry to academia” fellowships, reviewers must only complete questions 6-11 and questions 12-14. Questions 1-5 should be left blank.

These questions will cover the following criteria:

For “academia to industry fellowship” applications the reviews are based on the following factors:

Research track record of the candidate
Comment on the qualities of the Applicant and their suitability for this award.

Quality of the proposed collaborative research project
Comment on the quality of the collaborative research project.

The potential for impact upon student learning and employability
Comment on the potential impact upon teaching and student learning if the applicant was to be awarded.

The strategic benefits and sustainability
Comment on the mutual strategic benefit to the academic and industrial/commercial organisations including potential to lead to longer-term collaboration.
Exploitation of results
Comment on the credibility of plans to exploit the results if successful

For "industry to academia fellowship" applications the reviews are based on the following factors:

Research track record of the candidate
Comment on the track record of the applicant (commensurate with their career stage and careers breaks are taken into consideration). This needn’t be an academic-style research CV with many publications, but should include R&D experience and any relevant involvement with relevant professional institutions.

Track record of industrial organisation
Comment on the track record of the industrial organisation in commercialising new technology and on any previous relevant collaborations that the industrial organisation has had with universities and other partners.

Quality of the proposed collaborative research project
Comment on the quality of the collaborative research project.

Potential research impact
Comment on the innovation and potential impact of the applicant’s research (this includes impact on knowledge transfer).

The strategic benefits and sustainability
Comment on the mutual (strategic) benefits to the academic and industrial/commercial organisations including potential to lead to longer-term collaboration.

Exploitation of results
Comment on the credibility of plans to exploit the results if successful.

Please provide an overall comment\(^1\) for all applications
Please provide a brief summary on the overall quality of the application and your recommendation (a clear YES / NO) on whether the applicant should proceed to Selection Panel.

Score
Reviews must also provide an overall score out of seven, as defined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^1\) The commentary provided by Panelists should justify the mark given and should be written in such a way to enable the Academy to provide constructive feedback to applicants. This information may also be used to inform the decision as to which applications should proceed to Selection Panel deliberations.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excellent (worthy of a Fellowship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very good (potential reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good (worthy, but uncompetitive for this scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Optional – Additional comments**

Please add any additional comments you wish to make relating to conflicts of interest, etc. (for Academy use only).

**Online grants system**

Applications are submitted through the online grants system at [https://grants.raeng.org.uk](https://grants.raeng.org.uk) and reviews must also be undertaken on the system.

Once logged into the system, reviewers will be presented with the application they have been allocated to review, along with some basic details such as the name and affiliation of the applicants.

Clicking on the application reference number (in the format IFS2021\XX) will take you through to the application summary page, where you can view the application and access the review form. A visual step-by-step guide called the ‘Story Board’ is attached.

**What will happen next?**

Once a reviewer has completed a review form, the ‘submit review’ button will become available at the bottom left corner of the form. Please bear in mind that once submitted a review cannot be altered. Once complete, all reviews will be available at the Selection Panel meeting.

The Programme Manager will collate both reviewers’ scores in time for the Selection Panel where comments will be discussed and a final decision made on whether the application will be awarded.

**Feedback**

Where possible the Academy will provide feedback to candidates. Please ensure that any comments provided are both complete enough and specific enough to allow the Academy to derive useful feedback. Unsuccessful Applicants may well go on to be successful in other activities with the right guidance.
Contact

If you have any further queries on the review process or on using the grants system please contact Neeshe Khan (Jorge.ospina@raeng.org.uk).