AHRC

TRAINING GRANT

FUNDING GUIDE

2019-20

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

Table of Contents

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

1 Introduction

This document sets out AHRC's conditions for the management of AHRC Training Grants, and AHRC's expectations with regard to the funding of postgraduate students. This Guide applies to all AHRC studentships supported through Doctoral Training Partnerships (DTPs), Centres for Doctoral Training (CDTs), and Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships (CDPs). These will be referred to as 'Training Grants' throughout this document.

This Guide should be read alongside the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Terms and Conditions and the UKRI Training Grant Guide (opens in new window). UKRI has also issued a Statement of Expectations for Doctoral Training (opens in new window), which outlines UKRI's expectations of research organisations and students in relation to doctoral training. These documents should be read in parallel to AHRC's Research Training Framework.

This Guide will be amended from time to time during the year. Any changes to our rules, regulations or procedures will apply to all studentships unless otherwise stated.

The initial point of contact for any queries about Training Grants is UK SBS Ltd. Any issues concerning the Joint Electronic Submissions (Je-S) system should be directed to JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk.

1.1   Definitions

1.1.1   AHRC's definition of research

The AHRC's definition of research is primarily concerned with the definition of research process, rather than outputs. The definition is built around three key features that students should address in full in order to be considered eligible for support:

• It must define a series of research questions, issues or problems that will be addressed in the course of the research. It must also define its aims and objectives in terms of seeking to enhance knowledge and understanding relating to the questions, issues or problems to be addressed.

• It must specify a research context for the questions, issues or problems to be addressed. It must specify why it is important that these particular questions, issues or problems should be addressed; what other research is being or has been conducted in this area; and what particular contribution the project will make to the advancement of creativity, insights, knowledge and understanding in the area.

• It must specify the research methods for addressing and answering the research questions, issues or problems. It must state how, in the course of the research project, the student will seek to answer the questions, address the issues or solve the problems. It should also explain the rationale for the chosen research methods and why they provide the most appropriate means by which to address the research questions, issues or problems.

1.1.2   Practice-led research

This definition of research distinguishes between research and practice per se. Creative output can be produced or practice undertaken as an integral part of a research process. The AHRC expects this practice to be accompanied by some form of documentation of the research process, as well as some form of textual analysis or explanation to support its

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

position and to demonstrate critical reflection. Creativity or practice which involves no such processes is not eligible for support from the AHRC.

For research to be considered as practice-led, the student's own practice must be an integral part of the proposed project, and the creative and/or performative aspects of the research should be made explicit. The research carried out should bring about enhancements in knowledge and understanding in the discipline, or in related disciplinary areas. Research to provide content is not considered practice-led research in this context. For example, if a film-maker wanted to make a film about refugees, the research questions should be about the process of making the film, not about the experience of the refugees. Work that results purely from the creative or professional development of an artist, however distinguished, is unlikely to fulfil the definition of practice-led research in this context.

1.1.3   The AHRC's definition of research training

The AHRC uses 'research training' in its broadest sense to describe the knowledge, understanding and skills that a student will need to successfully pursue their studies, complete a high quality thesis and prepare for a career once their studies have been completed. We aim not to be prescriptive about the type of training or how it should be delivered. 'Training' encompasses all the opportunities – formal and informal – available to postgraduate students to develop as researchers and practitioners in their fields and as highly qualified individuals in preparation for their future careers. The focus is on the assessment of individual researcher needs and the provision of training to meet those needs. The AHRC considers training to be an ongoing process which takes place throughout a student's studies and is adapted as new needs arise. This means the student's needs should be monitored and assessed at regular intervals.

Please see the AHRC's Research Training Framework (opens in new window) for full guidance.

Annex A of this document also provides guidance and advice on collaborative research training.

1.1.4   The Role of the Supervisor

A student's primary supervisor and co-supervisors play a key role in supporting the student's progress and development – in terms of their research project, their development as a researcher, and their wider professional skills. The AHRC expects institutions to have mechanisms in place to ensure that supervisors are aware of the AHRC's and broader UKRI expectations, as well as awareness of the training opportunities available to students, either locally, or through a Training Grant if appropriate. This should include awareness of UKRI's Statement of Expectations for Doctoral Training (opens in new window), the AHRC's Research Training Framework and for supervisors of Collaborative Doctoral Awards (CDA), UKRI's Joint Vision for Collaborative Training (opens in new window).

The AHRC welcomes co-supervision of students between supervisors of different disciplines or different institutions. Where such arrangements are made, both supervisors should be recorded in Je-S Student Details.

2   Funding

2.1   Fund headings

Each grant will contain one or more of the following fund headings, depending on the scheme under which it was awarded.

2.1.1   Stipend

This fund heading covers students' maintenance payments for the duration of the grant. Where the Training Grant is for CDA studentships, and where applicable, this fund heading also contains the additional CDA maintenance payment. London Weighting (an additional £2,000 per annum) has been included in the calculation of the costs for the grant (where this applies) and the additional stipend must be passed on to students who are eligible for this payment.

CDA Stipend – £550 per annum is added to the student stipend for CDA students. This is intended to help towards any additional costs incurred by CDA students due to the need to work both at the host Research Organisation (RO) and the non-HEI partner site.

For Centres for Doctoral Training (CDTs) and Doctoral Training Partnerships (DTPs), and Collaborative Doctoral Partnership (CDP) since October 2016, calculations are based on a studentship duration of 3.5 years full-time at doctoral rates, but will be profiled over a 4-year period.

For Doctoral Training Partnerships 2 (DTP2) and Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships 3 (CDP3), calculations are based on a studentship duration of 4 years full-time and will be profiled over a 4-year period.

2.1.2   Fees

This fund heading contains funds to cover students' tuition fee payments for the duration of the grant. As with stipends, fees for studentships funded through DTPs, CDTs and CDPs are calculated on a 3.5 year term, but are profiled over a 4-year period. For studentships funded through DTP2, fees are based on a studentship duration of 4 years full-time and will be profiled over a 4-year period.

2.1.3   Research Training Support Grant (RTSG)

This may be used to support study visits and conference attendance, as well as other research costs which are necessary for the student's primary research, for example, consumables or exhibition costs. For further guidance on the use of RTSG funding, see below (2.7).

For DTP1 and CDT, this fund heading is calculated on the basis of £200 per doctoral student per annum.

For DTP2 it is calculated on the basis of £500 per doctoral student per annum.

2.1.4   Disabled Students Allowance (DSA)

A funding stream will be added at the end of the academic year for claims within that year. In the final year, funds should be requested at reconciliation. DSA claims can be made using the process described on the UKRI website (opens in new window).

2.1.5 Other

This fund heading includes the Cohort Development Fund (CDF) for studentships funded via DTP, DTP2 and CDT. For guidance on the use of CDF, please refer to the section later in this document.

2.2 Student Development Fund (SDF) – (note: this guidance does not apply to DTP2 – see 'Student Development Activity' for guidance for DTP2 grants)

The SDF is not a separate fund heading, but the term used to cover the way that the additional 0.5 years duration of funding provided within each studentship is treated as a flexible pot.

Funding within DTPs, CDTs and CDPs is provided to enable longer PhDs to be supported. Funding for each studentship has been calculated on the basis of a duration of 3.5 years, but this additional 0.5 years of funding should be pooled by the Training Grant to form a Student Development Fund. This funding is primarily available to extend the duration of PhD studentships flexibly and responsively, i.e. to support an appropriate range of training for individual AHRC-funded students according to their individual needs. Any individual student can be funded for up to 4 years using the flexibility provided by the SDF.

The funding must be used to support needs-based training for individual students, in the form of development opportunities beneficial to a student's doctoral research. In many cases, the SDF funding will mean that a studentship is extended beyond the normal 3 year period for full-time registration. For example:

> **Placements** – where a student is undertaking a placement which is not an integral part of the research project.

> **International placements** – where a student requires an extended period overseas, for example, to develop specific language skills to undertake their research project successfully. It is expected that the need to develop language skills will have been agreed at the start of the award, i.e. in these cases the student's initial offer will be for more than 3 years' funding.

> **Skills development** – where extended time is intended for students who need to acquire additional skills, for example, high-level methodological skills, or significant and demanding new discipline-specific skills, such as palaeographical, papyrological or epigraphical skills. Where the development of new skills is required in order to undertake fieldwork, or new skills are developed by undertaking fieldwork, this is an appropriate use of the SDF. Where fieldwork is being undertaken principally for primary research e.g. access to an archive, this should be supported from the RTSG.

There may be other circumstances in which the SDF is used to enable students to be supported for a longer period, and which were outlined in the original DTP/CDT application. These will have been agreed with the AHRC at the outset of the award. Equally, there may be uses of SDF funding, (e.g. to cover the costs of a specific training course relevant to a student's research or practice) which do not entail an extension to the period of the studentship. If the SDF is used in this way for high-cost training, the grant holder may need to seek appropriate financial approval from their RO to charge costs to the grant ahead of the grant profile.

Where a student is in receipt of 'fees only' funding from the DTP/CDT, they may also benefit from training funded from the SDF, provided this does not take the form of a stipend award, (e.g. it could not be used to cover the period of a placement).

Students may receive an extension at any time during their award as a result of an SDF opportunity. It is important that the change to the end date is recorded in Je-S Student Details, noting that the end date but not the submission date would be changed. A brief note should be added to state the reason for the change, e.g. '3 month internship opportunity'. ROs do not need to seek AHRC approval for this, but should provide details in Je-S for auditing purposes, e.g. Submission Rate Survey (see below).

The SDF should not be used to create additional doctoral studentships. Neither should it be used to support any existing infrastructure, to reimburse the costs of university or partner staff resources such as Travel and Subsistence, or to be used to support activities that would normally be supported by ROs.

Up to and including 1st October 2018, Master's students could be supported through the SDF. There must be a clear rationale for the subjects that are offered at Master's level. This might include the benefits to the individual students, the impact on capacity building and known gaps in support for some subject areas. An individual student receiving Master's support (from the SDF or from matched funding) may not automatically progress from their Master's to AHRC-funded doctoral study. All students are required to undergo a full application process in open competition to receive a doctoral award, regardless of when and where they completed their Master's degree, or how it was funded.

A student entering with an existing Master's qualification could simply be funded for their doctoral study; it is anticipated that most students will enter via this route.

Any Master's students funded from the award must be fully supported throughout and must not be expected to self-fund any aspect of their study.

Please note that beyond the 2018/19 academic year, there will no longer be the option to allocate AHRC funding to support Master's students.

2.3   Engagement Provision - DTP2

The change in DTP2, to funding on the basis of 4 years, means that we will no longer have a separate Student Development Fund. However, we expect DTP2 consortia to have clear plans for ensuring that a wide variety of development opportunities are available to students. The maximum funding duration permitted will be 4 years FTE (or part-time equivalent), but doctoral projects must be designed and supervised in such a way that students are able to submit their thesis within the funded period, as defined at the outset of the project.

For DTP2, consortia are permitted to use up to a maximum of 5% of the value of stipend, tuition fees and RTSG (note: not CDF) to support the additional costs associated with students taking up engagement and development activities. These additional costs could be travel and subsistence costs associated with undertaking a placement or engaging with an external collaborator. It could also include fees charged for training courses that are associated with student development. The 5% is an upper limit and unused or unneeded funds must be used to support studentships.

The flexibility should be managed on a similar basis to the previous SDF, in that it should be pooled and allocated on a needs-basis.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

2.4   Cohort Development Fund (CDF)

The purpose of CDF is to support innovative training and development activities for the wider cohort of AHRC-funded students. Generally, these activities should be accessible to the entire cohort of DTP, CDT, or CDP funded students. In some cases, more focussed subject-specific activities may be provided, but these should be open to all eligible students.

CDF is not intended to support needs-based training for individual students. CDF funding may be used to cover the travel costs of DTP, CDT or CDP funded students travelling to cohort events. However, tickets cannot be purchased for travel which will take place after the end of the studentship award or the end of the grant. It is the Training Grant holder's responsibility to ensure that the costs incurred in the course of attending CDF activities are reasonable.

The AHRC has not provided a list of eligible and non-eligible uses for the CDF in order to allow consortia the freedom to address the needs of their distinctive cohorts. The only caveats are that we would not expect the CDF to be used to support any existing infrastructure, to reimburse the costs of university or partner staff resources such as Travel and Subsistence, or to be used to support activities that would normally be supported by ROs.

It is also possible that CDF-funded activities could be opened to other AHRC-funded students (CDA award holders for example) or the wider community of Arts and Humanities students within a consortium or RO, (e.g. spaces could be made available at a CDF-funded student-led conference for students within a consortium who are not funded by the AHRC). If a consortium is able to extend CDF-supported events to non-AHRC-funded students, this would be welcomed, provided that students supported through the Training Grant have priority.

2.5   Consortium Contribution (DTP2 Only)

This is the mandatory financial contribution from the consortium to the funding of the DTPs' stipend, tuition fees and RTSG. The financial value of this contribution has been calculated based on the notional number of studentships awarded as outlined in the DTP Outcome Letter and in the additional grant terms and conditions.

The AHRC recognises that the Consortium will, in addition to the Consortium Contribution, support the costs of the DTP, through funding for the director, management and administration of the Partnership. It will welcome the reporting of this support alongside any additional funding that is secured to support CDF activities.

2.6   Matched Funding of SDF or CDF (Not DTP2)

Award holders may be able to secure matched funding for the SDF or CDF. To be considered as 'matched funding', we would expect this to be used for the same range of activities that are covered by the AHRC funding. However, within this, it would be possible to use the funding for wider activities than those which are eligible for AHRC funding. For example, matched funding might include supervisor or partner travel which are not eligible from AHRC funding.

2.7   Research Training Support Grant (RTSG)

The Research Training Support Grant (RTSG) can be used to enable doctoral students to undertake overseas and UK study visits, attend conferences, and to cover other primary research costs, e.g. consumables or artist materials. The RTSG is included within all

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

Training Grants through which doctoral students are supported. Full award, fees-only, full-time and part-time doctoral award holders are all eligible to receive RTSG support. Project students and Master's level students are not eligible for RTSG support. It is the responsibility of the Training Grant award holder to determine how this funding is allocated, within the guidelines provided by the AHRC.

The value of the annual RTSG paid as part of a Training Grant is calculated on the basis of the notional number of AHRC-funded doctoral students on the grant. Although the total RTSG is calculated on the basis of an amount per doctoral student per year, there is no limit to the amount of funding any one student can receive from the total RTSG funding allocated to the grant. RTSG is not a 'voucher' for each individual AHRC-funded student per year and it should not be allocated to students or their supervisors in this way. Rather, the Training Grant award holder should consider the total RTSG payment on the grant as a pot from which it allocates funds on the basis of student needs and priorities.

Funds from the RTSG may be pooled across all training grants and entitled schemes (Project Studentships are not eligible). At final reconciliation stage, the Training Grant award holder is required to declare how much in total has been spent against RTSG for that grant (but a student-by-student breakdown will not be required). Award holders should maintain a robust accounting system of the amounts spent on each eligible AHRC-funded student and should be able to demonstrate a transparent and fair process for awarding RTSG funding to eligible AHRC-funded students. These records will be included in the Funding Assurance Programme (FAP), and the AHRC is entitled to request these records at any time.

RTSG should not be used for broader professional training and development costs (these are covered by the CDF and SDF). Nor should it be used to support costs of working with an external partner, this applies whether the external partner is part of a CDA or CDP or a partner for a placement or internship. The full range of activities which the RTSG will cover should be made clear to all parties. The process for applying for the funding and the decision-making process must also be transparent to all parties. Some general considerations which should be taken into account are:

• Funding must be allocated only for activities which are essential to the satisfactory completion of the student's thesis.

• It is the RO's responsibility to ensure that it is satisfied that the student has obtained the necessary visas and permissions for their programme of research, and that a proper account of any health, safety and security issues has been taken

• The RTSG can be used to provide a contribution towards the costs of travel, additional accommodation, and other associated costs that are incurred as a result of the student's trip. It is the Award holder's responsibility to ensure that the costs incurred on the study visit or in attending the conference are reasonable.

• The duration of a study visit should not normally exceed 12 months.

• We would not normally expect a student to go on a UK or overseas study visit in the last three months of the funded period of their award.

• RTSG must <u>not</u> be provided for students after the end of their period of funding.

• Funded activities must <u>not</u> take place before the student's award has commenced (retrospective funding is not permitted).

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

2.8   Use of Funds

Training Grant awards are cash-limited.

Consortia may use their funding flexibly, including matched funding, to support students for longer or shorter periods. The student cannot be asked to self-fund any part of their study.

Where funding is being awarded on a competitive basis (which will be the case for the majority of uses), the process for applying for the funding and the basis on which decisions are made, must be made clear to all parties. The award holder must also have a clear complaints and appeals process in place to address any problems which might arise.

It is the Training Grant award holder's responsibility to ensure that the costs incurred by students in participating in activities funded from the Training Grant are reasonable, and that that these funds are used responsibly.

2.8.1   Virement

It is permissible to vire out of any of the fund headings except DSA and "Other". It is permissible to vire into any of these headings except for "Other" unless specifically for CDF activity. In terms of reconciliation, it is important that costs are assigned to the correct heading. As an example, primary research costs (including study visits), which have no developmental aspect to the activity, should be charged against RTSG. It is possible to vire into RTSG, and award holders should vire rather than charge costs to an inappropriate heading, e.g. maintenance.

2.8.2   Can money be moved between training grants?

It is not possible to move funding between Grants as reconciliation will be against the funding provided on an individual Grant.

You may, however, fund students from multiple Grants. For example, if a student's end date is beyond the end date of the Grant, and you have another Grant which has funding available to cover the student's remaining period, you may draw the student's funding from this other Grant. You will need to update the Je-S Student Details record to show that the student is now being funded from this second Grant. If it is not possible to move a student onto another grant, or if there is no other grant available, please contact the AHRC.

The exception is the RTSG, which can be "pooled" across grants. This means that funding in this line of a grant can be used for any eligible AHRC student. You must ensure that records are kept as to how this funding has been allocated, and you must not claim more than the total RTSG allocated for any individual grant.

2.9   Payments

2.9.1   Payments to ROs

All payments from the AHRC are made to the lead RO if it is a DTP or CDT or to the RO at which the student is registered if it is for a CDA. The AHRC does not make payments directly to students. For DTP1, DTP2 and CDT awards, and for CDAs attached to a CDP, payments for each year from the AHRC to the Training Grant Award Holder will be profiled into four equal, quarterly payments.

2.9.2   Payments to students

The Training Grant award holder should make regular maintenance payments to the student in advance, in accordance with the student's entitlement. The Training Grant award holder should not pay maintenance due to students in arrears.

2.10 What other funding is available?

2.10.1 Policy Internship Scheme

The Policy Internships Scheme provides the opportunity for UK Research and Innovation funded PhD students to work for three months in one of a selected group of highly influential policy organisations, on one or more policy topics relevant to both the student and the host. The student will be expected to produce at least one briefing paper, participate in a policy inquiry and/or organise a policy event, or equivalent piece of work.

Internships are available in a number of parliamentary departments, government departments and non-governmental bodies, learned societies and other organisations. For more information please visit https://www.ukri.org/skills/policy-internships-scheme/.

2.10.2 International Placement Scheme

The AHRC's International Placement Scheme (IPS) funds short-term fellowships at prestigious international research institutions for UK postgraduate students and early career researchers. The scheme is run annually, with places available across a number of different host institutions including:

• Harry Ransom Center, The University of Texas at Austin, USA

• The Huntington Library, California, USA

• Library of Congress, Washington DC, USA[1]

• National Institutes for the Humanities, Japan

• Shanghai Theatre Academy, Shanghai, China

• Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., USA

• Yale Center for British Art, Connecticut, USA

• National Museum Institute, New Delhi, India

 Please check the IPS page on the AHRC's website (opens in new window) for details.

2.10.3 UK-Canada Globalink Doctoral Exchange Scheme

UKRI's Globalink Doctoral Exchange scheme provides an opportunity for UKRI and Canadian doctoral students to participate in a UK-Canada research exchange scheme.

---

[1] ESRC-funded candidates may also apply to the IPS, but only to the Library of Congress.

Successful applicants have the opportunity to develop into global citizens with international competencies, during 12-week research placements in Canadian Universities

https://www.ukri.org/research/international/international-funding-opportunities/uk-canada-globalink-doctoral-exchange-scheme/

3 Award Management

3.1 Managing Studentships

In addition to the information below, Annex B of this document includes further guidance regarding the management of Training Grant awards, together with AHRC's expectations regarding our engagement and partnership with award holders.

3.1.1 Changes and Adjustments

The AHRC recognises that changes in circumstances are inevitable over the course of a long award and equally, wishes to encourage the development of new and innovative approaches to research training. Most of these changes can be agreed by the RO or consortium and, if necessary, reported in the annual report or raised with AHRC during their visits.

Training Grant award holders must contact the AHRC to discuss any significant planned departure from the plans set out in their original proposal. For example, if they intend to withdraw completely from offering AHRC awards in a particular subject, or to offer awards in a new subject area not previously covered by their allocation. The Director should contact the AHRC with details of the change, the impact it will have, and any action that is being taken in mitigation.

DTPs, DTP2, CDTs and CDPs should seek approval from the AHRC for a change of director or manager, and should ensure they provide timely notification of any change of contact details. In seeking approval for a change of director the lead RO must provide a C.V. and brief rationale explaining the reasons for its proposed choice.

Award holders do not need to seek permission in advance from the AHRC for minor adjustments to their original award as long as these are consistent with the AHRC's strategic direction.

Where problems arise with the management of funds within the Terms and Conditions of the Training Grant, the RO should discuss this with the AHRC. It should be noted that the AHRC will only permit the extension of training grants under exceptional circumstances.

3.1.2 Recruitment

On all advertisements, regardless of the forum, it must be clearly stated that it is AHRC studentships that are being offered. We expect all award holders to offer the option of studying part-time, and to be open to applications from students who have already commenced study, subject to the Terms and Conditions in respect of the 50% funding minimum.[2]

---

[2] UKRI Terms and Conditions of Research Council Training Grants,

Studentships should be advertised as fully-funded regardless of whether the full amount is coming from the AHRC. Studentships should not be advertised as being part-funded.

Consortia and ROs should not recruit students to specific, pre-determined research topics, with the exception of CDAs, see below. These schemes need to foster and encourage innovation and students must be able to approach an RO with whatever project they want to undertake. Training Grant award holders will need to determine and be satisfied that the proposed project or course falls within a subject area within the award.

When advertising for students, it would be permissible to highlight particular research strengths or research strategies. This may be in connection with research areas or teams where the student might benefit from working in a wider research environment.

CDAs differ in that students are being recruited to pre-determined projects, and hence need to be made aware of the context in which they are taking on their research. Equally, they must be allowed scope to help shape their thesis and have input into how the project will operate. Where a student declines an offer of a studentship, the award holder may wish to offer the award to a reserve candidate, but only where the individual is of sufficient calibre. For longer training grants, such as for DTP, DTP2 and CDTs, the award holder may wish to leave the award unfilled and carry forward the funding to the next recruitment round.

As a general point, it is not permitted to pre-allocate awards (even notionally) or 'ring-fence' AHRC funding for any reason, e.g. for particular ROs, specific subject areas or for inter-disciplinary awards, etc. AHRC awards must be allocated on an open and competitive basis. The exception is for CDAs under DTP2, where ring-fencing is permitted and it is expected that this will happen in line with the approach specified in the application (or any subsequent agreement with AHRC). Within the ring-fence, there must be a quality threshold for the awards to ensure that CDAs are on a par with other students supported through the DTP2. If there are insufficient high quality CDA applications to meet the ring-fence, this should be reported to AHRC in the annual report. CDAs can be held over to the following year.

3.1.3 Student Eligibility

Every student, their subject, course of study, and the RO at which they are studying must meet the eligibility criteria set out in the UKRI Terms and Conditions of Training Grants (opens in new window) and UKRI Training Grant Guide (opens in new window), along with any scheme-specific guidance. Information on the AHRC's subject domain can be found in the AHRC's Research Funding Guide (opens in new window).

Residency: The decision on eligibility for a full award or fees-only award based on residency must be taken by the award holder in discussion with the RO(s) in the consortium, and in accordance with UK Research and Innovation's Terms and Conditions.[3] Please do not contact the AHRC for advice or a decision on particular cases as our staff are unable to provide advice on this issue.

---

[3] UKRI Terms and Conditions of Research Council Training Grants, p.13

Academic eligibility: Those applying for a doctoral studentship should normally have, or be studying for, a Master's degree or similar postgraduate qualification. They should have met all the course requirements prior to the start date of their AHRC doctoral studentship.

If a student does not have experience of formal postgraduate study, they may be eligible for a studentship only if they can demonstrate evidence of sustained experience beyond their undergraduate degree level that is specifically relevant to their proposed research topic, and could be considered equivalent to Master's study. The RO must have evidence as to how the training and development the student has received is equivalent to that obtained through a Master's course and, therefore, prepares them to continue to doctoral study.

3.1.4   Duration of study supported

Training Grant award holders must consider carefully the duration of the funding award that is being offered to the student. AHRC funding allows for a full-time award of longer than three and up to a maximum of four years, and it is likely that this will be determined after the studentship has commenced. If the initial offer is less than four years, we would suggest that it is made clear to the student and their supervisor that there is a possibility of extension.

Students who have already commenced doctoral study are eligible to apply for AHRC funding, provided that, at the start of the AHRC award, they will have at least 50% of their period of study remaining. The award would be made for the remainder of their period of study, mirroring the co-funding requirement that at least 50% of the costs of a studentship comes from an AHRC Training Grant (for DTP2 this would be from the combined funds of the AHRC funding and Consortium Contribution). In determining the length of a studentship to be offered, the period may be reduced to take account of any time a student has already spent on doctoral study. Funding should only be offered for the period required to complete their studies.

We expect students to receive full support from their RO to enable them to achieve the submission date that was agreed at the start of their award, notwithstanding other opportunities which may arise as noted above. Please see 3.2 for further information on submission dates.

3.1.5   Changing between full-time and part-time study

Please see the UKRI Training Grant Terms and Conditions for guidance on approving requests to change between full-time and part-time study.

Where approval has been granted, ROs should calculate the remaining length of the studentship on the basis of funding already received.

Where a student has changed from part-time to full-time status, the student's submission due date should be set to be 12 months after the end of the studentship. ROs will need to input this information into Je-S.

Where an overpayment occurs as a result of a change of the mode of study, ROs are expected to take reasonable steps to recover this overpayment.

3.1.6   Can a CDA student be replaced?

The AHRC will allow some flexibility if a nominated student subsequently withdraws after commencing their studies. The award holder may be able to re-recruit in full to the studentship place within the first year of the project. Studentships should be re-advertised

in the same way, but it may be possible to offer it to a suitable candidate who had previously applied through open selection. Please contact the AHRC for further advice.

3.1.7   Suspensions

When a studentship is suspended the funding end date and the submission date move forward by the duration of the suspension.

If the suspension takes the student beyond the end date of the training grant, the RO should add the student onto a later grant to cover the remaining period of the studentship. If no other grant is available, a no-cost extension to the grant can be requested. This would be an exception as extensions are not typically allowed to training grants. Funds remaining on a Training Grant will not follow that student to the new grant. The flexible use of funding in the Training Grant should allow Training Grant award holders to make the best use of the funding available, for example, to part-fund another student. If a Training Grant award holder is unsure how to deploy unused funds, please contact the AHRC to discuss options. Any funds left over will be reconciled once the grant has finished.

If it is not possible to move a student onto another grant, or if there is no other grant available, please contact the AHRC.

If a student is unable to resume their studies after a period of suspension, when the grant is reconciled, the RO will be expected to repay any funds that have been overpaid to the student.

Note: Changing student details in Je-S does not change the Training Grant itself, as the two are independent.

3.1.8   Internships and placements

If the internship will be salaried, the student must suspend their studies during the period of the internship.

If the student will be paid hourly as an intern, and will not be working full-time, it is for the student and the RO to decide whether this will disrupt the student's studies. If the RO decides to agree to the student undertaking the internship while continuing their studies for a discrete period of time, the AHRC award does not need to be suspended. As a rule of thumb, if the internship will last for longer than five weeks, then the studentship should be suspended.

The AHRC does not expect a student to receive stipend as part of an AHRC studentship if that student will be earning money for a placement or internship that will cover the same basic costs.

If the student is undertaking an internship or placement as part of their award (e.g. through SDF or DTP2 flexibility), it is possible to extend the studentship period to take into account the placement period, e.g. a studentship which is originally awarded as three years but then has a two month placement would allow for a studentship of 38 months.

3.1.9   Changes of thesis title, research direction, course, or programme of study

The AHRC accepts that projects evolve, but Training Grant award holders must not agree a change to a course or programme of study that falls outside the AHRC's subject domain or outside the subject areas allocated for that particular award. If the programme falls in another subject area, the Training Grant award holder should consider this in respect of

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

the overall balance of subjects within the award. If the Training Grant award holder is unsure, they should contact the AHRC.

3.2   Submission Due Dates

On accepting a studentship to pursue a programme of doctoral research, a student also accepts a commitment to make every effort to complete their project, and to submit their thesis, by the end of the period of funding.

Doctoral projects must be designed and supervised in such a way that students are able to submit their thesis within the funded period, as defined at the outset of the project.

3.2.1   Setting of submission dates

For DTP/CDT and CDP students: Full-time students are expected to submit one year after the end of an award, and no later than four years after the start of the award. Part-time students are expected to submit two years after the end of an award, and no later than four years FTE after the start of the award. This is assuming that the award is not suspended at any point (see sections below). The submission date for these students should set on the basis of these rules.

For DTP2 students: the AHRC's aim is for its funding to enable students to submit by the end of the funded period. The expectation is that ROs will put in place processes to enable students to achieve this aim. There should be no assumption of an unfunded period when the doctoral programme is designed and the submission date is set. Students can receive up to four years' funding and the submission date for full-time students must be set at no more than four years after the start of the award (or FTE for part-time students).

For students who have already commenced their doctoral study prior to the AHRC award, the submission date would still be set at one year from the end of the AHRC award for full-time students (or part-time equivalent). In line with the above, it would be set at the end date of the funding for DTP2 students.

Where a student has changed from full-time to part-time status, the student's submission due date should be set to be two years after the end of the studentship. If the change is from part-time to full-time, the submission date should be set to one year after the end of the studentship. ROs will need to input this information into Je-S. As above, for DTP2, the submission date would be amended to match the updated end date of funding.

By the end of the funded period of the studentship, students are expected to have completed their thesis. Any period after the end of a funded period of the studentship and before the submission date provides an opportunity to meet any unforeseen circumstances that have arisen during the course of the studentship. This period is not funded by the AHRC.

On accepting a Training Grant award which includes studentships to pursue programmes of doctoral research, the Consortia or RO also accepts a commitment to support each student throughout the duration of their studies to ensure that a high-quality thesis can be submitted on time. However, it is not appropriate for the RO to require a student to submit a thesis that is below the necessary standard in order to enable the RO to maintain its submission rates.

3.2.2 Changes to submission dates

The submission date should not be updated unless there is a change in the student's circumstances for which a change in submission date is permissible. It is the RO's responsibility to inform students of any changes to their submission date resulting from suspensions or submission date extensions.

Periods of suspension should be taken into account when both the end date of a student's AHRC funding, and the date by which the student should submit their doctoral thesis, are calculated, with the date extended by the length of the suspension.

If an extension to the funded period has been made in order to offset a period of absence, the submission due date should also be extended by the same period.

If an extension to the funding period is granted for reasons such as placements or training, when the student is continuing to receive AHRC funding (i.e. there is no suspension), then the submission date should not be changed. The only exception is if, at the time of the extension, the submission due date is the same as the end date of the funding period. In this case, the submission due date will need to be moved to ensure the due date is not before the funding end date.

The AHRC does not need to approve extensions to submission dates. The RO is responsible for considering the request in accordance with the Terms and Conditions and these guidelines.

Requests must be made to the RO formally and in advance of the submission date. The RO should only consider requests to extend the submission date by up to one year. Extensions cannot be approved or recorded retrospectively therefore it is important that such cases are brought to the RO's attention in advance of the student's expected AHRC submission date.

If the extension is eligible and agreed by the RO, the RO should amend the submission date on Je-S Student Details, and add an appropriate reason, as shown in the bullet points below. Je-S must be updated to ensure the student is included in the correct survey period.

Periods of paternity leave of up to 2 weeks granted during the period of the studentship or the writing up period will not be taken into consideration when submission dates are calculated. However, requests to extend submission dates on the basis of a period of paternity leave can be considered during the writing up period. Such requests should be submitted to the RO in advance of the expected submission date, and recorded by the RO in Je-S Student Details if approved.

Periods of shared parental leave of up to 50 weeks granted during the period of the studentship should be dealt with as an interruption to studies and recorded in Je-S Student Details in the normal way and the submission date updated.

Periods of illness without a medical certificate - extensions to submission date will not be approved for periods of illness without appropriate medical certificates.

If the reason for the extension is not in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the award, or insufficient detail regarding the reason for this change has been recorded on Je-S Student Details, the AHRC reserves the right to contact the RO to query the change in

submission date, and to revert to the original submission date if the extension is not permissible within our Terms and Conditions.

When the RO alters a submission date on Je-S, they will have to add a reason for the change, which will be monitored as part of the submission rate survey. The RO should ensure there is sufficient detail recorded on Je-S, with reference to the Terms and Conditions of the award, regarding the reason for the change to enable AHRC to be assured of the decision and the rationale behind it. The RO should ensure that they do not include information of a personal or sensitive nature.

Changes to the submission date after the end of funding period

While the AHRC will normally accept a submission date extended by the RO to take account of any period of suspension during a studentship, only in exceptional circumstances will we accept the RO extending the submission date on account of difficulties that arise after the end of the funded period.

These exceptional circumstances might be:

• Illness or accident – this refers to any period after the end of the funded period where the student was unable to work on their thesis for medical reasons.

• Exceptional personal circumstances – this includes bereavement and any other difficult personal circumstance that has rendered the student unable to work on their thesis after the end of the funded period.

• Scholarships – when a scholarship is awarded after a studentship has finished and before submission. The scholarship must provide additional value to the original thesis or offer the student a rare opportunity to research a related topic. Extensions should not be granted if a scholarship is awarded to fund an additional year of research on the student's current thesis topic.

• Maternity, adoption, or shared parental leave – a maximum of 12 months is permitted for each individual period of maternity, adoption, or shared parental leave after the end of the funded period.

Any requests for extensions to submission dates relating to periods of paternity or shared parental leave that occur after the end of the funded period, regardless of duration, should be submitted to the RO in advance of the expected submission date, and recorded by the RO in Je-S Student Details if approved.

If the student makes a request, after the end of the funded period, for an extension to their submission date based on a certified period of illness experienced during the tenure of their studentship, the RO may extend the submission date. The date may be extended only by the period specifically covered by medical certificate(s), only if the RO was notified of the period of certified illness at the time it occurred, and only if the student's funded period and submission date had not already been extended because of the absence.

The following cases are **not** considered grounds for an extension to the submission date:

• Taking up full-time employment after the award has ended - the RO should not grant an extension to the submission deadline if the submission has been delayed because the student has taken up full-time employment after an award has ended, i.e. after the end

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

of the funded period. Taking up employment at the end of a studentship is considered a normal outcome of doctoral study and is therefore not a reason for extending a submission date.

• Transfers from full-time to part-time study after the funded period of the studentship has ended - the RO should not approve extensions to submission dates because the student has changed their mode of registration after their studentship has ended, i.e. after the end of the funded period.

• Requests submitted after a student's submission date has passed - the RO cannot grant extension requests retrospectively. If a student does not submit their thesis or a legitimate extension request on or before their submission date, they will count as a nil submitter.

If, having read the guidance above, you are still unsure whether a student who has passed the end of their funded period has a valid reason to extend their submission date then please contact the AHRC via email at: pso@ahrc.ukri.org.

3.2.3   Transfer of Student from one RO to another
Students who are attached to DTP/CDT awards may only transfer to another RO if that RO is a current member of a DTP/CDT

Students who are attached to a CDP Award will not be permitted to transfer their studies on the project to another RO. There may be exceptions to this where the academic supervisor moves to another RO. If this is the case the AHRC will consider transferring the award and the studentship(s) to the new RO, but only where it is considered imperative to the continuation of the project. In such cases all parties involved must be in agreement and a student would not be under any obligation to transfer.

3.2.4   Ethical Issues
Students and supervisors should give careful consideration as to whether there are ethical issues raised by any aspect of the proposed project. We expect such projects to be approved by the university's ethical committee or equivalent body. This would also be the case for any issue which arose as the project evolved. For any project with potential ethical concerns, the student should be given appropriate training before embarking on the project, or as soon as the concerns arise, and he/she should be provided with the necessary advice and support as the project progresses.

We recommend that award holders or lead administrators put in place a process to capture this information if they do not do so already so that the Je-S Student Details can be updated to confirm that ethical issues have been considered.

3.2.5   Project Partners
Je-S Student Details allows for partner details to be recorded for any project which includes collaboration with a non-HEI organisation, including co-funding. These fields are currently open for CDA projects and must be completed for CDAs.

For non-CDA projects, any partner collaboration should be recorded, even if the collaboration is informal or short-term and the contribution is in-kind. It would be helpful if any internships or placements are recorded through these fields. Project partner details should be completed for all non-HEI organisations involved in the student's award. Any financial or in-kind contributions provided should be the total for the project and not annual contributions. The RO will need to provide a contact at the non-HEI organisation. He/she should only be recorded as a supervisor if they are formally undertaking that role, which

will be the case for CDAs. If they are only supervising the work undertaken during the placement, then we wouldn't expect them to be recorded as a supervisor.

3.3   Management of funding

3.3.1   Costs incurred before the commencement of the grant

It is permissible for the award holding RO to incur limited expenditure before the start date of a grant, which is subsequently charged to the grant, but only where this relates to the development of Cohort Development Fund (CDF) related activities and where these have been specified in the proposal. For example, this might cover the set up and development costs for an online learning environment, where this has been specified in the proposal as an element of the RO's or consortium's plans for the CDF.

3.3.2   Ineligible costs

Costs for advertising, marketing, recruitment, branding, etc. should not be charged to the Training grant. In common with other Research Councils, we expect these costs to be covered from the postgraduate fees that ROs charge for their PhD programmes.

3.3.3   The relationship between DTP2 and DTP/CDT awards

The awards can, if they wish, open up aspects of their training programmes to current AHRC-funded students – for example, DTP2 involving existing DTP or CDT students in subject or interdisciplinary cohort activities. Award holders should consider opening up opportunities to other awards. For example, an event focussed on a particular subject might be open to any student funded from a DTP, CDT, CDP or DTP2 undertaking research in that area and who might have an interest. We would encourage award holders to develop funding models which allow activities to be more open to students from other awards, with the potential to develop cohorts of students across awards.

SDF and Engagement Provision funding is, however, award specific and should continue to be used solely for the benefit of AHRC students recruited to that DTP/CDT or DTP2.

3.3.4   Extensions for AHRC-funded students beyond the end date of the Training Grant

Where an AHRC-funded student is granted an extension to their studentship (e.g. for maternity leave, suspension of studies, etc), and this causes the studentship to extend beyond the end of the training grant that they are currently being funded from, they should be funded, if necessary, from another AHRC Training Grant. The AHRC expects Directors of Training Grants to make appropriate provision within the grants for this possibility, in discussion with other members of the consortia as appropriate.

In a situation where a Collaborative Doctoral Award (CDA) student's award needs to be extended, it is possible for the student's funding to be continued from any of the current AHRC Training Grant awards on which the institution is a partner.

3.3.5   Funding Flexibility – DTP2

Training Grant award holders are encouraged to make full use of the flexibility permitted by the terms and conditions of the Training Grant to create and maintain high-quality research training environments, and recruit the strongest students. The main restriction is that the Cohort Development Fund (CDF) should be ring-fenced for cohort development activities and not used, for example, to create additional studentships. Further information on the types of expenditure that are appropriate under other fund headings is given elsewhere in this guide.

Within DTP2, the funding is calculated on the basis of four years' funding for each student. This allows the students to undertake development opportunities which might extend the award as well as enabling them to submit their thesis within the funding period. Where individual students do not need the full four years' funding, the flexibility should be used to support extensions for maternity leave etc. The DTP Director should monitor spend and keep AHRC informed of any possible underspend.

The terms and conditions specify requirements relating to the joint funding of a studentship, e.g. jointly between the AHRC grant and institutional funding.

3.3.6 Institutional Commitment and Matched Funding/Co-Funding (Not DTP2)

We expect all ROs to honour the financial or in-kind commitments made in the original proposal document, this applies to lead and partner ROs, and to any commitments made by partner organisations. If, for any reason, there are changes to what an RO or partner is able to provide, the AHRC should be contacted immediately to discuss the situation. The AHRC will need to treat very seriously any suggestion that an organisation may have made unrealistic commitments as part of a DTP or CDT proposal. The AHRC will address the issue with the senior management of the RO concerned, and may require a DTP or CDT to limit, or exclude, an individual RO from receipt of further funding from the award.

Where a studentship is co-funded in accordance with the flexibility permitted by the terms and conditions of the training grant, e.g. 50:50 funded with institutional funding, and therefore is badged as an 'AHRC Studentship', the studentship must have been awarded through open competition. This means that institutional funding (or funding from other sources) can only be used alongside AHRC funding to co-fund a studentship where that student has been prioritised for funding against others in the rank ordered list.

All students who are 50% or more AHRC-funded (or fees-only students receiving 100% of fees) need to be recorded on Je-S Student Details so that AHRC has a full picture of the students that are being supported with AHRC funding. This includes Master's students funded from the SDF. It would not include doctoral or Master's students who are wholly funded from institutional matched funding.

In certain circumstances, it is possible for a 100% matched-funded student to be counted as part of a DTP or CDT's financial commitment. As a general rule, 100% institutionally-funded students can be deemed part of an institution's funding commitment where the funding in question is deployed as part of the award process for AHRC studentships, and the DTP / CDT is content for the RO's funding to be used in this way.

Typically, this might be a situation where an RO has a financial commitment to make, but there are not enough students in the top ranking to fund them 50:50. In other words, the RO may choose to use its institution funding commitment to decide to 100% fund a number of the top-ranked students, rather than be in the situation of not being able to honour its co-funding commitment. Another situation would be where there is a student below the cut-off line for AHRC funding who will be registered at an RO which has the scope to make additional 100% institutional funding available.

We also recognise that ROs may wish to recruit students onto a CDT/DTP programme who are not eligible for AHRC funding, e.g. overseas students. Again, 100% institutional funding could be deployed, and deemed part of the institution's co-investment, but only where the decision on the student application in question has been made as part of the DTP / CDT's award process. In other words, institutional funding for international students

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

provided by an RO as part of separate competition cannot be deemed part of the funding commitment made to AHRC by an institution; funding must be deployed within the award process for AHRC studentships for it to count.

The annual report (see below) will give Directors the opportunity to report the full range of investments. This would include any funding for studentships that are awarded through the DTP or CDT mechanisms, but which are 100% institutionally funded, e.g. because they are international students who are not eligible for Research Council funding. These students should not be reported to the AHRC through Je-S Student Details, but should be included in the annual report as part of recording the institutional co-funding commitment.

3.3.7 Institutional Commitment and Matched Funding/Co-Funding (DTP2 Only)
In accepting the DTP2 award, the Consortium has made a financial commitment to co-fund the DTP through the Consortium Contribution.

The mandatory Consortium Contribution for DTP2 awards means that all PhD students appointed are notionally co-funded by the AHRC and the Consortium. In order to ensure that all students remain at least 50% funded by the AHRC, the total Consortium Contribution (Stipend, Tuition Fees and RTSG) must not exceed the value of the AHRC's total contribution to those three fund headings.

In addition to the mandatory commitment, the consortium has outlined in the application how it will support the DTP through the provision of management and training infrastructure, including the time commitment from Directors and DTP2 Managers and administrative support. We expect the Consortia to honour these financial or in-kind commitments made in the original proposal document. If, for any reason, there are changes to what a Consortia is able to provide, the AHRC should be contacted immediately to discuss the situation. The AHRC will need to treat very seriously any suggestion that the application has made unrealistic commitments. The AHRC will address the issue with the senior management of the DTP concerned.

3.3.8 AHRC Visibility
It is vital for the AHRC to be able to demonstrate and promote the cultural, social, artistic and economic value of publicly funded research and training. Our Training funding is a part of this public investment and we expect award holders to publicise the AHRC's investment, and to ensure that students know that their funding is from an AHRC award. We are also keen to hear about any interesting projects or activities undertaken at the Training Grant level, by individual AHRC-funded students or student cohorts, which demonstrate the depth and breadth of the high quality training and development opportunities which have been provided.

The AHRC logo must be included in any recruitment material, publications, publicity, or marketing material relating to the Training Grant - including printed material, event signage or electronic communications such as a website or blogs. In the case of media coverage in newspapers, magazines, radio or on television, acknowledgement should also be given where possible. Information on how to use the AHRC logo can be found here (opens in new window).

4 Monitoring
Students and ROs must complete and return any reports relating to the awards, as may be required from time to time.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

4.1 Monitoring and progress reporting

The AHRC expects a Training Grant Award to deliver on the plans set out in its proposal, and to have mechanisms in place to review its own progress against the specified vision, aims and objectives. Directors should contact the AHRC as soon as possible if a significant change to the plans set out in the proposal is envisaged.

4.1.1 Annual Report

As part of the monitoring process, the grant holder must submit an annual report to the AHRC. We recognise that there is commonality between some DTP and DTP2 awards, however, we will need to treat these as separate awards for reporting purposes. This does not mean that you can't share activities across the awards or treat the students as a single cohort but, we will need clarity on what activities have been supported under each award. You will also need to keep separate financial records as the funding is not transferable between awards and you will need to accurately account for spend against each award. This annual report will supplement the information on individual students and their projects that must be reported through Je-S Student Details, Researchfish and the submission rate survey which will continue as annual exercises. The report is intended to capture information on the management of funding and training provided; particular achievements and challenges; institutional co-investment and the Consortium Contribution; collaborations and partnership working; and use of CDF and, where appropriate, SDF and Engagement Provision.

Reports will need to be completed for each year of the award. We are keen to ensure that the report can build on a Training Grants own internal reporting processes, and so is timed to follow on from the review of activities that Training Grants will themselves wish to undertake each year in the October-December period. Grant holders will receive a reminder of this requirement in September each year.

Reports should be submitted electronically directly to the AHRC and NOT through Je-S or the UK SBS Ltd. Instructions will be sent nearer the time.

4.1.2 Financial reporting

All Training Grants will need to complete a Final Expenditure Statement. In addition, DTP2 awards will be asked to complete an annual, high-level financial expenditure report outlining both expenditure of AHRC funding and also the Consortium Commitment. The AHRC reserves the right to request Interim Expenditure Statements during the lifetime of the Training Grant.

4.2 Alumni and first employment destinations

It is essential that AHRC has an understanding of the careers that AHRC-funded students go on to and the contribution that they make to the UK's cultural, social and economic landscape. As part of our partnership working with the Training Grant holders, we would like to develop a strategy for capturing this information more effectively and engaging with alumni in the short, medium and long-term.

The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) conduct on the AHRC's behalf an annual survey of the first employment destinations of funded students. ROs will be required to submit an annual return. This provides the Council with useful information about the progress of funded students in the labour market, and the AHRC asks students to co-operate by keeping their RO informed about their employment. There may also be other surveys undertaken by UKRI, or undertaken on their behalf, as well as national surveys

such as DHLE, to which we expect ROs and RC-funded, and previously funded, students to contribute.

4.3   Management of Je-S Records

The Training Grant award holder has responsibility for ensuring that student details are up to date in the Je-S system. Processes should be put in place to ensure changes are recorded such as change of supervisor, change of funding end date, change of submission due date and associated details, changes between full and part-time study and project partner details within a month of the change occurring.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

5   Annex A: Collaborative Working, Academic and Non-Academic

This section applies to both academic and non-academic partnership/collaborative working. It should be read in conjunction with the AHRC's "Partnership Working the in the Arts and Humanities, A Guide to Good Practice", available on the AHRC's website here, and UKRI's Joint Vision for Collaborative Training (opens in new window).

5.1.1   Developing and Demonstrating a Collaboration

The first step in setting up a collaboration, whether academic or non-academic, is to establish who may be a suitable partner for the project. Non-HEI organisations may wish to contact an HEI's Research, Development or External Liaison Office to discuss how their activities may benefit a project. Alternatively, HEIs may seek to find a non-HEI organisation which could utilise a particular area of research or knowledge. HEI departments should also contact the appropriate office/person in their organisation for guidance and support. This office/person may be particularly useful with regard to setting up agreements or contracts.

Colleagues who are already running successful collaborations may also be a good source of help and information in setting up a partnership. We encourage new collaborators to seek them out and utilise their expertise.

Initiating or joining a network of partnership projects can be useful in developing new partnerships as well as providing a forum for discussing ideas, problems and good practice. Anecdotal feedback has also shown that AHRC CDA students find real value in networking opportunities amongst themselves.

Collaborative working can be extremely rewarding and exciting, but it is not an easy option as it takes effort, hard work and most of all commitment to make it work and to manage it successfully. Partners should not underestimate this in setting up a project, and should not enter such a partnership if there is any doubt that they will be able to make that commitment. Academic supervisors should expect that the supervision of research students who are working on a collaborative project will involve an increased workload in comparison to the supervision of a standard doctoral student. In relation to the length of the commitment, partners must be prepared to commit to the project for the full length of the award, at least up to the submission of the research student's thesis.

Non–academic partners should not be discouraged from entering a collaboration because they consider they do not have the capability or capacity to offer academic supervision to a PhD student. The responsibility for academic supervision lies with the academic supervisor. While some organisations/individuals may be able to offer some academic support, the non-academic supervisor role offers something different. It provides specific training and access to resources, people, collections, processes, knowledge and expertise that are vital to the success of the research project, and which would not be possible without the collaboration. It is imperative that the non-academic supervisor has the full support of their organisation and is able to co-direct the project and ensure that not only are the organisation's objectives being met, but that the student's research is fully supported and kept on track.

Non-academic organisations may also wish to approach a collaboration with the view that involvement in collaborative projects provides good opportunities not just for students, but for their own staff development and skills training. In all cases, the AHRC encourages

both academic and non-academic partners to make good use of the opportunities afforded by collaborating to share their skills and knowledge and learn about each other's organisations and ways of working.

Those considering establishing a collaborative arrangement must be able to demonstrate that a true/real relationship exists between the partner organisations, and that it is established as an equal partnership. Whilst the student and their PhD are central to the award and the PhD must meet the requirements and regulations of the HEI concerned, one of the main aims of collaboration is to establish and maintain links between academia and external partners that have some real, tangible and long-lasting benefits.

The main indicators of a strong collaboration are listed below and should be considered both in the formation of a collaboration and development of a proposal. These are based on the development of a joint PhD project but the principles apply equally to shorter term projects which might form a placement opportunity:

• Do we agree what the project is about, will it make a good doctoral project and what are the wider benefits?

• Does the project meet the needs of both collaborating partners?

• What is the 'bottom line' in terms of expectations?

• Is it feasible within the period of an AHRC studentship?

• Do we have a common understanding of language – do we agree what the terms supervisor and training, for example, mean?

• Do partners have the necessary time and resources to commit to the project?

• Are we clear on:

- the arrangements for joint supervision of the project/student;
- the arrangements for sorting out confidentiality or ethical issues and intellectual property rights;
- the means for identifying an appropriate student;
- provision for training, monitoring and review of the student/project;
- provision of and access to the required resources, collections etc.;
- financial commitments, contributions and procedures;
- expected outcomes, timing and availability of research results?

• Do we have a mechanism for establishing a formal agreement setting out expectations and responsibilities for the above?

• Is there clear agreement that it is an equal partnership with mutual benefits?

5.1.2   Other Sources of Information
The National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (opens in new window) includes further useful information and suggestions for building and maintaining collaborations.

5.1.3   Collaborative working – academic
Where two or more ROs are working in a consortium, the AHRC award is made to all ROs identified in the proposal, although we expect the award to be administered and coordinated by the lead organisation, and expect the Coordinator to be based at the lead organisation.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

A consortium award is made on the assumption that the lead organisation of the consortium will take the overall responsibility for the leadership and management of the award. The AHRC will direct all correspondence relating to the award to the lead organisation, and expects this organisation to keep the AHRC informed of progress and any change in circumstance relating to the award.

In accepting the award, the lead organisation is confirming the acceptance of the terms and conditions of the award by all organisations within the consortium.

We recommend that, before commencing an AHRC award, the collaborating organisations have in place a signed agreement describing how the collaboration will operate, and setting out expectations and responsibilities for each partner organisation. This should cover areas such as:

• specific objectives, obligations, and responsibilities of each partner;

• provision of resources;

• how awards are allocated between organisations;

• how decisions will be made;

• how any disputes will be resolved;

• issues of ethics or confidentiality;

• ownership of research results and intellectual property;

• outcome of studentships;

• supervision and training;

• monitoring and review;

• financial contributions.

The AHRC reserves the right to request a signed copy of any such agreement for its records.

The AHRC will not intervene in any disputes between the collaborating organisations but reserves the right to withdraw or terminate the award if the agreement is broken or terminated by one of the parties or if disputes cannot be resolved satisfactorily.

The AHRC accepts no responsibility for any financial arrangements made between the consortium organisations.

5.1.4   Collaborative working – non-academic

Collaborative working between a student and a non-academic partner can take place in a number of ways, including internships and work experience placements, as well as though the CDA and CDP schemes. It is expected that all collaborative working opportunities are managed and adhere to certain principles.

Research Councils expect the RO and collaborating organisations to have an agreement in place before the project begins, which recognises the student's contribution, and ensures that the IP arising from the research and/or training can be managed effectively.

It is recommended that the student receives an induction programme in the non-academic organisation similar to that provided for new employees, although this will vary depending

on the nature of the project and the size of the organisation. Induction should be tailored to the needs of the student and the project and, if necessary, should also be offered to the academic supervisor where it might serve the needs of furthering trust, understanding and effective working relationships.

Where the non-academic collaborating partner has agreed to make additional payments to the student, arrangements should be made between the partners and the student as to the amount, frequency and mechanism for payment. The AHRC will assume no responsibility or involvement in such payments, nor will it act as intermediary in any disputes over such payments.

Partners and students should note that costs incurred whilst working at or visiting the premises of the non-academic collaborating organisation are not eligible for support from the Research Training Support Grant (RTSG).

The AHRC recognises that despite good planning and project management, working in a collaborative environment could in some cases leave students subject to external changes or forces that are out of their control. For this reason it is important that the RO is informed at the time of any impediment to progress and where this may have a significant impact on a student's ability to submit their thesis within the required timeframe.

5.1.5   Collaborative Doctoral Awards

Collaborative Doctoral Awards (CDAs) are doctoral studentship projects which are developed by a university based academic working in collaboration with an organisation outside of higher education. They are intended as a way of facilitating collaboration with a diverse range of non-HEI partners including smaller, regional partners and spreading capacity for non-HEIs to work with HEIs in focused, mutually beneficial ways. CDAs provide important opportunities for doctoral students to gain first-hand experience of work outside the university environment and enhance the employment-related skills and training which a student may gain during the course of their award.

CDA projects also encourage and establish links that can have long-term benefits for both collaborating partners, providing access to resources and materials, knowledge and expertise that may not otherwise have been available and also provide social, cultural and economic benefits to wider society.

Whilst there are many ways in which a DTP might engage with non-HEI organisations, in order to be classified as a Collaborative Doctoral Award, a studentship must meet the specific CDA criteria outlined below.

5.1.6   CDA Criteria

1. The project needs to have been jointly developed by the academic and non-University partner. It's not sufficient for the student simply to be accessing resources/archives held by the non-University partner; both partners should be equally invested in the project, and the student will have a supervisor at both organisations. This doesn't preclude a prospective student being engaged in the development of the project, and s/he could be named on the application. It would be possible to badge a studentship as a CDA once it has commenced, if the non-University partner comes on board at a later date, is fully engaged and has agreed to jointly supervise the student.

2. The project proposal would need to meet the expectations of the RCUK Joint Vision for Collaborative Training, in other words:

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

- The research is relevant to the organisation's priorities and objectives;
- The project is based on a truly collaborative approach;
- Evidence of a clear commitment from the non-University partner to provide access to training, facilities and expertise not available in an academic setting alone;
- The opportunity provided by the project to enable the student to develop a range of valuable skills and significantly enhance their future employability.

3. There must be an opportunity for the student to spend time working at the non-University organisation's premises. During this time, the student must be engaged in activities which are an integral component of the research to be presented in the thesis, as well as wider development activities and opportunities. For a full-time student, the minimum is 3 months and the maximum 18 months. When and how this time is spent will vary according to the nature of the project, and is subject to negotiation between the partners and the student.

4. The partner organisation can be from the private, public or voluntary sector (where a private company is defined as being at least 50% privately owned with a wealth creation base in the UK). The word 'organisation' is used as a generic term and should be interpreted as widely as possible. The AHRC wishes to encourage collaborations from any area within its subject remit and with a full range of organisations, bodies and businesses, including the creative, cultural and heritage industries, both large and small and to include sole traders and partnerships.

5. In most cases the non-HEI partner must have an operating base in the UK.

6. In exceptional cases, a collaboration with a company or organisation based outside of the UK can be considered. AHRC recognises that, given the distinctive nature of its subject domain, there may be potential for reciprocal research collaborations outside the UK. A DTP will need to be clear what additional benefits are to be gained from the collaboration, that demonstrable value from the project will be accrued to the UK, and that the collaboration will deliver long-term, lasting benefits. The overseas partner must specify a minimum contribution and would be expected to cover additional costs of travel to and from the UK. The logistics of running such a partnership should be carefully considered in order to demonstrate that the project is both viable and feasible.

7. University museums and galleries or organisations that are deemed to be a spin-off or are supported by an HEI are eligible as project partners, providing that the project is not a collaboration with the parent institution. We are keen to see a wide variety of partners engaged with collaborative studentships, including local partner organisations

Organisations belonging to Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships (CDPs) can be partners for DTP Collaborative Doctoral Awards.

Whilst not a requirement, experience has demonstrated that the signing of written agreements as part of these projects can be extremely valuable. Agreements ensure that all parties, including the student, are aware of, and understand, the requirements and responsibilities underlying the partnership. DTPs or HEIs may wish to develop a template agreement for setting out the expectations and responsibilities of CDA partnerships.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

5.1.7 Specific Guidance for Collaborative Doctoral Awards (CDAs) and Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships (CDPs)

The recruitment and selection of students to CDAs and CDPs should involve both the academic and non-academic partners to ensure both are in agreement that the best student is selected and to engender a shared ownership of all decisions relating to that studentship. Selecting, retaining and supporting the right student is key to the success of the project, so the collaborators must be fully involved and supportive of both project and student.

It is recognised that some collaborative projects will have originated with a particular student. Where that student has the appropriate ability and as long as they meet the eligibility criteria, it would be unfair and inappropriate for the studentship to be advertised. There may also be instances where a very particular knowledge or skill-set is required, which means that a project is developed with a student in mind or that the field of potential well-qualified students is extremely limited. In such cases, recruitment of the student without competition may be justified, as long as the proposed project has been identified through a competitive process and the student has demonstrated that they have the requisite skills to be able to complete the doctorate. However, it is considered advisable that the majority of collaborative studentships should be advertised.

The AHRC will allow some flexibility if a nominated student subsequently withdraws after commencing their studies. An RO may be able to re-recruit in full to the studentship place within the first year of the project. Studentships should be re-advertised in the same way, but it may be possible to offer it to a suitable candidate who had previously applied through open selection. Please contact the AHRC for further advice. CDA and CDP awards are made on the basis of a partnership between an RO and a collaborating external organisation. A student will have agreed to working with those partners on the specified project and to remaining registered at the relevant RO.

Collaborating partners are required to have mechanisms in place to ensure the continuation of the project. However, if for any reason the collaborative arrangement were to cease before the end of an AHRC studentship it may be possible for any student concerned to continue as a standard doctoral studentship provided that their research is still viable, that adequate supervision is available and that they will be able to complete their thesis within the required time. Fees-only students will be eligible for tuition fee payments from the AHRC but not for maintenance grant payments (including the additional CDA maintenance contribution). The AHRC will not require the non-academic partner to make maintenance payments to such students, but they may do so if they wish.

During the studentship a collaborative doctoral student will spend time working in the non-academic organisation's premises. During this time the student must be engaged in activities which are an integral component of the research to be presented in the thesis. The recommended minimum is three months and the maximum eighteen months, although when and how this time is spent will vary according to the nature of the project and is subject to negotiation between the partners and the student. It is recommended that this forms part of the formal agreement.

6 Annex B: AHRC Engagement with Award holders

6.1 Dialogue and partnership with the AHRC Introduction

DTPs, CDTs, CDPs and DTP2 represent a significant investment in postgraduate research training in the arts and humanities. The AHRC will be looking to work in partnership with the awards in all four schemes through the Directors and managers, to maximise the impact of this funding. Equally, the innovative research training environments created by these awards, and the experience of their PhD students, is likely to inform the AHRC's own future strategy.

6.1.1 Annual Directors' Conference

We will hold an annual conference with all CDT/DTP/DTP2 Directors to discuss issues, share best practice and develop informal networks across consortia/institutions. It is anticipated that the CDP Directors will continue to meet separately and that the Chair of the CDP Group will be invited to the annual conference. These meetings are intended to be reasonably informal, with an emphasis on creating an on-going dialogue around the practicalities of handling the awards, as well as the evolving nature of postgraduate research training in the arts and humanities more broadly.

We intend to share with Directors each year the subject profile that has emerged across the combined recruitment of DTP2 and the CDPs, as reported to the AHRC through Je-S Student Details. This will provide an opportunity for the AHRC and Directors together to consider any emerging recruitment patterns or recruitment problems in specific areas.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

7 Annex C: Submission rate survey

The AHRC is accountable for the public funds it manages and distributes. The Submission Rate Survey is one method the Council uses to monitor the progress and outcome of studentships.

The Submission Rate Survey is an annual survey that calculates the rate of thesis submission by doctoral students who have held AHRC postgraduate studentships in a particular Research Organisation. This is calculated as the percentage of students for each RO who have submitted before or on their submission due date in relation to all the students at the RO who were due to submit in that period.

The survey period is 1st October to 30th September and the census date is 30th September. Je-S Student Details is used to collect information from ROs about actual and expected submission dates of doctoral students due to submit by the survey census date. Once the end of the census date has passed, ROs will be informed that the submission survey window is open and will be given the opportunity to check and amend the data for all students who were due to submit within the census date. ROs which do not meet the published deadline for completing the survey are recorded as a nil return. Once the deadline for completing the survey has passed, the submission and completion rates for individual institutions will be calculated.

The survey considers all AHRC-funded doctoral students with a submission due date within the census period. This includes part-time students due to submit in the census year who are included in the RO submission rate calculations alongside full-time students.

Sanctions will be applied by the AHRC if submission rate thresholds set by the AHRC are not met (see below).

The AHRC also collects information on completion rates as part of the annual submission rate survey. For these purposes, completion is defined as the award of a doctoral or other degree. This is normally counted as the date of the successful viva examination and is the earliest date on which it is known that the doctoral degree can be recommended. If that information is not readily available, an alternative is the date the Degree Committee or equivalent recommended the award.

If a student submits a doctoral level thesis and is subsequently awarded a lower degree e.g. MPhil, the RO should record this within Je-S Student Details as 'No Degree Awarded'. This will still be shown as a submission for the purposes of the submission rate survey, as a doctoral thesis will have been submitted. However, if the decision is taken in advance of submission that a student should submit a thesis at a lower degree level, this will be shown as a nil-submission for the purposes of the submission rate survey exercise, as no doctoral thesis will have been submitted.

The AHRC will also be requesting updated information on submission and completion for students that were first included in previous submission rate surveys, and where this information has not previously been provided. Should the 5 year rate be published, it will appear as an overarching figure for all AHRC doctoral studentships and will not be broken down by RO.

During the Submission Rate Survey, the AHRC will check to see whether any amendments have been made to submission dates through Je-S Student Details, and will consider the reason for the change provided by the RO. If a student's submission date is amended without providing an appropriate or eligible reason, the AHRC will consider the date amendment to be invalid, and the student will be counted as a 'nil-submitter' in that year's Submission Rate Survey.

ROs cannot change submission or completion dates for individual students once they have been included in published survey results.

7.1   Sanctions policy

The AHRC's monitoring of submission rates is intended to encourage the timely completion of a thesis and incorporates a sanctions policy. ROs identified in the survey with submission rates below the target thresholds are ineligible to hold doctoral studentships for two years. We will continue to monitor and sanction at RO level, even if the RO is part of a consortium, as it is the RO at which the student is registered which is responsible for that student.

The Council aggregates the results for departments in a single RO. This is to ensure that high submission rates are maintained within each RO, and is in accordance with UKRI-wide policy. Action will be taken by the AHRC where an institution has 8 or more studentships included in their survey over the 4-year survey period and that institution's submission falls below a specified rate (see below). This ensures that ROs with a smaller number of studentships, where a small number of nil submissions can have a significant effect on submission rates, are not penalised.

The Council will look at the submission rate for the current survey year and the aggregated institutional submission rate for the current year and the preceding three years to give an overall aggregated 4-year submission rate. The Council will take action based on these two submission rates (the current year and the aggregated 4-year rate) as follows:

Current year submission rate	Aggregated 4 year submission rate	Action taken by Council
Any	>70%	No Action
> 70%	<70%	No Action
60% - 70%	<70%	RO will receive a warning but will not be sanctioned unless they were warned in the previous year.
<60%	<70%	RO will be sanctioned

7.1.1   Institutional warnings

A warning will be issued to ROs where the aggregated 4-year submission rate falls below the 70% threshold but the rate is between 60% and 70% for the current year. In this case the Council will write to the RO to confirm that they will receive a warning for their current submission rate. The Council will also confirm that if the RO fails to meet the 70% threshold in the following year's survey for both the current year submission rate and aggregate 4-year submission rate they will be sanctioned.

7.1.2   ROs facing sanctions

ROs facing sanctions will have their AHRC funding for support of new doctoral studentships withdrawn for a period of two years. This applies to all doctoral awards, regardless of the

scheme through which they were originally awarded. Where the RO is part of a consortium, we will ask the consortium not to allocate doctoral awards to that RO for a two-year period.

Changes affecting submission rate calculations

The AHRC will take the following changes of circumstance/registration into consideration when calculating expected submission dates.

7.1.3   Transfers between ROs

If a student has transferred from one RO to another, the ROs concerned must ensure the student's records are properly updated in Je-S Student Details (please note that the receiving RO needs to update the registration record and the submission record), and that the student is showing as being registered at the receiving RO. Provided this has taken place, the student will appear on the survey of the receiving RO, and will count in the calculation of the submission rate of that RO.

7.1.4   Transfer between ROs after the award has ended

If an RO exceptionally agrees that one of its students transfers to another RO after the end of their AHRC award, but before their expected AHRC submission date, that student will still be surveyed under the original RO, i.e. where they were registered prior to the transfer.

The date at which the student first took up the award will remain the same for the purposes of submission rate calculations.

7.1.5   Suspension of studies during the period of an award

ROs should update the expected submission date to reflect any periods of suspension. However, AHRC reserves the right to revert to the original submission date if the suspension is not in accordance with our Terms and Conditions.

7.1.6   Deceased

Students who are recorded as deceased on Je-S Student Details are omitted from calculations of submission rates.

7.1.7   Terminations

Full-time students whose awards are terminated during the first year of the award will be excluded from all submission rate calculations. Similarly, part-time students whose awards are terminated during the first two years of the award are excluded from calculations. Students whose award is terminated after the periods indicated above will still be included in the calculations.

8 Annex D: Master's Support

For DTP1 and CDT, the AHRC only supported Master's studentships that were designed to lead on to doctoral research. Beyond the 2018/19 Academic Year, AHRC no longer supports Master's studentships. The following guidance on stipend and eligibility is therefore for information only.

Master's students should be paid at least the minimum stipend applicable for the type of award they hold. We have no longer specified a separate Master's rate, and for Master's studentships funded from DTP and CDT awards, students were funded a stipend at the doctoral rate.

Masters Eligibility: a student should have gained an undergraduate degree (usually an Honours degree, such as a BA, BMus, BSc, LLB or equivalent) from a recognised RO, or be an undergraduate expecting to graduate prior to the studentship being taken up. If the student subsequently fails to gain an undergraduate degree, they are not entitled to receive AHRC studentship funding. Other qualifications should be considered only exceptionally.

Students without an undergraduate degree could be considered for an AHRC studentship only if they are able to demonstrate substantial equivalent and relevant experience that has prepared them to undertake their proposed course of study.

Any AHRC-funded or matched-funded Master's student wishing to continue to doctoral study (whether at the same or different RO) must apply separately for a doctoral award and compete with all other potential candidates. We do not wish students to be locked into or out of funding, but rather we wish to ensure that the best quality students are supported at all stages. It may also be necessary for a student to transfer to a different RO to undertake their doctoral studies, which should be encouraged if it is in the best interests of the student.

9 Submission Date and Submission Rate Clarification

Submission dates and funding periods for DTP2 students

Setting the submission due date

The conditions below apply to all students. The text relates to full-time students but applies equally (pro-rated) to students registered for part-time study. In normal circumstances, i.e. with no period of suspension or extensions for reasons of certificated absence, students should not receive more than four years' funding and the submission due date must be set no more than four years from the start of the award.

In section 3.2 we state that:

> 'Doctoral projects must be designed and supervised in such a way that students are able to submit their thesis within the funded period, as defined at the outset of the project.
>
> For DTP2, the submission date for full-time students must be set at no more than four years after the start of the award (or FTE for part-time students). The expectation is that ROs will put in place processes to enable students to submit by the end of the funded period. There should be no expectation of an unfunded period when the doctoral programme is designed and the submission date is set.'

Whilst this does allow for flexibility in the approach, AHRC would strongly encourage award holders to set the submission due date on Je-S as the same date as the funding end date. This applies to both the initial submission due date and any instances in which there is an authorised change to the due date. The communication with students and with supervisors should make clear that it is AHRC's expectation that there will be no unfunded period and the submission due date has therefore been set as the end date of the award.   Linked to this, it is important to note that there is provision within the DTP2 awards for students to receive four years of funding.   It should be made clear that AHRC is providing additional funding to enable students to be funded up to the point of thesis submission. This policy is not designed to give them less time to submit though, in practice, they may require less time because funding allows them to focus on their research and writing up.

When students have been offered less than four years' funding at the start of their award, there should be options to allow for both the end date of the award and the submission due date to be extended, to up to four years from the start. The DTP2 should set out clearly under what circumstances additional funding will be provided.   In determining these circumstances, we encourage award holders to be flexible, as set in the section below on 'increased flexibility'.

In cases where four years' funding has been offered at the start, the submission due date should be set at four years and it won't be possible to extend it (except when, for reasons of absence (certified sickness or maternity leave), the funding period has been extended beyond four years). It is expected that any development opportunities are accommodated within the four-year period. There should also be an understanding that the funding could be less than four years if the student submits earlier than planned.

In cases where less than four years funding has been provided, if the submission due date is extended, AHRC expects that the funding end date will be extended by the same period, up to a maximum of four years from the start date of the studentship.

VERSION 3.0
January 2020

It is acceptable for the funding period to be extended and the submission due date to be moved more than once, e.g. if multiple opportunities are taken up but, up to the limit of four years from the start date of the studentship. There should be options for dates to be reviewed throughout the award as opportunities arise.

For students who receive a DTP award after they have commenced study, the above conditions apply but the initial time period might be less. In other words, a student receiving funding from their second year might be offered three years of funding and the submission due date would be set at three years from the start of the award (four years from the start of doctoral study).

We recognise that this is a change of approach and that RO policy and practice may mean that you set submission dates at four years. The driver is to create conditions which benefit the students by removing the unfunded, 'writing up' period. The approach is to fund students for longer: not to put pressure on the students to submit before they are ready. It is important that supervisors and students understand this aim. It is likely that, when accompanied by appropriate project design and supervision, an additional period of funding is likely to result in students working more effectively than if they were unfunded.

AHRC will be monitoring the funding end dates and the submission dates to facilitate discussion at the annual meetings with award holders.

Increased flexibility

A further driver for calculating a studentship on the basis of four years' funding is to allow for development opportunities to be integrated into the studentship.

In cases where the student has been offered less than four year's funding, we encourage award holders to think flexibly about the way in which opportunities might extend the period of funding required. Whilst, a three-month placement is an obvious case for allowing an additional three months' funding, award holders might also consider how other activities, central to the project or student's development, have had an impact on the project duration. For example, if a student requires one month's intensive training to develop the archival skills needed to take forward their project, then the case might be made to extend the funding period and submission due date by one month. We recognise that this is more challenging to implement in a fair and transparent way but, would encourage award holders to consider how such additional support might be provided.

Submission dates and funding periods for DTP and CDT students

The submission policy is unchanged for current DTP and CDT students and we would not expect their submission due dates to be amended. What might be considered, however, are opportunities to support the students for a longer period if they have undertaken significant development activities during their award, i.e. there would be an option to extend the end date of their funding. Award holders would be permitted to use SDF flexibly for this purpose, provided this can be implemented in a fair and transparent way. The submission due date would not be amended; this would be a mechanism to reduce the unfunded period.