**Ingenious marking scheme**

**Round 18 Ingenious Awards**

**Introduction**

This document provides guidance on the Ingenious reviewing process to members of the Ingenious Panel.

The review process is an essential part of the Ingenious assessment procedure and your input is essential in making funding decisions.

The Ingenious scheme has a three stage review process:

1. an internal Academy eligibility sift (including Academy staff and Ingenious Panel Chair)
2. assessment by external reviewers (including public engagement and educational practitioners, engineers and Academy Fellows)
3. funding decisions made by Ingenious Panel (Academy Fellows and a public engagement practitioner)

The review process and roles and responsibilities of external reviews and Ingenious Panel members are provided in more detail below.

**Eligibility criteria**

* All projects must involve engineers in the development or delivery of projects, so they have the opportunity to gain skills, knowledge and experience in public engagement.
* Funds will be awarded to successful projects in April 2024 and project research and development may begin from this time. However, any delivery of activities must take place after 1 May 2024. Projects must be completed by 31 July 2025.
* Applicants must be employed and based in the UK. Joint/partnership applications between engineers and organisations that specialise in communication/engagement with the public are welcomed.
* The engineers involved in the project must be based in and studying or employed in the UK; be graduate level or equivalent and above (including those at senior level); and can be from academia, industry or the public sector. Engineers may also be apprentices and engineering technicians. Applications which only engage undergraduate engineers are ineligible for Ingenious.
* Any applications that are incomplete or do not adhere to the guidelines may be rejected.

**The review process**

**Stage 1 – Internal sift**

Each application undergoes an internal review process. Any applications which are deemed ineligible according to the Ingenious guidelines or are especially weak are sifted out. Applications that have been sifted out will receive constructive feedback.

**Stage 2 – External reviewers**

Applications that pass the internal sift are sent for external review. Each application is reviewed by at least two reviewers who are either Fellows of the Academy, engineering researchers or public engagement/educational practitioners.

They score the application against the following criteria:

* Opportunities for participating engineers
* Public engagement
* Impact
* Engineering content
* Quality of the application
* Effective project planning
* Experience and expertise

**Score:** External reviewers give overall score out of seven for the application. The table below indicates the quality-thresholds required for each score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Rating** | **Indicators** |
| **7** | Outstanding | Has met and exceeded the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have a major impact on both the public and participating engineers. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and programme of activities are outstanding. |
| **6** | Excellent | Has fully met the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have a significant impact on both the public and participating engineers. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and programme of activities are excellent. |
| **5** | Very Good | Has clearly met the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have noticeable impact; or has the potential to have a significant impact but with associated risks. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and programme of activities are good.  |
| **4** | Good | Has met most of the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have some useful impact; or has the potential to have noticeable impact but with associated risks. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and/or programme of activities are sound but could be improved or be more creative. |
| **3** | Average | Has met some of the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have a minor impact. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and/or programme of activities need improvement. |
| **2** | Below Average | Has met very few of the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have little impact. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and/or programme of activities insufficient. |
| **1** | Poor | Has not met any of the aims, objectives and key criteria of the scheme and is likely to have little or no impact. Public engagement opportunities and training for engineers and/or programme of activities severely lacking. |

Anonymised comments, questions and queries from the reviewer’s comments are sent to the applicant, to give them an opportunity to respond before the funding panel takes place.

**Stage 3 – Selection Panel**

The role of the Panel is to consider applications and make funding recommendations using the reviewers’ comments and any subsequent responses received from applicants.

The Panel consists of one chair and consists of up to ten Fellows and two public engagement experts.

Applications will be scored and awarded first and foremost on quality and merit. However, the Panel should also look to fund a balanced portfolio of projects including but not limited to: format, target audience, geographical region, engineering discipline and scale.

The panel must review submitted costings for where the cost the Academy would be providing could be seen as providing an economic benefit to one enterprise over another and have an effect on competition. Examples of this could be, if they were using the funds to subsidise ticket sales for a museum for example, or using the funds to pay for ticket entry where the ticket costs would be going directly to an enterprise and used for non-charitable economic activities, or where the funds are to subsidise the development of a product that will subsequently be sold for profit e.g. an educational software suite. If such cases are noted, these should be highlighted to the office such that appropriate mitigations can be taken to ensure grants are made in compliance with the Subsidy Control Act 2022

**Diversity and Unconscious Bias**

Reviewers are reminded that the Academy is committed to diversity and to increasing the participation of minority and under-represented groups across science, engineering and technology, and especially women. For more on Academy diversity activity and policy please visit <https://raeng.org.uk/diversity>

Unconscious bias is when we make judgments or decisions on the basis of our prior experience, our own personal deep-seated thought patterns, assumptions or interpretations, and we are not aware that we are doing it. For more information see the section below on [General Academy Policies](#Academypolicies).

**Award notification by staff**

After the final award list has been agreed, the Programme Manager will notify the awardees of the results through the online grant system.

Unsuccessful applicants will also be notified through the online grant system and feedback based on the notes of the Panel review and discussion can be provided.