Royal Academy of Engineering

**2024/25 RAEng Industrial Fellowships:
Guidance notes for Reviewers**

Contents

1.   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.

2. Confidentiality

Applications and reviews are submitted to the Academy in confidence.

- Reviewers should not discuss and share the application and assessment information with any third party
- Reviewers should not discuss the application and have any contact with the applicant
- Reviewers should not retain any hard copies and electronic versions 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 the panel members of the assessment process

3. 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.

4. Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)

The Academy's research programmes are aligned with the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), which is a set of principles aiming to improve the ways in which the output of research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties. The outputs from research are many and varied, and as a funder of engineering research the Academy needs to assess the quality and impact of these outputs in order to make awards - it is thus imperative that research output is measured accurately and evaluated wisely.

In the assessment of research output, we would like to emphasise that all outputs are welcome and considered valuable to the Academy. Outputs can include open data sets, software, publications, commercial, entrepreneurial or industrial products, clinical practice developments, educational products, policy publications, evidence synthesis pieces and conference publications. With regard to research articles published in peer-reviewed journals, the scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

We value and appreciate the time and effort that reviewers give to support our research programmes. A good, helpful review for the Academy is one which assesses research on its own merits rather than by surrogate measures, such as on the basis of the journal in which research is published.

5. 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

6. Impact of COVID-19

During these uncertain times, the Academy understands that some applicants will have their research activities severely hampered, or in some cases stopped, due to Covid-19 restrictions. We will try to ensure that individuals are not penalised for any disruptions to their careers that may have been caused by the pandemic. Here are some general principles for reviewing applications:

- Please take into consideration the unequal impacts that COVID-19 related disruptions might have had on individuals, universities and industry partners and bear in mind that they may not have chosen to disclose information.
- Reviewers should assume that any changes that arise from the COVID-19 pandemic, post-submission, will be resolved and these should not affect their scores.

7. Completing and submitting your review

Reviews will be completed via the grants management system (GMS). On GMS reviewers will be presented with 6 questions related to the type of fellowship that they are reviewing. The GMS is link is: https://grants.raeng.org.uk

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 IF2425-19-XX-XXX) 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 available upon request.

Reviewers must also comment on the overall quality of the application and provide a score out of seven and a clear YES / NO recommendation on whether that application should be awarded.

8. Reviewing criteria

Important: Before starting your review, please verify the type of fellowship that you are reviewing. There are two types of industrial fellowships: "**academia to industry**" and "**industry to academia**".

You should only provide comments against each of the assessment criteria that is relevant to the type of fellowship that you are reviewing. The assessment criteria are listed below and are divided by the two types of fellowships.

Jump to the section appropriate to the type of fellowship that you are reviewing.

8.1 Academia to industry fellowships reviewing criteria.

Research track record of the candidate
Comment on the qualities of the applicant and their suitability for this award. *Please take into consideration the impact of COVID-19*. See section 5 of this document for more information.

Quality of the proposed collaborative research project
Comment on the quality of the collaborative research project. Comment on the consideration of diversity and inclusion in research and team development.

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.

8.2   Industry to academia fellowships reviewing criteria

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, any relevant involvement with relevant professional institutions, line management of technical/engineering staff or training responsibilities. Please take into consideration the impact of COVID-19. See section 6 of this document for more information.

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. Comment on the consideration of diversity and inclusion in research and team development.

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 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:

Rating	Definitions
7	Outstanding
6	Excellent (worthy of a Fellowship)
5	Very good (potential reserve)
4	Good (worthy, but uncompetitive for this scheme)
3	Average
2	Below average
1	Poor

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

9. 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.

10. Feedback

Where possible the Academy will provide anonymous 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.

---

[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.

11. Contact

If you have any further queries on the review process or on using the grants system please contact Dr Amy Barker (amy.barker@raeng.org.uk).

Version	Owner	Amendments	Date
1.0	Dr Amy Barker	Original Document	13 June 2023