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***General Notes on Completing the Application Form***

* The application must be supported by two references.
* All sections of the form must be word-processed using at least a 10pt font. Please ensure that the format of the form is preserved.
* You may submit up to **four images** with your application in a separate PDF file but otherwise no other documents (for example a personal statement or covering letter) will be accepted. Each image should be on a separate page, and should not be made from a combination of other images.
* It is the applicant's responsibility to complete the application. The applicant should keep in regular contact with anyone providing information to ensure that all parts are completed and submitted by the deadline. Incomplete applications will not be progressed.
* Application assessment criteria are provided at the end of these notes.
* Wherever possible questions should be addressed to your University contact in the first instance; if this is not possible then please contact LDoc Administration at ldoc@rca.ac.uk

***Submission Checklist***

In order to complete your application, please ensure that the following have been sent to your chosen University contact (as per Question 6) by the deadline.

* Completed Application Form
* Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form

***Detailed Notes on Completing the Application Form***

***Question 2: Contact details***

Please provide contact details covering the period November 2017 to June 2018.

***Question 3: Eligibility***

We will need to see proof of eligibility to work in the UK before any offer of employment can be made.

***Question 4: Professional experience***

Provide information about any employment, work or professional experience (research and /or practice-based) that is relevant to your proposed programme of study and will therefore strengthen your application. Please use the space provided and do not attach additional pages.

***Question 5: Career in higher education to date***

If you have more than one qualification at the same level, please provide details.

***Question 6: Details of the Institution and Fellowship***

Please enter the University and Fellowship for which you are applying, and give the name of the principal person (either an administrator or academic) you have been liaising with, and to whom references should be sent. This is most likely to be the contact name on the Fellowship advert.

***Question 7: Proposed research project.***

This is the proposal for your project, in response to the themes raised in the Fellowship Vision. You should outline how you would develop the project in line with your own research interests, expertise, and career development needs.

Assessors will look for evidence of high quality and strong potential for research (evidence of intellectual purpose and originality, reasons for, and approach towards, undertaking your proposed study, awareness of the research context).

Use clear and concise language, avoiding jargon.

Please note there is a strict limit of 1,000 words (excluding bibliographic references) on the main section. The number of words used must be provided. **Please note that any text exceeding 1,000 words will be cut out and the assessor will not be able to read it.** A list of brief academic references at the end of your research proposal is preferable to footnotes.

***Question 8: Training needs***

Please give an indication of training needs you anticipate, both to support your research project and the development of your future career. Although LDoc cannot commit to meeting these needs, your answers here will be used to inform LDoc training plans.

***Question 9: Resources***

Please describe any study trips, facilities, access to libraries, archives or similar, which are integral to your research. This will enable assessors to determine whether LDoc can provide or support these.

Also mention any other potential Partner organisation with which you already have links as part of your research.

***Question 11: Why a Creative Economy Engagement Fellowship?***

Please explain why you have chosen to put forward an application for a Creative Economy Engagement Fellowship, how your proposal fits with the creative economy (<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/innovation/creative-economy-research/>) . You should also use examples from your previous experience to demonstrate why you are suitable for this position.

We are basing our interpretation of the ‘Creative Industries’ on the DCMS definition - ‘those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property.’ However, we are also extending this to include any organisation or business which uses creative elements without necessarily being a ‘creative industry’ (for example, a designer working within a banking organisation). Note: There are thirteen sub-sectors under the term ‘creative industries’ and these are: advertising and marketing; architecture; crafts; design; fashion; film, TV, video, radio and photography; software and computer games; museums, galleries and libraries; music, performing and visual arts; and publishing.’

***Question 11: Your referees***

You should choose your two referees carefully. Together they should have a good knowledge of your academic or professional record to date.

***When the application form has been completed…***

* Submit the completed application form to the University contact person listed on the Fellowship Advert, along with **the** **Equal Opportunities form** (see page 5).

***Guidance for LDoc Member Institutions on completing questions 15-18***

**These questions are for internal use only, and only to be completed for the successful applicant who is put forward for the Fellowship.**

***NOTE: Question 9: Resources***

**Although question 9 is for completion by applicants on their Application Form, institutions should identify cases where use of a particular resource is critical to the research project. This may include LDoc Partner institutions, or other potential Partner Institutions.**

***Question 14: Mentors***

**Please give full details of the mentoring team. All researchers should have one academic mentor based at their institution. Depending on their career aspirations, researchers may benefit from a second academic mentor, or from an industry based mentor.**

***Question 15: Researcher Training Needs: what training is needed to support the researcher’s research or career development?***

**Is the researcher’s own assessment in Q 10 realistic? Are there any other areas you would identify at this stage? LDoc will liaise with you in planning its wider programme for researchers’ development and training, but it is useful to have an indication at this stage.**

***Question 16: Ethical Issues: please describe any ethical issues which will need to be addressed by the University***

**Significant ethical issues which may arise during the course of the applicant’s research should be flagged and details given on how they will be addressed. The Management Group will take a view in regards to training issues or requirements for expertise in relation to the ethics identified. Consideration should be given to issues such as potentially vulnerable participants, safeguarding/child protection, risks to participants or the researcher, methods of research anticipated and confidentiality.**

***Question 17: Please make any other points relevant to the application not mentioned elsewhere***

**Suggestions about working with external partners might be made here.**

**See also Question 11.**

***Selection and Notification Process***

Applicants will be assessed by selection panels in the university through which they have applied.

Those offered an award will be informed by 7th December, and will have to confirm their acceptance by Wednesday 13th December. If no answer is received by that date it will be assumed that the offer has been declined.

**All fellowships must begin on Tuesday 2nd January 2018.**

***Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form***

LDoc and the AHRC are committed to ensuring that applicants are selected on the basis of merit. Completion of the Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form will help us to ensure that our policies and procedures are effective in avoiding discrimination and promoting equal opportunities in awarding studentships.

Please complete the Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form and return it to your University contact (detailed in Question 8) by the deadline.

Your answers will be used to evaluate the effective operation of our Equal Opportunities Policy and to report to the AHRC.

**Please note: Your answers will not affect your application in any way.** The form does not need to be sent to your referees or potential supervisors and will not be seen by the Selection Panel.

It is a requirement of your application to submit the Equal Opportunities form.

***Grade Descriptors used for the assessment of applications***

***Updated 1st November 2017***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Quality of Researcher** **33%** | **Quality of Proposal****33%** | **Feasibility of Proposal****33%** |
|  | Assessment criteria:* Past academic/professional achievement
* Contribution of academic and professional experience
* How research will contribute to long term career aims

As evidenced in Questions 6, 7, 18 and references | Assessment criteria:* Ideas underpinning the proposal
* Concept and design of research
* Fit of the project to further the Creative Economy

As evidenced in Questions 9, 12 and 18 | Assessment criteria :* Coherence and quality of research plan
* Feasibility of research being completed within 6 months
* Advancement of work in the current field
* Potential impact
* Feasibility of necessary training, fieldwork or study trips

As evidenced in Questions 9, 10, 11 and 15 to 18. |
| **6** | A researcher of outstanding quality, who is outstandingly well prepared to undertake the proposed research.  | An outstanding proposal in all of the following: scholarship, originality, quality, significance and openness to diverse approaches. It provides full and consistent evidence and justification for the proposal in terms of concept and design. The proposal merits the very highest priority for funding. | The research plan is coherent, clear and convincing and the project has strong potential for impact. The project will significantly advance work in the current field and is undoubtedly capable of completion within 6 months. There is an excellent fit between the proposed project and the expertise and aims of the team. Resourcing of training or fieldwork is unproblematic. |
| **5** | A researcher of excellent quality, who is exceptionally well prepared to undertake the proposed research.  | An excellent proposal in all of the following: scholarship, originality, quality, significance and openness to diverse approaches. It provides full and consistent evidence and justification for the proposal. The proposal should be funded as a matter of priority, but does not merit the very highest priority rating. | The research plan is coherent, clear and convincing and the project has strong potential for impact. The project will advance work in the current field and is capable of completion within 6 months. There is a good fit between the proposed project and the expertise and aims of the team. Resourcing of training or fieldwork is unproblematic |
| **4** | A researcher of good quality, who is well prepared to undertake the proposed research. | A very good proposal in all of the following: scholarship, originality, quality, significance and openness to diverse approaches. It provides very good evidence and justification for the proposal. It is worthy of consideration for funding. | The research plan is coherent, clear and convincing and the project has some potential for impact. The project will advance work in the current field and is capable of completion within 6 months. There is an adequate fit between the proposed project and the expertise and aims of the team. Resourcing of training or fieldwork is unproblematic. |
| **3** | A researcher of satisfactory quality, who is prepared to undertake the proposed research. | A satisfactory proposal in terms of the overall standard of scholarship and quality but which is more limited in terms of originality, significance, its contribution to the research field or openness to diverse approaches. In a competitive context the proposal is not considered of a sufficient quality to recommend for funding. | The research plan is adequate. The project may advance work in the current field and it may be possible to complete it within 6 months. There is an adequate fit between the proposed project and the expertise and aims of the team. Resourcing of training or fieldwork may present some problems. |
| **2** | The quality of the researcher is inconsistent. The researcher may be of insufficient quality or may not be well prepared to undertake and complete the proposed research. | A proposal of inconsistent quality which has some strengths, innovative ideas and/or good components or dimensions but also has significant weaknesses or flaws in one or more of the following: conceptualisation, design, methodology. As a result of the flaws or weaknesses identified, the proposal is not considered to be of fundable quality. | There are significant weaknesses or flaws in the management of the project and it would be unlikely to be completed in 6 months or to advance work in the field. The fit between the project and team is inadequate. Resourcing of training or fieldwork is likely to be problematic. |
| **1** | A researcher of an unsatisfactory quality who is not well prepared to undertake and complete the proposed research. | A proposal of an unsatisfactory quality which:* Has unsatisfactory levels of originality, quality and/or significance
* Contains insufficient evidence and justification for the proposal
* Displays limited potential to advance the research field

It is not suitable for funding. | The project is unconvincing in terms of its management or capacity to deliver the proposed outcomes or its contribution to the field. The fit between the project and team is inadequate. Resourcing of training or fieldwork is likely to be problematic. |