|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| COVID-19 Data Science Research Funding Call Response Template  Lead Applicant Details | | |
| Name of Research Organisation: | |  |
| Address: | |  |
| Name of proposed Grant Holder: | |  |
| Email Address of proposed Grant Holder: | |  |
| Secondary Contact Email (Optional): | |  |
| Scoring Criteria:  REJECTED if incomplete | | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1.1 Please provide a plain English summary that explains your research and why it is important. Include i) what datasets you will use, how they are linked and why they are needed; ii) the potential for Public Benefit and iii) how you will increase the likelihood of public benefit being delivered.  *This should be written in simple terms that a member of the public can understand. It should allow the reader to understand the aims of the research, the reasons why it is important and how the research will be conducted. Applications that include clear paths to achieving Public Benefit will be prioritised.* | | |  | (250 words) | | Scoring Criteria:  0 – Summary, description of public benefit and path to public benefit mostly unclear  4 – Summary, description of public benefit and path to public benefit somewhat unclear  7 – Summary, description of public benefit and path to public benefit mostly clear  10 – Summary, description of public benefit and path to public benefit very clear | | | | | |
|  | | | |
| 1.2 The research question(s) that the project team intend to answer by accessing NCS data in TREs.  *The question needs to be relevant to the pandemic response, and clearly add value to existing* [*programmes of research*](https://www.hdruk.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-national-core-studies/) *under the NCS – see priority research themes in the funding specification for guidance* | | | |
|  | (30 words) | | |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – Research question(s) not stated or entirely unrelated to the pandemic response and/or priority themes of this call  4 – The link between the research question(s) and pandemic response and/or priority themes of this call is unclear or indirect  7 – The link between the research question(s) and the pandemic response and/or priority themes of this call is clear and direct  10 – Link between research question(s) and pandemic response and/or priority themes is clear and direct, with clear value added to existing NCS research | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.3 Proposed research plan and how it will achieve the project’s aims/objectives.  *Specify the methodological approaches proposed in sufficient detail to allow them to be assessed (justification for sample sizes, inclusion and exclusion criteria, choice of analysis and why etc.).* | |
|  | (400 words) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – Research plan very unlikely to produce robust answer to research question  4 –Weaknesses in research plan lower the likelihood of robust answer to research question  7 – Research plan largely strong, moderate likelihood of robust answer to research question  10 – Excellent research plan, high likelihood of robust answer to research question | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.4 Which datasets the project team requires access to, details of planned data analyses, linkage and which TRE will be used (available datasets listed [here)](https://www.hdruk.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Data-for-COVID-research-across-the-UK-Brochure.pdf)  *Priority will be given to projects that seek to utilise the multiple datasets currently linked and available in TREs to conduct analyses. Projects analysing single or regional datasets are considered lower priority.* | |
|  | (200 words) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – The data sets are not clearly identified  4 – The response identifies single data sets and/or has a local focus  7 – The response clearly identifies multiple data sets OR takes a nationwide approach with single sets  10 –The response clearly identifies multiple data sets AND takes a nationwide approach | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.5. Any improvements that the project team would make to the NCS datasets, or outputs such are tools that would help lead to public benefit.  *Any improvements or outputs must be made openly available to other researchers.* | |
|  | (200 words) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – Response does not address improvements to the datasets or creation of tools  4 – Response indicates non-specific improvements to the datasets or creation of tools  7 – Response clearly explains improvements to the datasets or creation of tools  10 – Response clearly explains improvements to the datasets or creation of tools, with a plan to make these openly available to other researchers | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.6. The (i) proposed project management approach, including (ii) key deliverables  *Provide a (iii) project plan (e.g., Gantt Chart) and (iv) risk register to accompany this form* | |
|  | (300 words) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – No response or insufficient detail to award a higher score  4 – Either (i) and (ii) addressed but (iii) and (iv) are not sufficient, OR (iii) and (iv) are provided but (i) and (ii) are insufficient.  7 – Response fully addresses (i) and (ii) and response fully addresses (iii) or (iv)  10 – Response fully addresses (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.7. The necessary skills/ expertise of the team to undertake the proposed work  Please include a table of (i) named researchers who would access the TREs, (ii) their employer organisations, and (iii) whether they already have accreditation/connection to use any TREs. | |
|  | (200 words) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – Team lacks necessary skills, and does not have named staff to work on the project  4 – Team partially demonstrates skills/ expertise required. Response provides (i) or (ii) and not (iii).  7 – Team fully demonstrates skills/ expertise required. Response provides (i) or (ii) and not (iii).  10 – Team fully demonstrates skills/ expertise required. Named staff already onboarded to work in TRE environments. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.8 The funding requested. Submit a full costing (using fEC TRAC methodology) proposed for that funding amount, and a statement to justify resources and value for money.  *Please note: A maximum of £2M, inclusive of VAT is available for this call. The maximum available for any individual award will be £250,000 inclusive of VAT (if applicable). Awards will be made at 80% FEC.*  *We anticipate awarding funding for at least ten studies and to as many as is possible based on the scoring criteria until the maximum funding is allocated.*  ***Please ensure your funding request is detailed and sufficient, yet sympathetic to the intent to make multiple awards.*** | |
|  | (100 words, excluding a detailed breakdown table/spreadsheet) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – Neither the funding amount or cost model provided  4 – Funding amount not clearly stated, OR high-level cost model not provided, OR value for money not demonstrated  7 – Funding amount clearly stated and high-level breakdown of the cost model is provided, value for money is unclear.  10 – Funding amount clearly stated. Clear and specific breakdown of the cost model proposed. Value for money is clear | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.9 How have people with relevant lived experience (which might include carers) and/or members of the public) helped to: i) select and shape the research questions you intend to answer? ii) design the proposal, its objectives and any outcomes to be measured?  *If people with lived experience, carers and/or members of the public have NOT been involved, please explain why they have not been involved. If you require extra support with PPIE, you may find* [*NIHR PPI resources*](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/ppi-patient-and-public-involvement-resources-for-applicants-to-nihr-research-programmes/23437) *useful. HDR UK also has a dedicated team who can support you - contact* [*judy.slape@hdruk.ac.uk*](mailto:judy.slape@hdruk.ac.uk) | |
|  | (250 words) |
| Scoring Criteria:  0 – Very limited PPIE input into proposal development  4 – PPIE input to proposal development has limited detail and with poor integration  7 – PPIE input to proposal development is sufficiently detailed with good integration  10 – PPIE input to proposal development is sufficiently detailed with excellent integration | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1.10 Please describe how you are planning to include PPIE across stages of the research cycle:  *This may include some of the following activities if relevant:*   1. *Identifying and/or prioritising research questions and/or outcomes* 2. *Design of the research* 3. *Planning/contributing to development of PPIE activities* 4. *Management of the research (e.g., steering/advisory group)* 5. *Undertaking/analysing the research (e.g. member of research team)* 6. *Dissemination of research findings to academic/stakeholder audiences* 7. *Developing communication/engagement activities for the public* | | |  | (250 words) | | Scoring Criteria:  0 – Very limited PPIE input into proposal development  4 – PPIE input has limited detail and with poor integration across research stages  7 – PPIE input is sufficiently detailed with good integration across research stages  10 – PPIE input is sufficiently detailed with excellent integration across research stages | | |