UNIVERSITY OF
LINCOLN

Political Studies
Association

Academic Fellows in Parliaments: Impact, Lessons and Challenges

Arnott, M., Bennister, M., Bochel, C. and Clark, A.

Authors

Professor Margaret Arnott, University of the West of Scotland
Dr Mark Bennister, University of Lincoln
Dr Catherine Bochel, University of Lincoln
Dr Alistair Clark, Newcastle University

Acknowledgements

With thanks to Dr Sarah Foxen and Naomi Saint, Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, and Dr Caroline Kenny, Nursing and Midwifery Council (formerly Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology), for their input. The UK Parliamentary Academic Fellowship Scheme discussed in this report was coordinated by POST's Social Science Section. The next round will be coordinated by POST's Knowledge Exchange Unit. Both are supported by a grant from the ESRC to UCL's Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy.

The authors would also like to thank the Parliamentary staff who helped to organise the workshop, as well as the academic Fellows and Parliamentary staff who participated in the event.

Executive summary

1. Parliamentary Fellows on the Political Studies Association/House of Commons Fellowship Scheme (launched in November 2016) hosted a workshop in the House of Commons on 16 November 2018, together with Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) staff (see POST's separate report, *Parliamentary Academic Fellowship Scheme Pilot: A review of the scheme, its impacts, and recommendations for future schemes* (https://www.parliament.uk/documents/post/Academic%20Fellowship%20Scheme/WEB-Fellowships-long-report.pdf), focused on the POST parliamentary fellowship scheme pilot at Westminster). The purpose of the workshop was to inform an evaluation of the more structured fellowship schemes that have been set up by legislatures in recent years. The findings set out here draw on the views of Fellows and parliamentary staff who attended from across the UK's legislatures.

2. The aims of the workshop were: a) to find out how fellowship schemes have been working, what has worked well, share good practice, identify problems or challenges and suggest possible improvements; b) to identify any impacts that have been generated as a consequence of the fellowship events and seek to understand how impact can be tracked and evaluated; c) to raise the profile of existing fellowship schemes; d) to discuss ideas for the future of the fellowship schemes in UK legislatures.

3. The value of different schemes and application processes was highlighted by both academics and parliamentary staff. Direct calls could be seen to respond to a clear need in a specific policy area, while open calls enable projects that might not otherwise come to fruition.

4. Allocating a mentor from within the legislature to Fellows was widely seen as useful. However, it was felt that the role of a mentor could be clarified.

5. Consideration should be given to the most effective way for Fellows to work in the legislature, and how to enable them to conduct work that is beneficial to them and also to the legislature. This may vary across schemes and projects.

6. There are a range of funding approaches across fellowship schemes. This raises issues such as what parliaments can expect from Fellows, not least when they or their institutions may not receive any funding for a project.

7. The fellowship schemes should ensure that they are recruiting from a wide range of universities.

8. For parliamentary staff and Fellows, the recording and measurement of Fellows' 'impact' was widely seen as important. To maximise impact there could be a clearer focus on what skills and benefits academics could bring, for example, which might sometimes be particular knowledge or expertise, but which could also include helping committees to appraise evidence and bringing a critical perspective. On the parliamentary side, there was a view that the fellowships offered a different perspective and potentially contribute to change in culture and behaviour. Achieving impact may, however, bring different challenges depending on the experience and career stage of the academic involved.

9. While the Research Excellence Framework (REF) has led to a greater emphasis on impact in higher education, the definition of impact used by the REF can be quite narrow, and it would be expected that in many instances the impact and engagement activities of Fellows would extend beyond the REF interpretation.

10. POST's work on informing REF panellists' understanding of impact and how research is used in Parliament, aiming for more realistic expectations in their guidelines, was acknowledged as very helpful.

1. Background

The UK legislatures host a number of successful fellowship schemes, including in partnership with various Research Councils, learned societies, charities and specific institutions, to enable academics at different career levels, and from different disciplines, to spend time working on specific projects that have mutual benefit to the academic and to the legislature. These schemes, often restricted to PhD students, are detailed in Annex A. Where more senior academics have collaborated with the legislatures, this has mostly been limited to those studying parliaments or parliamentary-related issues, and such activities have been arranged on an ad-hoc basis. These informal arrangements have produced considerable insights into the workings of the legislatures, but they have been largely driven by individual initiative. Moreover, while some schemes may have been evaluated, there has been little sharing of information on how well they work and what impact they have.

In recent years, the Westminster Parliament, Scottish Parliament and the National Assembly for Wales have sought to establish more structured schemes that are clearer in their objectives and open to applications through free and fair competition to all appropriately qualified persons. In general, these schemes were set up as pilots – in particular, the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) parliamentary fellowship scheme pilot launched in November 2016 (see POST's separate report, *Parliamentary Academic Fellowship Scheme Pilot: A review of the scheme, its impacts, and recommendations for future schemes* (https://www.parliament.uk/documents/post/Academic%20Fellowship%20Scheme/WEB-Fellowships-long-report.pdf)) – and it is now appropriate to review how such schemes are working in practice in order to determine whether they should continue, and if so, in what forms and any lessons that might be learnt.

1.1 Aims

Parliamentary Fellows on the Political Studies Association (PSA)/House of Commons Fellowship Scheme (also launched in November 2016) hosted a workshop in the House of Commons on 16 November 2018, together with POST staff. The purpose of the workshop was to inform an evaluation of the more structured fellowship schemes that have been set up by legislatures in recent years. It brought together current and former Fellows with parliamentary staff, and other interested parties such as learned societies and research councils, to share their experiences, highlight best practice and shape the future of the fellowship schemes in the UK legislatures. More specifically, the event had four aims:

- To find out how fellowship schemes have been working, what has worked well, share good practice, identify problems or challenges and suggest possible improvements;
- To identify any impacts that have been generated as a consequence of the fellowship events and seek to understand how impact can be tracked and evaluated;
- To raise the profile of existing fellowship schemes;
- To discuss ideas for the future of the fellowship schemes in UK legislatures.

This report draws on reflections from attendees, made in confidence at the workshop. The report is divided into four sections covering: reflections from academics; reflections from parliamentary staff; a consideration of impact; and recommendations.

2. Academic Fellows: expectations, practicalities and challenges

2.1 Expectations and purpose

It was clear that many Fellows, and their institutions, hoped to be able to maximise impact through responding to a need in the legislatures. For universities, the evaluation of 'impact' in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) is likely to have contributed significantly to this.

In addition, there was a view that the schemes help demonstrate to universities that parliaments recognise that academics can make valuable contributions, and also provide a clear mechanism for academics to feed into at a time that is relevant and useful for parliaments.

Participants noted, however, a tension between justifying what they were doing on their fellowship to their institution and generating impact in parliament through their work on the fellowship, including between what they were saying to parliament and what they were saying

to their institution. Home institutions often had expectations that did not match easily with the expectations of parliament and the remit of their fellowship.

Perhaps inevitably, projects changed during the course of some fellowships. While this was sometimes positive, as new avenues were pursued, it also occurred because projects turned out not to be feasible and because the timeframes for projects were either different from what had been expected or were unrealistic. This could present challenges for individuals, their institutions and parliament.

2.2 Practicalities

It was recognised that there was a value in having different schemes and application processes, and that both direct and open calls were useful. Direct calls could be seen to respond to a clear need in a specific policy area, while open calls can enable projects that might not otherwise come to fruition.

Having a mentor in parliament was widely seen as useful, but it was felt that the role of a mentor could be clarified. Concerns were expressed by some Fellows about making demands on a mentor's time.

There were issues around communication and logistics for some Fellows. The different timeframes associated with the work of parliaments and home institutions occasionally created practical challenges that could (and in some cases did) affect personal life and teaching.

Many Fellows felt that the assumed knowledge of the workings of parliaments created practical challenges, such as navigating the physical space of parliaments, figuring out their own role within parliaments, and finding dedicated space for work, interviews, etc. Fellows could also feel isolated, unsure of their status, role and sometimes lacking guidance. Some Fellows were well integrated into work teams, others were left largely to their own devices.

2.3 Challenges

Academic independence was raised as an issue. Academics felt that both parliamentary staff and other academics should understand that Fellows have a distinct role, that they do not represent parliaments outside of their fellowship, and that they should be able to critique it. It was also noted that academics can have access to particular information through their role in parliament that they would not normally have. While some felt that the position in formal 'contracts' designed by the legislatures was clear enough, others would like a public professional statement explicitly stating the independent role of academics. It was suggested that this could be adapted from the statement regarding advisors to government departments. It was also noted that there are different 'contracts' in different legislatures, and for different schemes.

Working with and getting clarity over the use of sensitive and confidential material was a challenge for some – much of the use of material seems to be based simply on trust – raising questions over and highlighting tensions between integrity and academic freedom.

Another, rather different type of challenge, concerned how to create continuity and sustainability in respect of projects beyond the fellowship's formal end, for example, maintaining the knowledge-exchange aspects of the fellowship and potentially mentoring new Fellows. For academics, an interest in a topic or project might not simply end with the formal fellowship.

2.4 Suggestions for improvements

With regard to induction and orientation, while practice has varied across schemes, it was felt that more information could be provided for Fellows from the outset. This might include a range of different information, such as maps of the legislature, information on how the legislature works, how to get a parliamentary IT account (if appropriate), and an organogram to give a sense of the relationships and structures within parliaments, similar to that of the European Commission. This might be pulled together in a handbook drafted by Fellows, or adapted from the Civil Service Fast Stream handbook or other existing materials. It was suggested that there could usefully be a single point of contact for each scheme, to, for example, assist in the arrangement of interviews and conduct inductions (with guidance on practicalities such as access).

There were suggestions that parliaments could use previous and existing Fellows to help support the fellowship schemes and to lessen the workload on parliamentary staff. They could, for example, help induct new Fellows, and establish a Fellows' network so that Fellows could meet

and share experiences, information and opportunities. Such a network might also help address the continuity issue raised in the previous section.

Some expressed the view that fellowships could do more to explore what added value an academic can provide, and how parliaments can make the most of the opportunity. It might be appropriate for each scheme, and indeed for each project, to be clear what the parliament is seeking, and to consider what training and support would be required for both Fellows and parliamentary staff. As noted above, it might be possible to utilise previous Fellows, as well as parliamentary staff, in providing introductory workshops at the start of each fellowship scheme.

3. Parliamentary staff: expectations, practicalities and challenges

3.1 Expectations and purpose

It was noted that parliamentary staff who were working with Fellows are often not sure what their role is: mentor, supervisor, manager, etc., and it was pointed out that this could complicate both individual relationships and projects. This included questions such as how 'hands on' to be, and how much 'freedom' to give the Fellows. Similarly, if a Fellow is having difficulties, for example, with fitting work into parliamentary timelines, what is the responsibility of the parliamentary mentor to follow this up? For some participants there were also issues over who should be responsible for contacting who?

There were challenges associated with the variety of schemes and projects, and with individual Fellows. Some staff noted that there are big differences between a very engaged Fellow who is proactive and requires less supervision, and a less engaged Fellow who requires more support and 'chasing up'. As a result, there is no set management or mentoring style and the requirements will be different for each fellow.

Given that projects vary considerably, and that there are no set rules for working hours (and indeed, while some projects require considerable presence within parliaments, others do not), it is not always easy for staff to gauge how much the Fellow should be doing, which, in turn, makes it difficult to pick up on if they are not doing enough or are struggling with a project.

Some staff were also unclear on the role of Fellows in parliament: are they in parliament to do research or promote research? As a result, perhaps unsurprisingly, some Fellows have found it difficult to know what their role in parliament is and how the parliamentary 'ecosystem' works, and how they can get the most out of it. Others, such as those with expertise in parliamentary studies, have understandably been less likely to experience such issues. It might be useful to support academics in understanding how parliament works and how best they could fit the work they are doing around the parliamentary system. At the same time, it was observed that it may be a good thing that Fellows come into parliament with a different way of working, and that doing things in a different way could be beneficial – it was recognised that it is not always ideal to keep doing things the way that they have always been done and there may be a value in academics questioning things – while it was also acknowledged that change in processes can take a long time in parliaments.

While there was a view that it is understandable that the choice of Fellows might be prioritised based on how important their research area is seen to be to the particular legislature at specific points in time, it was also felt that ideas that emerged from academics in open calls could equally be valuable.

3.2 Practicalities

The needs of the parliamentary bodies which host Fellows are likely to impact on projects. For example, there can be inherent uncertainties when it comes to timing of work for committees, and this can be challenging for Fellows to work around. However, this cannot always be foreseen in the application process, and a fellowship can be advertised for one project but that may then evolve into something very different as priorities change.

The National Assembly for Wales have good communication between research services and committees, so the work that Fellows produce is commonly presented to committees and ties in well with committee priorities, and the position in Scotland is broadly similar. However, clearly, across the legislatures, a number of fellowships have been designed to look at other aspects of parliamentary work, and these may face different challenges and pressures.

Parliamentary staff have found their expectations of what Fellows know about parliament have sometimes been misleading, and that Fellows can start with very little knowledge of parliament or parliamentary structures.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, parliamentary staff have found that projects have been particularly successful when there is a good working relationship between the Fellow and the member of parliamentary staff that is supervising them. An 'Induction Day' or similar activities might not be able to cover this, but the importance of such relationships should be an important consideration for successful projects.

3.3 Challenges

A key area of concern was that while some fellowship schemes can sometimes have 'pots of money' allocated to them for funding, many are funded by the individual institutions that the academics work for, or indeed are self-funded, with the academics spending one or two days a week in parliament to work on their fellowship project and the remainder of the time they are fulfilling their teaching and research duties at their institutions.

This raises issues such as whether parliaments can demand too much of Fellows when they are not being paid by parliaments? There was a view that fellowship schemes need to make sure that they are recruiting from a wide range of universities, and not just the Russell Group, members of which tend to have more funding for this type of activity.

The different requirements and target groups for projects can also lead to different pressures and expectations. At Westminster, for example, there have been issues with select committees not being comfortable with the writing style of a Fellow's work. This suggests that Fellows may need further guidance about the language used in parliamentary work and the style of briefing documents or other forms of parliamentary material. Fellows can also find it challenging to produce work in the context of what politicians need to know, and in writing for a parliamentary rather than academic audience. To respond to this, the application process could include an assessment of writing style, or at least make clear what might be expected from a parliamentary perspective. For example, the Scottish Parliamentary Information Centre (SPICe), which hosts Fellows at Holyrood, has a contract that sets out expectations of Fellows, and that has been amended to reflect experience over time.

The timescales that individual projects are expected to follow is sometimes unclear. It was suggested that an 'agreed outputs' discussion as part of the application process might be beneficial. Such formal arrangements will clearly vary dependent on the scheme – for the PSA House of Commons Fellowship Scheme, for example, the cohort decided the outputs among themselves and they were given a pass and a mentor as a point of contact, but required very little supervision and were left to work fairly independently. However, this may not be the best approach for all fellowships. Consideration has to be given to the most effective way for Fellows to work in the legislature and how to enable them to conduct work that is beneficial to them and also to the legislature. This may vary across schemes and projects. For Fellows who are working on a project that is policy specific, this tends to be slightly different because there is often a more clearly defined deadline and output.

Reflecting these issues, there were suggestions that:

a) Fellows may sometimes find it easier to fit into the work of the libraries or other parliamentary bodies rather than committees. Indeed, the requirements and workings of committees raised a number of issues, including that Fellows can find it hard to work to the timings of committees, which frequently have a quick turn-around time.

b) The expectations of Fellows and their institutions should be managed with regard to the impact that their work may have on committee inquiries.

c) Fellows involved in producing work for committees sometimes comment that the committee process does not get the best out of their work. At the same time, they can tend to over-prepare and over-reference and misjudge the level of detail that the committee require, and may not be aware of the constraints, including that inquiries are political discussions that not all Fellows will be familiar with, and that many parliamentarians already have 'information overload'.

d) Pre-conceived ideas of Fellows could perhaps be mitigated by having conversations from the start of (or even before) the fellowship about

what they can realistically expect to achieve in parliament.

e) Fellows could have strong academic research evidence for a subject that will not 'fly' politically. Such situations may require different strategies.

It was clear that there is no single view with regard to the expected outputs and impact from fellowships, and that these can vary considerably. In addition, Fellows have not always fully understood the editorial review processes that are part of the internal critiquing of parliamentary work before it is published, and it could be explained at the start of each fellowship scheme that this is part of the process in parliament, and that those running the scheme have the final say in what is published by parliaments, as opposed to academic outputs that might be produced by Fellows. It was also recognised that:

a) If a brief is published, then that may be a beneficial output to the Fellow.

b) Blog posts and podcasts are also ways that Fellows can publicise the work that they are doing in parliament to their benefit.

c) Some fellowships conduct primary research that results in an academic paper, rather than a briefing, and that again has value for the Fellow.

4. Impact: views from Academic Fellows and Parliamentary staff

4.1 Measurement and recording of impact

'Impact' was clearly of central concern to both parliamentary staff and Fellows. Much of the discussion above has highlighted such issues, perhaps particularly from the perspective of the needs of parliaments and for the future of fellowship schemes. Nevertheless, for both staff and Fellows, the recording and measurement of Fellows' 'impact' was widely seen as important. It was felt that in order to maximise impact there could be a clearer focus on what skills and benefits academics could bring, for example, which might sometimes be particular knowledge or expertise, but which could also include helping committees to appraise evidence and bringing a critical perspective. On the parliamentary side, there was a view that the fellowships could be valuable in offering a different perspective, and could allow staff to say things they might not otherwise say, potentially bringing about change in behaviour. Achieving impact may, however, bring different challenges depending on the experience and career stage of the academic involved.

Demonstrating, recording and monitoring impact is as much a problem for parliamentary staff as it is for academics, and a number of ideas were suggested. These included a new House of Commons Library website and blog, which it might be possible for Fellows to publish on. Extending the metrics away from a focus on citations towards multiple sources was thought to be important, although no real alternatives were settled on. The importance of liaising, where appropriate, with parliamentary staff and mentors to help target findings to appropriate audiences within and outside parliament was noted, while the use of parliaments' communications staff and networks were highlighted as something which might help broaden fellowship impacts, as well as potentially adding something more measurable. The need for impacts to be considered, not just in the short term, but also in the longer term, was highlighted as a challenge.

While a joint publication with a parliamentary host is useful evidence of collaboration, it was acknowledged that this is not necessarily evidence of impact as defined by REF.

4.2 Impact expectations

Two issues emerged regarding the nature of 'impact' activities and expectations from universities about what 'impact' might be possible from fellowships:

- How impact might be 'measured';
- Expectations of universities about the impact that academics can achieve in and through parliaments, and whether this could be more realistic.

While the REF has led to a greater emphasis on impact in higher education, the definition of impact used by the REF can be quite narrow, and it would be expected that in many instances the impact and engagement activities of Fellows would extend beyond the REF interpretation. Indeed, Fellows were concerned about the broader meaning of impact value, and emphasised that fellowships can have impact in terms of teaching, understanding, and the

building of networks too. While, in general, the fellowships are mutually beneficial, personal impacts and the development associated with them may be hard to convey. Attendees commented that it was helpful for academics to learn about the political process, the inner workings of parliament, and the context of policymaking. For example, one Fellow said that they gained an understanding of select committees and parliamentary work that will shape their research and publication approach in order to have more meaningful impact in the future.

Impacts on parliamentary staff were also discussed, including the relationships with experts, 'soundboarding', and informal support in understanding of issues, especially those that change rapidly and unpredictably. An example was discussed where a particular piece of work by a Fellow had been very useful in helping committee members assess evidence and make decisions; however, in such instances Fellows may not be aware which aspects were particularly impactful and it may not be possible to share such details with their institutions.

4.3 Institutional expectations

As noted above, there was an awareness that the needs of their institutions for REF submissions were a significant pressure for some Fellows. While there were different views associated with this, some attendees were concerned about how much impact they could claim in REF submissions and how it might be evidenced. Some also noted that parliamentary staff may suffer from 'REF fatigue' if they are asked to provide letters or other forms of evidence frequently. Issues raised included the limits to what parliamentary staff might be able to say in terms of testimonials due to, for instance, FOI legislation and the need to prevent any perceptions of undue influence.

Ethical considerations around working in parliament were also mentioned – confidentiality with sensitive material, etc. – as something Fellows needed to understand might place limitations on what might be claimed or used for research and impact. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the REF approach may encourage some institutions to emphasise the implementation of research in policy, rather than academia's broader role in informing policymaking and scrutiny.

POST's work on informing REF panellists' understanding of impact and how research is used in Parliament, aiming for more realistic expectations in their guidelines, was acknowledged as very helpful. Attendees commented that this could be useful as a reference point for universities.

It was noted that impact is also important to universities where REF is less of a priority.

5. Recommendations

The workshop provided a useful forum for the evaluation of existing fellowship schemes. Drawing on comparative experiences across legislatures, it is possible to identify a number of recommendations:

a) The application process should include a discussion of outputs, including both publications and impact. This would help to manage expectations of Fellows and their institutions about what they can realistically expect to achieve, and what parliaments can and should expect from them.

b) It might be useful to support academics in understanding how parliament works and how best they could fit the work they are doing around the parliamentary system. An 'Induction Day' at the start of all fellowships, designed to give a consistent basic overview of parliament, might help address this.

c) A handbook drafted by Fellows, or adapted from the Civil Service Fast Stream handbook, or other existing materials, such as maps of the legislature, information on how the legislature works, how to get a parliamentary IT account (if appropriate), and an organogram to give a sense of the relationship and structures within parliaments, would facilitate mentor and Fellows.

d) Parliaments could use previous and existing Fellows to help support the fellowship schemes and to lessen the workload on parliamentary staff, as well as providing an academic perspective on expectations of parliaments and Fellows. They could, for example, help induct new Fellows, and establish a Fellows' network so that Fellows could meet and share experiences, information and opportunities.

e) At the end of the fellowship, participants could provide a short reflective document, which

could also include responses from the mentor(s). These could help establish and capture new and unexpected outcomes and values, and be available for new Fellows to learn from as appropriate.

f) The experience of existing fellowship schemes emphasised the strength of on-going interaction of academics and parliamentary staff. Given the arguments for adding continuity, consideration could be given to ways of achieving this, as appropriate for each scheme and each legislature.

g) The UK legislatures could consider whether any existing networks or structures could usefully be used to disseminate lessons from the fellowships.

Annex A: Academic Fellowship Schemes in the UK Parliament

There are a number of schemes operating in the UK Parliament and other legislatures to bring academics and researchers in to work on specific projects. Schemes are available for researchers at different career levels and those working in different subject areas. An overview of some of the different schemes available is set out below. This is not a comprehensive list and not all of the schemes are currently available. The list below does not include details of any of the ad hoc or informal arrangements between academics and Parliament.

Fellowship schemes for academics (post-PhD)

1. House of Commons Academic Fellowship Scheme

The House of Commons Academic Fellowship Scheme was run in partnership with the Political Studies Association (PSA), and was open to senior social scientists currently researching or wishing to study the work of Parliament. This includes those studying Parliament in a comparative context. Fellows were granted a two-year fellowship and gained access to the parliamentary estate and House services, as well as a designated sponsor to help facilitate their research. Fellows had the opportunity to increase the impact of their research by working with the House to build public understanding of Parliament, and inform, evaluate and enhance the House's work and that of its Members.

2. Parliamentary Academic Fellowship Scheme

The Parliamentary Academic Fellowship Scheme offers academics from different subject areas and at any career stage the opportunity to come and work in Parliament. Funded by monies made available to universities by two Research Councils (the Economic and Social Research Council [ESRC] and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [EPSRC]) to increase the impact of their research (Impact Acceleration Accounts), the Scheme is open to academics employed at a UK higher education institution that holds either an ESRC or EPSRC IAA account. The Scheme is being run by the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST). The Scheme involved two phases:

The first phase, which closed in November 2016, was a Directed Call and gave academics the opportunity to apply to work on one of six projects proposed by Parliamentary offices. Projects available included:

- House of Lords Library: Supporting the Library in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data to monitor its performance, effectiveness and impact.
    - House of Commons Library: Supporting the Library to develop and apply a range of approaches to improve information on how its core services (enquiries, briefing papers and online) meet its customer needs and offer insights into its customers and how they work.
    - House of Commons Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee: Assisting the Committee in its work scrutinising the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.
    - House of Commons Health Committee: Assisting the Committee in following up on its work on childhood obesity.
    - House of Commons International Trade Committee: Assisting the Committee in its work scrutinising the Department for International Trade.
    - House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee: Assisting the Committee in its examination of constitutional issues, the quality and standards of administration within the Civil Service and scrutiny of reports produced by the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.

In total, 22 applications were received and six academics accepted.

- The second phase was an Open Call, which closed in September 2017. This allowed academics to propose a project of their choosing as long as they could demonstrate its relevance to Parliament. In total 49 applications from 20 universities were received, and 29 academics from 15 universities were accepted.

Fellowship schemes for PhD students

1. Schemes open to PhD students funded by a UK research council

1.1 UKRI Policy Internship Schemes which offers placements in Westminster with the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) and the House of Commons Select Committees; with the Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe); with the National Assembly for Wales Research Service; with the Northern Ireland Assembly Research and Information Service (RaISe).

1.2 Specific Doctoral Training Partnerships, for example POST previously hosted PhD students from two NERC- funded Doctoral Training Partnerships (The Postgraduate Centre in the Science of the Environment: Natural and Anthropogenic Processes, Impacts and Opportunities (SCENARIO) DTP based at the Universities of Reading and Surrey, and the NERC Centre for Hydrology and the British Geological Survey; and the Science and Solutions for a Changing Planet (SSCP) DTP based at the Grantham Institute).

1.3 Students based at a particular institution, for example the Parliamentary Archives previously hosted an ESRC PhD Studentship in collaboration with the University of Warwick Doctoral Training Centre.

2. Schemes open to PhD students funded by other organisations

2.1 Wellcome Trust Humanities and Social Science Programme: Offers placements in POST for Wellcome Trust-funded PhD students, post-doc or early-career researchers in humanities and social science.

3. Schemes open to PhD students that are members of specific organisations

3.1 Political Studies Association (PSA) Parliament PhD Internship Schemes: Offers placements in a Commons select committee or the Commons Scrutiny Unit for PhD students who are members of the PSA.

3.2 British Ecological Society (BES): Offers placements in POST for PhD students who are members of the BES.

4. Schemes open to PhD students working in particular subject areas

4.1 British Psychological Society: Offers placements in POST to postgraduate students studying on a psychology-related subject.

4.2 Institute of Chemical Engineers Ashok Kumar Fellowship: Offers placements in POST for postgraduate researchers in engineering or other disciplines related to the chemical and process industries.

4.3 Institute of Food Science and Technology: Offers placements in POST for postgraduate students studying topics related to food science and technology.

4.4 Institute of Physics: Offers placements in POST to postgraduate students registered for a physics PhD.

Annex B: Academic Fellowships in the UK Parliament

In total, 34 academics have been successful across the two academic fellowship schemes. Five fellows have been accepted through the House of Commons Academic Fellowship Scheme, and 29 on the Parliamentary Academic Fellowship Scheme.

1. Dr Tarek Al Baghal, University of Essex: Based with the House of Lords Library to improve research services for Peers and staff through the collection and analysis of performance data.
2. Professor Margaret Arnott, University of the West of Scotland: The future of Parliament and devolution.
3. Dr Riza Batista-Navarro, University of Manchester: Based with the Commons Library on social media analytics for Parliament.
4. Dr Mark Bennister, University of Lincoln: Questioning the Prime Minister: How Effective is the Liaison Committee?
5. Dr Danielle Beswick, University of Birmingham: Based with the House of Commons International Development Committee on witness diversity.
6. Dr Catherine Bochel, University of Lincoln: Procedural Justice: A Fair Process for Public Engagement?
7. Dr Carrie Bradshaw, University of Leeds: Based with POST on food waste.
8. Dr Alistair Clark, Newcastle University: Regulating and Communicating Parliamentary Standards.
9. Dr Ruth Dixon, University of Oxford: Based with the Lords Library on the role of Peers in shaping legislation.
10. Dr Stephen Elstub, University of Newcastle: Based with the Education and Engagement Service on public engagement and Parliament.
11. Professor Laurence Ferry, University of Durham: Based with the Commons Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee on the accountability of local government.
12. Dr Seth Flaxman, Imperial College London: Based with the Commons Library on developing data science approaches for Parliament.
13. Professor Matthew Flinders, University of Sheffield: How can Parliament deliver a restored and renewed Palace of Westminster?
14. Dr Janet Harris, University of Sheffield: Based with POST on integrating health and social care.
15. Dr Maria Karaulova, University of Manchester: Based with POST to look at the impact of POSTnotes.
16. Dr Theodora Koulouri, Brunel University: Based with the Research and Information Team in the House of Commons to learn about the needs, motivations and behaviour of MPs, MP's staff and parliamentary staff in order to improve and develop the services offered to them.
17. Dr Roderick MacKenzie, University of Nottingham: Based with the Commons Library to look at data science approaches to find out how Parliament digests research and information.
18. Dr Sarah Mander, University of Manchester: Based with the Commons Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee on energy and climate change issues.
19. Dr Felicity Matthews, University of Sheffield: Based with the Commons Petitions Committee on MPs' engagement with e-petitions.
20. Dr Oliver Mytton, University of Cambridge: Based with the Commons Health and Social Care Committee on childhood obesity.
21. Dr Julie Murphy, University of Newcastle: Based with POST on public engagement with science.
22. Professor Navonil Mustafee, University of Exeter: Based with POST on behaviour change.
23. Dr Dave O'Brien, University of Edinburgh: Based with the Commons Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee on the arts of inequality.
24. Dr Andreas Pantazatos, University of Durham: Based with the Restoration and Renewal team on the relationship between heritage and Parliament.
25. Professor Gavin Phillipson, University of Durham: Based with the Commons Library on Brexit and the UK constitution.
26. Professor Sabina Siebert, University of Glasgow: Based with the Restoration and Renewal team on the role of the building in preserving institutional traditions and customs.
27. Dr Gabriel Siles-Brügge, University of Warwick: Based with the Commons International Trade Committee to provide support and advice.
28. Dr Michael Stock, University of Cambridge: Based with the Commons Environmental Audit Committee and POST on the impact of natural hazards on the UK.

29. Professor Phil Syrpis, University of Bristol: Based with the House of Commons Library to help brief MPs on legislating for Brexit.
30. Dr Joseph Tomlinson, University of Sheffield: Based with the Commons Justice Committee on administrative justice.
31. Professor Stefano Utili, University of Newcastle: Based with the Commons Science and Technology Committee on EU and UK funding for research and development.
32. Dr Thijs van Rens, University of Warwick, Based the House of Commons Health and Social Care Committee to scrutinise the Government's Childhood Obesity Plan.
33. Dr Carole White, University of East Anglia: Based with the Commons Library on the opportunities and risks for the UK fisheries sector.
34. Dr Kathryn Wright, University of York: Based with the Commons Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee on regulatory divergence after Brexit.

UNIVERSITY OF
LINCOLN

Political Studies
Association

Designed and printed at the University of Lincoln
October 2019