



NORTH WEST DOCTORAL TRAINING CENTRE

Studentship Guidance for Pathway Leads and Administrators

CASE and Standard Studentship Competitions 2015/16

(Updated July 2015)

Introduction

This guide is to assist academic and professional services staff with the assessment procedures involved in both the **NWDTC CASE Studentship Competition** and the **NWDTC Standard Studentship Application Competition**.

Students wishing to apply to the competition should use the regular Standard Studentship Application Guidance, which can be found at <http://www.nwdtc.ac.uk/how-to-apply/>

The **NWDTC CASE Studentship Competition** is an opportunity for academics at one of the three NWDTC institutions to propose doctoral projects in collaboration with non-HEI partners which, if successful, they will then be able to recruit a student to. This competition will close in early November 2015, with awards made in December 2015 and students commencing the project in September/October 2016. The full process and schedule for this competition can be found in Appendix 1. Applications will be sent directly to pathway leads in the first instance.

The **NWDTC Standard Studentship Competition** is an opportunity for prospective postgraduate students to propose their own projects for funding. These may be for funding towards a PhD or a masters and PhD. This competition will close in early February 2016, with awards made in March 2016 and students commencing the project in September/October 2016. The full process and schedule for this competition can be found in Appendix 2. Applications will be sent to School PGR Administrators in the first instance (see Appendix 4 for contact details).

Structure of Panels

Pathway Leads are responsible for assessing applications which are submitted to these competitions.

Applications will initially be assessed by an **Institutional Pathway Panel**. The panel should consist of senior academics from within the relevant pathway within each institution. Each application should be judged on its own merits based on the information provided in the NWDTC CASE/Standard Application Form and the transcripts / references. The panel should agree a mark for each application and then rank the applications.

The Institutional Pathway Panels should then present their top applicants at a **NWDTC Pathway Panel**. This should consist of one nominated pathway lead from each NWDTC institution. This panel decided which applications will go through the final committee panel.

Finally, the applications which pass the previous two stages will be presented to the **NWDTC Studentship Allocation Committee** by the overall pathway lead. This committee will then decide on studentship allocation across the NWDTC. For information about the structure of the Studentship Allocation Committee, please see www.nwdtc.ac.uk/aboutus/committees

Roles and Responsibilities of Institutional Pathway Panel Members

Individual Pathway Panels should be organised by the Institutional Pathway Leader in each institution. These panels will usually consist of a Panel Chair (Institutional Pathway Leader) and at least two Panel Assessors (academic colleagues from within the relevant pathway).

Panel Chair (usually the Institutional Pathway leader in the institution)

The role of the Pathway Panel Chair is to preside over the institutional pathway panel ensuring that it completes the assessment according to the ESRC NWDTC awards assessment criteria (see page 7 below), whilst ensuring that the universities are compliant with ESRC rules and regulations. The chair must try to ensure that the overall, strategic aims of the pathway, schools and universities are considered when making the final judgement on selection. In addition to this role, Panel Chairs also function as panel assessors (see below).

Panel Assessors (academic colleagues from within the pathway)

The role of the panel assessor is to use their professional judgement to assess the quality of an applicant's submission according to the ESRC NWDTC assessment criteria (see page 7 below). They should reach a collective decision, and award a single rating for each submission received by their pathway panel. In addition to this they may also be required to make assessments on application.

Roles and Responsibilities of NWDTC Pathway Panel Members

NWDTC Pathway Panels should be organised by the overall Pathway Leader. These panels should consist of one representative from each institution, ideally the institutional pathway lead.

Overall Pathway Lead

The role of the Overall Pathway Lead is to act as chair, presiding over the NWDTC pathway panel and ensuring that it comes to a unanimous decision about which candidates will be taken forward and the order in which they are ranked. The overall pathway lead will also be responsible for:

- ensuring a cover sheet is completed for each candidate who is to be put forward to the final committee,
- forwarding all documents for final candidates to the NWDTC central office,

- presenting the chosen applications at the NWDTC Studentship Allocation Committee and answering any questions the committee has about the individual candidates.

In addition to this role, Overall Pathway Leads will also function as Institutional Pathway Leads (see below).

Institutional Pathway Leads

The role of the Institutional Pathway Lead is to present the applications brought forward from their own Institutional Pathway Panel, assess these objectively in conjunction with the applications brought forward from the other institutional and co-operate with opposite numbers to produce a list of ranked applications which are to be taken forward to the NWDTC Studentship Committee.

Eligibility Criteria

The eligibility criteria as set out by the ESRC can be found in their document [ESRC Postgraduate Funding Guide](#).

The School Postgraduate Office which initially receives applications will be responsible for checking candidate eligibility. A final check of candidate eligibility will be undertaken by the Institutional NWDTC Administrators prior to the NWDTC Studentship Committee.

Anyone who can meet ESRC requirements for both academic qualifications and residential eligibility may apply for an ESRC studentship.

Current PhD students who are in the first year of their PhD (i.e. who commenced their PhD in September 2014 or September 2013 if part-time) are eligible to apply for ESRC funding. Students in their second and third years are not eligible.

Academic eligibility

For 1+3, 2+2, +3 and +4 awards

Candidates must have qualifications of the standard of a good honours degree at first or upper second class level, from a UK academic institution. In the majority of cases, candidates will have undertaken an undergraduate course at a recognised UK higher education institution. However, some may have qualifications from outside the UK, or be able to offer a combination of qualifications and/or experience. In both cases, it will be necessary to ascertain whether these qualifications can be equated to an honours degree, and at what level.

Enhancement

If applying for an award, a less than sufficient first degree may be enhanced by the attainment of a Masters degree. In exceptional circumstances, the ESRC NWDTC may also accept candidates for Doctoral study who have never undertaken an undergraduate degree but have achieved a Masters

degree. However, applicants should note carefully the additional requirements for +3 only awards (see below).

In addition, the ESRC may accept a candidate who has enhanced a less than sufficient undergraduate degree by at least one satisfactorily completed academic year of full-time study or its part-time equivalent (i.e. two years), towards a UK higher degree. When a candidate is applying who has enhanced their degree, this training / experience should be clearly stated on the application form as being of equal standard to completing a first in a degree or that it has sufficiently enhanced the candidate's knowledge to ESRC standards. This statement will be considered by the Examiner marking the application.

+3 Awards Only

Students applying for a +3 only award must also demonstrate on the application form that they will have completed, by 30 September 2015, the full research training requirements contained in the *Postgraduate Training Guidelines*. This would normally be through the '1' of an ESRC recognised 1+3 programme. Programme Directors and/or Heads of Disciplines/Pathways will be able to advise if the student's qualifications meet the criteria. Students with other qualifications will need to demonstrate how their qualifications equate to the *Postgraduate Training Guidelines* criteria. If the qualifications are more than 5 years old, then it will be expected that further professional experience and/or training in the relevant subject area would have been maintained.

Professional Qualifications

Membership of professional bodies or learned societies usually requires the candidate to have achieved, through formal training or work experience, a level of expertise which can be equated to that achieved by an honours degree student. The ESRC NWDTTC will accept such a professional qualification providing the candidate has also undertaken three years' subsequent full-time relevant professional work experience. The work experience would be calculated from the 1 October (i.e. to be eligible for a studentship from September/October 2015, the work experience will be calculated from 1 October 2012). However, applicants should note the additional requirements for +3 only awards (see above).

Non-UK Qualifications

Qualifications which have been attained outside the UK will need to be equated to the UK honours degree standard. Assessments are based on the British Council's NARIC guide. Candidates should be aware that whilst a higher education institution may accept a non-UK qualification for entry to the degree course at the institution, the institution will be required to assess whether the qualification is of sufficient standard for an ESRC award. Where a student with non-British qualifications is applying for a +3 only award, institutions will need evidence that they have acquired the necessary research training at postgraduate level as outlined in the *Postgraduate Training Guidelines*. For non-UK qualifications transcripts in English as well as details in the original language must be provided with the application form.

Eligible Courses

Candidates must be planning to study in an ESRC recognised pathways (see Appendix 3 for a list of recognised pathways for the NWDTC).

Residential eligibility

The legal basis for defining residence eligibility for postgraduate training awards is set down in the Education (Fees and Awards) Regulations 1991. The guidance below is based on the Regulations and on guidance produced by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES):

Candidates for awards must have a relevant connection with the United Kingdom. A relevant connection may be established if, at the start of the course:

- The student has been ordinarily resident in the UK throughout the 3-year period preceding the date of application for an award, *and*
- Has not been resident in the UK, during any part of that 3-year period wholly or mainly for the purposes of full-time education (EU students – see below) *and*
- Has settled status in the UK within the meaning of the Immigration Act 1971 (i.e. is not subject to any restriction on the period for which he/she may stay).

Candidates who meet all three of the above criteria may apply for a *full award*.

A relevant connection may be established for an **EU student** if the student has been resident in the UK throughout the 3-year period preceding the start of the course, even if for purposes of full-time education. EU students in this situation may apply for a *full award*.

EU Students who have not been ordinarily resident in the UK for the last three years may apply for a *fees only award*.

Non-EU students who have not been ordinarily resident in the UK for the last three years are not eligible to apply.

The above criteria does not apply to applicants to the Economics pathway or those whose project is deemed to employ Advanced Quantitative Methods - such candidates are eligible to apply for a full award whatever their residential status.

For more information on residential eligibility please see: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/images/ESRC-Postgraduate-Funding-Guide-DTCs_tcm8-28310.pdf

Financial basis of the awards

A full postgraduate award for full-time study provides (at master's and at doctoral level):

- Payment of approved **Tuition Fees** to the relevant institution
- An annual **Maintenance Grant** (£14,057 in 2015/16 – rate subject to confirmation from the RCUK for 2016/17)

Students who receive a full-time award in Economics will receive an additional enhanced stipend of £3000.

Students who are undertaking a project which has been identified as employing Advanced Quantitative Methods (AQM) will receive an additional enhanced stipend of £3000. Students in receipt of AQM enhanced awards will be expected to undertake an annual review to ensure they are utilising AQM as detailed in their original application. Please refer to the [‘What is AQM’](#) guidelines on the NWDTC website.

All NWDTC Students are also entitled to claim certain research expenses from the NWDTC Research Training Support Grant (RTSG).

Students who specify in their original application that their doctoral project will require fieldwork may also submit a claim for additional financial support to enable them to undertake this fieldwork, once they have commenced their studies. For more information on this please refer to the NWDTC Current Students web pages. Fieldwork funding can only be claimed at doctoral level, not at master’s.

Fees Only Awards for eligible EU students constitutes the payment of tuition fees and eligibility to apply for RTSG and Fieldwork funding.

Students opting to study part time will receive a pro rata maintenance grant of the equivalent of a full time award.

Students will receive additional disability allowance where appropriate.

Assessment Procedure

The panels will assess the ESRC application form together with two references and transcripts.

Panel Process

Panel Assessors and Chairs will be asked to complete a coversheet for each application received by their pathway panel, ranking all candidates from 1-10 (10 being the highest) on both the applicant’s track record and proposal. The Institutional Pathway Panel should decide which candidates will be taken forward to the NWDTC Pathway Panel.

It is the responsibility of the Institutional Pathway Leads to ensure that all documentation regarding the students which are progressing (coversheets, applications etc) is circulated to opposite numbers prior to the NWDTC Pathway Panel.

On the basis of the Institutional Pathway Panel guidance, The NWDTC Pathway Panel should decide upon their potential allocation of ESRC awards, as well as agreeing a reserve list. It is the responsibility of the Panel Chair to take note of the meeting, ensure that the final ranked list is collectively agreed by the panel and subsequently report the outcome to the NWDTC Administrator by the relevant deadline (see Appendices 1 and 2).

The Faculty/Centre will check independently that all successful applications meet ESRC and universities residential and academic criteria before compiling rankings and applications to forward to the overall NWDTC Studentship Committee.

Implementation of NWDTC Studentship Committee Decisions

All successful candidates, reserve candidates (standard studentship competition only) and unsuccessful candidates from the final NWDTC Studentship Allocation Committees will be informed by email by the relevant institutional administrator (successful/reserve) or the NWDTC central office (unsuccessful).

Any candidates who are filtered out at the Institutional Pathway Panel or NWDTC Pathway Panel should be informed by pathway leads or their supporting school/faculty administrators.

Successful candidates will be given deadlines to confirm the appointment of the student or the acceptance of the award (see Appendices 1 and 2), and the NWDTC reserves the right to rescind the offer of an award or re-allocate the studentship if this deadline is not met.

Assessment Criteria

Pathways will score each candidate a mark on a scale of 1-10 (10 being the highest, 1 the lowest) on each of two criteria:

- a. The candidate's **track record** (evidence of quality of the applicant), based on (i) career information provided in the application, including information on marks achieved so far as reported in the references and/or transcripts; (ii) the quality of the references themselves.

The score will also reflect the applicant's description of how his/her previous experience (academic and professional) has prepared him/her for postgraduate study, and the applicant's description of how the programme of study will contribute to his/her long-term career plans.

- b. The quality of the **research proposal**, judged in terms of (i) cogency of exposition - i.e. does the proposal make sense and seem feasible; (ii) originality. Note, in the case of Doctoral applications, this should be judged relative to the stage of the applicant. Subject panel members should be aware that current PhD students may have more detailed and cohesive proposals as a result of commencing the programme. No unfair advantage should be given to these students.

In deciding on borderline candidates, panels may wish to make a judgement on pathway 'fit' – i.e. is this the sort of work that belongs in this particular pathway, in terms of library/archival resources, supervisory expertise, etc.

Detailed criteria are given below, to ensure that panels use approximately the same spread of marks. These criteria should be used flexibly: for example, if a PhD candidate has performed well at MA level but much less well at UG, but the latter is explained by referees as the result of unusual circumstances, more weight should be given to the former, and indeed the latter might be set aside altogether.

Detailed criteria: doctoral applicants

a. Track-record

- 7-10 Scores in this range will require EITHER a first class degree OR an already achieved distinction at Masters Level (or overseas equivalents) OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. A mark of 7 would correspond to a marginal first/distinction (i.e. a combination of high 60s and very low 70s); a mark of 8 would correspond to a secure first/distinction, predominantly in the range 70-5; a mark of 9 would correspond to a high first/distinction, with marks in the range 75-80; and a mark of 10 to an exceptional distinction, predominantly at 80+. Where these academic grades are not met, a candidate would have strong relevant professional experience in order to achieve a rank score between 7-10.
- 3-6 Scores in this range will require a 2.1 OR an already achieved Merit at Masters level OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. A mark of 6 should correspond to a very high 2.1/Merit, just short of a first/distinction - this should typically include some marks of 70+; a mark of 5 should correspond to a good 2.1/Merit, with marks in the mid-60s but rarely if at all reaching 70; a 4 should correspond to a middling 2.1/Merit, and a 3 to a low 2.1/Merit.
- 1-2 A Pass at Master's level - i.e. marks typically in the high 50s (2) or low 50s (1) OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. We would be very unlikely to support candidates with 2.2s, unless the first degree result was an aberration explained by the referees, or if they have high graded masters to enhance this.

b. Quality of the Research Proposal

The assessors will look for evidence of an ability to articulate a research project, a coherent and well thought-out plan for doctoral study, and a good awareness of the place of his/her research within the current field whilst bearing in mind the current stage of the applicant in their research program (see point 3.2 b above):

- 7-10 Cogent proposal scoring well in terms of both cogency and originality. The proposal evaluates and succeeds in the following areas: quality and feasibility of the research question, engagement with the field, methodology and critical appreciation of sources. A mark of 10 should be reserved for an exceptionally eye-catching and original proposal, but marks of 7-9 will indicate strongly supportable projects.
- 3-6 A promising proposal with some limited weaknesses that need to be addressed. Projects in this range are potentially supportable.
- 1-2 Problematical proposal – would need further work before it could be firmly supported.

Detailed criteria: master's applicants

a. Track-record

- 7-10 Scores in this range will require an already achieved first or clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. Typically a score of 10 will indicate a student regularly achieving marks of 80+; a score of 9 will correspond to marks in the range 75-80; a score of 8 to a secure first with marks predominantly in the low 70s; and a score of 7 to a marginal first, with marks in the high 60s and low 70s. Where these academic grades are not met, a candidate would have very strong compensatory relevant professional experience in order to achieve a rank score between 7-10.
- 3-6 Scores in this range will require an already achieved 2.1 OR clear evidence that the applicant has the potential to reach that level. A score of 6 should typically include some marks touching 70+; a mark of 5 should correspond to a good 2.1, with marks in the mid-60s but rarely if at all reaching 70; a 4 should correspond to a middling 2.1; and a 3 to a low 2.1. Where these academic grades are not met, a candidate would have strong compensatory relevant professional experience.
- 1-2 A candidate who seems unlikely to achieve a 2.1. We would be very unlikely to support candidates who have already been awarded 2.2s, unless the first degree result was an aberration explained by the referees, or if they have high graded masters to enhance this and/or strong compensatory relevant professional experience to enhance this.

b. Quality of the Research Proposal

The assessors will look for evidence of an ability to articulate a research project, a coherent and well thought-out plan for future doctoral study, and a good awareness of the place of his/her research within the current field whilst bearing in mind the current stage of the applicant in their research program (see point 3.2 b above):

- 7-10 Cogent proposal scoring well in terms of both cogency and originality. The proposal evaluates and succeeds in the following areas: quality and feasibility of the research question, engagement with the field, methodology and critical appreciation of sources. A mark of 10 should be reserved for an exceptionally eye-catching and original proposal, but marks of 7-9 will indicate strongly supportable projects.
- 3-6 A promising proposal with some limited weaknesses that need to be addressed. Projects in this range are potentially supportable.
- 1-2 Problematic proposal – would need further work before it could be firmly supported.

Principles of match-funding

The following principles are to be followed for schools/faculties/institutions who want to provide additional funding to facilitate an increase in the number of studentships awarded.

- Studentships may only be match-funded on a 50/50 basis.
- Institutions will be expected to pay 50% of the maintenance, fees, enhanced stipends (for AQM or Economics students) and any award extensions for sick or parental leave.
- The NWDTC will still cover 100% of the expenses associated with RTSG, fieldwork and any award extensions which are approved by the NWDTC for academic purposes (internships, fieldwork, difficult language training, Overseas Institutional Visits etc).
- Institutions must 'split' the award of a successful candidate in the relevant pathway/discipline to fund another candidate, thereby providing 50% funding for two candidates.
- Only candidates who are classified as reserves at the Allocation Committee can be funded through match-funding. Candidates who are classified as unsuccessful, or who were not presented at the Allocation Committee, cannot be funded in this way.
- While half the funding is provided by the institution, the student will still have full ESRC NWDTC status and full access to all ESRC/NWDTC events and opportunities.
- Match funding proposals can be presented either ahead of the NWDTC Allocation Committee in March 2016 or after, but must be proposed before the 31st May 2016.
- All matched funding decisions will ultimately be at the discretion of the NWDTC Director.

Appendix 1: CASE Studentship Competition Schedule 2015-16

Aug 2015

- NWDTC CASE Competition documents live online

9th Nov 2015

- Deadline for applicants to submit applications to **Institutional Pathway Leads** for consideration

- Pathways must undertake a review and (where relevant) selection process which involves all institutional pathway leads prior to submitting the CASE applications for consideration by the CASE Studentship Allocation Committee. The nature of this review is at the discretion of the pathway, although a similar process to the standard studentship competition (institutional pathway panels followed by overall NWDTC pathway panel) is recommended.

20th Nov 2015

- Deadline for Pathway Leads to forward CASE Applications to Hayley Meloy (hmeloy@liv.ac.uk)
- **Pathway Leads (or their supporting School administrators) should notify those applicants who are not taken forward to the Allocation Committee**

11th Dec 2015

- NWDTC CASE Studentship Allocation Committee in Lancaster

by 18th Dec
2015

- Communication of results of CASE Competition to Pathway Leads and individual applicants

by 26th Feb
2016

- Deadline to notify NWDTC of chosen candidates by submitting the CASE Studentship Notification Form to Hayley Meloy (hmeloy@liv.ac.uk).
- The Overall Pathway Lead should formally sign their approval of the choice of candidate on the CASE Studentship Notification Form prior to submission.

- Formal agreements between project partners, recruited students and the University to be produced in liaison with relevant University's Research Support Office, prior to the candidate commencing their programme

Appendix 2: Standard Studentship Competition Schedule 2015-16

August 2015

- NWDTC Standard Studentship Competition documents live online

1st Feb 2016

- Deadline for applicants to submit applications to School Administrators (see Appendix 4 for specific contact details)

- Once student eligibility and University application status have been checked, School administrators to forward all applications to Institutional Pathway Leads

- Institutional Pathway Panel (suggested w/c 8th February)

- Overall NWDTC Pathway Panel (suggested w/c 15th February)

26th Feb
2016

- Deadline for Pathway Leads to forward final candidates' applications, cover sheets and rankings to Hayley Meloy (hmeloy@liv.ac.uk)
- **Pathway Leads (or their supporting School administrators) should notify those applicants who are not taken forward to the Allocation Committee**

w/c 29th
Feb 2016

- AQM sub-committee

11th March
2016

- NWDTC Standard Studentship Allocation Committee in Manchester

by 25th
March 2016

- Successful, Reserve and Unsuccessful candidates informed of outcome

by 8th April
2016

- Deadline for successful candidates to confirm acceptance of award. NWDTC reserves the right to re-allocate awards after this date, if acceptance is not confirmed.

Appendix 3: List of NWDTC Pathways

- Accounting and Finance
- Business and Management
- Development and Humanitarianism
- Economic and Social History
- Economics
- Educational Research: Policy and Practice
- Geography and Environment
- Health and Wellbeing
- Language-Based Area Studies (LBAS)
- Linguistics
- Planning and Environment
- Politics in a Global World
- Psychology
- Science, Technology, Innovation and Social Practices (STISP)
- Security, Conflict and Justice
- Social Anthropology
- Social Statistics
- Social Work
- Sociology

Appendix 4: List of contacts for submission of applications

Applications for the **Standard Studentship Competition** should be sent to the administrative contact for the institution and pathway they are applying to:

Pathway	Liverpool Contact	Manchester Contact	Lancaster Contact
Accounting & Finance	Jill Roberts ulmsphdenq@liv.ac.uk	Lynne Barlow-Cheetham lynne.barlow@mbs.ac.uk	Sarah Patterson s.patterson@lancaster.ac.uk
Business & Management	Jill Roberts ulmsphdenq@liv.ac.uk	Lynne Barlow-Cheetham lynne.barlow@mbs.ac.uk	Sarah Patterson s.patterson@lancaster.ac.uk
Development & Humanitarianism	Jayne Avies soesresearch@liv.ac.uk	SEED: Christopher Kitchen christopher.kitchen@manchester.ac.uk SALC: Joanne Marsh Joanne.Marsh@manchester.ac.uk	Anne Thorley a.thorley@lancaster.ac.uk
Economic & Social History	Chris Pearce HLC-PGR@liverpool.ac.uk	Joanne Marsh Joanne.Marsh@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Economics	Jill Roberts ulmsphdenq@liv.ac.uk	Victoria Barnes victoria.barnes@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Patterson s.patterson@lancaster.ac.uk
Educational Research		Christopher Kitchen christopher.kitchen@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Geography & Environment	Jayne Avies soesresearch@liv.ac.uk	Christopher Kitchen christopher.kitchen@manchester.ac.uk	Anne Thorley a.thorley@lancaster.ac.uk
Health & Wellbeing	Jennifer Pellegrini pcbspgr@liverpool.ac.uk	James Power James.K.Power@manchester.ac.uk	Dawn McCracken d.mccracken@lanacs.ac.uk
LBAS	Chris Pearce HLC-PGR@liverpool.ac.uk	SoSS: Victoria Barnes victoria.barnes@manchester.ac.uk SALC: Joanne Marsh Joanne.Marsh@manchester.ac.uk	

Linguistics		Joanne Marsh Joanne.Marsh@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Planning & Environment	Jayne Avies soesresearch@liv.ac.uk	Christopher Kitchen christopher.kitchen@manchester.ac.uk	
Politics in a Global World	Chris Pearce HLC-PGR@liverpool.ac.uk	Victoria Barnes victoria.barnes@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Psychology	Lindsay Edmonds ledmonds@liverpool.ac.uk	James Power James.K.Power@manchester.ac.uk	Anne Thorley a.thorley@lancaster.ac.uk
Security, Conflict & Justice	Clare Kelly slsjpgr@liverpool.ac.uk	Helen Davenport helen.davenport@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Social Anthropology		Victoria Barnes victoria.barnes@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Social Statistics	Jayne Avies soesresearch@liv.ac.uk	Victoria Barnes victoria.barnes@manchester.ac.uk	Anne Thorley a.thorley@lancaster.ac.uk
Sociology	Clare Kelly slsjpgr@liverpool.ac.uk	Victoria Barnes victoria.barnes@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
Social Work	Clare Kelly slsjpgr@liverpool.ac.uk	James Power James.K.Power@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk
STISP		Michael McGlinchey Michael.Mcglinchey@manchester.ac.uk	Sarah Purcell fass-pg@lancaster.ac.uk

In the **CASE Studentship Competition**, academics should send their applications to the relevant [pathway lead](#).