# AHRC Peer Review College

# Panel Guide

## Contents

# Version Control

We will record the latest changes to the Panel Guide here. Please ensure you are referring to the most up-to-date version.

| Version | Date | Change(s) |
|---------|------|-----------|
| 1.0 | 8 September 2025 | Old guidance overhauled and combined into Panel Guide. |
| 1.1 | 22 October 2025 | Broken website links fixed |
| 1.2 | 25 November 2025 | Sentence added clarifying the use of AI tools |

# Introduction

This guidance is to help you, as a panel member, to prepare for a panel meeting. You are also welcome to get in touch with the meeting's nominated Funding Officer if you have any questions you wish to raise prior to the meeting.

The panel process takes place on the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Funding Service platform. We typically aim to notify you that papers are ready a minimum of four weeks before your panel, to provide you with the necessary preparation time. Where possible we aim to ensure that this timeline is longer. Details of how to access the system will be provided within your panel invitation email.

We will notify you within your invitation email if the panel meeting is taking place in-person or virtually.

Please add the Funding Service automated email address [noresponse@funding-service.ukri.org](mailto:noresponse@funding-service.ukri.org) to your recognised senders to avoid system-generated emails going into your spam folder.

# Purpose of Panel Meetings

The purpose of AHRC panel meetings is to score and rank applications in order of priority for funding and, where necessary, agree broad feedback or conditions for applicants.

Panel meetings also provide an opportunity for you to raise issues and provide policy or process feedback to AHRC.

The rank-ordered list agreed by the panel forms the funding recommendation for AHRC, which is then presented to the AHRC Executive Chair and Directors Group who make the final funding decisions based on the ranked list and level of funding available.

# Types of Panel Meeting

AHRC uses two main forms of panel meetings to score and rank applications: moderation and assessment panels.

## Moderation panels

Moderation panels are used to make funding decisions for the majority of AHRC's schemes, including Research Grants and Catalyst Awards.

The panel moderate the expert reviews and applicant responses, assign final scores to the applications and rank them in order of funding priority. The role of the panel is to make judgements on the applications on the basis of the expert reviews and applicant response only. It is not their role to re-review the applications or make detailed assessments of application costings when deciding on the final score.

**Moderation approach**

When moderating the applications, panellists must ensure that their judgements are based solely on:

- the aims and objectives of the funding opportunity and the information that is provided in the application
- the expert reviews and the applicant's response to those expert reviews (where applicable)

Should panellists appear to be providing their own assessment of an application, rather than moderating the expert reviews and the applicant's response to those reviews, the chair will direct the discussion back to moderation (supported by AHRC colleagues if appropriate).

With regards to the expert reviews, panellists should note:

- important issues identified by the expert reviewer comments which the project lead (PL) failed to address in their applicant response
- any discrepancies between expert reviewer comments
- any comments on the general level of resource requested (for example, when requested resources are considered excessive or inappropriate)
- specific feedback that may need to be provided to the applicant
- where the expert reviewer comments were of insufficient quality to aid the discussion

Panellists are advised to pay particular attention to the expert reviewers' comments, rather than the score that has been provided. Scores may not always be consistent with comments, especially around the margins of a particular score (meaning one expert reviewer may think of an application as a 'high 5', but another will think of it as a 'low 6').

Panel scoring should not average out reviewer scores. Panellists' own scores and comments should be based on their judgement of the quality of the reviews and the applicant's response to the comments made.

# Assessment panels

Assessment panels operate without using expert reviews. This is the case for AHRC schemes such as the Curiosity Awards.

It is the role of the panellists to assess the applications and assign a score against the opportunity criteria. The panel discusses each application's strengths and weaknesses on their own merit, and then ranks the applications in order of priority for funding.

### Assessment approach

When assessing applications, panellists should be consistent in their assessments of each application. Panellists are suggested to use the same approach and rigour as they would when providing an expert review. Judgements should be based solely on the aims, objectives and assessment criteria for the funding opportunity, and the information that is provided within the application.

In assessment, panellists should:

- provide evidence to support their observations, using only the information provided in the application
- consider the information they are asked to provide under each heading or item in the funding opportunity assessment criteria, ensuring sufficient detail is provided for each
- give a clear assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the application and indicate whether these are major or minor concerns
- provide an evaluation of the risks associated with the application
- contextualise the application that they are assessing within current work in the field, and comment on its relative importance or significance
- be receptive to new ideas and approaches to thinking within their discipline as well as methodology
- identify any inconsistencies and contradictions in the application
- in the case of interdisciplinary applications, assess if the different disciplines meet up in a coherent way
- provide enough information to enable a judgement on the relative quality of this application compared to other applications

More generally, they should:

- provide an impartial, objective, fair and analytical assessment of the application they are reviewing
- ensure they provide an evaluation, not a description, of the work proposed
- ensure their score is justified by, and consistent with, their comments

## Interview panels

Interview panels can also be used to score and rank applications; this can be directly from application stage or after expert review. Interviews may involve a presentation.

### Interview approach

Panellists should familiarise themselves with the guidelines and assessment criteria for the interviews, and the applications invited to interview.

Panellists will be provided with the meeting agenda, relevant documentation and full applications prior to the meeting. There may be some pre-panel work to complete or sessions to

attend, and they may be required to submit pre-scores – this will be confirmed by the AHRC contact.

They will also be invited to a briefing session before the meeting takes place, where:

- the interview approach, format and structure will be stipulated
- the agreed questions will be shared
- they will be provided with any further information
- they will have the opportunity to ask questions

It is especially important that when the interviews take place, all panel members are attentive, keeping their cameras switched on (in the virtual environment), and are prompt to the agreed timings of the day. This is to ensure fairness and that there are no disruptions for the applicants in the interview environment.

# Panel Roles and Responsibilities

Panel meetings typically consist of:

- a chair, and sometimes a deputy chair
- 8-10 panellists
- a Grants Operations Manager from AHRC, who can advise on AHRC policy and processes
- a Funding Officer from AHRC, who is typically the AHRC contact for the meeting.

The Funding Officer will share the Meeting Record during the meeting (this shows the order in which applications will be discussed) and record the scores as the meeting progresses.

You should allow time to attend for the full day so that discussion of applications and their ranking are not rushed at the end of the day, thereby ensuring all applicants are treated fairly.

As panellists and chairs, you will be provided with all the necessary information prior to the meeting and are expected to:

- familiarise yourself with the aims, guidelines and assessment criteria for the funding opportunity
- be aware of the full range of scores and descriptors (see Appendix A)
- understand the UKRI principles of assessment and decision making, avoiding any bias in assessments of applications, especially relating to the protected characteristics of any individual
- alert AHRC to any conflicts of interest you may have, including potential conflicts not picked up internally by AHRC
- alert AHRC if you have provided an expert review for any applications at the panel meeting
- contact AHRC staff if anything is unclear
- attend the panel meeting to agree final scores and rankings for all applications with a score of 1-10 (see Appendix A)

- agree any feedback where applicable

In undertaking the above tasks, you are expected to:

- exercise your knowledge, judgement and expertise to reach clear, unbiased, evidence-based decisions
- treat all applications, reviews, applicant responses and assessments as strictly confidential at all times
- always be fair and objective, and adhere to the principles outlined in AHRC's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan

You should not allow private knowledge of the applicant or the proposed research to influence your judgement. You are expected to decline invitations to sit on a panel if your personal views, knowledge, or relations will affect your judgement of applications.

All applications must be moderated or assessed on equal terms, regardless of the protected characteristics of the applicant. Applications must therefore be moderated or assessed and scored on their merits, in accordance with the criteria and the aims and objectives set for the funding opportunity.

## Assessment criteria

Each section of the application in the Funding Service includes the guidance provided by AHRC to the applicants. By clicking on the 'View Application Question' section, you will be able to see the points that applicants were asked to address in their application. All criteria are equally weighted and should form the framework for:

- the expert reviewer comments that you will moderate (in moderation panels)
- your assessment of each individual application (in assessment panels)

Please refer to the Funding Finder to look at the specific assessment areas for the opportunity you will be moderating or assessing.

### Costings

All costs justified as reasonable for the research proposed are allowable and should be accepted. Comments on the justification can only be considered for:

- 'Directly Incurred' costs
- the level of effort from any member of the core team (for example, the time they are spending on the application)
- 'Other Directly Allocated' costs (except charge out costs for departmental technicians and administrative services)
- 'Exceptions' costs

You can find cost category definitions in the Research Funding Guide.

Please be aware that it is now UKRI policy to only request high-level budgets and we therefore ask that you refer to the justification to understand the more costly resources in detail.

Applications may include costs for reasonable adjustments. Where an application includes reasonable adjustment costs, UKRI will ensure they are eligible, and these should be accepted without comment. You can find further information on disability and accessibility support for UKRI applicants during the application and assessment process on the website.

**Flexible working**

It is important that researchers and their research teams are able to work flexibly and in a way that meets their personal circumstances. We therefore allow applicants to tailor the support that they request in order to facilitate this. This might include, for example:

- part-time or other flexible working patterns for the project lead or team members
- support for costs over and above standard care arrangements to allow, for example, conference attendance
- support for adjustments or adaptations due to personal or health circumstances

You should be mindful of the impact that flexible working, alternative career routes and career breaks may have had on the track record and career development of individuals included in the applications.

Applicants are not required to explain the personal circumstances that resulted in the need for flexible working or a career break.

Where reference has been made to a period of flexible working or a career break, you should recognise that this is likely to affect productivity and career development (for example, publication record, track record of securing funding, ability to build networks or to take up opportunities in a different geographical location). This impact may also continue beyond a return to work.

## Introducers

Prior to the meeting, panellists are assigned the role of First, Second or Third introducer on a number of applications. In the Funding Service, you can view the introducers' list which sets out your assigned roles for any of the applications for which you are an introducer, along with any additional information regarding the applications to be considered.

Each application typically has two to three introducers; these roles are equally weighted. Introducers should lead discussion with prepared notes and will have assigned pre-scores to each of their applications prior to the meeting:

- first introducers give a brief summary of the application
- second and third introducers should only add comments that have not already been raised by the first introducer, or where there is disagreement with the first introducer

Within assessment panels, you may be assigned applications that do not fall within your precise area of subject expertise. However, you will still need to assess these applications against the aims of the funding opportunity, guided by your experience as both a reviewer and a researcher. Within moderation panels, you will be assigned applications at random and not based on your subject expertise.

As well as the applications that have been allocated to you as an introducer, we ask that you read as many applications as you can, if possible. This facilitates a full discussion and promotes a robust moderation or assessment process, as well as allowing you to set the applications that you are an introducer for into context.

Chairs are not assigned any applications to introduce; however, they are expected to have read all applications to familiarise themselves with the content. This is necessary for them to be able to regulate the panel discussions, so that they can be alert to any discussion which is not in line with the process.

Please note that in some instances, applications or applicant responses may include links to a website containing further information on the research proposed. You are not required to access links to carry out assessment or recommend a funding decision. If you do choose to look at this information, it is possible that your anonymity to the applicant could be compromised.

## Introducer comments and scores

You should enter your pre-panel scores into the Funding Service 'pre-panel score' tab and submit them by the deadline specified for your panel meeting, as these drive panel discussion in a logical and structured way.

You should:

- view the scoring range (Funding Service 'pre-panel score' tab)
- enter your score between 1 and 10, including up to two decimal places if required (note that a score of 10 is the maximum available when submitting your pre-scores)
- ensure you select the 'save and submit' option once you are satisfied with your scores, noting that you are unable to amend them after they have been submitted (you will still have the opportunity to revise your scores at the panel meeting)

Once submitted, pre-scores will be shared with the panel, chair, and AHRC staff at the meeting.

In some instances, the funding opportunity may require you to submit comments; you will be notified by AHRC if this is the case. The Funding Service provides functionality for comments up to 1,000 words. You shouldn't use the comments space for making personal notes as an aide-mémoire to support you when it comes to the panel meeting and discussion. (Please note: if a freedom of information request is made, these comments would be disclosed. If this happens, you will remain anonymous).

If you are making personal notes or comments as an aide-mémoire to support panel meeting discussion, you should not use the Funding Service to do this.

## Panel chair

At the start of the meeting, the chair should briefly remind the panel of:

- their role as an introducer
- the strictly confidential nature of the process
- the need to consider all applications on equal terms, considering only the information provided in the application (in addition to the expert reviewers' comments and applicant response at moderation panels)
- the potential for unconscious bias to enter into people's judgements
- the procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest
- the role of the panel (moderation or assessment)
- the scoring descriptors and their meanings
- the ranking process
- the opportunity for feedback on the AHRC review process
- the post-meeting administrative process and decisions made

In addition to the [panel roles and responsibilities](#) outlined above, the role of the panel chair is:

- to understand the aims and ambitions of the funding opportunity
- to read and familiarise themselves with all submitted applications
- to oversee and run the panel meeting, ensuring that it keeps to time
- to set the context and tone for the meeting in terms of process and methods of working, following guidance from AHRC colleagues
- to seek clarification of the panel's views and to ensure there is appropriate discussion, before the panel agrees a score for each application
- to ensure that AHRC procedures and protocols are followed, and to refer to AHRC staff for guidance when necessary
- to provide final approval on feedback, and conditions on awards where appropriate
- to ensure that AHRC is provided with a final and agreed ranked list of applications
- for moderation panels: to ensure the discussions are based solely on the expert reviewer comments, and the applicant's response to those comments (so that panellists do not introduce new comments or criticisms)

We will arrange a chair's briefing prior to the meeting taking place. This is an opportunity to discuss the running of the day and address any queries.

## Deputy chair

In the event of the chair being absent or conflicted, the role of the deputy chair would be to oversee the running of the meeting as above.

## Panellists

In addition to the panel roles and responsibilities, panellists are also expected to comment on all applications to which they have been assigned an introducer role and to provide pre-scores in advance of the meeting.

If you are unable to attend a meeting at short notice, it is helpful if you can still send in your scores and any comments to your AHRC contact – these can then be used at the panel meeting to give every application the same number of introducer comments.

# Code of Conduct and Safeguarding Decision-Making

We are committed to ensuring that our decision-making is fair, robust, transparent and credible. We are also committed to raising awareness of, and taking steps to remove, the impact of unintentional bias in our systems, processes, behaviours and culture. In addition to this, we will ensure that our funding is not influenced by protected characteristics.

We know that pressure to make decisions, time pressures, high cognitive load and tiredness all create conditions that introduce the risk of unintentional bias.

Many of these factors could be present in panel meetings and therefore, we ask that you are aware of this risk and safeguard the panel's recommendation by:

- moderating or assessing all applications objectively and on equal terms, based on their merits, using the criteria set for each funding opportunity
- making evidence-based decisions, based on all the information provided
- questioning and challenging cultural stereotypes and bias, and being prepared to be challenged
- being aware that working with a high cognitive load with time pressures and the need to make quick decisions creates conditions for bias, which could impact the research we fund
- allowing sufficient time for decision-making and discussion of each application
- reconsidering the reasons for your decisions, recognising that they may be post-hoc justifications
- remembering that you are unlikely to be fairer and less prejudiced than the average person
- remembering that you can detect unconscious bias more easily in others than in yourself, so you should feel able to call out bias when you see it

You can find further information on unconscious bias on the Royal Society website.

Applications are submitted to AHRC in confidence and may contain confidential information and personal data belonging to the core team (and others named in the application). Please ensure that all applications are treated confidentially.

In addition to this, you are not permitted to use generative AI tools as part of your assessment activities, including to correct language, grammar and formatting. Using these tools can potentially compromise the confidentiality of the ideas that applicants have entrusted to UKRI to safeguard. For more detail, please see our [policy on the use of generative AI](#).

# Conflicts of Interest

Everybody involved in UKRI decision-making and funding processes must comply with the [UKRI declaration of interests policy and guidance](#).

It is vital that panellists and chairs are seen to be completely impartial at all stages of the moderation or assessment process. You should not moderate or assess any application where a conflict of interest could be construed. If you think you may have a conflict, please inform the staff member responsible for your panel at the earliest possible opportunity.

You will be asked to confirm any further conflicts when granted access to the Funding Service meeting for the first time. If you mark any conflicts of interest within the Funding Service, please also inform your AHRC contact for the meeting as soon as possible. If you mark any conflicts accidentally, just let your AHRC contact know and they can remove these for you.

Anyone in conflict with an application must leave the meeting whilst it is being discussed. In the virtual environment, this is done via the use of the meeting lobby.

If the chair is conflicted, AHRC will nominate someone to deputise. All panel members are permitted to be present for the ranking of all applications. In the case that further discussion of applications is required, panel members should not participate if they are conflicted. If this is an application the chair is conflicted on, then the previously nominated deputy will act as chair once more.

You can find further information on potential conflicts of interest within [the UKRI declaration of interests: guidance for assessors, reviewers and panellists](#), and on [the AHRC website](#).

# The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)

We are committed to supporting the recommendations and principles set out by [the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)](#). You should not use journal-based metrics, such as journal impact factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess any member of the core team's contributions, or to make funding decisions.

For research assessment, please consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets, software, inventions, patents, preprints or other commercial activities), in addition to research publications. You should consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

The content of a paper is more important than publication metrics, or the identity of the journal in which it was published, especially for early-stage researchers. Therefore, you should not use journal impact factor (or any hierarchy of journals), conference rankings and metrics such as the H-index or i10-index when moderating or assessing AHRC applications.

We encourage you to challenge research assessment practices that rely inappropriately on journal impact factors or conference rankings, and promote and teach best practice that focuses on the value and influence of specific research outputs.

If you are unsure about DORA, please speak to your AHRC contact or panel chair.

# Scoring and Ranking Applications

The panel will agree an overall score from 1-10 for each application, reached through discussion, considering the introducers' initial scores and comments alongside the comments of the panel. The overall score will be used in determining the applications' relative ranking.

All applications need to be scored, but not all will need to be ranked, depending on final scores. A decimal scoring system is an effective and efficient mechanism for the ranking of applications. This allows the introducers to indicate the strength of their scoring, for example a 'good 6' might become a 6.6, a 'weak 6' a 6.1, and an 'excellent 9' a 9.8. Applications can be scored a maximum of 10. The decimal is only for the purpose of ordering the applications: it has no value outside the rank-ordered list. The key aim is to ensure that the score and its descriptor fit the quality of the application (for example, an application scoring '6' fulfils the criteria for a score of 6), and that the panel is content with the ranked order of the applications.

AHRC, in conjunction with the chair, has the discretion to change the threshold above which applications should be ranked. They will advise on the day if this is the case for your panel meeting.

The panel should rank applications relative to one another as they proceed through the meeting. At the end of the meeting, the panel will review the ranked list before finally agreeing the ranked order.

The panel will not use averages or 'weighted scores' in determining the final score; the panel needs to consider all the information that has been provided and make a judgement as to the appropriate score. During the ranking process, the overall score agreed for applications should not be changed, and only the decimals should be altered if necessary to agree a final ranked order. Please note that only the whole number will be fed back to the applicant, not the decimal score.

The scoring descriptors will be available in the meeting, should you need to refer to them at any point during the discussion.

# Amendments, Conditions and Feedback

The panel can make recommendations on individual applications based on panellists' comments, for AHRC to take forward.

## Costings

Where the panel considers that significant resources or an aspect of a programme of work are not fully justified, the panel can recommend that associated costs are removed from the project. It should be done in exceptional circumstances where the application is otherwise competitive. There is no need to consider the removal of non-eligible costs, as these will be automatically removed by AHRC.

## Conditions

The panel can suggest conditions for AHRC to impose on an award where the application is otherwise competitive. These could either be conditions that need to be met before an award is confirmed or a requirement that the condition be met during the lifetime of the project. Once the award holder has advised AHRC that they have met the conditions imposed for the award to be granted, AHRC will ask the chair or a designated panel member to advise on whether they are satisfied the conditions have been met.

## Feedback

The panel can provide feedback for unsuccessful applications. Additionally, the panel may also provide feedback for successful applications if it wishes to highlight advice for the project that is not significant enough to be made a formal condition of the award.

For assessment panels, where applicants will not have had the benefit of seeing expert reviewer comments, the panel may wish to provide applications with specific feedback where there is something significant to be communicated to the applicant that is not covered by the scoring descriptor. In doing so, unsuccessful applicants should receive more detail than successful applicants to help them prepare future applications.

Any feedback for both successful and unsuccessful applications should be agreed in principle by the panel at the meeting (this may also be agreed outside of the meeting alongside the chair if time does not allow). Specific text or a clear set of bullet points can be provided, with the final feedback text being agreed by the chair before being communicated back to the applicant.

# Feedback on AHRC Processes

Should you have any feedback on AHRC policy, process or documentation, this can be discussed and recorded once all applications have been assigned a final score and ranked. If there is not sufficient time to discuss this at the end of the meeting, please feel free to contact AHRC staff by email afterwards. This will be formally recorded and used by AHRC to inform the future development of processes.

In addition to this, you are always more than welcome to get in touch with us at peerreviewcollege@ahrc.ukri.org with any feedback.

# Post-Panel

It is vital that you do not divulge or discuss panel meeting outcomes with individuals outside the meeting. Maintaining confidentiality is paramount.

For assessment panels, if there is a further assessment stage, AHRC will select the applications that will go forward to that stage based on the ranked list provided.

All announcements of outcomes and funding decisions will be made by AHRC. If you are asked directly for feedback by applicants, you should refuse and advise applicants to direct all such requests to AHRC.

You may talk to applicants about the Council's structures, policies and modes of operation, so long as the information is in the public domain (for example, in the Research Funding Guide or on our website). You must not divulge information about individual awards or application statistics, unless the information is already in the public domain (via press releases or annual reports).

Following the meeting, you must delete all associated notes and copies of documents you have created. For in-person panel meetings, you should leave behind any hard copies of applications or notes so that we can dispose of these securely.

Where the panel has agreed feedback for applicants or conditional awards, the panel chair will be invited to agree the final wording to be communicated back to the applicant. This is to ensure it is a true reflection of the comments agreed by the panel at the meeting or to check that the condition has been met.

AHRC staff may gather feedback from the panel chair regarding the running of the meeting, its content and any associated processes they may wish to discuss. They will also request the approval of the panel chair for the completed Meeting Record. This acts as the formal record of the meeting and will include the final wording of any feedback or conditions guidance, along with the final scores and ranking of the proposals. The chair is required to sign the Meeting Record as an authorised record of the meeting.

## Panel outcomes

Once the final funding decisions in relation to your panel meeting have been made and communicated, you will be able to find them in the AHRC Panels Outcome Dashboard. Please note that panel members' names and their organisations are also published here.

If you would not like your name to be published as part of the panel attendance record, please inform peerreviewcollege@ahrc.ukri.org following the panel meeting.

Please note that due to UKRI's transition to the Funding Service, there may be a delay in the external publication of panel outcomes and attendance.

## Expenses

Unless otherwise stated, the standard fee for attendance at a panel meeting is:

- for panellists: £170 per day (half-day fee £85)
- for chairs: £230 per day (half-day fee £115)

Honorarium is treated as income from self-employment and panel members are required to declare themselves as self-employed in this respect. If you would prefer to waive this payment, please let us know.

You will also be reimbursed necessary expenses incurred in attending in-person panel meetings or other events you are required to attend.

Please refer to the UKRI Travel, Subsistence and Expenses Policy before submitting an expenses claim form. We process expenses securely online via the Non-Employee (NEE) Expenses Portal. Expenses claim forms should be submitted to AHRC within 60 days of your panel meeting – they must be completed and signed, and scanned copies of any receipts should be attached where applicable. You can find further guidance for using the portal on our website.

Please note: for those with non-UK bank accounts, you are currently unable to submit an expenses claim via the online platform, and instead will need to complete a claim form for non-UK bank accounts and return it to pso@ahrc.ukri.org following the meeting.

If you experience any issues with or have any questions regarding expenses, please contact pso@ahrc.ukri.org.

# Accessibility and Inclusion

We are committed to promoting equality and to ensuring our guidance is accessible to all users. Please see the accessibility statement for the UKRI Funding Service.

We welcome and encourage you to contact [peerreviewcollege@ahrc.ukri.org](mailto:peerreviewcollege@ahrc.ukri.org) with any feedback, queries or concerns.

## Additional support

If you require any additional support, or have any specific accessibility requirements with regards to accessing panel materials or your participation in a panel meeting, please don't hesitate to get in touch with us at [operations@ahrc.ukri.org](mailto:operations@ahrc.ukri.org). We will do our utmost to support, work with you, and implement reasonable adjustments to facilitate your participation throughout the process.

# Appendix A: Panel Scoring Scale

Each application must be scored against the assessment criteria using the panel scoring scale as defined below.

## Score 10
The application is exceptional. It very strongly meets all of the assessment criteria to the highest standard. The panel agrees that it is difficult to articulate how the application could be improved.

## Score 9
The application is outstanding. It very strongly meets all of the assessment criteria.

## Score 8
The application is excellent. It strongly meets all of the assessment criteria.

## Score 7
The application is very good. It meets the assessment criteria well, but with some minor weaknesses or limitations.

## Score 6
The application is good. It meets the assessment criteria well, but with some clear weaknesses or limitations.

## Score 5
The application is adequate. It meets the assessment criteria, but with clear weaknesses or limitations.

## Score 4
The application is weak. It meets the assessment criteria, but with significant weaknesses or limitations.

## Score 3
The application is poor. It meets the assessment criteria, but has major weaknesses or limitations.

## Score 2
The application is unsatisfactory. It does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria.

## Score 1
The application is unsatisfactory. It does not meet any of the assessment criteria.

# Appendix B: Useful Links and Contacts

## Assessment
- UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making: https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-principles-of-assessment-and-decision-making/
- Funding Finder, AHRC opportunity webpages: https://www.ukri.org/opportunity/?filter_council%5B%5D=814
- Research Funding Guide: https://www.ukri.org/publications/ahrc-research-funding-guide/
- San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment: https://sfdora.org/read/

## Conflicts of Interest
- UKRI Declaration of Interest Policy and Guidance: https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-declarations-of-interest-policy-and-guidance/

## Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)
- AHRC EDI Action Plan: https://www.ukri.org/publications/ahrc-equality-diversity-and-inclusion-action-plan/
- UKRI Reasonable Adjustments Policy: https://www.ukri.org/apply-for-funding/how-to-apply/disability-and-accessibility-support-for-ukri-applicants-and-grant-holders/
- Unconscious Bias: https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/publications/2015/unconscious-bias/

## Post-Panel
- Non-Employee Expenses (NEE) Portal: https://extranet.bbsrc.ac.uk/ahrcexpenses/SitePages/Home.aspx
- NEE Portal Guidance: https://www.ukri.org/publications/peer-review-college-expenses-forms/
- Panel Outcomes and Attendance: https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/arts.and.humanities.research.council/viz/PanelsOutcomeAttendanceTFSApplications/PanelSelectPage
- UKRI Expenses Claim Form for Non-UK Bank Accounts: https://www.ukri.org/publications/peer-review-college-expenses-forms/
- UKRI Travel, Subsistence and Expenses Policy: https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-travel-subsistence-and-expenses-policy/

## Useful Contacts
- Operations Team (operations@ahrc.ukri.org): for queries about an upcoming panel meeting
- PSO Team (pso@ahrc.ukri.org): for any issues or queries regarding the Expenses Portal
- PRC Team (peerreviewcollege@ahrc.ukri.org): for anything related to your membership