

STFC 2016 PARTICLE PHYSICS REVIEW OF THEORY CONSOLIDATED GRANTS

**Guidelines for Applicants
October 2015**

CLOSING DATE: Grant Proposals and Form X – 4 February 2016

Contents

1. Overview	3
1.1 Introduction.....	3
1.2 Timetable.....	3
1.3 Particle Physics Grants Panel (PPGP) remit.....	3
1.4 Strategic guidance.....	4
1.5 Enquiries.....	4
2. Consolidated Grants	4
2.1 2016 Consolidated Grant (CG).....	4
2.2 Consortium Grants.....	5
3. Classification of Posts	5
3.1 Categories of Staff.....	5
3.2 Definition of Core Posts.....	6
3.3 Case for the Core Posts.....	6
3.4 Non-Core Posts.....	6
3.5 Project Studentships.....	6
3.6 Academics with Dual Theory/Experiment roles.....	7
3.7 Co-investigators named on grants.....	7
4. Applying for a Consolidated Grant	7
4.1 Submitting applications through the Je-S System.....	7
4.2 Additional documents required.....	8
4.3 Costings.....	9
4.4 Justification of resources.....	9
4.5 Appendix 1 – Report on current grant activities and future proposed programme.....	9
4.6 Other information.....	11
4.7 Appendix 2 – funds requested.....	11
4.8 Appendix 3 (Publications).....	13
4.9 Pathways to Impact.....	14
4.10 Data Management Plan.....	14
4.11 Form X.....	14

5. Peer Review Process	15
5.1 Introducers.....	15
5.2 Reviewers.....	15
5.3 Applicant’s response to reviewer’s comments.....	15
5.4 Peer review meeting.....	16
5.5 Assessment criteria.....	16
5.6 Cost revision following review.....	16
5.7 Wakeham review Efficiency 2011-15.....	16
6. New Applicant Scheme	16
6.1 New Applicant Scheme.....	16
6.2 Eligibility.....	17
6.3 Terms of the Scheme.....	17
6.4 Proposals.....	17
7. Other Useful Information	18
7.1 Cross-disciplinary or cross-council proposals.....	18
7.2 Unconscious bias and peer review framework.....	18
7.3 Researchfish.....	18

1. Overview

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This document sets out the guidelines for the 2016 Particle Physics Theory Consolidated Grants round. While the document provides specific guidance on the consolidated grant round, it should be read in conjunction with the [Grants Handbook](#). Please note that there are some important changes to the process and documents required in the 2016 review.

1.1.2 The grants round and these guidelines have been developed to ensure that the process is:

- transparent and accountable, particularly with respect to the means of prioritisation;
- efficient, both in terms of the requirement for applicants (length of proposals and detail provided), and the reviewers – both panels and referees, and the use of office resources;
- provides a timely outcome.

1.2 Timetable

1.2.1 The timetable for the review will be as follows:

Closing date for consolidated grant proposals and Form X	4 February 2016
Reviewing process	February –April 2016
Applicants to receive and respond to reviewer comments	May 2016
Peer Review meetings	1 day end of May 2016 2 days mid June 2016
Outcome announced	October 2016
Grants commence	01 October 2017

1.3 Particle Physics Grants Panel (PPGP) remit

1.3.1 Grant proposals are reviewed by the PPGP. The panel's role is to:

- Assess and make recommendations to the STFC Executive on research grant applications in particle physics;
- Take account (as appropriate) of the recommendations of external reviewers and the conclusions of specialist peer review panels. The latter may be convened by the executive to advise on consolidated grants, contiguous groups of research requests, or research requests which are judged (on the basis of cost or propriety) to warrant such separate, in-depth assessment;

- Advise the STFC's Science Board and the Executive as required on all issues relating to research grants, including monitoring the level of funding allocated to grants; and
- Carry out such other tasks associated with peer review as the Executive might require.

1.3.2 The membership of the PPGP taking part in the 2016 review of the consolidated grants can be found on the [STFC website](#)

1.4 Strategic guidance

1.4.1 In assessing proposals PPGP will take account of the outcome of the [2013 Programmatic Review](#) and the strategic priorities identified by Science Board; in particular, the panel will ensure insofar as possible that:

- The programme supported is scientifically excellent;
- The programme is clearly in line with STFC's Programmatic Review and strategic science objectives; it addresses the impact agenda and is responsive to changes and future opportunities;
- There is an appropriate balance between the programmatic themes within particle physics and the development of novel, generic technologies consistent with the overall STFC science strategy.

1.5 Enquiries

1.5.1 Enquiries can be directed to the following staff at STFC:

- Mrs Jane Long: tel. 01793 442141, jane.long@stfc.ac.uk
- Mrs Gina Miller: email only gina.miller@stfc.ac.uk
- Je-S enquiries: JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk

2. Consolidated Grants

2.1 2016 Consolidated Grant (CG)

2.1.1 STFC provides support for the particle physics community through consolidated grants. Each university Institution (or equivalent sub-unit with the university) may submit one consolidated grant proposal per subject area every three years. Particle physics theory and particle physics experiment are considered to be separate subject areas. This grants round will consider consolidated grant requests in the particle physics theory subject area. Where more than one department/group at a university is involved in the same subject area a single consolidated grant proposal should be submitted.

2.2 Consortium Grants

- 2.2.1 Groups from different institutions working collaboratively in the same well-defined research area may apply for a consolidated research grant as a consortium. This is intended to allow members of such consortia the opportunity to bid for shared resources, that they might not otherwise be able to secure on their own, perhaps due to the size and/or scope of their activity. In practice, this would require the submission of a single case for support, with either one Je-S form per institution or one Je-S form on behalf of the consortium.
- 2.2.2 An individual will only be supported on a maximum of one consolidated grant per subject area. Therefore individuals in groups that apply as a consortium will be excluded from also applying as part of their individual institution's application.
- 2.2.3 If you are considering submitting a consortium grant, please let STFC know in advance. If this is a new consortium you are required to discuss this with STFC prior to submission to agree whether a consortium grant application would be appropriate. In some instances, a brief written summary of the proposed consortium may be requested as part of this process.
- 2.2.4 Applicants should request 3 years of support and should note that consolidated grants are considered independently of each other. If a CG is awarded which overlaps with an existing grant due to an extension, the existing grant remains active and its duration unchanged.
- 2.2.5 Posts will normally be awarded for 3 years, but where required an extension of up to one year may be applied for to provide groups with flexibility, for example to delay the start date of a post. An extension cannot be applied for at the time of the proposal submission, but can be applied for once the grant is active and any delayed posts have commenced.

3. Classification of Posts

3.1 Categories of Staff

- 3.1.1 Consolidated grants have three categories of staff: academics, core staff and non-core staff.
- 3.1.2 New posts may be requested in either the core or non-core categories, or a change in categorisation may be requested, so a post assigned as non-core in the 2013 round may now be requested as part of the core group and vice versa. It is not expected that core posts would represent a high proportion of the non-academic total grant costs.

3.2 Definition of Core Posts

3.2.1 ‘**Core posts**’ are defined as underpinning research capability that is, to a great extent, not contingent on the specific details of the group’s future programme of work. It is not normally expected that RA posts would be defined as core posts. Ultimately, the grants panels will make judgements on a case-by-case basis, but the following may be used as a guide:

- Software/computing support
- Senior research posts (typically, these post holders are expected to have at least five years postdoctoral research experience).

3.2.2 The senior research posts would only be identified as core staff if their role is essential to the scientific success of the group and they possess critical expertise with skills that would be difficult to replace. Pool staff and general secretarial or generic computing support staff would not be considered to be core staff.

3.3 Case for the Core Posts

3.3.1 If requesting core posts, each group must make a case as part of their proposal, stressing the areas of expertise of the post(s), over the last two years. The proposal should also give a plan of work for the next three years (ie from 1 October 2017), and explain the contribution of the core post(s).

3.3.2 Posts requested as core may be awarded as non-core posts by the panel, if it is felt that the scientific case does not require the long term continuity intended for core posts, but that the case is strong enough to justify funding.

3.4 Non – Core posts

3.4.1 Non-core posts will be allocated in response to strong physics cases. A competitive allocation procedure will be used for them, comparing cases for continuation of existing, and for new posts.

3.4.2 Requests may also be made for support staff. These include administrative effort as well as general computing support. These posts are also considered as non-core posts.

3.5 Project Studentships

3.5.1 It is possible to apply for project PhD studentships as part of grant proposals. For Guidance, please see the [Grants Handbook](#)

3.5.2 The PPGP will assess the scientific quality of the project, consider whether the project offers suitable training in research methods and techniques, comment on the broader training and consider if the studentship adds

value overall to the research proposal. All potential costs should be included in the proposal.

3.6 Academics with Dual Theory/Experiment roles

3.6.1 PPGP is prepared to use the following 'fast-track' procedure to avoid academics having to apply to both PPGP(T) and PPGP(E). Academics spending up to one third of their time in the other discipline (e.g. a theorist working as a full member of an experimental collaboration or an experimenter with specific duties/obligations to a theoretical collaboration) should apply for all of their time to the panel relevant to the majority of their work. Details should be included the Case for Support for the project.

3.7 Co-investigators named on grants

3.7.1 Co-applicants who, following peer-review, are not in receipt of any funding for FEC time are usually not listed on the grant. However, genuine participants in the research who do not require any funding for FEC time such as emeritus researchers or fellows fully or partially funded from other sources are eligible to be named as co-investigators. It is recognised that such individuals may sometimes be difficult to identify, so the PI should alert STFC to ensure that any such instances can be dealt with. Cases should be made for such posts as the grants panel will assess these along with all others.

4 Applying for a Consolidated Grant

This section should be read in addition to the guidance provided in the [STFC Grants Handbook](#)

4.1 Submitting applications through the Je-S system

4.1.1 All proposals should be submitted online using the [Je-S login screen](#). This screen also has links to tutorials and system help. In the event of any queries relating to the Je-S system please contact the Je-S helpdesk directly by email at: JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk or by phone on: +44 (0)1793 444164. Applicants should use the Je-S form for standard grants, and should apply for a grant of three years duration. The following options should be selected in the Je-S system when putting your proposal together:

Council:	STFC
Doc Type:	Standard Proposal
Scheme:	Standard (FEC) – no FR
Call:	PPGP Theory 2016
Peer Review Preference:	PPGP (Theory)

- 4.1.2 Failure to select the correct options may mean the proposal does not reach the correct Research Council or department and will ultimately result in your Je-S proposal being returned.
- 4.1.3 The consolidated grants for this round will have a start date of 1 October 2017 and an end date of 30 September 2020. You are reminded that all consolidated grants must start on the announced start date. For this reason there is no longer any flexibility to adjust the grant's start date, and when awarded, the latest start date will be the same as the earliest date.
- 4.1.4 The deadline for the submission of consolidated grant proposals and Form X is 4pm on **4 February 2016**.
- 4.1.5 Please note: it is the responsibility of the PI to ensure that their institution's Administration Department submits the proposal before the submission deadline. Applicants can view the status of their proposal online by logging into the Je-S system – STFC office staff are unable to view the proposal until it is finally submitted by the institution's administration department and has undergone initial checks by the UK SBS. Proposals submitted after the closing date **will not** be considered.
- 4.1.6 Further information on how to apply for a grant can be found on the [STFC website](#).

4.2 Additional documents required

- 4.2.1 In addition to the online application form which must be submitted through Je-S, the following documents are required:
- A Case for Support which is a single document containing the following:
 - o Appendix 1: Report on research in the previous three years and plans for the future programme
 - o Appendix 2: Funds requested
 - o Appendix 3: Publications table and list

Then separate attachments are required for each of the following:

- Pathways to Impact document
 - Data Management plan
 - Form X: Staff details and programme/project participation
- 4.2.2 Please note, that applicants should be careful to classify documents correctly using the options available and submit as a PDF. Failure to do so will result in incomplete proposals being sent out to reviewers (e.g. documents classified as 'Other' are not sent out for review). The appendices and Pathways to Impact document should be uploaded as attachments to the Je-S proposal. The Form X spreadsheet should be emailed to pp@stfc.ac.uk

4.2.3 The Case for Support, Pathways to Impact and Data Management Plan must be in 12-point type with a 2cm margin.

4.3 Costings

4.3.1 All details relating to the grant costs can be found in the [Grants Handbook](#):

4.4 Justification of resources

4.4.1 All costs associated with the research proposal must be justified, with the exception of estates, indirects, infrastructure technician costs and the unit cost of TRAC-determined elements such as investigator salary costs or research facility charge-out costs; although the amount of resource required does need to be justified.

4.4.2 An explanation for all costs requested on the Je-S form must be given in the Case for Support. Each directly incurred post must be given a name or, for unnamed posts, a unique number (e.g. RA1, RA2 etc.). The same name or number must be used in the Je-S proposal, Case for Support and the Form X. **Where these details do not match the documents will be returned for correction.**

4.5 Appendix 1 – report on current grant activities and future proposed programme

4.5.1 Appendix 1 should provide a concise report on the scientific progress of the group since 1 January 2013, and set out proposals for the future programme. In the case of a consortium application by groups from different institutions, the consortium should provide a single Case for Support. In such a case the word 'group' in the guidelines that follow should be interpreted to apply to the consortium as a whole.

Appendix 1 should include the following:

4.5.2 **Summary of the group's activities and strategy:** The report should begin with a summary of the group's activities/achievements and the strategy for the future programme. This part of the report is expected to be between 1-2 pages in length.

4.5.3 **Reports on Scientific areas:** Include for each scientific area:

a) a report on the programme of work carried out by group members since (1 January 2013)

b) a science case for the group's future programme for October 2017 to September 2020

- 4.5.4 Scientific areas should be broad enough that they enable groups to consider appointing postdoctoral researchers from a sufficiently broad area to be able to attract the best available candidates and to allow them to set their own research programme within that area. However, they should be narrow enough that the Panel can assess the likely impact of the group in that area and to differentiate the different areas of a group's activities. As a rough guide, one might imagine that a scientific area should be of a sufficient size so that the whole of particle theory could be covered in 8-15 areas. For example, one might consider as one scientific area "Standard Model collider phenomenology" rather than "NLO QCD calculations" (too narrow) or "Phenomenology" (too broad). We would not expect even the largest groups to present their proposed work under the headings of more than three or four scientific areas.
- 4.5.5 **Part (a)** should explain if there have been any major changes to the programme compared with the original plans, and provide an assessment of the extent to which the major aims have been met.
- 4.5.6 **Part (b)** should set out the science case for the proposed programme of work over the requested period. For each scientific area it should address the following:
- 1) What are the major goals and scope?
 - 2) How does it fit within the international context?
 - 3) How will it advance the field?
 - 4) Explain how the group's expertise, experience and specific research achievements of related previous research since (1 January 2015) relate to the proposed programme of work.
 - 5) Where work on the scientific area is proposed as part of a consortium of university groups, the relationship between the groups and added value of funding the area as a consortium should be explained.
- 4.5.8 References to individuals in the group's reports should be highlighted in bold face. Only the publications and equivalent material since 1 January 2013, in which the group has played a major role, should be mentioned in the text of the report or case for support, and references should be made to these in Appendix 3, rather than including the bibliographic information several times.
- 4.5.9 The maximum length for each scientific area for each of Parts (a) and (b) is half a page per FTE in the scientific area, or one page per scientific area, whichever is the greater. Where page limits are not adhered to proposals will be returned. (FTE is defined as per head for an academic or fellow, and actual proportion of time for a researcher).

4.5.10 **Synergy between work in different scientific areas**

For groups proposing to work in more than one scientific area, a section of up to half a page may describe the synergy between their work in different areas, i.e. the value added by funding work on these areas in the same group.

4.6 **Other information**

4.6.1 The following information should also be provided:

a) For the programme of work carried out since 1 January 2013 an explanation of any expenditure which has resulted in a variation of 20% or more against the funds awarded against each heading in the original announcement.

b) Other STFC support and non-STFC support: For the period since (insert date), the Grants Panel seeks information on STFC support outside the consolidated grant over the review period, for example grants funded through PPRP. Examples of non-STFC support include organisations like the European Research Council. The Panel is only interested in support which has been obtained for equipment, consumables, travel and staff posts directly involved in the programme; it is not necessary to detail any other items.

c) Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers: The applicant is required to report on how the concordat is being implemented within the context of the group.

4.7 **Appendix 2 – funds requested**

Scientific posts

4.7.1 A case relating to the proposed programme and Form X must be made for the continuation of each current staff post, or fraction of a post, and for initiation of new posts. In line with the principles of FEC, cases must be included also for academic staff posts for which no salary funding is sought.

4.7.2 A scientific case for each post (including project studentships) should be made, with a maximum of half a page allowed for each post. If appropriate, the case should indicate why the post should be considered “core”, and a proposed plan of work identified for the next three years. The case for investigator time should be justified in terms of the future programme, not past productivity, including posts where no funding is sought.

4.7.3 Posts should be justified in the following order: a) academic posts, b) core posts, c) non-core posts, d) non-core support posts. Within each category posts should be listed alphabetically by surname, or post title for unnamed posts. The posts on Form X must be listed in the same order. The naming format used must be consistent on the case for support, Je-S form and

Form X. All posts should have the same name/number as given on the Je-S form so that it is clear how each case for support relates to a post listed on the JeS form.

- 4.7.4 Academics should apply for the amount of their time they expect to spend on research, taking into account other commitments (e.g. teaching, other funded research activity). If a proposal is only requesting a particular investigator's time for part of the grant duration (e.g. if an academic has fellowship funding for the first two years of the grant and so only seeks funding for the last year), this needs to be made clear in the text as the Je-S form does not have the facility to enter this information. Similarly if an academic is requesting variable levels of FTE support during the grant this also needs to be made clear, with the different amounts of FTE and exact start and end dates of the changes specified. If no salary costs are requested for a particular investigator but estates and indirect costs are requested for that investigator, again this needs to be made clear in the text as it will not be apparent from the Je-S form.
- 4.7.5 Bids for continuation of existing posts, and for additional staff support, will be assessed on their merits by the PPGP. The overall group size and the number of academics in the group are among the factors that the PPGP may take into account in their deliberations.

Support posts

- 4.7.6 A case, no longer than one page, should be made for the administrative and computer support requested. Where administrative or computing support is requested under the 'Other Directly Allocated' heading or the 'Directly Incurred' heading, the following information should be provided for each post: type (e.g. administrative support or computing support), FTE, duration and total cost per person. The cases for support posts should be in alphabetical order by surname, or post title for unnamed posts. Support posts should be included on Form X below the scientific and technical posts. The order and format of names should be consistent in both the case for support and Form X.

Non-staff costs

- 4.7.7 A case, maximum two pages in total, should be made for travel and subsistence, public engagement resources and consumables (which includes equipment items under £10k). If you are likely to want to purchase equipment items over £10k please contact the office for advice. Please note that DiRAC recurrent costs are not to be requested.
- 4.7.8 Applicants should request the full estimated cost of group travel, in line with the rules of their institution, including a justification of the request. Funds may be requested to make visits to discuss new projects if these cannot be combined with other journeys. The PPGP also expects that groups should seek travel funds from sources other than their institutions.

4.7.9. Other Directly Incurred (ODI) costs

When applying for ODI costs, please ensure that the funds requested are clearly listed under the separate headings given below in your Case for Support. The cost of the items listed should agree with those provided in the JeS form. Please refer to the Grants Handbook when putting together these lists and ensure that these items are individually less than £10k.

a) Consumables

b) Computing

c) Public engagement: Applicants may request funds for public outreach activities on consolidated grants, subject to a well justified case. A description of the proposed activities and a justification of the resources requested should be included as a separate section within Appendix 2 of the proposal document. (This is required in addition to the Pathways to Impact document so that the request can be peer-reviewed.) This section should be a maximum of one page. For more guidance please see the 'Public Engagement' section of the STFC Website

4.7.10 Other Directly Allocated (ODA) costs

You are required to provide details of all posts (excluding infrastructure technicians). Please list the names, cost and effort requested for all pool staff and non-infrastructure technicians (other than those listed on the JeS form).

4.8 Appendix 3 (Publications)

4.8.1 A table of the group's publications accepted for publication or published from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2015 should be provided in the following format:

Investigator	Number of refereed publications	Number of conference proceedings
A. N.Other1		
A. N. Other2 ¹		

1. Note: A.N. Other2 was on maternity leave from June-Dec 2012.

4.8.2 For the purposes of this exercise 'Investigator' also includes Research Assistants as well as academics. In the case where there is a justifiable career break such as a period of maternity leave, or extenuating circumstances, a footnote should be added as shown above. You are

required to provide a full list of the publications entered into the table above. This should include PhD theses completed.

4.9 Pathways to Impact

4.9.1 A 'Pathways to Impact' document is required for all new grant applications and should be uploaded to the JeS proposal as a separate attachment. The Pathways to Impact document is an opportunity to describe how the potential impacts of the research, including knowledge exchange and public engagement, will be realized (please note – this is a forward looking document). For more information on completing the document, please see the [guidance](#) on the STFC website.

If there is no Pathways to Impact statement, or parts are missing, or the panel decides that the statement does not adequately address the criteria, then the principal investigator will be asked to address these deficiencies before a grant is awarded.

4.10 Data Management Plan

4.10.1 Applicants are required to provide a Data Management Plan; further information can be found in the [guidance](#) on the STFC website: Proposals must include an acceptable data management plan before a grant will be awarded.

4.11. Form X

4.11.1 Groups should provide the details of staff posts by completing the Form X using the Excel workbook provided, and send it to the following email address: pp@stfc.ac.uk by 4th February 2016.

4.11.2 Form X is intended to give the PPGP an indication of how the focus of effort for each staff post has changed since the previous review and how it will change through the period of the grant. Effort should be given as a percentage.

4.11.3 All group staff should be included on Form X, including those funded from other sources – please list these at the end of the table. This is to allow a complete picture of the effort required. Staff should be listed in the following order: academic posts, non-academic core posts, non-core posts e.g. postdocs, support posts, students. Within the sub-categories the posts should be listed in the same order as in Section 2, i.e. alphabetically by surname, or post title for unnamed posts. It is essential that the names used are consistent between the Je-S form, the Case for Support and Form X. STFC will return forms that do not match.

4.11.4 The blocks given on the spreadsheet should be copied to allow an entry for each staff member. Please indicate staff type and if posts are core or non-core. Each staff member should have a line for each of the scientific areas

in which they are involved. Current support and the new request should be shown as two separate lines. The colour coding should be used to distinguish between the two so that the spreadsheet can be read more easily. If your grant has been extended, the current and new requests will overlap. Please take extra care when providing details in the overlapping year.

- 4.11.5 It should be made clear on the Form X where one post is replaced by another. Where there has been a change in postholder, please put 'vice (name of previous postholder)' in the cell below the name of the new staff member. Please place the corresponding posts one under the other.
- 4.11.6 Where other sources of funding have been specified, please explain what this is in the case for support.
- 4.11.7 The Form X provided must be returned completed and must respect the formatting and any formulae built in to the spreadsheet; it is not permissible to create your own Form X or amend any of the formatting on the Form X provided (apart from adding rows).
- 4.11.8 Please note: the years on the form now relate to Academic Year rather financial year as they did in previous grants rounds.

5. Peer Review Process

5.1 Introducers

- 5.1.1 Two or three members of the PPGP will be allocated as "introducers" for each consolidated grant proposal. As in previous rounds, introducers will liaise with PIs to clarify any issues which are unclear in the grant proposal documentation.

5.2 Reviewers

- 5.2.1 The reports on individual science areas will be sent to reviewers of international standing for assessment. Rather than nominate a single reviewer on the proposal form, applicants are invited to send reviewer nominations for each Scientific Area to pp@stfc.ac.uk. The PPGP will take the nominations into consideration when assigning reviewers, but it is not guaranteed that the nominated reviewers will be used.

5.3 Applicant's response to reviewers' comments

- 5.3.1 Following the reviewers process, applicants are then given the opportunity to see and comment on the reports via the Je-S system.

5.4 Peer review meeting

- 5.4.1 A peer review meeting will take place to consider the consolidated grant proposals and make recommendations on the programme to Science Board and the STFC Executive.

5.5 Assessment criteria

- 5.5.1 The PPGP will assess all proposals in accordance with the assessment procedures set out in the [Grants Handbook](#).

5.6 Cost revision following review

- 5.6.1 If, as a result of the PPGP review of the grants, a reduction is recommended in resources on a proposal, STFC will return the application to the research organisation to re-calculate estates and indirect costs. There will be a 10 working day period for the research organisation to provide the revised figures. If the amended submission is not received within the 10 working day timescale, STFC will amend the award on a pro-rata basis in line with the reduction or increase in research staff effort awarded.

5.7 Wakeham Review Efficiency 2011-15: Ensuring Excellence with Impact

- 5.7.1 Applicants are advised to check the latest [RCUK guidance](#) available in response to the Wakeham report and recommendations. This includes supplementary guidance, the top-slice calculation and the changes to indirect cost grant submissions from 1 July 2011.

6 New Applicant Scheme

6.1 New Applicant Scheme

- 6.1.1 Newly appointed academic members of staff (lecturers or lecturer equivalent fellows) who have joined a department between grant reviews may exceptionally apply separately for support. This will potentially allow them to begin to establish a research programme on appointment. If grant funding is agreed, funding is likely to be awarded as an addition to the department's existing consortium or consolidated grant.
- 6.1.2 It should be noted that the number of awards is likely to be very limited and funding will be extremely competitive.

6.2 Eligibility

- 6.2.1 Applicants may not be funded on more than one grant. For example, if an individual transfers from another university, they cannot hold resource on both a new applicant grant, and a consolidated grant at their previous institution.
- 6.2.2 Applicants must be employed on a full or part-time basis as academic members of staff at the grant-holding University by the start date of the new applicants grant. Note that the usual eligibility rules apply – please see the STFC research [Grants Handbook](#).
- 6.2.3 The relevant department's next consortium/consolidated grant submission date should be a minimum of one year away from the submission date of the new applicants grant.
- 6.2.4 Applicants will need to demonstrate that there are insufficient funds within the flexibility of the existing grant to support their research.

6.3 Terms of the scheme

- 6.3.1 Applicants must be the sole investigator.
- 6.3.2 Applicants can only apply once at any institution for a new applicant award.
- 6.3.3 Applicants can apply for funding for a minimum of a year and a maximum of three years (or until the issue of the department's/ consortium consolidated grant). Applicants can apply for limited resources to allow the applicant to begin to establish a research programme.
- 6.3.4 The relevant grant panel will assess applications against the same criteria as the consolidated grant proposals (and funding will come from the appropriate grants line); however, research potential in addition to track record will be taken into account.
- 6.3.5 Grants are not renewable and cannot be extended.

6.4 Proposals

- 6.4.1 Applicants should submit a one page pre-proposal for consideration by the executive in consultation with the relevant grant panel.
- 6.4.2 Requests will be considered under urgency procedures.
- 6.4.3 The pre-proposal should briefly set out the circumstances, explaining why a new applicant proposal is appropriate, and how the application matches the eligibility criteria set out above.

- 6.4.4 The pre-proposal should also briefly sketch the nature and strength of the scientific case that would be described in full if permission for a full proposal is given.
- 6.4.5 The pre-proposal should provide an indication of the requested resources.
- 6.4.6 The pre-proposal should be accompanied by a brief letter from the Principal Investigator of the consolidated grant held by the department concerned, confirming the employment status and timing, and explaining carefully why the new member of staff's research cannot be supported using the spending flexibility allowed within the existing grant.
- 6.4.7 If the case for funding is considered to be potentially a high priority, applicants will be advised of next steps.

7. Other Useful Information

7.1 Cross-disciplinary or cross-council proposals

- 7.1.1 For advice on cross-disciplinary or cross-Council proposals please see the [Grants Handbook](#)

7.2 Unconscious bias and the peer review framework

- 7.2.1 Details relating to unconscious bias can be found at:
<http://www.stfc.ac.uk/funding/research-grants/peer-review-and-assessment>
- 7.2.2 Peer Review framework information is at:
<http://www.stfc.ac.uk/funding/research-grants/peer-review-and-assessment>

7.3 Researchfish

- 7.3.1 Researchfish is an online system which is pivotal in demonstrating the case for investment in science. STFC has a responsibility to demonstrate the value and impact of research supported through public funding. By using Researchfish we have a central means for researchers to log the outputs, outcomes and impacts that have been realised through STFC's research funding. Outputs are then made available through the Research Councils' 'Gateway to Research' portal. Further information can be found at: <http://www.stfc.ac.uk/1846.aspx>