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Introduction

The aim of this review stage is to provide expert peer review to the Panel to enable the selection of candidates for interview. Reviewers should give each application a score out of 7, and a Yes/No recommendation on whether they should proceed to the interview stage.

The reviews should be submitted online through the Academy's Grant Management System.

Confidentiality

Applications and reviews are submitted to the Academy in confidence.

Reviewers

- Reviewers should not discuss or share the application with any third party, without prior approval from the Academy
- Reviewers should not discuss the application or have any contact with the applicant
- Reviewers should not retain any copies of application documents once their role as reviewer has been completed
- The identity of reviewers will not be made known to applicants, but may be revealed to other members of the assessment process

Panel Members

- 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
- Any hard copies of application documents, or any electronic versions of application documents saved locally, must be destroyed/ deleted upon submission of the 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, 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 organisation, or having a commercial interest relevant to the application.

Diversity

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 on Academy diversity activity and policy please visit: http://raeng.org.uk/about/diversity/default.htm.
The scheme

Over the last thirty years, the Academy’s highly prestigious Research Chairs (RC) / Senior Fellowships (SRF) scheme has successfully supported numerous academic appointments and enhanced internationally renowned centres of excellence.

The Academy’s Research Chairs (RC) / Senior Research Fellowships (SRF) scheme aims to strengthen the links between industry and academia by supporting exceptional academics in UK universities to undertake use-inspired research that meets the needs of the industrial partners.

Awardees are expected to:
• Establish or enhance a world leading engineering research group
• Deliver ‘use-inspired’ research that meets the needs of their industrial partners
• Disseminate the outcomes of their research for appropriate academic impact.
• Become a self-sustaining research group by the end of the award (by securing substantial external grant income: RCUK, EU, industry, charities, etc.)

Universities are expected to:
• Adopt appropriate mechanisms to ensure only the highest calibre of candidates are submitted to this scheme
• Adopt a proactive approach in encouraging researchers from unrepresented groups, especially women, to apply
• Evidence their commitment to equality and diversity if requested by the academy. They must be in a position to demonstrate that their selection criteria do not unlawfully discriminate or disadvantage candidates because of their personal characteristics or background

Online grant system

Applications have been submitted through the online grants system at https://grants.raeng.org.uk and reviews must also be undertaken on the system.

You may already have an account with the Academy, e.g. from being a Fellow or when you applied for events or grants, and the same login details should be used.

Once logged into the system, you will be presented with the application you have been allocated to review. Clicking on the application reference number (in the format RCSRF2021\11\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 on using the system has been sent to you along with this document.

The review form

The review consists of the areas given below, and a score out of seven. Each application will be peer-reviewed by at least three experts in the subject area (usually Fellows of the Academy).

Following peer-review a selection panel (comprising of Fellows of the Academy) will
be convened to evaluate all applications and select candidates for interview.

1 **Quality of the Candidate**
   - Quality of the applicant’s research track record and the academic quality of the underpinning basic research.
   - Quality of the applicant’s research vision and their potential to establish or enhance a world leading research group at the host university in their chosen field of engineering.

2 **Quality of the Collaborative Research Programme**
   - Quality and significance of the proposed ‘use-inspired’ collaborative research programme (including: timeliness, novelty, vision and ambition).
   - Quality and effectiveness of the proposed planning and management, and whether the requested resources are appropriate and have been fully justified.

3 **Strength of the Strategic Partnership**
   - Strength and long-term sustainability of the strategic partnership between the company and the university.
   - Commitment and level of support from both the host university and the industry sponsor.

4 **Beneficiaries and Impact**
   - Extent to which the industry sponsor and other beneficiaries will benefit from the proposed collaborative research programme.
   - Potential to translate research outcomes into societal and economic impact.

**SCORE**
Reviews must also give an overall score out of seven, as defined below. Reviewers are encouraged to refer to these indicators in their comments and where possible to provide evidence from the application itself as this will greatly assist the Panel in the decision making and selection process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Applicant is a very strong fit for the award, a leading academic in their field, head of a world leading research group, excellent choice of host university and strong support from host including additional funding. Excellent choice of industry partner, based on a strong existing relationship and strong support from industry including additional funding. Proposal is novel, ambitious, achievable, and shows great potential for significant wide-reaching impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Applicant is a strong fit for the award, a proven academic in their field, head of a potentially world leading research group, excellent choice of host university, strong support from host. Excellent choice of industry partner and strong support from industry. Proposal is novel, ambitious, achievable, and shows potential for significant wide-reaching impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>is a good fit for the award, a proven academic in their field, head of a potentially world leading research group, good choice of host university, strong support from host, good choice of industry partner and strong support from industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>is a reasonable fit for the award, a proven academic in their field, demonstrated leadership and team building qualities, good choice of host university, good support from host, good choice of industry partner and good support from industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>is not a good fit for the award, lacks evidence of proven track record and leadership ability, reasonable choice of host university, standard support from host, reasonable choice of industry partner and standard support from industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>is a poor fit for the award, lacks evidence of proven track record and leadership ability, poor choice of host university, little support from host, poor choice of industry partner and little support from industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>is a poor fit for the award, lacks evidence of proven track record, poor choice of host university, little support from host, poor choice of industry partner and little support from industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional – Additional comments
Please add any other comments you wish to make, for Academy use only.
For example, any perceived conflicts of interest, or questions to ask at interview.

The commentary provided 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 will be used to inform the decision as to which applications should proceed to the next stage. Reviewers may be asked to provide additional information if their submitted comments do not contain sufficient information to validate the score given or for all panel members to assess and make an informed judgement.

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 accessible by the Panel.
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 the Programme Manager on lucy.wheeler@raeng.org.uk.