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QUICK FACTS

- **Budget**: up to £200,000
  - Around 18-21 proposals per year

- **Duration**: up to 18 months

- **Deadline**: none (rolling call)
  - But 3 Grant Assessment Panels,
    - March, July and November each year
PART 1: KEY PARAMETERS OF THE GRANT

1. ESRC-funded data
2. Early career researchers
3. Research impacts
4. Innovative data or methodologies
LIST OF ESRC RESOURCES

Longitudinal
Biodata
Election studies
Big data
Employment
International comparative
Qualitative studies
Linguistic

For full list, please refer to appendix A:
* http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/funding/funding-opportunities/sdai-open-call-specification/
EARLY CAREER RESEARCHER (ECR)

Genuine involvement of ECR:
- Lead author on paper/s
- Involved in dissemination
- Tailored skills development
- Can be PI

Definition:
- Maximum of four years academic research experience since submission of PhD, unless already PI on ESRC grant / Or equivalent professional standing / Must have submitted PhD by the time the grant starts / Career breaks will be taken into account

For more information, see FAQs: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/funding/funding-opportunities/sdai-open-call-faqs/
RESEARCH IMPACT

- Identification of and communication with key stakeholders, i.e. non-academic organisations working in the field throughout project

To be demonstrated through
- Letters of support
- Collaboration
- Detailed and sophisticated dissemination strategy
INNOVATIVE DATA OR METHODOLOGIES

Data linkage with
- Administrative Data Research network (http://adrn.ac.uk/)
- Local government and business data
- Part of the ESRC Big Data initiative
PART 2: ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Proposals reviewed by (at least) two academics and one user

Shortlisting for consideration by panel

Introduced by two academics and one user panel member
  - Subject expertise of reviewers and introducers

Figures from SDAI 3:

96 outline bids

40 invited to submit full applications and considered by panel

18 proposals funded
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Originality, innovation and potential contribution to knowledge
Research design and methods
Potential for capacity-building
Project management and research partnerships
Outputs, dissemination and potential for impact on theory, policy and practice
Value for money
Time commitments of research staff
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Originality, innovation and potential contribution to knowledge
Research design and methods

Potential for capacity-building
Project management and research partnerships

Outputs, dissemination and potential for impact on theory, policy and practice
Value for money
Time commitments of research staff
REVIEWER AND INTRODUCER SCORES

REVIEWERS:
Outstanding, excellent, good, satisfactory, fair/ some weaknesses, poor
(essentially six point scale)

INTRODUCERS:
10 point scale, effectively only scores 5 to 10 being used
(now we are talking numbers)
## RANKING OF PROPOSALS BEFORE MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely decision</th>
<th>No of bids</th>
<th>Range of reviewer scores</th>
<th>Range of introducers scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8 - 4.7</td>
<td>9 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5 - 4.0</td>
<td>7.67 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7 - 4.0</td>
<td>6.7 - 5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 40 Funds for 20 projects  
Total funded: 18

Essentially, (just over) half the maybes could be funded
# Examples of *Maybe* Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introducer scores</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 3: REFLECTIONS

Key criteria
- Contribution to knowledge, often through innovation
- Impact: Letters of support/collaboration
- Capacity building: career development for promising ECR
- Important topic
- Less important – value for money

What else is being discussed:
- Being able to deliver, i.e. publications
- Comparative case studies needed to be justified beyond comparable data
- Paying researcher in other countries again needed to be well justified
DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION SPECIAL SDAI INITIATIVE

Essentially similar format as SDAI proposals
- £200,000
- 18 months

But
- not limited to ESRC funded resources and
- submissions need to address topic areas specified by the DoE:
  - Teaching and testing
  - Disadvantage/ supporting vulnerable children
  - Education trajectories
  - Predictive tool for individual pupils
  - Attendance at school
  - Careers provision

Deadline: 16th of March 2017

http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/funding/funding-opportunities/sdai-dfe-highlight-notice/
PART 4: ANY QUESTIONS?

More information: ESRC website
- http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/funding/funding-opportunities/sdai-open-call-specification/

Contact: sdai@esrc.ac.uk

Myself: T.Haux@kant.ac.uk