**Making a Bid for Research & KE Funding**

If you are intending to make a bid you should, in the first instance, discuss the potential bid with your Head of Institute (or line manager if appropriate) to get initial approval as to whether the bid will be supported by your Institute.

At this stage, the bid should not be formally signed off by the Institute since this is only an initial approval to be confirmed when the bid has been worked up and the resource implications fully established. It is recognised that in some areas, particularly with the work of Research Centres and Groups, Heads of Institute/line managers may have agreed in principal and in advance to that Centre/Group undertaking a range of activities. If this initial approval is given, you should inform the Research Funding Office (RFO) of your intention to bid for external funding using this form. The bid will be logged as ‘Being Prepared’ in the University’s Research Funding Database and allocated a reference number.

The preparation of a research funding bid can take months if you want to get it right. Ideally you should plan out a detailed timescale for your preparation that allows plenty of time for the costing process, for review by peers, for the completion of application forms and for the approval of the bid.

The bid must be approved as follows:

* by Finance
* by your Head of Institute or a research lead designated by the HoI
* by the DPVC Research

Bids that have not allowed sufficient time for costing, peer review or approval may not be approved and submitted.

The RFO can assist with many aspects of the preparation and submission of funding bids (and provides fact sheets and/or training workshops on these areas):

* Advising on what should be included in the Case for Support
* Advising on resources required
* Identifying the appropriate salary point for any research staff required
* for the project
* Costing the project
* Ethical Approval
* Insurance
* Risk assessment
* Assisting staff to register for online application systems
* Advising on the completion of application forms (paper or online)

Costing should be undertaken in consultation with Finance. Bids ***on which UW is the lead*** which have a full economic cost of £50,000 and over or are being submitted to certain funders is subject to peer review – details of the required peer review process can be found in Appendix 2.

For all bids the final version of the bid and any associated paperwork (e.g. ethics documentation, risk assessments) should be submitted to the RFO in electronic copy ***at least 2 weeks before the submission deadline***. The bid should only be submitted when the RFO has advised the Lead Investigator that all approvals have been received. The bid will status will be updated in the University’s Research Funding Database as ‘Submitted’.

It is recognised that some research funding bids are made in response to a call and that timescales may be much shorter than those set out above (and that occasionally staff may only become aware of an opportunity with a deadline looming). In these cases, there is still a need to ensure the quality of the bid and the accuracy of the costings, as well as to get the necessary approvals. The system, however, is intended to be flexible and in such instances the RFO will work with the bidder to make sure a high quality application is submitted on time.

It is also recognised that where you are a partner in a bid being led by another organisation, it may not always be possible to provide a full version of the application for review and approval on the timescales set out above. In these instances, it is still necessary to get approval for the UW costings and for your part in the bid. We may not be able to quality assure the bid as a whole but we still want to ensure that the costings and the section(s) of the bid for which UW is responsible are appropriate, accurate and well written.

**Appendix 2 – Peer Review Process**

Bids which meet the following criteria are subject to peer review prior to submission:

* Bids which have a full economic cost of £50,000 or above
* Bids being submitted to one of the following funders:
	+ UK Research Councils
	+ National institute of Health Research
	+ Department of Health
	+ NHS
	+ British Academy
	+ Royal Society
	+ Leverhulme Trust
	+ Wellcome Trust
	+ Joseph Rowntree Foundation
	+ Nuffield Foundation
	+ Medical Research Charities
	+ European Commission
* Any bid identified by a Head of Institute or nominated research lead or by the DPVC Research as subject to peer review

Please note that this process only automatically applies to bids on which UW

is lead. Where UW is a partner on a bid this process does not normally apply. The lead investigator is expected to organise peer review. This should be done in good time to ensure that the investigator has time to revise the bid in

light of the reviews. Two reviewers should be used and their name and institutions recorded in Section 4 of the approval form. The reviewers may be internal or external - this is at the discretion of the investigator.

Reviewers should meet the following requirements:

* They must not be co-investigators on the project
* They must be broadly independent of the project
* They must have expertise in the subject area

Ideally, at least one of the reviewers should have experience of bidding for and winning funding and experience of the funder in question, but it is recognised that this may not always be possible. The nature of the review process is at the discretion of the investigator and the reviewers. They may decide that it should be an iterative process with a reviewer seeing and commenting further on the revised application or they may decide that a reviewer will comment on the initial draft and have no further role to play. Peer review should be a formative process. It is important that investigators take on board all comments from reviewers. There is no expectation that an investigator should accept all comments but where a reviewer has serious concerns about the viability of a bid, this should be given serious consideration. The RFO does not ask to see the reviews or evidence of how the investigator has responded to reviews. It does, however, wish to see evidence that peer

review has taken place. Reviewers should therefore sign the approval form to demonstrate that review has taken place (or alternatively an email stating this can be appended to the form).