

Discussion session on EPSRC funding

Alison Ramage, University of Strathclyde

ICMS Retreat for Women in Applied Mathematics

January 2023

Format of peer review panel

- Usually held over 2 days at EPSRC in **Swindon**.
- Dedicated **panel suite** with custom designed layout.

Format of peer review panel

- Usually held over 2 days at EPSRC in **Swindon**.
- Dedicated **panel suite** with custom designed layout.
- Currently all done on Zoom. . .

Format of peer review panel

- Usually held over 2 days at EPSRC in **Swindon**.
- Dedicated **panel suite** with custom designed layout.
- Currently all done on Zoom. . .
- **Number** and expertise of panel members varies with number and type of proposals.

Format of peer review panel

- Usually held over 2 days at EPSRC in **Swindon**.
- Dedicated **panel suite** with custom designed layout.
- Currently all done on Zoom. . .
- **Number** and expertise of panel members varies with number and type of proposals.
- **Paperwork** circulated (electronically) around a month in advance with instructions.

Format of peer review panel

- Usually held over 2 days at EPSRC in **Swindon**.
- Dedicated **panel suite** with custom designed layout.
- Currently all done on Zoom. . .
- **Number** and expertise of panel members varies with number and type of proposals.
- **Paperwork** circulated (electronically) around a month in advance with instructions.
- This includes proposals, reviews, PI responses, **list of reviewers** plus meeting paperwork.

Process at peer review panel

- Three **introducers** for each proposal.

Process at peer review panel

- Three **introducers** for each proposal.
- An **introducer's report form** is completed for each proposal in advance.

Process at peer review panel

- Three **introducers** for each proposal.
- An **introducer's report form** is completed for each proposal in advance.
- This includes assigning a **grade** from 1-10 (10 high).

Process at peer review panel

- Three **introducers** for each proposal.
- An **introducer's report form** is completed for each proposal in advance.
- This includes assigning a **grade** from 1-10 (10 high).
- After discussion, an **overall grade** for the proposal is agreed by the panel.

Process at peer review panel

- Three **introducers** for each proposal.
- An **introducer's report form** is completed for each proposal in advance.
- This includes assigning a **grade** from 1-10 (10 high).
- After discussion, an **overall grade** for the proposal is agreed by the panel.
- This overall grade is used to rank proposals in **priority order** for funding.

Process at peer review panel

- Three **introducers** for each proposal.
- An **introducer's report form** is completed for each proposal in advance.
- This includes assigning a **grade** from 1-10 (10 high).
- After discussion, an **overall grade** for the proposal is agreed by the panel.
- This overall grade is used to rank proposals in **priority order** for funding.
- The panel reviews the overall rankings, revising them if necessary, before agreeing a **final priority list**.

Role of introducers

- Introducers summarise the **collective views** of the reviewers and the PI response.

Role of introducers

- Introducers summarise the **collective views** of the reviewers and the PI response.
- **First introducer**: initiates discussion with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.

Role of introducers

- Introducers summarise the **collective views** of the reviewers and the PI response.
- **First introducer**: initiates discussion with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Second introducer**: comments on any differences, again with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.

Role of introducers

- Introducers summarise the **collective views** of the reviewers and the PI response.
- **First introducer**: initiates discussion with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Second introducer**: comments on any differences, again with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Third introducer**: comments on any differences, with a focus on the major secondary criteria of national importance.

Role of introducers

- Introducers summarise the **collective views** of the reviewers and the PI response.
- **First introducer**: initiates discussion with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Second introducer**: comments on any differences, again with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Third introducer**: comments on any differences, with a focus on the major secondary criteria of national importance.
- **All** consider applicant(s) ability, resources and management etc. in the light of the reviewers' comments.

Role of introducers

- Introducers summarise the **collective views** of the reviewers and the PI response.
- **First introducer**: initiates discussion with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Second introducer**: comments on any differences, again with a focus on quality/excellence as the primary criterion.
- **Third introducer**: comments on any differences, with a focus on the major secondary criteria of national importance.
- **All** consider applicant(s) ability, resources and management etc. in the light of the reviewers' comments.
- **Panel members are not allowed to re-review the proposals.**

Topics the introducers should cover

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.
- Any **discrepancies** between reviewers' comments.

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.
- Any **discrepancies** between reviewers' comments.
- Any **response** from the applicant.

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.
- Any **discrepancies** between reviewers' comments.
- Any **response** from the applicant.
- Any comments on the general level of **resource** requested.

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.
- Any **discrepancies** between reviewers' comments.
- Any **response** from the applicant.
- Any comments on the general level of **resource** requested.
- Any specific **feedback** to the applicant.

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.
- Any **discrepancies** between reviewers' comments.
- Any **response** from the applicant.
- Any comments on the general level of **resource** requested.
- Any specific **feedback** to the applicant.
- Whether the reviewers' comments were of sufficient **quality** to help in the decision.

Topics the introducers should cover

- Any **important issues** identified by the reviewers.
- Any **discrepancies** between reviewers' comments.
- Any **response** from the applicant.
- Any comments on the general level of **resource** requested.
- Any specific **feedback** to the applicant.
- Whether the reviewers' comments were of sufficient **quality** to help in the decision.
- If the **reviewer** was an appropriate choice.

Additional points

Additional points

- The scores have **no value** outside the panel meeting and are not communicated to the applicant.

Additional points

- The scores have **no value** outside the panel meeting and are not communicated to the applicant.
- The panel decides on the final ranked list: **EPSRC managers** will then try to fund as many proposals as possible.

Additional points

- The scores have **no value** outside the panel meeting and are not communicated to the applicant.
- The panel decides on the final ranked list: **EPSRC managers** will then try to fund as many proposals as possible.
- Ranked lists for different types of grant are **tensioned** against each other to enable cross-referencing.

Additional points

- The scores have **no value** outside the panel meeting and are not communicated to the applicant.
- The panel decides on the final ranked list: **EPSRC managers** will then try to fund as many proposals as possible.
- Ranked lists for different types of grant are **tensioned** against each other to enable cross-referencing.
- The panel also identifies a **funding cut-off point**: EPSRC aims to have only fundable proposals reach panel.

Additional points

- The scores have **no value** outside the panel meeting and are not communicated to the applicant.
- The panel decides on the final ranked list: **EPSRC managers** will then try to fund as many proposals as possible.
- Ranked lists for different types of grant are **tensioned** against each other to enable cross-referencing.
- The panel also identifies a **funding cut-off point**: EPSRC aims to have only fundable proposals reach panel.
- The introducers' forms are collected at the end of the meeting and can be used to help provide **feedback** to the applicant.

- Download the relevant **Peer Review form** in advance:

<https://epsrc.ukri.org/funding/assessmentprocess/review/formsandguidancenotes/>

- Download the relevant **Peer Review form** in advance:
<https://epsrc.ukri.org/funding/assessmentprocess/review/formsandguidancenotes/>
- **Quality** Primary criterion.
Please comment on the degree of research excellence of the proposal, making reference to: (1) The novelty, relationship to the context, timeliness and relevance to identified stakeholders; (2) The ambition, adventure, transformative aspects or potential outcomes; (3) The suitability of the proposed methodology and the appropriateness of the approach to achieving impact. (For multi-disciplinary proposals please state which aspects of the proposal you feel qualified to assess.)

- **Importance** Secondary major criterion.
- **Applicant and Partnerships** Secondary criterion.
- **Resources and Management** Secondary Criterion.

- **Importance** Secondary major criterion.
- **Applicant and Partnerships** Secondary criterion.
- **Resources and Management** Secondary Criterion.

- **Overall Assessment**

My judgement is that:

- ① This proposal is scientifically or technically flawed
- ② This proposal does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria
- ③ This proposal meets all assessment criteria but with clear weaknesses
- ④ This is a good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses
- ⑤ This is a strong proposal that broadly meets all assessment criteria
- ⑥ This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment criteria

PI Response

Responding to referees

Responding to referees

- Response should be in A4 format with a maximum length of 2 pages, written in a minimum of 11pt font (Arial or equivalent) and with a minimum of 2cm margins.

Responding to referees

- Response should be in A4 format with a maximum length of 2 pages, written in a minimum of 11pt font (Arial or equivalent) and with a minimum of 2cm margins.
- Find the **time** to take this very seriously: it is critical to the proposal's performance at panel.

Responding to referees

- Response should be in A4 format with a maximum length of 2 pages, written in a minimum of 11pt font (Arial or equivalent) and with a minimum of 2cm margins.
- Find the **time** to take this very seriously: it is critical to the proposal's performance at panel.
- Don't **waste space** quoting positive remarks from referees: concentrate on addressing any issues.

Responding to referees

- Response should be in A4 format with a maximum length of 2 pages, written in a minimum of 11pt font (Arial or equivalent) and with a minimum of 2cm margins.
- Find the **time** to take this very seriously: it is critical to the proposal's performance at panel.
- Don't **waste space** quoting positive remarks from referees: concentrate on addressing any issues.
- Don't **waste space** with lengthy quotes from the reviewers.

Responding to referees

- Response should be in A4 format with a maximum length of 2 pages, written in a minimum of 11pt font (Arial or equivalent) and with a minimum of 2cm margins.
- Find the **time** to take this very seriously: it is critical to the proposal's performance at panel.
- Don't **waste space** quoting positive remarks from referees: concentrate on addressing any issues.
- Don't **waste space** with lengthy quotes from the reviewers.
- Use **clear headings** (e.g. grouping common issues or organising your response by reviewer): PI responses are sometimes just received at the meeting and have to be read quickly.

Responding to referees (cont.)

- Where possible, **refer back** to information that the referee has missed in the proposal in your response.

Responding to referees (cont.)

- Where possible, **refer back** to information that the referee has missed in the proposal in your response.
- The comments of **other referees** can be used to refute specific criticisms.

Responding to referees (cont.)

- Where possible, **refer back** to information that the referee has missed in the proposal in your response.
- The comments of **other referees** can be used to refute specific criticisms.
- Use **references** to publications to add weight to your argument.

Responding to referees (cont.)

- Where possible, **refer back** to information that the referee has missed in the proposal in your response.
- The comments of **other referees** can be used to refute specific criticisms.
- Use **references** to publications to add weight to your argument.
- **Stick to your guns**: don't just agree to make all the changes the referees suggest.

Responding to referees (cont.)

- Where possible, **refer back** to information that the referee has missed in the proposal in your response.
- The comments of **other referees** can be used to refute specific criticisms.
- Use **references** to publications to add weight to your argument.
- **Stick to your guns**: don't just agree to make all the changes the referees suggest.
- Don't sound **aggressive or arrogant** in your response (no matter how ridiculous the criticism): tackle the issues concisely and with a calm, measured tone.