

Prepare and Convene a Meeting

Council Operating Procedure Number: EP.G.15A

Version 3.4

Document Control

Version	Date	Author(s)	Comment
Draft	23.07.2010		
1.0	24.09.2010		Reviewed
1.1	29.10.2012		Revised following Shaping Capability Peer Review Implementation now includes details EP.G.13A Role of the Chair, panel members and Conveners and EP.G.14A Guidance for Observers at Meetings.
1.2	24/04/2014		Updated to reflect new policy on Conflicts
1.3	28/07/2014		Meeting Processes COP merged with this one
1.4	05/03/2015		Reviewed in line with PRP changes
1.5	23/02/2016		Updated to reflect changes in panel ROLs
1.6	19/04/2016		Updated guidance on official meeting notes
1.7	10/05/2016		Updated to address gender mix at meetings
1.8	19/07/2016		Further guidance on mixed gender meetings
1.9	23/09/2016		Added clarification on how to create and close meetings correctly in Siebel.
1.9.1	01/12/2016		Late reviews not to be sent to panel
1.9.2	09/12/2016		and no quality cut on ROL
2.0	29/03/2017		Full review and rewrite. Also includes equality and diversity changes. Change of COP name
2.1	14/06/2017		Update to sections on storage of the Contextual Briefing and Observers and also Late & Tabled papers, limits of burden on panelists and Request to fill in panel questionnaire . Web link to Principles of PR and not skipping applications
2.2	10/10/2017		NIA update Meeting Convener Cover letter update Further updates to the Contextual briefing Update to Ptl procedure Work around for 'Inform Outcome' button not working
2.3	24/1/2018		Policy on Roving Panel Members
2.4	10/7/18		Strengthen wording on when to book funding meetings and additional section on timely Funding area approval post panel. Also instructions on Panel Presentations being sent out in advance
2.5	12/11/2018		Fixed broken hyperlinks
2.6	18/01/2019		Unconscious bias briefing for panel members to be included in panel papers for all panel members.
2.7	23/01/2019		Added an extra statement in the optimum environment section about not having two or more panel members from the same research institution
2.8	29/01/2019		Removed references to First Grants, updated post-meeting notes section and added link to PR meeting guidance tools
2.9	19/03/2019		Added reference to general panel guidance , panel score range to be used in all panel meetings.
3.0	22/5/2019		Inclusion of policy on Journal-based metrics
3.1	05/08/2019		Inclusion of note taking and retention guidance/Removal of Contextual Briefing guidance
3.2	16/6/20		Removal of references to Ptl
3.3	06/07/2020		Guidance on convening a panel with mixed assessment criteria due to changes to Pathways to Impact added.
3.4	06/11/2020		Changed EPSRC Principles of Peer Review to UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making
3.5	08/09/2021		Updated feedback section as still mentioned outdated RCUK policy

COP Owner:	██████████
Approval:	██████████
Last Review/Update Date:	28/9/18
Next Review/Update Date:	28/9/20
Link to Document location:	

EP.G.15A

Prepare and Convene a Meeting
Council Operating Procedures

Table of Contents

Prepare and Convene a Meeting - EP.G.15A.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Scope.....	1
Pre-requisites.....	1
End Point.....	2
Forms to be used.....	2
Internal and External References.....	2
Meeting Convenor Tool: http://psliveappsweb0/MeetingConvenorTool	2
Introduction.....	2
Meeting types.....	2
Call Planning.....	2
Purpose of the Meeting Process.....	2
Optimum environment for panel members.....	3
Change to Pathways to Impact: Meetings with mixed assessment criteria.....	3
How to prepare for a meeting:.....	4
Creating the meeting on Siebel.....	4
Assigning Proposals to Meetings.....	4
Selecting Meeting Attendees.....	5
Inviting panel members.....	6
Allocating Introducers.....	7
Observers.....	8
Roving Panel Members.....	8
Advice to panel members.....	10
Timeline - Six weeks or more before the meeting.....	10
Pre-requisite.....	10
Pre-Panel Documentation - Guidance on using the Meeting Convenor Tool.....	10
Panel Guidance.....	11
Panel Scoring.....	11
Individual Assessment Criteria Scoring.....	11
Overall Score Indicators.....	12
Introducer Report Forms.....	14
Timeline - Two Weeks before the Meeting (approx.).....	15
Timeline - The Week before (approx.) Chair's Brief.....	15
Panel Meeting Spreadsheet.....	15
Agreeing Funding Areas.....	15
Timeline - Two Days before the Meeting (approx.).....	16
Convenor Presentation.....	16
Timeline - During the meeting.....	16
Roles and Responsibilities at the Prioritisation Panel Meeting.....	16
The Convening Team.....	16
At the start of the meeting:.....	17
During the meeting.....	17
Note Taking.....	18
New Investigator Award.....	18
At the end of the meeting.....	18
Officials at the meeting:.....	18
Convenor.....	18
Panel members: Introducers.....	19
Different role of introducers.....	20
Reaching the Funding Prioritisation Order.....	20
Guidance on panels suggesting different research areas:.....	21
Before closing the meeting the Convenor should ensure the following:.....	21
After the meeting.....	22
Post-Meeting Actions.....	22
The Funding meeting.....	22
Panel Records.....	22
Managing Meeting Outcomes.....	23
Completing the Rank Order List.....	23

Feedback.....23
Closing the meeting on Siebel.....24
Other Guidance..... 24
Annex 1 - Competencies used to identify Panel members and Chairs.....25

Prepare and Convene a Meeting - EP.G.15A

Standard process for all prioritisation meetings in EPSRC and includes how to prepare and convene and close a meeting, post meeting actions and the role of attendees

Purpose

This document provides step by step instructions for anyone involved with managing prioritisation panel meetings but in particular for Portfolio Managers and support staff on how to prepare for a prioritisation meeting, which documents should be used, various roles of the attendees at the meeting and post meeting actions.

Scope

End to end process standardly used in EPSRC. Variations from this process for outlines and interviews are described in Outline meetings COP [[EP.G.28B](#)], Interview Meeting Procedures COP [[EP.G.18A](#)], Call Planning COP [[EP.G.1G](#)] which should be used in conjunction with this COP

Responsibilities

- **Convenor:** Overall responsibility for the end to end process for a particular meeting. Includes overseeing panel member selection, introducer assignment, COIs, paperwork accuracy and accessibility. Support Chair in their role and manages the relationship. Ensures EPSRC policies are upheld and manages the meeting on the day. Ensures paperwork supporting the agreed outcomes is correct and filed correctly. Manages post panel actions through to announcement or rejection.
- **DST:** As part of the Convenor team have a major supporting role for meetings including ensuring proposals are ready for the meeting, domestics for the meeting, preparing the Extranet and the paperwork to appear on it. Supports the meeting on the day as previously agreed with the Convenor. Siebel and other post meeting actions are completed correctly after the meeting and ensuring panel members expenses and fees are paid.
- **Portfolio Managers:** The Convenor is normally a PM and usually has a PM buddy although the buddy could be another member of the grant team.
- **Chair:** Lead meeting and facilitate discussions, keep to time, ensure UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making are adhered to, have overview of proposals at meeting. Lead discussion to set proposals in context of EPSRC portfolio and ensure panel considers all relevant information and advice has broad support of panel members. Agrees and signs off final outcomes.
- **Panel members:** With reference [to the guidance](#) read meeting papers, score proposals prior to meeting, introduce and discuss proposals at the meeting (based on reviewer comments and PI response), rank proposals
- **Observer:** attends meeting to observe the prioritisation meeting process. Priority in attending as an Observer should be given to EPSRC staff for training, strategic advisory members (e.g. Council or SAN). More details on processes concerning Observers can be found in the [Observers Section](#) of this document.

Pre-requisites

The prioritisation meeting (panel) date and responsible Convenor has been agreed and the meeting set up on Siebel.

End Point

Meeting has taken place and actions from it are complete and the panel status is closed.

Forms to be used

These are highlighted and linked throughout the document.

Internal and External References

[Panel Member Guidance](#)

Meeting Convenor Tool: <http://psliveappsweb0/MeetingConvenorTool>

Introduction

This standard process COP includes:

- Purpose of the Meeting Process
- Details of the roles of the Chair, Introducers, Convenor and DST at an EPSRC panel meeting.
- How to prepare for a meeting.
- How to prepare the pre meeting contextual briefing, Convenor presentation, contextual presentation and meeting spreadsheet
- How to convene a meeting.
- Post meeting actions.
- Close a meeting

Meeting types

EPSRC rely various types of meetings to help judge the relative quality of applications competing for funding. The type of meeting or meetings to be held depends on the peer review process for the call or scheme.

There are four basic types of meeting;

- **Standard** – standard prioritisation panel meetings, process should also be used for Calls.
- **Interview** – standard interview panel meetings, process for Calls and fellowships, see Interview Meeting Procedures COP [[EP.G.18A](#)]
- **Outline** - not part of the standard process – only used as part of a process advertised through a call. See the Outline meetings COP [[EP.G.28B](#)] for specific differences to this process.
- **Expert** – Used on rare occasions when postal reviews are not sought. Can only be used in conjunction with a Call.

Call Planning – For guidance when planning and setting up a Call and help with deciding which peer review process is most appropriate e.g. Expressions of Interest, Outlines or Expert panels, please refer to the Call Planning COP [[EP.G.1G](#)].

Purpose of the Meeting Process

EPSRC relies on peer review panels to judge the relative quality of research proposals competing for funding. The review panels are responsible for placing the proposals before it in a funding priority order. From this list, the final decision is made on funding.

To present defensible decisions to community and applicants, our procedures must be:

- fair to all;
- easy to understand;
- transparent;
- efficient to administer.

It is important that EPSRC uses peer review with integrity and in a consistent way, so all EPSRC funding initiatives follow a number of principles, details of which can be found on our [web site here](#).

There may be occasions where a specific activity does not fit with all the principles. These matters should be discussed with the activity's sponsor, for example the Head of Theme or Research Council Owner. If it is felt that the activity cannot be accommodated in line with the principles, this should be raised with the relevant Director for discussion and approval. If there are any exceptions to these principles, we should clearly state this at the time the call or scheme is established.

EPSRC is committed to ensuring that those who participate in the peer review process recognise the factors that introduce bias into decision making. To do this, it is important to raise awareness of, and take steps to remove the opportunities for unconscious bias in all aspects of our decision-making processes.

All those involved in peer review must help us safeguard our decision making by taking the following steps:

- All applications or nominations must be assessed on equal terms and objectively assessed on their merits using the criteria set for each funding mechanism.
- Question and challenge cultural stereotypes and bias in any EPSRC meetings and be prepared to be challenged.
- Be aware that working with a high cognitive load, with time pressures and the need to make quick decisions, creates conditions for bias which could have an impact on the science we fund.

Panel Convenor's should attend the *Unconscious bias: how to manage bias in your role as a Panel Convenor* training course. Further details are available on Oracle.

The meeting stage provides a very specific function in the peer review process. Taking into consideration the reports from reviewers, and the applicants' responses to those reports, EPSRC's current portfolio, the meeting's sole task is to place the proposals before it in a funding priority order. Standard prioritisation panels' do not review proposals, nor are they asked to make a detailed study of proposal costings. Given this task, the standard prioritisation panel is seen as a generalist body, making use of, but not duplicating or adding to, the expert role of the reviewers.

Optimum environment for panel members

To carry out the assigned tasks, panel members will be most effective if the following conditions are in place:

- Reviewer reports are of a good quality;
- Applicants have seen and responded to the reviewer reports – this provides assurance to panel members that any questions raised by reviewers and the applicant has had an opportunity to respond to them;
- Paperwork is uploaded to the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet in good time. The panel has a reasonable workload, non-competitive proposals are sifted in advance and the panel will have sufficient time to discuss the proposals;
- Meeting attendees understand their task and prepare appropriately and have provided pre-scores in advance of the meeting;
- The panel chair and inexperienced members have been appropriately briefed and they understand their role and responsibilities;
- All panel members are provided with a clear guidance and they are familiar with the assessment criteria and the panel protocols.
- All panel members must be employed by different research institutions, i.e. you cannot have two or more panel members from the same research institution together in at meeting

Change to Pathways to Impact: Meetings with mixed assessment criteria

From 1st March 2020 a separate Pathways to Impact statement and Impact summary is no longer required for ALL UKRI SCHEMES. Where possible, proposals should be assigned to a meeting as early as possible to facilitate assessment of submissions sent prior to the Ptl changes in advance of those without a Ptl

statement. However, we recognise that once submissions post-1 March 2020 are being examined and reviewed you may have no choice but to assign them to the same meeting as those submitted with a Ptl.

If you are preparing for a meeting where a mix of proposals submitted before and after the Pathways to Impact change will be assessed please follow the guidance provided in the link below:
<https://psuportal.ahrc.ac.uk/espace/wzones/Integrators/pr/Docs/Projects/8.Impact%20changes%202020/Integral%20guidance/Peer%20Review%20Assessment%20following%20Ptl%20changes.docx>

This guidance should be read in conjunction with the information within this document.

How to prepare for a meeting:

Meetings are planned in line with the Head of Theme's commitment plans but will also need to take account of the need for sufficient time to feedback reviewer reports to applicants and collate meeting papers in a professional manner.

Many team/theme members will be involved in the planning and preparation of any grant meeting, and it is incumbent on all parties to understand their role and the contribution they will be making to the success of the meeting.

The practicalities of planning for the meeting will need to be addressed, including finalising the date. DST will then book the Peer Review Suite (or alternative meeting room if it's already in use) and arrange overnight accommodation for meeting attendees if required.

Creating the meeting on Siebel

DST are responsible for creating the meeting on Siebel following the guidance in the [PROP. G2.2.A](#)

Please note:

- When creating the meeting, you must select the correct meeting type i.e. 'proposal', 'interview' or 'outline'.
- In the meeting name you must write 'Interviews' or 'Outlines' if it is an interview or outline panel, this ensures the information is published on GOW correctly.
The 'Inform Outcome' box must not be ticked. To inform the panel of the outcome you must do this offline, using the Template in the [Peer Review Toolkit](#). The Rank order list should be uploaded to the extranet and a manual email sent to advise that it is there.

Assigning Proposals to Meetings

Where there is sufficient support from the reviewers, the proposal will be allocated to the most appropriate prioritisation panel meeting. The applicant will see the reviewer reports in order to respond to any factual inaccuracies or questions raised. (The process for feeding back reviewer reports to applicants is described in the COP EP.G.10A [Principal Investigator Responses](#). If reviewer comments are not supportive, the PM should 'review-reject' the proposal.

The normal expectation is that a decision to send a proposal to a meeting is based on the comments from at least three usable reviewer reports, two of which should be supportive. Exceptionally, where a research proposal has been in the system for longer than normal and where it has proved difficult to obtain three reviewer comments, it can be put to a meeting with only two usable/supportive reviewer comments. See COP EP.G.9A [making decision on reviewers](#).

The maximum number of applications assigned for a standard panel to assess in one day is 50. If it is a two-day meeting, the panel should not exceed 70 in total. These limits do not apply to Outline panels or

non-standard panels where the level of paperwork per application is reduced. Convenors should however manage the workload of panel members and consider the impact on decision making.

Selecting Meeting Attendees

Meeting attendees are selected for a specific meeting. EPSRC believes that this approach – rather than using standing committees – offers more value in terms of widening the spread of involvement across our community, greater transparency, and the avoidance of a funded research portfolio dominated by those most involved in the decision-making process. Panel Members are paid a fee for their involvement, except members who are employees of Government bodies as they are not entitled to receive fees.

Panel members are usually chosen from the [EPSRC College](#) and are selected for their expertise in a general field. Membership will come from both universities and industry and is tailored to the types of applications at the meeting, so membership changes from meeting to meeting. We do have some members who will serve on consecutive meetings to maintain continuity.

Panel members should be asked to introduce no more than 12 applications at a standard meeting. For prioritization panels the Chair should NOT be assigned any proposals as introducer as they are expected to have an overview of all the proposals being presented.

What to look for when choosing panel members:

The Chair of the panel:

The Chair works with panel members and EPSRC staff before, during and after the meeting to ensure the panel considers all relevant information. They also need to ensure panel advice has broad support of panel members, delivers EPSRC's strategic goals and is clearly and correctly reported to EPSRC

- Should have EPSRC reviewing experience within the last two years.
- Should be an EPSRC College member.
- Should have recent EPSRC panel experience, ideally within the last two years.
- Should be aware of EPSRC policy, procedures and strategy.
- Should be able to lead and chair a panel meeting.
- Should have standing in the research community served by the panel.
- Should be able to take a broad and strategic view of research inside and outside their own research area.

Panel members/Introducers:

Types of people who make good panel members are:

- Those who have been on a previous panel and have stood out.
- Those who have been seen chairing or contributing effectively to other types of meetings such as steering boards.
- Someone who has a good understanding of the area not just their research field.
- Someone who is pro EPSRC and understands the policies, procedures and strategies.
- Someone who has the respect of the research community.

A more detailed list of competencies for panel members and the chair is available in Annex 1 of this document (below).

Balance of panel members:

Make sure that the panel members cover the range of proposals going to that meeting. The number and type of proposals should determine the panel members that you need. You need to consider:

- Balance of Experience of the process – have they been on a meeting recently? How many have they been on EPSRC panel before? What types of meetings have they been on?

- The proportion of industrialists on the panel – if the proposals going have a high percentage of collaboration with users then this should be reflected in the panel members. For example, in research base, it would be expected that the engineering meetings contain a number of industrialists whereas the math's meetings many not
- **All EPSRC prioritisation and interview panels must be mixed gender.** There is a 30% target for the under-represented gender for all panels. This target does not mean that every panel has to meet that 30%, but some panels will need to exceed this target if some do not meet it.

Exceptions to this policy should be very rare and only in unexpected circumstances. For example, for a small panel of three or four members where someone drops out at the very last minute and no one else can be found. To better accommodate individual requirements, we would like to encourage colleagues to explore alternative options for participation, such as video conferencing.

Support available for people with caring responsibilities

EPSRC is committed to attracting the best potential researchers from a diverse population into research careers and providing support to help them stay should their situation change. We have therefore developed these [guidelines](#) to highlight the support available to researchers (both for panel members and applicants) with caring responsibilities.

Where participation in an EPSRC activity would involve additional care requirements, our expectation is that their employer is approached in the first instance to meet these costs. If their employer is unable to cover these additional costs then EPSRC may reimburse reasonable extra costs incurred. Making arrangements for the care to be provided is the responsibility of the career themselves.

Claims should be made using the relevant form here: <https://epsrc.ukri.org/about/standards/travel/>

Conflicts of Interest are particularly disruptive to smaller panels and there are specific requirements in the EPSRC Policy on Conflicts of Interest ([here](#)) which must be followed. You are advised to recruit panel members as far in advance as possible and to consider approaching additional members to help mitigate against the impact of a panel member dropping out, or the last-minute discovery of a hard conflict of interest. It is easier to stand a panel member down than to find additional panel members at short notice. Information on the interviewees and their team (if appropriate) should be shared as soon as possible so prospective panel members can raise any Conflicts of Interest early.

Checking for conflicts of interest;

Before the panel member is invited to be on a meeting:

- Look at proposals going to the meeting, DO NOT choose anyone who has a proposal going to the meeting.
- Read the panel paperwork to pick up conflicts such as letters of support from industry.
- If the paperwork contains a number of proposals from the same institution then avoid using people from this institution.
- For interview panels – the panel members SHOULD NOT have an institution conflict with any of the proposals. It is EPSRC policy that interviewees should be notified of the panel membership prior to the meeting.

Panel membership should be communicated to interviewees in advance of the interview date. Should the panel membership change e.g. a panel member drops out that cannot be replaced due to short notice, the Convenor should make reasonable effort to inform the interviewees in advance of their interview.

Other panel activities such as external advisory boards, mid-terms reviews are also expected to be mixed gender in line with this policy.

For the further information please see the [EPSRC Conflict of Interest Policy](#)

Inviting panel members

There is a prescribed process for selecting and inviting panel members which must be used. This process was developed in order to ensure that we can demonstrate consistency and transparency in our panel member selection and give an accurate record of diversity.

Once the membership has been agreed and a Chair identified by the Convenor, the DST support staff responsible for the meeting can then contact the short-listed individuals to invite them to attend the meeting.

Panel members should be invited by an F9 email through the meeting in Siebel. If an F9 email is not used, copies of the invite emails should be saved as attachments on the Siebel meeting.

If a panel member has confirmed their attendance, DST will update their status on Siebel to 'Attendance Accepted'. If they decline, the status on Siebel should be marked as 'declined' and a 'declined reason' selected. If it turns out that a panel member has a proposal being considered at the panel meeting, they should be asked to step down.

Please note: any panel member listed on the meeting who has a conflict will be named on the meeting schedule. If you have any panel members who are listed and won't be attending the meeting (i.e. those who have declined) please remove from the panel member list and re-add once the eVolume has been run and / or meeting has happened.

Allocating Introducers

Pre-requisites:

- Ensure that all panel members have been assigned a 'role' in Siebel.
- Before assigning introducers, you must press the 'Conflict' button in Siebel. This needs to be done at **least two hours** before introducers are assigned, then the conflicts will be flagged. (This is for responsive mode only, for Managed calls it is an automated process)
- Panel members need to be marked as 'Attendance Accepted'

Once panel members have been invited and they have accepted, they should be marked as Attendance Accepted in Siebel and then they need to be assigned as introducers.

Panel members should be asked to introduce no more than 12 applications at a standard meeting. For prioritisation panels the Chair should NOT be assigned any proposals as introducer as they are expected to have an overview of all the proposals being presented.

Each proposal is assigned 3 introducers. Each of the specific roles listed below should be considered when assigning in Siebel:

- **First Introducer:** Should be a generalist
- **The Second Introducer** is the 'specialist' - In this context, specialist refers to the Panel member with expertise closest to the subject area of the proposal (considering any conflicts of interest).
- **Third Introducer:** Should be a generalist, who should look at a group of proposals within similar research areas (as far as is practical) so that they are able to compare proposals.

For more detail on the role of each introducer at the meeting, please see section [on 'panel member: introducers'](#).

When assigning Introducers, you should ensure that the procedures set out in the EPSRC policy for avoiding conflicts of interest are fully complied with.

Best practice is for the RC Officer to assign the Secondary introducer first based on the introducer's expertise. Then assign the Primary introducer relatively randomly to balance workload. The tertiary introducer should be assigned based on groupings of research areas where possible and considering workload balance

Meetings must be operated in accordance with the EPSRC policy on conflicts of interest which can be found [here](#).

Siebel will highlight the following conflicts:

1. The Participant is at the Applicants' current Organisation or Co-Investigators Organisation
2. The Participant is at the Organisation of the Proposal
3. The Participant has a staff role on the Proposal
4. The Participant is named as a Project Partner contact or Visiting Researcher on the Proposal
5. The Participant is at an Organisation that is a Project Partner or that of a Visiting Researcher on the Proposal
6. The Participant is at the same Organisation as another Contact who is an Introducer on the Proposal
7. The Participant is a Reviewer of the Proposal

Observers

Priority in attending as an Observer should be given to EPSRC staff for training, strategic advisory members (e.g. Council or SAN). University Research Office staff and academics should not usually be invited to observe a panel meeting unless they can be accommodated consistently, this should be discussed with the Business Improvement Team in advance.

If you have an Observer attending the meeting it is the job of the Convenor to:

- Inform Observers of the arrangements for the meeting including the location, timetable for the day and panel member details. Make it clear that all panel members are asked to abide by the [Principles of public life](#). The contents of the meeting are confidential, including all meeting papers and discussion.
- Inform Observers who are travelling to Polaris House for the meeting to please be aware that parking is limited on site and is on a first come basis; although there is a pay and display car park nearby. On arrival at Reception they should ask for their contact for the day (yourself or a member of support staff) who will collect them from Reception and take them to the meeting room. Staff Observers from within the Research Councils should be informed to decide to meet the panel contact shortly before the meeting to take them to the meeting room.
- On arrival at the meeting room, introduce yourself to the Observer and ensure that there is a nameplate on the table indicating where they should sit.
- Once the meeting starts ask the Observer along with the rest of the attendees to briefly introduce themselves and explain their reason for attending as an Observer.
- Observers are not permitted to participate in the discussion of the meeting, so inform them that if they have any questions or comments, these should be discussed with the meeting Convenor or the Convening Team during the breaks or after the meeting.
- Inform Observers that we welcome any feedback that they may have on the process. If they need further information about the process after the meeting, they should contact the meeting Convenor. Observers should not complete the panel member questionnaire.
- External Observers should not have access to the panel paperwork unless they are from an organisation that is officially a part of the funding process. If access is required on the day of the meeting then this should be arranged beforehand using a loaned EPSRC laptop which has links set up to the relevant documentation.

Roving Panel Members

- Roving panel members are occasionally used to help with tensioning between parallel panels and ensuring consistency in panel practice. Please note that:
 - a. Roving panel members must be added to the panel meeting record in Siebel as a panel member so that they appear on Grants on the Web
 - b. Adding them in Siebel will also ensure that Roving Panel members receive fees in the same way as other Panel Members (please ensure that they only receive payment from one panel meeting)
 - c. They should be given the same Extranet access as normal Panel Members.
 - d. Conflicts identified with Rovers should be highlighted and managed in the usual way

Meeting Papers

Papers for all grant related meetings are available on the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet for all attendees, both external and internal to EPSRC. (Note observers only gain access to the extranet on the day of the meeting.) Panel members will be invited to join the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet by DST in order to access the paperwork. **Printed papers will not be provided by EPSRC.**

A [Panel Member guide to managing Unconscious Bias](#) in Peer Review has been developed with Pearn Kandola for Convenors to use as part of the panel briefing. Convenors should spend time discussing this document with the Chair and the panel in advance of the panel meeting.

Late papers can make the process unfair as there may be insufficient time for the panellists to consider the evidence and the panel may not have all the relevant evidence. If a reviewer comment has been received but has not been sent to the applicant for response then the review must not go to the meeting, (and marked unusable). If a comment has been fed back to the applicant then it must be presented to the meeting along with any response from the applicant. Ensure the panel has sufficient time to read the document. Late papers should be sent to panel members no later than 5 working days prior to the panel meeting.

It is the responsibility of the Convenor to ensure that the panel papers are correct **before** they are shared with panel members. This is particularly crucial for calls that use non-standard papers and where a different process is being followed, as papers won't have automatic editing to remove conflicts of interest for example.

It is the responsibility of the convening team & PMs to ensure that they are aware of any issues or relevant information that may affect an application, and that these are handled appropriately. This includes checking information raised by applicants in their Cover Letter, and the notes sections on Seibel. Please note: information shared in the Cover Letter is for Office use and it is not to be shared with reviewers or panel members. **Personal information must be treated as Official Sensitive.** If you are uncertain of how to handle personal information and the action you need to take please contact the Business Improvement Team.

Sensitive Information and Making Adjustment

It is the responsibility of the applicant to communicate any personal circumstances that may affect their application or interview for EPSRC to consider. The applicant should raise this in their Proposal Cover Letter, or through correspondence at the point of being invited to interview.

So that no applicant is unfairly disadvantaged the Convening Team and Portfolio Manager have a responsibility to address any matters that will require some form of consideration, such as timing or logistical arrangements. If appropriate this may include but is not limited to deferral of the interview to a later date, interview via video conference, or moving the interview slot to later in the interview schedule. Examples of circumstances that could be raised include, that the interviewee was deferred to a later meeting, the interviewee is currently on maternity leave, or the interviewee has a disability.

If you are uncertain of what can be requested, contact the Business Improvement Team, or PSU HR for advice. Requests will be considered on a case by case basis, and the applicant should be consulted as well.

If appropriate and relevant the Convenor must ensure that the Panel members are aware of anything that has been agreed for example: 'Due to personal circumstances of the applicant, the interview was deferred to a later date'. The Convenor must ensure they have the applicants' permission before sensitive information is shared.

Candidates are able to raise sensitive information with the panel in their interview, but panels are reminded that ALL applicants must be assessed against the published assessment criteria.

Advice to panel members

It is important that we provide advice and guidance in order to ensure that panel members acting on our behalf are adequately trained for the task and are able to operate in an effective way. We provide guidance to panel members in a number of ways:

- All College members are asked to complete the on-line College training which introduces the EPSRC peer review process.
- College training is backed up by advice on the website at: <https://epsrc.ukri.org/funding/assessmentprocess/college/>
- Information about peer review meetings is available on the website at: <https://www.epsrc.ac.uk/funding/assessmentprocess/panels/> All attendees receive a link to the guidance on the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet.
- At the start of each meeting, the PM will give a presentation which includes a description of the role of all attendees.

Timeline - Six weeks or more before the meeting

Pre-requisite

The prioritisation panel meeting date is set and room booked.

Funding meeting is setup to involve all relevant Heads of Theme involved in the funding of the meeting– it is important to book a room well in advance of the meeting, to avoid post panel delays

Assign grants to the appropriate list on the panel meeting in Siebel

Pre-Panel Documentation - Guidance on using the Meeting Convenor Tool

The Meeting Convenor Tool (MCT) has been developed to help panel Convenors in preparing the documentation needed for the panel and associated briefings. The tool is a tailored browser using a set of defined queries within MIS and can be accessed [here](#). The tool front page displays a drop-down list of panel meetings available through the tool. The tool is able to show proposals which have joint funding and classification missing; please note changes made in Siebel will only become visible in the tool following the subsequent MIS update overnight.

The tool provides the following:

- Contextual Briefing document which is an individual tailored PDF for each panel member (including the Chair) showing:
 - Guidance about how EPSRC's Balancing Capability strategy should be considered in the context of the role of a panel member
 - The grants they are introducing and for each grant the associated research areas and trajectories, with links to the relevant rationales and Grants on the Web (GoW) pages.
- A table of all research areas relevant to the meeting, and their trajectories, with links to the relevant rationales. The full Convenor report for that panel showing reviewer information for each proposal to be used alongside the [Panel Meeting Proforma](#) to aid note taking
- .Introducer Pre-scores form. Individually tailored pre-populated form to be used to capture the introducer pre-scores prior to the panel meeting.
- Introducer Report Forms (see below)
- A meeting spreadsheet. It automatically updates with data from the tool. It includes macros to support introducer assignment, capture of pre-scores and continuous ranking at the meeting. This spread sheet should be used to capture the panels overall scores for the production of the rank order list, Transformative Rating scores, and additional Conflicts of Interests at the meeting. The spread sheet includes joint funding on proposals on the list and is to be used for the funding

meeting with the Head of Theme. NOTE: columns colour coded are those that need to show on the printed and signed ROL

- Panel Member Letter template:
<https://psuportal.ahrc.ac.uk/espace/do/peerreview/PeerReviewDocs/Projects/Guidance%20Documents%20Project/Docs%20for%20migrating/Templates/Panel%20Member%20Cover%20Letter%20template.docx> This is available in the Peer Review Toolkit, it should be emailed to the panel member and uploaded to the Extranet. Amendments may also need to be made for specific Calls. Please note that the areas in red in this template will need to be updated with relevant information before being sent out

What do I need to do?

- The Convenor needs to ensure that the tailored PDFs are produced and uploaded to the panel member's personal space on the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet. (This can also be done by DST during the eVolume exercise, practices vary please check with support team).
- The PDFs should be saved as attachments to the meeting on Siebel.

Panel Guidance

Panel Guidance should be saved within the Meeting Document folder on the extranet for panel members to access. The general panel guidance for standard mode panel meetings can be found [here](#). There will be specific guidance for different schemes, such as Fellowship panel meetings. For calls specific guidance will need to be developed.

Panel Scoring

Each application must be scored against the assessment criteria using the standardised scoring scale.

It is important that **all panel's use the Overall Score indicator range defined below**. This will give EPSRC a more uniform understanding of how well any application meets the assessment criteria for any call or scheme, across all panel meetings. This is required for UKRI reporting, and the Overall Score will influence the Decision Category used.

Individual Assessment Criteria Scoring

The following individual score indicator range has been developed to help you to determine the score of each of the assessment criteria. The score should be based on the evidence, using your judgement and interpretation of the reviewer comments and PI response to these.

Individual Assessment Criteria Score Indicators	Score
Exceptional – World leading or of exceptional strategic importance	10
Excellent – Leading edge and internationally competitive	9
Very High Quality – Leading edge and internationally competitive	8
High Quality – Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts	7
High Quality – Leading edge nationally, potentially internationally competitive	6

Good Quality – Nationally competitive	5
Potentially Useful – Requires significant improvement	4
Potentially Useful – Requires major improvements	3
Not competitive	2
Not suitable	1
Not ranked – Defer or invite resubmission	0

Overall Score Indicators

The following overall scoring indicator range has been developed to help you to determine the overall score for each application. The overall score should be based on the evidence, using your judgement and interpretation of the reviewer comments and PI response to these. Please consider the different weighting of individual criteria, the overall score should not be an average of all the individual scores, you should consider which indicator is the most appropriate.

Overall Score Indicators	
Exceptional – World leading or of exceptional strategic importance	10
<p>World leading proposals which are of internationally excellent levels of scholarly merit, originality, innovation, novelty and/or timeliness, with an outstanding approach to management and leadership.</p> <p>Leading edge research that is transformative and/or creating new improvements to technologies/techniques/methodologies/tools.</p> <p>Highly likely to make an exceptional contribution to advance the field and wider research endeavour. Will produce invaluable and exciting outcomes, driving the answers to important questions and new knowledge generation.</p> <p>Effectively meets all assessment criteria.</p> <p>Highest priority for funding.</p>	
Excellent – Leading edge and internationally competitive	9
<p>Outstanding proposals which are of internationally excellent levels of scholarly merit, originality, innovation, novelty and/or timeliness, with an excellent approach to management and leadership.</p> <p>Leading edge research that is transformative and/or creating new improvements to technologies/techniques/methodologies/tools.</p> <p>Highly likely to make significant contribution to advance the field and wider research endeavour. Will produce valuable outcomes, addressing important questions and new knowledge generation.</p> <p>Effectively meets all assessment criteria.</p> <p>Very high priority for funding.</p>	

<p>Very High Quality – Leading edge and internationally competitive</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>Work that demonstrates very high levels of scholarly merit, originality, innovation, novelty and timeliness, with an excellent approach to management and/or leadership.</p> <p>Leading edge research that is transformative and/or creating new improvements to technologies/techniques/methodologies/tools.</p> <p>Highly likely to advance the field and wider research endeavour. Will produce valuable outcomes, addressing important questions and new knowledge generation.</p> <p>Effectively meets all assessment criteria.</p> <p>High priority for funding.</p>	
<p>High Quality – Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts</p>	<p>7</p>
<p>Work that demonstrates high levels of scholarly merit, originality, innovation, novelty and timeliness, with a high-quality approach to management and/or leadership.</p> <p>At the forefront of UK research with potential for transformative research and/or creating new improvements to technologies techniques/methodologies/tools.</p> <p>Likely to advance the field and wider research endeavour. Likely to produce valuable outcomes, addressing important questions and new knowledge generation.</p> <p>Effectively meets all assessment criteria.</p> <p>Priority for funding.</p>	
<p>High Quality – Leading edge nationally, potentially internationally competitive</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>Work that is of high quality, effective levels of scholarly merit, originality, innovation, novelty and timeliness, with a high-quality approach to management and/or leadership.</p> <p>Competitive research, potentially transformative and/or creating new improvements to technologies techniques/methodologies/tools.</p> <p>Likely to contribute to the field with valuable outcomes, addressing important questions and new knowledge generation.</p> <p>Effectively meets assessment criteria.</p> <p>Fundable</p>	
<p>Good Quality – Nationally competitive</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Work that is of adequate quality with some strengths, good levels of scholarly merit. Limited originality, innovation, novelty. With a good quality approach to management and/or leadership.</p> <p>Potentially transformative and/or creating new improvements to technologies techniques/methodologies/tools.</p> <p>Moderate likelihood of contributing to the field.</p> <p>Does not fully meet all assessment criteria.</p> <p>Not a funding priority in its current form.</p>	

Potentially Useful – Requires significant improvement	4
<p>Work that will add to understanding but is of inconsistent quality. Has some scholarly merit, innovative ideas and good components, but has significant gaps. Unlikely to advance the field significantly.</p> <p>Does not meet all assessment criteria.</p> <p>Not a funding priority in its current form.</p>	
Potentially Useful – Requires major improvements	3
<p>Work that will add to understanding, but is of inconsistent quality, innovative ideas and/or components, and has major gaps. Unlikely to advance the field significantly.</p> <p>It does not meet all assessment criteria.</p> <p>Not recommended for funding in its current form.</p>	
Not competitive	2
<p>Work which will add to understanding, but to a low or inconsistent quality and has major gaps. Unlikely to advance the field.</p> <p>It does not meet assessment criteria.</p> <p>Not recommended for funding.</p>	
Not suitable for funding	1
<p>Work that is unlikely to advance the field. A proposal that has an unsatisfactory level of originality, quality and significance.</p> <p>Flawed in their scientific approach or are repetitious of other work.</p> <p>Not suitable for funding.</p>	
Not ranked – Defer or invite resubmission	0
<p>Defer: usually because there is insufficient information to make a decision, e.g. additional reviews are required.</p> <p>Invite resubmission: for exceptional cases, where a simple change can substantially improve the proposal in order to make it very competitive for funding in its revised form.</p>	

Introducer Report Forms

For each proposal, one or more panel members (the 'Introducers') will have been nominated to act as summarisers and to lead the discussion.

The Introducer's Report Form is intended as an 'aide memoire' during discussions at meetings as well as a record of the introducers assessment summary. Introducers need to be encouraged to complete all sections of the form. They are collected at the end of the meeting must be stored as an attachment on the meeting in Siebel as they form part of the audit trail of the decision-making process.

Introducer Report Forms are generated by the Meeting Convenor Tool, these will populate bespoke forms for each introducer. Manual/off-system forms are not permitted. For Calls, up to five additional assessment criteria can be added to introducer report forms from the MCT.

Introducers are asked to look at proposals and assign their initial scores before the meeting and return their pre-scores to the office at least three working days before the meeting.

Timeline - Two Weeks before the Meeting (approx.)

- Contact the Chair to introduce yourself as the Convenor and go through their briefing, highlighting key points (see below).
- Produce / Print off meeting notes from MCT. Select meeting then click 'Create Convenor Notes'
- It is the Convenors job to be familiar with read meeting papers
 - note any missing reviewer comments, PI responses
 - note any late papers
 - fill out panel notes with any foreseeable concerns.

Timeline - The Week before (approx.)

Chair's Brief

After looking through the papers write a chair's brief and upload to the chairs secure folder on the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet. A template chair's brief is available [here](#) and includes:

- Timetable
- Attendees including EPSRC staff and observers
- Processes that will be used in the meeting that are not described in the meeting guidance notes.
- Issues from previous meetings that have filtered through to the upcoming meeting.
- Issues on proposals in the upcoming meeting

Ensure that the chair understands that EPSRC require the panel to have a full discussion during the panel to ensure all relevant information is covered. The Chairperson should consider how they will structure/facilitate these discussions during the meeting. Make a note of any late papers that are added to the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet before the meeting.

Late papers should be sent to panel members no later than 5 working days prior to the panel meeting.

Panel Meeting Spreadsheet

Use the spreadsheet that is created through the Meeting Convenor Tool. This now contains all the mandatory columns needed for the signed Rank Ordered List. All the other columns are useful at some point in the process and should not be deleted but just hidden as required for current use. If the spreadsheet is created at least one day after the introducers have been assigned in Seibel then the spreadsheet will also include assigned introducers and all known Conflict of Interests

Panel Presentation

The panel presentation should be discussed with the panel and uploaded in advance of the meeting.

Agreeing Funding Areas

Any Senior PM within a theme has the authority to agree any Funding area relevant to that theme. To

avoid delays post panel, Senior PMs should be prompted to agree Funding Areas in Siebel. This is only required on successful grants, but to avoid delays post panel these may be agreed in advance of the meeting on all applications assigned to that meeting. Senior PMs should be prompted to complete this action immediately after the funding meeting and inform the Convenor once completed. This will help avoid delays in processing, especially when there are cross-theme funding areas.

Timeline - Two Days before the Meeting (approx.)

Introducers are asked to look at proposals and assign their initial scores before the meeting and return their pre-scores to the office at least three working days before the meeting. These scores should be entered into the panel Convenor Rank Ordered List spreadsheet. This will contain the proposals going to the meeting in rank order based on the pre-scores, with highest pre-score is at the top of the list.

Upload the pre-ranked list to the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet and inform panel members it is available.

Convenor Presentation

A [Panel Presentation template](#) can be used for the convenor presentation

- The template contains the standard slide set for Convenors.
- Convenor will need to add an agenda for the meeting and any panel specific guidance.
- The Convenor must take time to go through the UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making and explain the importance of following the prescribed process to ensure fairness and reduce the opportunities for bias. Making reference to the unconscious bias briefing for panel members included in the panel papers.
- The Convenor should also take time to explain the assessment criteria being used, the weighting of criteria, and to point out any differences in criteria between schemes (hard copies of the standard grant, New Investigator and fellowship assessment criteria are available in the Peer Review Suite).
- The Convenor should also take time to explain how the panel score should be derived, stating that this is not an average score of the reviewer or introducer scores, and the pre-score is used to produce a running order.
- For Calls the Convenor should also provide additional background information about the call the peer review process that has been used.
- The final presentation should be saved:
 - In the [relevant Meeting folder](#) within Meeting Convenor Tool Documents
 - As an attachment to the meeting on Siebel

Timeline - During the meeting

Roles and Responsibilities at the Prioritisation Panel Meeting

The Convening Team

Each meeting is moderated by the panel Convenor. The Convenor works closely with the meeting Chair and their role is to ensure the meeting adheres to EPSRC principles and protocols. The Convenor usually has a buddy to provide additional support in the meeting and to keep accurate notes of the discussion.

Specific activities to note are as below.

- A member of DST is usually responsible for setting up any electrical appliances needed for the day, making sure the nameplates are set out in the meeting room and also for the domestics of the day. This will include collecting the panel members from Reception (a colleague in the same section may need to take on this role to alleviate the pressure on the principal support staff member). There are also hard copies of the standard assessment criteria and the Transformative Research rating definitions available in the Peer Review Suite. Off-site panel meetings should also provide these for quick reference.

At the start of the meeting:

- Chair will lead brief introductions of attendees at the beginning of the meeting, so that the roles of all staff attending or observing are clear to all.
- The tabling of papers is no longer permitted as this may lead to bias as the panel members will not have sufficient time to read and assimilate the information given to assess the application properly. As a result of this reviews cannot be accepted less than 10 days before the meeting date. If an exception to this rule is required then themes must discuss this with the Business Improvement Team via the [REDACTED].
- The Convenor will brief the panel on the UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making, panel process, protocols, assessment criteria and the scoring range used at the meeting so that attendees are aware of their role and what is expected of them. A copy of the panel presentation template is available:
<https://psuportal.ahrc.ac.uk/espace/do/peerreview/PeerReviewDocs/Projects/Guidance%20Documents%20Project/Docs%20for%20migrating/Templates/Panel%20Member%20Cover%20Letter%20template.docx>
- The convenor should highlight our commitment to DORA principles, and remind assessors that journal-based metrics (such as journal impact factors) and conference ratings cannot be used as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles or contribute towards making funding decisions.
- The running order of the meeting is normally based on the pre-scores submitted by introducers in advance of the meeting.
- New Investigators, standard grants and fellowship applications will be considered on separate lists at the panel meeting.

During the meeting

- Ensuring that due process is followed requires the meeting Convenor to help the Chair conduct the meeting through the process of considering each proposal and reaching an agreed funding prioritisation list. A key role of the Convenor in this is to be alert to, and prevent, any re-reviewing.
- In the meeting the Convenor should support the Chair to ensure the UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making and EPSRC panel meeting processes are adhered to. The Convenor should be prepared to be assertive and challenge the Chair or panel members if they are not following best practice. It is important that the Convenor upholds objective decision-making processes.
- The **Convenor** should be willing to offer policy advice on individual proposals if required. The Head of Theme, if in attendance, may also be able to respond to any policy queries from the panel members.
- After each application has been discussed, scored and ranked, panel members are also asked to give a Transformative Research rating from A-D

Note Taking

At least one of the members of staff in attendance will take notes at the meeting. The [Panel meeting proforma](#) for note taking provides space for comments against each assessment criteria, including categories for grants processing notes and should be completed during the meeting for each grant.

- The proforma serves as an aide memoir of specific gaps in addressing assessment criteria and is used as reference when creating the rank ordered list
- The proforma provides clarification of the grant's assessment, required in order to complete processing checks
- Key justification for the final assessment score is derived from the proforma and used to create feedback (and a funding summary) where necessary.
- The proforma should be discarded once feedback has been sent (if relevant) or three months following the relevant funding decision, whichever is later.
- The full convenor report, produced by the Meeting Convenor Tool can be used for general notes and should be discarded once feedback has been sent (if relevant) or three months following the relevant funding decision, whichever is later.

Exceptionally for Interview Panels any questions asked in addition to the set questions need to be recorded

New Investigator Award

If the panel raise a concern that the application does not appear to fit the spirit of the scheme the Convenor should make a note of this but inform the panel that the applications presence at the panel confirms that this has already been considered and a judgement made of its suitability. In the case of New Investigator Awards EPSRC is more likely to provide panel feedback and invite a resubmission where minimal, simple changes would substantially improve the proposal in order to make it competitive for funding within the New Investigator Award. Please refer to the NIA COP for details on fit to scheme.

At the end of the meeting

- The Convenor should ensure that the **Chair signs the rank ordered list at the end of the meeting.**
- At the end of the meeting, make sure all panel members hand in all panel paperwork, including their completed Introducer Forms (if they haven't uploaded to the EPSRC Peer Review Extranet) and, if they wish, their travel and expenses forms.
- Panel members should be encouraged to complete the online meeting questionnaire after the meeting.

Officials at the meeting:

Convenor

- Should actively convene the meeting by being an active member of the meeting. The Convenor should be prepared to be assertive and challenge the Chair or panel members if they are not following best practice. It is important that the Convenor upholds objective decision-making processes.
- Should brief the Chair before the meeting on the proposals.
- Should perform the presentation at the start of the meeting so that everyone in the room knows what they are doing and what their roles are.
- Should keep the Chair to time and push the meeting on if needed.
- Should make sure that the meeting adheres to EPSRC policy and procedure by stopping any re-reviewing; stop the panel members if they are not using the invited resubmission policy correctly etc.
- Should be able to answer questions / queries that the introducers may have or find out at an appropriate time in the meeting e.g. lunch.
- Should be able to suggest solution and help the Chair to resolve conflict at the meeting.
- Should have the final say on how the conflict will be resolved such as defer for more reviewers.

- Should ask the introducers whether they have any specific feedback for the applicant and feed this back via the funded / not funded letters.
- Should keep a formal record of the panel decisions; overall score, TR score, and any Conflict of Interests that were not known before the meeting.

The Chair is either an academic or industrialist who has experience of EPSRC prioritisation meetings.

- Lead the panel meeting
- Facilitate discussions
- Keep the meeting to time
- Have an overview of all the proposals at the meeting
- Lead discussions that help set the proposals in the wider context of the whole EPSRC portfolio
- Ensure (in co-operation with EPSRC staff) the UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making are adhered to and procedures are followed.
- The Chair has the responsibility to ensure that the panel discussion is based the assessment criteria and the evidence provided.
- The Chair should challenge inappropriate or irrelevant comments.
- Ensure that changes to scores or a proposal rank has a clear and complete rationale to back them up.
- Work with panel members and EPSRC staff before, during and after the meeting to ensure the panel considers all relevant information.
- Ensure panel advice has broad support of panel members, delivers EPSRC's strategic goals and is clearly and correctly reported to EPSRC.
- Specify any formal panel feedback that should be provided to the applicant

Panel members: Introducers

- Should read as many proposals in the pack that they can so that they can join in the tensioning / ranking discussion.
- Should concentrate on the reviewer comments, principal investigators (PI) response and the contextual information in making their decision on the proposal.
- Should take into consideration the written comments made by the reviewers rather than the tick boxes.
- Comments should be based on the assessment criteria (quality, national importance, resources and management, applicant(s) ability) and any other call specific criteria.

For each application, three panel members (the 'Introducers') will have been nominated to present a summary of the information and to lead the discussion.

Introducers should present the collective views of the reviewers and set the application, reviews and PI response in the context of the wider EPSRC portfolio. Each Introducer should also complete an Introducer's Report Form for each proposal they introduce. Completed forms are collected and filed against the meeting as part of the audit trail of the decision-making process.

Introducers should also take into consideration the PI's response to the reviewers. Reviews that have not been fed back to the PI for comment should be marked 'too late' and not be included in the panel papers.

Having introduced a particular proposal, the Introducer will be asked to discuss their pre-scores out of 10 (quality, national importance, impact, resources and management and applicant's ability) and assign it a score. This is to help rank proposals in priority order for funding.

The final score is used in determining the proposal's relative ranking. Once compiled, the meeting will be asked to review the overall rankings, to revise them if necessary, and agree a final priority list.

It is important that all panel members uphold objective decision-making processes. All panel members should ensure that the discussion is based on the assessment criteria and the evidence provided. All attendees should challenge inappropriate comments or scores offered without clear and complete evidence to back them up.

Different role of introducers

- **First Introducer** (generalist) should:
 - Identify discrepancies between reviewers' comments, highlight important issues, and address whether the PI has responded well to these.
 - Lead discussion on the proposal, basing this around the assessment criteria and the scores given to each criterion.
 - Focus on quality as the primary criterion, giving due consideration to the other criteria
 - Comment on how the research fits with EPSRC's published strategy as part of the discussion of the major secondary criterion of National Importance criterion.
- **The second** introducer (specialist*) should:
 - Add any additional comments to first introducer.
 - Highlight reasons for differences in scores between introducers (where appropriate).
 - Focus on quality as the primary criterion, giving due consideration to the other criteria.
 - Comment on how the research fits with EPSRC's published strategy as part of the discussion of the major secondary criterion of National Importance criterion.
- **Third Introducer** (generalist, contextual) should:
 - Identify any discrepancies, particularly where there's disagreement between the first and second introducer.
 - Focus on the major secondary criterion of National Importance, introducing any discussion that hasn't taken place.
 - Raise any strategic issues based on the batch of proposals they are introducing (the third introducer will be assigned proposals based on a grouping of research areas).
- Introducers should bring a non-bias view to the proposal (work proposed and the applicant applying).

The aim is that the third introducer should look at a group of proposals within similar research areas so that they are able to compare proposals.

*In this context, specialist refers to the Panel member with expertise closest to the subject area of the proposal (considering any conflicts of interest). For joint projects, Introducers should be added to the Parent proposal only.

Reaching the Funding Prioritisation Order

The running order list is provided for panel members on the displayed spreadsheet, this is based on the average pre-scores. Note that the spreadsheet will also give the divider number, grant reference, name of applicant, institution, introducer 1 name and scores (quality/excellence, impact, National Importance, Resources and Management, Applicants ability), introducer 2 name and scores, introducer 3 name and scores and running order grade. The display should not show proposal values, in order to steer the meeting away from using cost as a comparative criterion.

The displayed list should also show 'conflicts' against any proposals, as a reminder for panel members to leave the room at the relevant point. Any additional conflicts which emerge at the meeting should be recorded on the spreadsheet and loaded up on Siebel in such a way that the evidence of the conflicts is clearly visible, thereby ensuring the preservation of documentation in the event of any challenge to the process.

Successive proposal discussion should be based on the merits of the individual proposal and how it scores against the assessment criteria. The pre-score does not determine the final ranking, these are to be used to establish the running order only. Once the introducers have discussed their scores, the application should then be ranked using the Overall Score using the scoring range defined [above](#). A proposal initially given a pre-score 10, for example, can be ranked lower than one initially graded at nine. The meeting will quickly see that the running order grades represent an initial guide only, and not an absolute mark.

By using the defined Overall Score definition, applications given a score below 6 will be deemed not fundable in their current form.

In adopting this procedure however, the meeting must not skip over the proposals which have low pre-ranked scores – fair discussion should be given to all the proposals. This is particularly important as the full rank ordered lists from the meeting will be published on the EPSRC web site. After discussing each proposal, the meeting should rank it immediately. This helps to keep the panel member's memory of the list fresh and will save time at the end of the meeting.

Please see the [Post Meeting Rank Ordered Lists COP EP.G.19A](#).

At the end of the meeting, print off a copy of the rank ordered list and ensure that the Chair signs and dates the list before he/she leaves the building. This confirms his/her contentment with the list. Since the signed rank-ordered list is also required by the Head of Theme before the final funding cut-off can be decided, obtaining the Chair's contentment at this point ensures that decisions can be processed in a timely manner.

Guidance on panels suggesting different research areas:

- The PDFs produced by the MCT provide the panel with guidance on which research areas we feel are most relevant to each proposal – this is based on our research area classification of the proposal.
- You may find that occasionally the panel disagree with our classification. If this is the case, it is the role of the Convenor to make a note of any discrepancies.
- If issues can't be resolved in the meeting then the Convenor should discuss this with the relevant PM, and if appropriate the Head of Theme, to decide if we should amend our classification.

Our policy should be that if the panel provides a strong case as to why the classification is incorrect then we should amend our classification.

Before closing the meeting, the Convenor should ensure the following;

- The Rank Ordered List is signed and dated by the Chair and shows those columns highlighted in the spread sheet from the MCT – Grant reference, PI Name, Holding Organisation Name, Overall Score, Rank, TR Score, Conflict1, Conflict 2, Conflict 3, Total Grant Value, Running Total.
- Ensure that the panel members have handed in completed introducer forms or uploaded them to EPSRC Peer Review Extranet or will send them by email (it is part of their work and forms part of the audit trail)
- Request panel members to complete the panel member questionnaire which should be available on the extranet

Note: The panel should not be asked to identify a Quality Cut Off

After the meeting

Post-Meeting Actions

The Convenor needs to prepare the ROL/Spreadsheet from the panel meeting for the Funding meeting.

Check that all information is correct and the following information has been added: additional Conflict of Interests identified at the meeting, TR scores, Host institution letter (if applicable) is acceptable, any specific feedback.

The Convenor needs to write up the [Generalised Meeting Note](#) of the prioritisation meeting. This includes:

Resubmission	Is this proposal being recommended for resubmission and if so on what basis.
Deferral	Is this proposal being deferred for further reviewers and if so on what basis and are there any suggestions for further reviewers.
Resources	Are the resources fully justified or has peer review identified inadequate justification, and if so, has the PI responded adequately in the PI response.
Conflicts	Record of any conflicts declared at the meeting.
Host Institution Letter of Support	If attached and relevant, is the Host Letter of Support satisfactory and if not is there any specific feedback?
Applicant Feedback for next stage Peer Review	Is there any specific feedback to share with the applicant and panel members at further peer review stages, in particular, Fellowship Interview Panels and full proposal panels following outline stage?

All notes of meetings are subject to Freedom of Information (FOI) requests. [The Generalised Meeting Note](#) must be uploaded to the meeting on Siebel for audit purposes.

The [Panel meeting proforma](#) is discarded once feedback has been sent (if relevant) or three months following the relevant funding decision, whichever is later.

Post-meeting the Convenor will add a note to the grant summarising any issues and actions specific to that grant **if relevant** such as unjustified resources, additional conflicts, adequacy of host letter of support. (Instructions: open grant-notes tab, select 'new' -from drop-down list under type select 'general note'-add note in 'description' field detailing follow-up actions.)

The Funding meeting

The Head of Theme will decide the cut-off line for funding at a meeting which has been planned into the process (to be held as soon as possible after the meeting(s)). This meeting should include the Convenor and their panel buddy. Any issues which need actions (e.g. about the Peer Review room or business process issues) can be raised at this meeting. The Head of Theme's decisions are entered into the rank ordered list.

Panel Records

Meeting Convenors should ensure all the following paperwork relating to the meeting are uploaded as attachments to the meeting on Siebel as soon as possible after the meeting.

1. Rank Ordered List – signed by Chair
2. Rank Ordered List – with funding cut off signed by all Heads of Theme involved (this could be the same document as 2).
3. Completed and complete excel file of the meeting spread sheet
4. Note of official feedback from panel to PIs
5. Specific panel guidance
6. Chairpersons brief
7. Completed Introducers forms - DST are responsible for uploading completed introducer forms. They should be sorted in grant reference ordered by introducer.
8. [Generalised meeting note](#)

Any specific feedback from the meeting should be entered on Siebel. The post meeting can also be a good opportunity to review which panel members should be invited again, and to identify if any member would be an appropriate future Chair.

Post decision checks should be carried out as detailed in the checklist for all submissions, whether funded or not:

<https://psuportal.ahrc.ac.uk/espace/do/peerreview/Lists/Post%20meeting%20checklists%20Martin%20Sweet/standard.aspx>

DST will inform panel members of the outcome of the meeting. An Enquiry or email should be raised to DST following the meeting, listing the panel members and asking them to email the panel members with the outcome.

The panel spreadsheet should be updated in the MCT with the rank, overall score and meeting outcomes.

A csv file should be prepared using the 'Create csv' button in the MCT. This should then be sent to the DST, to be uploaded into Siebel. (User Guidance is available in the Tool)

Make Decision - Please note that the Approval emails are sent straight away there is not an option to set a date or time.

Rejection emails are sent out at 7.30 pm on the communication date set by the user, regardless if a time is also set.

Convenor should check that meeting scores have been uploaded and all relevant documentation (Rank Ordered List, Introducer forms etc.) has been uploaded to the meeting before approving/rejecting proposals.

Note that when processing the application post panel that the 'Inform Outcome' box must not be ticked. To inform the panel of the outcome you must do this offline. The Rank order list should be uploaded to the extranet and a manual email sent to advise that it is there.

Managing Meeting Outcomes

Manually adding outcomes on a per Grant/Report basis is the Research Councils responsibility. Before the meeting outcomes are recorded the RC officer should ensure that the post panel actions have been completed. For guidance please see the [Managing Meeting Outcomes COP EP.G. 20C](#). Outline proposals need to be ranked appropriately to ensure the correct next steps in Siebel – see Rank Order List COP.

Completing the Rank Order List

The full process for managing the ranking in Siebel for both outline and full proposals can be found here: <https://moss.ssc.rcuk.ac.uk/grants/Documents/Post%20Meeting%20Rank%20Ordered%20Lists.doc>.

Feedback

In General

For standard applications that go through a postal peer review stage, feedback is received in the form of reviewer forms prior to the prioritisation meeting and the rank order list information published on [EPSRC's Grants on the Web \(GoW\)](#) system shortly after the meeting. Occasionally there is specific feedback from the prioritisation meeting which should be passed to the applicant. If an application has not been postal peer reviewed, feedback from the meeting will be provided. Feedback is not usually given for expressions of interest or outline applications.

If applications are in response to a managed funding opportunity, the funding opportunity document should detail what feedback will be available.

Reviewer comments will be available to applicants in the research office Joint Electronic Submission (Je-S) system account for a limited time. If there is specific panel feedback it should be sent to the applicant and research offices.

Please see the [Feedback to Applicants COP EP.G.20A](#) for further guidance on how and when to provide Feedback.

Closing the meeting on Siebel

Before closing a meeting on Siebel, it is important that the following actions are completed:

- Each meeting must have one EPSRC Convenor, marked as 'attended', with the role listed as 'Convenor'
- Each meeting must have one Panel Chair, marked as 'attended', with the role listed as 'Chair'.
- All panel members who attended must be marked as 'attended', with the role listed as 'member'
- All panel members who were invited to attend the meeting must be listed within the participant list.
- No meeting should be closed with any attendees listed with no final status, role or attended duration. (e.g. Selected and attendance accepted are not final statuses)

Other Guidance

Further guidance on meeting processes can be found in the following COP documents:

- www.epsrc.ukri.org/funding/assessmentprocess/principles/
- EP.G.18A [Interview Meeting Procedure](#).

Annex 1 - Competencies used to identify Panel members and Chairs

These competencies aim to summarise the personal qualities and characteristics of effective panel members, and therefore includes skills, experience, knowledge, qualifications, aptitude, and attitude. EPSRC uses these competencies in the identification of potential new members, and also during post-meeting review to select future panel members and Chairs.

Competencies are fundamental personal characteristics and are therefore not task or process specific. The extent to which an individual possesses specific competencies can be inferred from a consideration of their current job, previous and other professional roles, and also through personal interactions with EPSRC.

Research Knowledge

- Able to understand the content of the research proposals under consideration; (It is not a requirement to be able to assess the scientific merit of all proposals under consideration, since expert reviews are normally provided);
- Aware of developments in the broad research field and science generally;
- Familiar with the research process and able to appreciate the different aspects of research quality (e.g. methodology, innovation, adventure, dissemination, management etc.);

EPSRC Knowledge

- Understands EPSRC role in funding UK science, and its research strategy;
- Understands EPSRC business processes, including peer review procedures;
- Willing to operate constructively within the EPSRC peer review process;

Analysis and Judgement

- Able to make objective decisions, based on the evidence presented;
- Able to reconcile different, often contradictory, pieces of information in order to reach a balanced judgement;
- Able to sift out essential information.

Interpersonal Skills

- Listens actively, in order to understand other people's views;
- Able to summarise complex information and communicate key issues effectively;
- Able to present persuasive arguments, willing to debate actively where necessary;
- Able to work with others to achieve objectives;
- Able to accept collective decision making.

Organisation and Management

- Willing to undertake the requested work and complete thoroughly;
- Adopts an organised approach to tasks;
- Plans activities well, to anticipate potential problems and be fully prepared for events.

Values and Ethics

- Commitment to the advancement of science, and willing to champion the outcomes of UK research;
- Acts impartially (without regard for prejudice, special interests or self-interest);
- Belief in fairness and due process; adheres to Nolan principles of public life;
- Will speak out against misconduct and injustice.