Freedom of Information request: 2018/0214

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on __________ in which you requested the following:

Your Request:

1. For the invited resubmissions, we were informed that the BBSRC would "endeavour to have an Introducing Member that is familiar with the application from the original submitting round (17RM2)". Can you tell us whether this actually happened?
2. Was our correspondence explaining how we had provided the missing data requested by the original committee discussed at the recent Panel meeting? In addition, were the scores from the original applications (average 5.4 across five reviewers) taken into account when the recent decision on funding was taken?
3. When we were invited to resubmit we were informed that "some of the original reviewers will be invited to comment on the new submission, in line with our standard practice for managing resubmissions". Can you tell us why did this not happen (reports were obtained from 5 new reviewers) and was this taken into account by the committee when considering the resubmissions?
4. The average score for the invited resubmissions was 4.2. However, this included a score of 1 (unfundable; provided by reviewer [REVIEWER NAME] which we consider bizarre for an invited resubmission. Can you let us know whether the score of 1 was removed from the scoring, due as explained in our rebuttal, to the unfounded and incorrect statements made by the reviewer?
5. Can you tell us what the final score for the grants was?

Our response:

I can confirm UK Research and Innovation hold information relevant to your request.

Please see the information provided by BBSRC relevant to your request below:

1. On this occasion I can confirm this was not possible.
2. The panel were provided with the correspondence as part of the new application and informed that it was an invited resubmission. The panel did not consider the original application’s review scores - the new submission was assessed in its own right against the assessment criteria. This is standard practice for invited resubmissions.
3. Three of the five original reviewers were approached to review the new application. An additional 16 reviewers were approached on top of the five reviews we received.
4. No, the review scoring 1 was not removed, as it was considered a usable review. The Committee were provided with the reviews and the rebuttal and are asked to agree a score based on the scoring criteria, and the content of the reviews and the rebuttal. Committee members are asked to put emphasis on the content of reviews as opposed to the scores given and to use their judgement in determining whether the review is useful.

5. We do not disclose scores. The final ranked position was 66 of 87.

If you have any queries about this response please contact me, or if you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request and wish to request a review of our decision, please write to:

Complaints Officer
UK Research and Innovation
Polaris House
North Star Avenue
Swindon
SN2 1FL
Email: foi@ukri.org

Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the review, you may apply to refer the matter to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review procedure provided by UKRI. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner
Wycliffe House,
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Enquiry/Information Line: Between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday 0303 123 1113 or 01625 545745
Further information about the Office of the Information Commissioner can be found at
http://www.ico.gov.uk/

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]
UK Research and Innovation, Information Governance Team
Email: foi@ukri.org