SWDTP Postdoctoral Fellowship Call 2027

Assessment Criteria and Scoring Descriptors

1. Quality of work programme

- Has the applicant described a clearly defined programme of work that appropriately follows on from PhD? Are the specified objectives achievable and realistic within the period of the fellowship?
- Are the proposed activities clearly justified in terms of supporting the applicant's longer term career aspirations?
- Is it clear that the planned programme is based mainly in social sciences?

2. Impacts and Outputs

- Are the planned outputs of the fellowship appropriate and attainable?
- Are there adequate plans to share the results, and to engage with academic and non-academic audiences?

4. Mentoring arrangements

- Has the fellow's choice of mentor(s) been clearly justified?
- Has the mentor(s) adequately demonstrated that they have considered the individual applicant's needs, and how they would seek to address them?

5. Value for money

- Is there are clear and adequate justification of the costs being requested?

6. Consideration of ethical issues

- Does the proposal show sufficient awareness of any ethical issues that may be raised by the proposed fellowship, including the impact plans and user engagement?
- Has the applicant described how these will be addressed?

7. Data management plans

- Where the applicant is required to submit a Data Management Plan (DMP), does their Plan clearly show how the data will be managed throughout the lifecycle of the award including specific plans for archiving with UK Data Service?

Scoring Descriptors

Score	Description	Definition
6	**Exceptional** Should be funded as a matter of the very highest priority	Excels against all the criteria. Clear how the fellowship follows on from outstanding doctoral research and research-related achievements. A convincing case is made, with full and consistent justification that the fellowship will further the applicant's longer term career aspirations. Exceptional and innovative plans, highly likely to lead to significant impact. Very clearly sits mainly in the social sciences (including for applications to interdisciplinary pathways). **A proposal will only be scored at this level if the career building, impact, and research elements of the proposal are considered to be at this level.**
5	**Excellent** Should be funded as a matter of priority	All criteria are met. Clear how the fellowship follows on from excellent doctoral research and research-related achievements. A convincing case is made, with full and consistent justification, that the fellowship will further the applicant's longer term career aspirations. Exceptional and innovative plans, highly likely to lead to significant impact. Very clearly sits mainly in the social sciences (including for applications to interdisciplinary pathways). **A proposal will only be scored at this level if the career building, impact, and research elements of the proposal are considered to be at this level.**
4	**Very Good** Worthy of consideration for funding	All criteria are met. Clear how the fellowship follows on from doctoral research and research-related achievements that are of a high standard. A convincing case is made, with good justification, that the fellowship will further the applicant's longer term career aspirations. Good plans, likely to lead to significant impact. Very clearly sits mainly in the social sciences (including for applications to interdisciplinary pathways). **A proposal will only be scored at this level if the career building, impact, and research elements of the proposal are considered to be at this level.**
3	**Satisfactory** Not recommended for funding	All criteria are met. Clear how the fellowship follows on from doctoral research and research-related achievements. Does not make a fully convincing case that the fellowship will further the applicant's longer term career aspirations. Satisfactory plans, likely to lead to impact. Sits mainly in the social sciences (including for applications to interdisciplinary pathways).
2	**Not Competitive** Not suitable for funding	Does not meet all the criteria. Has some strengths with respect to furthering the applicant's longer term career aspirations but also has major weaknesses. Inconsistent plans, unlikely to lead to any significant impact. Sits mainly in the social sciences (including for applications to interdisciplinary pathways).
1	**Unsatisfactory** Not suitable for funding	**Either**, does not meet the criteria. Does not make a convincing case that the fellowship will further the applicant's longer term career aspirations. Unsatisfactory plans, unlikely to lead to significant impact. **Or**, does not sit mainly in the social sciences.