



Guidance on naming individuals in grant applications

Contents

1. Executive summary.....	1
2. Further information.....	2
3. Background.....	2
4. A principal researcher moves to the University and brings with them a research team... 2	
5. When a Research Fellowship is awarded to an individual, who is not affiliated to the university at the time of the award.....	3
6. A named individual is included in a grant application.....	3
7. Decision tree for when a named individual is included in a grant application	7

1. Executive summary

- 1.1. This document has been produced in response to frequent queries about naming individuals on grant applications and requests for guidance on when this should be done. It does not cover the specific make-up of contributors needed on some medical grant application.
- 1.2. The main reason for considering this across the University is that we need to that ensure we are treating people fairly and consistently. This is particularly important when naming individuals on grants as it often falls outside of the usual recruitment processes. However, it is essential that we achieve this aim whilst understanding and retaining the following principles:
 - 1.2.1. Naming individuals in grant applications has many benefits, including demonstration of the University’s commitment to retaining individuals, ability to request a higher salary in applications and demonstration of the high calibre of proposed staffing for research projects
 - 1.2.2. The process of naming individuals should not become overly bureaucratic
- 1.3. This document is intended to explain best practice in naming individuals in grant applications and enhance consistency between faculties. It has been collated following discussions across the University and pulls together examples of existing practice. It should be used as a best practice guide when considering whether to name an individual on a grant application. It is not intended to be taken as University of Leeds policy and there may well be circumstances which do not fit the situations described.

- 1.4. The purpose of naming individuals on grant applications should normally be to increase the chances of a successful grant application.

2. Further information

- 2.1. Where naming an individual on a grant application is being considered, there should be clear, demonstrable benefits in doing this. It is unlikely that there would be any benefits in naming someone on a grant if they are not to be used should the grant application be successful. Therefore, this is not an option that should be encouraged. Of course, there are likely to be times when the individual is no longer available to work on that grant when it is awarded but was available at the time of application.
- 2.2. This document is not intended to investigate the strategic drivers for whether the University should be naming individuals. The 'fit' with Faculty strategy should be considered when deciding whether an individual is named. In addition, the link to the University's Policy on the Employment of Researchers should also be considered.

3. Background

- 3.1. There are principally three ways in which it is possible for the University to recruit named individuals to research posts, rather than going through the usual recruitment process. These are:
 - when a principal researcher moves to the University and brings with them a research team;
 - when research fellowship funding is awarded to an individual, who is not affiliated to the university at the time of the grant application;
 - when a named individual is included in a grant application.
- 3.2. Whilst there are clear benefits in all three, the University needs to ensure that it is also satisfying its obligations as a responsible employer. Therefore, we need to ensure that we are following appropriate guidelines.
- 3.3. This document aims to provide a framework which allows the University to meet these obligations whilst facilitating career progression for research staff and enabling effective costing of research grants.
- 3.4. The guidance below describes situations where individuals are named on grant applications and covers:
 - Advertising posts
 - Holding appointing / validation panels¹
 - Grading roles

4. A principal researcher moves to the University and brings with them a research team

- 4.1. Implications:

¹ A validation panel consists of the same members as an appointing panel. However, instead of determining the best person for the job, their purpose is to check whether the person is capable of doing the job.

- 4.1.1. In this case the roles and role-holders already exist elsewhere and they are transferring to the University, rather than new jobs being created.
- 4.1.2. Advertisement: as a result of this, the standard advertisement process does not normally need to be undertaken.
- 4.1.3. Appointing / validation panels: it is normally expected that there would be a requirement for validation panels. The purpose of this is to ensure that the members of the research team would be appointable, had they applied for the posts at the University of Leeds.
- 4.1.4. Grading roles: the jobs need to be graded using the University of Leeds Role Analysis scheme, to ensure consistency of grading.
- 4.2. In this situation we recommend that you discuss this with the Faculty HR Manager, in case there are any other legal issues.
- 4.3. If a member of the team requires a Certificate of Sponsorship to work in this country, then there may be a requirement to advertise the position and undertake the full recruitment process. The reason for this is that Certificates of Sponsorship are not transferable between employers and, therefore, their current certificate may not be valid for the transferred post at the University of Leeds. In order to satisfy the criteria for a work permit, the post must normally be advertised for a minimum of four weeks.

5. When a Research Fellowship is awarded to an individual, who is not affiliated to the university at the time of the award

5.1. Implications

- 5.1.1. In most cases this is a straightforward process as the research fellowship is awarded to the individual and is not transferable.
- 5.1.2. Advertisement: as a result of this, the normal advertisement process would not normally be undertaken. The advertising and communication of the fellowship will have been done by the grant awarding body.
- 5.1.3. Appointing / validation panels: there is a need to ensure that the standard of research of the individual is as high as would be expected at the University of Leeds, i.e. whether they would be appointable if the person had applied for the fellowship directly to the University. Therefore, a validation panel would normally be required. However, there may be circumstances where the process already undertaken by the fellowship awarding body satisfies the University recruitment criteria. If this is the case and there are no potential issues of parity with existing employees, there would not normally be any benefit in holding a validation panel. In these circumstances, the decision whether to hold a validation panel would be at the discretion of the Dean of Faculty, in consultation with the Faculty HR Manager.
- 5.1.4. Grading roles: the jobs should be graded using the University of Leeds Role Analysis scheme, to ensure consistency of grading.

6. A named individual is included in a grant application

- 6.1. This is the most complex of the scenarios and the outcome depends on the nature of the contract of the named person and others in a similar position.

- 6.2. The decision tree below details the main possibilities and guidance for each eventuality.
- 6.3. Implications of naming people in grants who don't currently work for the University²;
- 6.3.1. This is not recommended.
- 6.3.2. By naming someone in a grant application who does not work here, we are actually creating a new post at the University of Leeds which does not currently exist. It would be difficult to justify why this person was the best person for the role, without undertaking the standard recruitment process. There could be other people with a greater level of experience or knowledge.
- 6.3.3. In addition, we have different legal responsibilities for people who already work here, such as where people may be coming to the end of a fixed term contract or may otherwise be seeking redeployment. Staff in this position could claim that they should have had the opportunity to apply for the post, with priority over external candidates.
- 6.3.4. Also, in line with the University values we are committed to providing equality of opportunities.
- 6.3.5. However, it is recognised that research councils may require additional information for costing purposes and you may, therefore, wish to insert the following information into the grant application:
- *It has been identified by the University that (PERSON) would be suitable for this research and they are interested in the opportunity. For this reason we have based the costings on their salary. However, as (PERSON) does not currently work for the University of Leeds, to ensure the University meets its obligations as an equal opportunities employer, the post will need to be advertised and (PERSON) will be encouraged to apply. For this reason and given the extensive experience of (PERSON) in this field, we are requesting a starting salary of £xxxxxx).*
- 6.4. Implications of naming people in grants who are currently employed on a fixed term contract or whose post is financed through fixed term funding, at the same grade as the new post³ This includes people who are employed on a permanent contract who are funded through a succession of fixed term grants and short periods of internal funding.
- 6.4.1. In these circumstances, there is a difference between extending the project on which someone is working and creating a new research project⁴.
- 6.4.2. Is the new funding an extension to the work that a researcher is currently employed to work on?

² It should be noted that students are not classed as employees, unless they also undertake paid work for the University and have an employment contract.

³ The individual must still be currently employed at the time of the commencement of the grant to fall under this section.

⁴ In the event of an uncertainty as to whether the new grant is or is not an extension to the work of the researcher, queries should be referred to the Faculty Dean who, in consultation with the Faculty HR Manager, will provide advice and recommendation.

- If yes, there is no problem with naming them on the grant application
 - If no, then consideration should be given as to whether there is anybody else on fixed term funding or on the redeployment register that may also have the skills, knowledge and experience to undertake the research on the new grant⁵.
- 6.4.3. If there is no-one else, then the individual can be named on the grant application. If there is or could potentially be someone else, then a process for all potential researchers to express interest in the grant should be undertaken before anyone is named and a fair process of selection undertaken.
- 6.4.4. Alternatively, it may be appropriate to use the following standard wording:
- *It has been identified by the University that (PERSON) would be suitable for this research and they are interested in the opportunity. For this reason we have based the costings on their salary. However, to ensure the University meets its obligations as an equal opportunities employer, the post will need to be advertised and (PERSON) will be encouraged to apply. For this reason and given the extensive experience of (PERSON) in this field, we are requesting a starting salary of £xxxxxxx).*
- 6.4.5. Appointing / validation panels: where a new grant is an extension to the researcher's previous work, then there is no benefit in holding an appointing or validation panel, provided that they went through the standard recruitment and selection procedure when they began working at the University. Where it is not an extension, a validation panel would usually need to be set up.
- 6.4.6. Grading roles: all roles are subject to grading using the University of Leeds Role Analysis scheme, to ensure consistency between this role and other positions.
- 6.5. Implications of naming people in grants whose roles are not financed from fixed term funding
- 6.5.1. Definition: This only applies where permanent internal funding has been agreed for a role on an on-going basis. It should be noted that this situation is relatively rare.
- 6.5.2. Fixed term funding is not the same as a fixed term contract. It is possible to be on a permanent contract but be generally financed by a series of fixed term grants, although this may also include periods of short term internal funding. Roles in this situation fall under the previous section, part b.
- 6.5.3. The few roles which do fall under this category, may or may not be problematic and will need to be considered on their merits. It might be difficult to justify naming someone in a grant application whose existing role was secure, when someone else, whose funding is finite, did not have the opportunity to move into this area. Therefore, the opportunity that the grant provides would often need to be advertised.

⁵ As the ways in which this could happen will vary between research areas, there are no definite guides to have this should best be achieved. However, it might be useful to consider the following methods. For small research areas with very specific, individual research techniques, a discussion amongst the principal investigators in the area may be sufficient. For larger areas, an email distribution amongst appropriate research staff or discussion with PIs at Faculty level may be more suitable.

- 6.5.4. However, if it can be shown that there is no-one else seeking redeployment who could be suitable for working on the grant and that we are ensuring equality of opportunities for staff, naming someone in this situation on a grant application should not cause difficulties.
- 6.6. Implications of naming people in grants who are currently employed on a fixed term contract or whose post is financed through fixed term funding, which may NOT be at the same grade as the new post
- 6.6.1. Normally, we should not be naming people in grants who are not currently working at the same grade as the new funding. The following standard wording should be used in applications:
- *It has been identified by the University that (PERSON) would be suitable for this research and they are interested in the opportunity. However, as (PERSON) does not currently work at this grade, to ensure the University meets its obligations as an employer, the post will need to be advertised and (PERSON) will be encouraged to apply.*
- 6.7. Implications of naming people in grants who have been the main author or have significant input into the authoring of the grant application and are currently employed by the University of Leeds
- 6.7.1. Where an individual has written the grant application or, normally in the case of those ineligible to act as PI, where the individual has had a significant input into the authoring of the grant application, that person can be named⁶. This is because the grant application was written primarily because of their work.
- 6.7.2. Supporting the development of all staff is important and the chance to be involved in writing grant applications should not be unnecessarily restricted.

⁶ In the event of any uncertainty about whether someone had a significant input into writing the grant application, this would be at the discretion of the Faculty Dean or nominee.

7. Decision tree for when a named individual is included in a grant application

