



JISC Grant Funding 20/11

JISC Business and Community Engagement (BCE) Programme

Embedding impact analysis in research using BCE practitioners: Second Round Call for Projects

6 December 2011

Of Interest To:

- Pro Vice Chancellors for Research
- Directors of Information Services and Systems
- Pro Vice Chancellors and Directors for (External) Engagement, Strategic Partnerships or Corporate Alliances
- Directors of Research Impact
- Pro Vice Chancellors, Directors and Heads of Research and Enterprise
- Pro Vice Chancellors and Directors responsible for Business and Community Engagement - Knowledge Transfer/Exchange; Employer Engagement; Lifelong Learning; Public Engagement
- Directors of Regional Development; External Liaison; Regional Liaison
- Directors of Marketing
- Directors of Web Services
- Directors of Business Development
- Directors and Heads of Business Schools

Introduction

1. The Joint Information Systems Committee¹ (JISC) invites institutions to submit funding proposals for partnership projects to embed good practice in impact analysis in research departments utilising the expertise of Business and Community Engagement practitioners and information management specialists.
2. This is the second round of funding for this purpose providing further opportunities for this activity.

Programme/ Initiative	Theme / Context	Description	Funds
Business and Community Engagement	External Impact	Tripartite collaborative partnership projects comprising research groups, BCE 'impact analysts' and information management expertise, to embed impact and benefits analysis in the research process.	£240,000 is available to fund up to 10 projects (between £15,000 to £30,000 each) 6 months duration.

3. The purpose of this work is to help institutions enhance their capability to analyse and articulate the benefits and impact (actual and potential) in their research, by utilising existing BCE expertise, and leading research information management expertise.

¹ Further information on JISC is available at: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk>

4. JISC will fund three-way collaborative partnerships, comprising
 - i). Research groups seeking to develop their capabilities in analysing and articulating the impact and benefits of their research;
 - ii). Business and Community Engagement (BCE) practitioners with expertise in identifying external impact and benefits, and designing institutional services for this purpose;
 - iii). Leading research information management expertise and resources for impact evidence.

The terms of reference section below outlines the specific requirements of the call.

5. Interested research groups, impact analysts and information management experts should register on the Ning online matching site here: <http://nccpe1.ning.com/> in order to find partners to develop their projects.
6. The research groups, and their host institutions, will lead the partnerships projects, but partnerships can be initiated by any of the three parties involved through the matching site above.
7. The call is open to higher and further education research groups of any type, academic discipline or institution, subject to the eligibility criteria below, who wish to develop improved capability and processes to analyse and articulate the benefits and impact of their research, in order to enhance their research excellence, impact and sustainability.
8. BCE expertise will be in the form of suitably experienced strategic engagement professionals working in a knowledge exchange, public engagement, employer engagement or lifelong learning capacity.
9. Expertise in the effective use of technology to underpin research impact analysis will be in the form of suitably experienced information management/ information technology professionals able to source readily available processes, tools and resources. It is possible that the BCE specialist or researcher group may also be able to provide the relevant information management expertise and experience.
10. The premise behind the work is that the expertise to analyse and articulate research impact currently exists in various BCE functions across institutions and the sector in general. The technology and information management expertise and resources required to inform this analysis also exist within the sector. These will draw upon JISC funded examples of digital technologies to enhance research information management and reporting. Examples and references are given below.
11. The intention, therefore, is to enable the sharing and cross-pollination of the expertise and technology resources so that existing resources are used more effectively and efficiently, both across institutions and within the sector in general, in order to enhance the capability of institutional research to demonstrate its value to the economy and society.
12. In order to support this cross-pollination of expertise, successful projects will be required to participate in a facilitation and synthesis project managed by the National

Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE)² This will provide an online forum to help bidders find suitable partners for their proposal, and will capture, synthesise and share learning both across projects and with the wider sector. The online connecting space will also function as a peer support environment for the matched projects.

13. The output from each project will be a concise case study, produced for a wide audience, outlining the context, process, learning, competencies, and changes resulting from the experience. The case studies, together with those from round one of funding and any other relevant learning from the portfolio of projects, will be synthesised by the NCCPE Facilitation and Synthesis project, into a publicly-available Compendium of Good Practice in technology-enabled research impact analysis and supporting process, and for the benefit of the wider sector.
14. The intended outcome of the investment is an enhanced capability among UK HE and FE education research groups to identify, analyse and articulate the actual and potential impact of their research. This in turn will enhance UK institutions' research excellence and will increase the potential for institutional knowledge to benefit the economy and society. The work will also result in enhanced institutional business intelligence about their research for institutions, through wider use of effective technology and information management resources and processes.
15. The deadline for receipt of proposals in response to this call is **12:00 noon UK time on 1 March 2012**. Further information about how bids should be structured and submitted is detailed later in this call. In particular, your attention is drawn to the need to adhere to the deadline and page length stipulated. JISC will not be able to consider for funding any bids that do not adhere to the page length and deadline, regardless of the quality of such bids.
16. Funding for this second round is available for projects starting from May 2012 for six months. All projects must be complete by 31 October 2012.

Eligibility

17. Proposals may be submitted by HE institutions funded via HEFCE, SFC, HEFCW and DEL Northern Ireland, and by FE institutions funded via BIS, SFC, DFES Wales and DEL Northern Ireland.
18. With regard to bids from Scottish institutions, SFC has applied a significant budget cut to JISC in 2011-12 AY. Following consultation with Scottish institutions, SFC has requested that the impact of this budget cut falls on the number of innovation projects JISC is able to fund at Scottish institutions, rather than to cut or increase charges for national services, such as JANET, JISC Collections and JISC Advance. Whilst Scottish institutions therefore remain eligible to bid for project funding in response to this call, depending on the quality of the submissions, JISC may need to limit the number of projects awarded to Scottish institutions.
19. Proposals may be from single institutions or consortia, but the lead partner must meet the criteria outlined above. Funds can only be allocated through the lead partner.

² <http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/>

20. **Institutions may not submit more than one bid.** This is intended to maximise the breadth of impact from the investment, and to spread the expertise and good practice as widely as possible.

Background

21. JISC supports higher and further education by providing strategic guidance, advice and opportunities to use Information and Communications Technology (ICT) to support research, teaching, learning and administration. JISC is funded by all the UK post-16 and higher education funding councils.
22. This activity forms part of JISC's work in research impact evidence and builds on JISC's work in Research Information Management³. Resources and good practice from the latter should be consulted in these partnership projects, and utilised where appropriate (examples are given below in the Terms of Reference section).
23. A recent JISC Digital Infrastructure grant funding call included a major strand of work on research information management, comprising internationally-informed projects on (i) research reporting infrastructure, (ii) research impact evidence and (iii) evaluation of JISC funded activities in the research information management programme.
24. This activity is part of the Business and Community Engagement Programme⁴, delivering to the External Impact' agenda and the BCE strategic priority Public Value and Civic Engagement. JISC's Business and Community Engagement (BCE) theme was established in 2007 as a strategic priority. The BCE programme is shaped by national policy drivers⁵ and the needs of institutions.
25. Business and Community Engagement is the strategic management, by higher and further education institutions, of relationships with external partners and clients, and of the associated services. The objective is to deliver benefits to the economy and society, and enrich the institutions themselves, resulting in a more highly skilled workforce, a more efficient, dynamic and sustainable economy and a more cohesive, knowledge-enabled society. The JISC BCE Programme contributes towards this objective through the innovative use of ICT process and information management improvements across the higher and further education sector.
26. For institutions, the scope of business and community engagement includes the commercial sector, the public sector (including charities and trusts), the cultural landscape and the social and civic (community) arena. BCE activities derive from and inform the core missions of research and teaching, involve a wide range of staff across the institution and cover the following institutional strategic areas: Knowledge Exchange; Employer Engagement; Public Engagement; Lifelong Learning. Research-derived BCE activities include consultancy and collaborative or contract research, while teaching-derived activities include continuing professional development and workforce development
27. JISC's BCE Programme aims to:
- enhance institutions' efficiency, effectiveness and opportunities in BCE activities;
 - improve access to institutions' knowledge and expertise for business and community organisations.

³ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/themes/informationenvironment/researchinfomgt.aspx>

⁴ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/bce.aspx>

⁵ For example: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/econsoc/buscom/>

28. The intention is to help higher and further education institutions achieve improved compatibility and synergy between relevant strategies, processes and systems, and to deliver targeted benefits, especially:
 - Easier reporting and more informed, resource-efficient strategic decision-making.
 - Process and outputs of institutions' knowledge better packaged for external impact.
 - Reduced long-term system costs and enhanced opportunity for shared applications.
29. It is recognised that BCE represents a long-term change programme, to which many agencies contribute, so working in partnership with change agents and key national stakeholders is key to the programme's success.
30. Strategic change of the type spearheaded through BCE also brings significant challenges for institutions in integrating resources, processes and resource profiles. BCE requires new and distinctive competencies, including boundary-spanning and brokerage skills, as well as external experience.
31. This project seeks to cross-pollinate, among research groups, the economic competencies that BCE practitioners have developed, utilising technology for research business intelligence, to help research groups be better equipped to project, analyse and articulate the benefits and (actual and potential) impact of their work.

Context

32. This activity, developed with the guidance of JISC's BCE Advisory Group⁶, has been established in response to the gap between research policy and practice and third mission/innovation policy, practice and enabling technology.
33. A discernable convergence of goals has been taking place between those researchers needing to evidence and articulate the impact of their work – with the changed Research Council funding criteria and the advent of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) - and the BCE practitioners (knowledge exchange, employer and public engagement staff) who routinely evidence the value of their work both to colleagues internally and to external clients and partners to secure business, and who use business intelligence processes and systems to inform and manage this work. Timing is appropriate, therefore, to bring these two areas closer together across the sector, to learn from each other and to share good practice in supporting process and technology, for the wider benefit of the sector.
34. BCE practitioners are expressly focussed on that which the customer/partner requires and so are accustomed to delivering external benefit and 'impact' and articulating their own and clients' value proposition. Hence they are likely to have useful experience, practice and technology for research groups seeking to identify impact in their work.
35. BCE practitioners have many different titles and levels of seniority, such as Business Development Director/Manager, Strategic Partnerships Director, Public Engagement Manager, Knowledge Transfer Manager and Research and Enterprise Director to name a few. Increasingly these roles are integrated into core institutional strategic

⁶ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/aboutus/howjiscworks/committees/workinggroups/bceadvisorygroup.aspx>

business, since the UK has invested in pump-priming support like the Higher Education Innovation Fund, Knowledge Transfer Grant, Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Employer Engagement support.

36. Indeed the UK has been a leading proponent of the development of this 'third mission' work, whereby institutions deliver economic and social benefit through strategic, externally focussed services like CPD courses, research contracts and consultancy, community events and festivals. Some institutions have undertaken major change programmes and now excel in this mission. However, there is still some considerable way to go in many institutions before full integration is achieved, and reflected both in institutional corporate processes such as HR, information management and marketing, and in the other strategic missions of teaching and research.
37. Currently research departments and third mission activities are often two parallel worlds and BCE expertise is typically not embedded within research practice. Most (but not all) research groups tend to operate in a more internalised culture defined by the boundaries of their discipline and pressures to deliver publications. This culture has also proved to be a significant barrier both to the genuine strategic integration of the third mission into institutional business, and crucially, to the translation of research into innovation for the benefit of the UK economy and society.
38. Because of the substantial differences between drivers of behaviour in each of these realms, and their conventions and incentives, hitherto there has been limited meaningful join-up or good practice exchange. However, there is now a real opportunity to add value and create a sense of shared purpose by considering the two areas of BCE/enterprise/knowledge exchange and the research impact agenda together, in an operational sense. This work aims to catalyse that added value.
39. The objective, therefore, is to spread BCE expertise and research information management expertise more widely across the sector in order to enhance the ability of research groups to identify, analyse and articulate the benefits of their research, and develop business intelligence. This will in turn evidence the relevance of research groups and the value of their activities, and will engender enhanced opportunities for collaborative and contract research with externals.
40. While the focus is particularly on the role of effective process and technology in identifying impact, the objective in bringing the three parties together across institutions is also to extend and share good practice, by helping develop research culture and practice and by amplifying the expertise of BCE practitioners across the sector.

Terms of Reference

41. £240,000 is available to fund eight to ten collaborative partnerships projects at up to £30,000 each (see below) from May 2012 to the end of October 2012.
42. Each partnership project will comprise three components:
 - i). Research groups, who seek to develop their practice and capabilities in analysing and articulating the impact and benefits of their research;
 - ii). Business and Community Engagement (BCE) practitioners with expertise in identifying external impact and benefits, and designing institutional services for this purpose – deployed as 'impact analysts';

- iii). Leading research information management expertise and resources for impact evidence (which may be provided by the BCE practitioner or the research group where appropriate).
43. A JISC-funded specialist Facilitation and Synthesis project, managed by the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement will provide an online forum to help bidders and partners match the three components and provide facilitation and validation for the partnerships. It will also synthesise and publicise the partnership projects' case studies into a Compendium of Good Practice for the benefit of the wider community.
44. In each partnership project, a BCE practitioner will help the research group develop and embed improved practices for identifying potential impact, benefits and beneficiaries, utilising leading research information management expertise for business intelligence, reporting and data interrogation practices.
45. As the objective is to spread capability in impact analysis across the sector, proposals that involve partnerships with BCE 'impact analysts' from a different institution are particularly welcomed.
46. In order to reflect the additional overheads incurred and added value created in cross-sector partnerships, project funding will be made available on a differentiated basis as follows:
47. a) Up to £30,000 for partnership projects in which the BCE impact analyst comes from a different institution to the research group (type 'A' bids). The research information management expertise may come from any appropriate source – see below;
b) Up to £15,000 for partnership projects in which the BCE impact analyst comes from the same institution as the research group (type 'B' bids) The research information management expertise may come from any appropriate source – see below.
48. For type 'B' bids, in which the BCE impact analyst is from the same institution as the research group, partnerships that are innovative in terms of the cross-disciplinary or boundary-spanning approach proposed (i.e. bringing together previously unconnected parties or disciplines) are likely to prove more competitive in securing funding.
49. The information management specialist may belong either to the same institution as the research group or may belong to another institution, but partnerships that make use of JISC-funded good practice in research information management (see below) are encouraged. In some cases, it is possible that the information management expertise may also be provided by the BCE impact analyst.

The Online Matching Process

50. Interested research groups, impact analysts and information management experts should register on the Ning online matching site here:
<http://nccpe1.ning.com/>
In doing so, these parties will be invited to state the need they have or the expertise they offer, respectively. Registered parties will then be invited to self-nominate to create partnerships in the online forum, in a process facilitated by the NCCPE. All bidders will need to register on the site and partake in the matching process to be

eligible.

51. The online matching facility makes key information available to relevant parties, providing some simple categorisation as part of the registration, in order to aid the matching process and to assist partnership formation, based on the needs of the research groups and the capabilities of the impact analysts and information specialists.
52. Interested research groups are invited to register stating their discipline or the broad area of their research (Arts and Humanities, Natural Sciences etc). Higher and further education research groups of any type or academic discipline, who wish to develop improved capability and processes to analyse of the benefits and impact of their research, to enhance their impact and sustainability are encouraged to register.
53. BCE impact analysts must be currently working for a higher or further education institution either as permanent staff or as associate staff, or must have done so within the past year (i.e. since 1 January 2011).
54. BCE impact analysts with a suitable combination of expertise in the following areas are invited to register on the Ning online matching site:
 - a. Knowledge exchange and knowledge transfer
 - b. Public engagement
 - c. Community engagement
 - d. Evaluation and valuation
 - e. Business analysis
55. Interested information management/ information technology professionals who offer the following should register on the Ning online matching site:
 - a. experience in the effective use of technology and process to underpin research impact analysis;
 - b. access to effective and readily applicable and available tools and resources to in research information management to underpin research impact analysis;
 - c. knowledge of how to implement the available tools and resources.
56. For the research information management component, projects are strongly encouraged to utilise technology good practice that JISC has helped develop, including good practice from the Research Information Management programme. Relevant examples include:
 - the use of institutional repositories to manage research output information⁷,
 - the use of the CERIF⁸ standard to encode information on research impact⁹,
 - the use of a modular research management system such as that being developed by the Research Management and Administration System (RMAS) project,¹⁰
 - using business intelligence for research excellence and impact¹¹.
57. The Facilitation and Synthesis project will manage and facilitate the matching process for the duration of the time the call is open (6 December 2011 to 1 March 2012).

⁷ E.g. University of Glasgow, Enquire: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/projects/enquire.aspx>

⁸ CERIF – Current Research Information Systems

⁹ E.g. Kings College London, MICE: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/projects/mice.aspx> ;
<http://mice.cerch.kcl.ac.uk>

and Brunel, BRUCE: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/projects/bruce.aspx>

¹⁰ <http://www.exeter.ac.uk/research/rmas/>

¹¹ For example: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/businessintelligence/vors.aspx>

When the projects have started, the online connecting space will then function as a peer support environment for the matched projects, facilitated by the NCCPE.

Bid Development

58. Once the tripartite partnerships are established, the institutional research groups in each one should lead the bid development in collaboration with the other two parties. Partnerships should then bid for funding at up to £30,000 each (for type 'A' bids as described above), or up to £15,000 each (for type 'B' bids, as described above) according to the criteria above. As a guide, these funds should be spent primarily on procuring the impact analyst's expertise and information management expertise, which together are expected to account for about two thirds of the funds, on research group bought-out time to ensure effective partnership-working with the experts, and on dissemination activities to share learning and a case study with the rest of the sector, making good use of web resources and online media.
59. Bids should be submitted by the institutional research group and should be endorsed by a senior manager (Pro Vice-Chancellor level) from the same institution, from outside of the research group. Letters of support are required from senior representatives of the institution submitting the bid and from senior representatives from the partner institutions to which the BCE impact analyst and the information management specialist (where applicable) belong. If the BCE impact analyst is not currently employed by an HE/FE institution, but has worked for one in the past year (i.e. since 1 January 2011, as per criteria above), then a letter of reference is required from the recent employing institution confirming that the individual worked successfully in the BCE role at that institution, including the capacity – i.e. part time / full time, associate capacity etc., and the relevant period of time worked there.

Deliverables

60. Each partnership project will deliver a concise case study, for which JISC will provide a standardised template, of the process utilised to embed the good practice and effective technology in research impact analysis.
61. The case study which will be no more than ten pages, clearly written for a wide audience both within and beyond academia, will include the following:
 - a. The impact or benefits analysis problem the research group was trying to solve
 - b. The as-is impact analysis capability and process within the research group
 - c. The expertise provided by the BCE impact analyst
 - d. The expertise provided by the information management specialist
 - e. The technologies and business intelligence practices and resources which were tested and deployed, and their origin
 - f. The particular competencies developed and awareness raised
 - g. How the research group has benefited from the project
 - h. Lessons learnt by the BCE practitioners
 - i. Process, technology approaches and other changes agreed as a result of the experience, and future implementation plans
 - j. How learning has been shared from the project within and beyond the institution.
62. The case studies, together with any other relevant learning from the portfolio of projects, will be synthesised by the Facilitation and Synthesis project into a publicly-available Compendium of Good Practice in technology-enabled research impact

analysis and supporting process, and for the benefit of the wider sector. Each partnership project will be required to engage in the online connecting space during the project period and should publish regular **blog updates**, highlighting progress and any discussion points, in a publicly accessible part of the site, as advised by the Facilitation and Synthesis project. Each project will also be required to take part in two workshops, organised by the Facilitation and Synthesis project, and contribute to wider dissemination activity.

Evaluation Criteria

63. Proposals will be evaluated according to criteria in the table below:

Evaluation Criteria	Questions Evaluators will be Considering
<p><i>Appropriateness and Fit to Programme Objectives and Wider Impact</i> – the extent to which the proposal addresses the issues and demands outlined in the call, and shows innovation as appropriate; the extent to which the project outcomes will be of overall value to the wider HE, FE and research communities (25%).</p>	<p>Is the proposal in scope? If it isn't, you should score the bid poorly under this criteria and NOT recommend the bid for funding.</p> <p>Is the proposal a good idea?</p> <p>Does the project meet an identified need?</p> <p>Does the bid clearly articulate its intentions?</p> <p>Does the proposal demonstrate that the project outputs meet a need and will result in benefits to the community?</p> <p>If appropriate, is the bid technologically innovative and sound?</p> <p>Is the bid innovative in terms of boundary-spanning (i.e. joining up previously unconnected parties/functions)</p> <p>Is there evidence that the proposal has been developed in the context of institutional business and community engagement, research and/or information management strategies to ensure that project outputs can be embedded and sustained beyond the JISC funding period?</p> <p>Will the outputs have an influence that lasts beyond the project's immediate completion?</p> <p>Does the project articulate how its outputs will contribute to the intended programme outcomes via the facilitation and synthesis work?</p>
<p><i>Partnership and Dissemination</i> – the degree to which the proposal demonstrates a strategic approach to combine the BCE, information management and research impact expertise within an effective partnership, JISC and other universities/colleges as appropriate - and to ensure that these partnerships function successfully (25%).</p>	<p>Is the purpose and constitution of the partnership clear and suitable for the research group's identified need?</p> <p>Are there supporting letters from the BCE impact analyst and the information management specialist (if appropriate), and from their employing institutions?</p> <p>Are the processes for collaboration between different partners well defined?</p> <p>Does the BCE impact analyst come from a different institution to the research group? If not, does the bid request the reduced amount of up to £15,000?</p> <p>Is the impact analyst currently a permanent or associate member of staff at an HE institution, or is evidence provided that they have been within the last year (i.e. since January 2011).</p> <p>Are the information management expertise and/or resources identified? Does the project proposal show any evidence of the bidders having consulted, and proposing to utilise, any relevant JISC resources, as mentioned in the terms of reference?</p> <p>Does the project articulate how it will work with the Facilitation and Synthesis team, and is this costed into the budget appropriately?</p> <p>Is a stakeholder mapping and/or user needs analysis provided?</p> <p>Does the bid propose an appropriate dissemination approach?</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Questions Evaluators will be Considering
	<p>Does it have an appropriate evaluation approach, e.g. talking to stakeholders?</p> <p>Does the bid demonstrate willingness to work in partnership with JISC and NCCPE in the dissemination and evaluation activities and to make available outputs beyond the funding period?</p>
<p>Quality of Proposal and Robustness of Workplan – the quality of the proposal will be assessed on the basis of the deliverables identified, and the evidence provided of how these will be achieved, including an assessment of the risks (20%).</p>	<p>Are there clear deliverables and is the case study described?</p> <p>Is the IPR position clear and appropriate with regard to project outputs?</p> <p>Is the methodology for meeting the deliverables sound and achievable?</p> <p>Is there active engagement throughout the project to ensure a sustainable and embedded end-product, where applicable?</p> <p>Is the workplan robust in terms of project management arrangements?</p> <p>How will the success of the project be measured?</p> <p>Does the bid include a well-thought-through initial assessment of risks, which considers the project's failure to deliver, and predictable consequences that are not necessarily positive?</p>
<p>Value for Money – the value of the expected project outcomes, vis-à-vis the level of funding requested, institutional contributions; taking into account the level of innovation, chance of success and relevance to the target communities (15%).</p>	<p>When considering value for money, evaluators will refer to their assessment under the above evaluation criteria and compare this with the cost requested from JISC.</p> <p>Does the bid discuss the quantitative and qualitative benefits to the project partners of undertaking the work?</p> <p>Given the benefits, are institutional contributions appropriate?</p> <p>Does the funding requested reflect whether the BCE impact analyst is from the same institution (maximum £15,000) or from a different institution (maximum £30,000).</p>
<p>Previous experience of the project team – evidence of the project team's understanding of the management, cultural and technical issues involved, and of its ability to manage and deliver a successful project, for example through work done to date in the area or in related fields (15%).¹²</p>	<p>Does the bid demonstrate a realistic understanding of the challenge and scale of the task, in terms of cultural, management and technical issues?</p> <p>Does the bid clearly link the expertise of the team with the roles to be undertaken and the staffing budget?</p> <p>The purpose of the funding is to share expertise and good practice more widely across the sector – will the constitution of the team help achieve this?</p> <p>Have the partners provided evidence of their commitment in the form of supporting letters?</p> <p>NB Letters of support should be from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • senior representatives of the institution submitting the bid; • senior representatives from the partner institutions to which BCE impact analyst and the information management specialist (where applicable) belong. <p>If the BCE impact analyst is not currently employed by an HE/FE institution, but has worked for one in the past year</p>

¹² In the case of consortium proposals, the **strength of the consortium** will be considered as part of the project team criteria. This refers to evidence of the commitment shown by the consortium partners to the consortium and the proposed project, and the degree to which the work proposed is aligned with institutional strategies and is shown to be embedded within the mainstream of the consortium and with the collaborative partners' priorities. Bidders may wish to refer to documents that exist such as partnership agreements, strategic plans etc. that the evaluation panel can obtain copies of upon request. Please do NOT include such documents as appendices to a bid.

Evaluation Criteria	Questions Evaluators will be Considering
	<p>(i.e. since 1 January 2011, as per criteria above), then a letter of reference from the recent employing institution is required confirming that the individual worked successfully in the BCE role at that institution, including the capacity – i.e, part time / full time, associate etc., and the relevant period of time worked there.</p> <p>Have the partners demonstrated how the work aligns with their programme objectives and priorities?</p> <p>Is it clear what the role of each partner is and how the actual or planned management structure, governance, decision-making and funding arrangements will function?</p> <p>Is a supporting letter provided from a senior manager of the institution who is outside the research group involved?</p>

Structure of Proposals

64. The content of the proposal should reflect the evaluation criteria as set out above. To assist in the assessment of all proposals against a common baseline, proposals should be structured as follows:
- a. **Bid Cover Sheet** – all proposals must include a completed bid cover sheet (using the template at Appendix D) which is included in the proposal as part of the overall maximum page limit.
 - b. **Appropriateness and Fit to Programme Objectives and Wider Impact**
 - c. **Partnership and Dissemination**
 - d. **Quality of Proposal and Robustness of Workplan**
 - e. **Value for Money: Budget** – a summary of the proposed budget, which in broad outline identifies how funds will be spent over the life of the project. The budget should be broken down across academic years (August–July) or parts thereof and should include itemised staff costs, any equipment and consumables, travel and subsistence, dissemination, evaluation, and any other direct costs required, e.g. rights clearance if required. All costs must be justified. Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) methodology must be used to calculate costs in bids from UK HE institutions. An Example Budget and guidance on the budgetary terms used can be found in Appendix C to this document. Bidders should provide a summary of the qualitative, and any quantitative, benefits the lead institution and any project partners as a whole expect to receive from the project in order to inform the funding to be requested from JISC and the costs being borne by the host institution and any project partners. Institutional contributions should be determined by taking into account the benefits to the lead institution and any project partners.
 - f. **Previous Experience of the Project Team** – names and brief career details of staff expected to contribute to/be seconded to the project, including qualifications and experience in the area of work proposed, linking the expertise to the roles required within the project, and evidence of any projects of similar nature successfully completed.
 - g. **FOI Tick List** – all proposals must include a FOI Withheld Information Form, indicating which sections of the bid you would like JISC to consider withholding in response to a freedom of information request or if your bid is successful and your project proposal is made available on JISC’s website. This can be found in Appendix A of this document. The FOI form will not count towards the page limit and should be included in a separate PDF file to the main bid sections described in a-f above, alongside the supporting letters.

- h. **Supporting Letter(s)** – a copy of the letter(s) of support from a senior representative of the institutions concerned and any project partners. Only one supporting letter per project partner should be submitted. The supporting letter(s) will not count towards the page limit and should be included in a separate PDF file to the main bid sections described in a-f above, alongside the FOI tick list. The address to include on letters should be JISC, Northavon House, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, BS16 1QD. It is not necessary to address the letter to a particular contact within the JISC Executive.

General Expectations

65. Projects are expected to allocate at least 10 person-days per year and related expenses to engage in programme-level activities. In particular, all projects are expected to attend programme meetings and relevant special interest groups. Any further expectations will be outlined in the relevant call.

JISC Services

66. Bidders should be aware of the range of JISC services that may be relevant to provide advice, guidance or support dependant upon the proposal being submitted. Further information on JISC's advisory services (JISC Advance), including the Regional Support Centres, can be found at:
<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/services/jiscadvance.aspx>

Technological Approaches to be Employed

Open Standards

67. Open standards should be used wherever possible, and any deviation from these should be justified in the proposal and any alternative interface specifications should be designed with re-use by others in mind. The JISC recognises that emergent technologies lack the maturity of standards of some existing technologies. Interoperability and data transfer are key to the provision of next generation technologies for education and research, and projects are expected to work with JISC to address these issues.
68. Relevant standards can be found in the JISC Standards Catalogue¹³. Those bidding for projects related to the Information Environment should also refer to the Information Environments standards¹⁴.
69. Bidders must also ensure that they request adequate funding for any additional costs that may be incurred by adopting a standards-based approach. Projects should demonstrate sound risk management with regard to the adoption of standards for immature emergent technologies and refer to appropriate sources of expertise.
70. Further guidance on standards and their stipulation can be found in the relevant calls.

Software Outputs

71. It is expected that software outputs will normally be licensed as open-source unless a case is made to the contrary and accepted by the evaluation panel. Applicants should make clear the licence under which software outputs will be released, mechanisms that will be put in place for community contribution (users and developers) throughout the project, and the sustainability plan for the software beyond the period of project funding. Applicants should consult with JISC's open source software advisory service

¹³ JISC Standards Catalogue : <http://standards.jisc.ac.uk>

¹⁴ JISC Information Environment technical standards <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/distributed-systems/jisc-ie/arch/standards/>

OSS Watch¹⁵ and the Open Middleware Infrastructure Institute UK¹⁶ on matters relating to open source software development. Applicants should refer to JISC's Policy on Open Source Software for JISC Projects and Services¹⁷.

72. To be able to re-use the software it must be of a certain quality and maturity. For example, it must have supporting information, FAQ, installation guides, test data etc. to help others use it. In addition to the advice from the OSS Watch and OMII-UK, elements that contribute to software quality and project maturity are outlined in the Software Quality Assurance (QA) and Open Source Maturity Model (OSMM) Development guidelines.¹⁸ Projects will be expected to follow the recommendations from these sources of guidance.

Risk Assessment

73. All projects have an element of risk. Even in the best-planned projects there are uncertainties, and unexpected events can occur. A risk can be defined as:

“The threat or possibility that an action or event will adversely or beneficially affect the ability to achieve objectives.”

74. A risk analysis when putting together a bid will help you predict the risks that could prevent a project from delivering on time or even failing. It will also help you to manage the risks should they occur. Consideration should be given not only to threats that could lead to failure to deliver objectives (as has already happened) but also to consider opportunities (constructive events) which if exploited could improve the way of achieving objectives.

75. A risk analysis addresses the following questions:

- What could possibly happen?
- What is the likelihood of it happening?
- How will it affect the project?
- What can be done about it?

76. Further guidance on Risk Assessments can be found in Section III, paragraph 7 of the Project Management Guidelines. JISC InfoNet also hosts an InfoKit on Risk Management¹⁹. It explains what risks are, how to do a risk analysis, and how to manage risks during a project.

Costing and Pricing a Bid

77. JISC innovation projects are funded in UK higher education institutions on the basis of full economic costs. Bids from these institutions should therefore be constructed on a full economic cost (fEC) basis using the TRAC methodology. An example budget for bidders to use can be found in Appendix C.

78. Other institutions submitting bids should use their usual costing and pricing practices but all costs should be clear and transparent, clarifying the number of days each

¹⁵ OSS Watch <http://www.oss-watch.ac.uk/resources/bidsupport.xml> and <http://www.oss-watch.ac.uk/resources/adviceforprojectbids.xml>

¹⁶ OMII-UK <http://www.omii.ac.uk/>

¹⁷ Open Source Policy <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/opensourcepolicy.aspx>

¹⁸ Software Quality Assurance (QA) and Open Source Maturity Model (OSMM) Development guidelines: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/SQA_OSMM_09.06.doc

¹⁹ JISC InfoKit on Risk Management <http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/InfoKits/risk-management>

individual working on the activity will provide, in order to assist the evaluators in determining the value for money of the proposal.

79. The bid should indicate the contribution to the project being sought from JISC and the intended contribution from the lead institution and any project partners. The funding levels outlined in this call are the maximum that JISC will provide towards the total cost of a project; institutional contributions are additional. Where a bid involves partners from outside UK HE, such as English FE or a commercial company, the partners should cost their activities using current costing practice in their college or organisation and clearly identify partner contributions.
80. When assessing proposals, JISC will take into consideration the reasonableness of the total cost of the project and the institutional contributions. It is important to JISC that HE institutions are costing proposals accurately and seeking the appropriate level of support from us, so that they are not over-committed, and hence are ensuring the long-term availability of their activities. However, JISC also needs to ensure consistency of treatment, and that it is using its funding effectively across all proposals.
81. Through the funding provided to projects there will clearly be sector-wide benefits. However, there may also be benefits to the lead institution and any project partners (e.g. prestige/kudos, academic synergy, and financial benefits) in delivering the individual projects. Bidders should provide a summary of the qualitative and quantitative benefits the lead institution and any project partners as a whole expect to receive from the project. JISC expects these benefits to be taken into account when considering the funding requested from JISC. JISC reserves the right to ask additional questions about the budget prior to agreeing any funding for a project.
82. Further guidance on fEC for JISC-funded research and development projects can be found at:
<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/bidguide/fulleconomiccosting.aspx>
For more information about TRAC, see the HEFCE web site at:
<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/finance/costing/>.
The consolidated TRAC Guidance can be found at
<http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/about.htm>.

Freedom of Information

83. JISC is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA). Therefore potential bidders should be aware that information submitted by them to JISC during this tender process, and throughout the life of any project subsequently funded, may be disclosed upon receipt of a valid request.
84. JISC will not disclose any information received during this bidding process whilst the evaluation of the bids received is still underway. The evaluation process is still deemed to be active until such time as all grant letters to successful projects have been sent out.
85. It is JISC policy to make the content of any bid funded by JISC through this call publicly available via the JISC web site shortly after funding has been awarded. Unsuccessful bids will be destroyed one month after the lead institution has been notified that their bid was not successful. However, it should be noted that the contents of unsuccessful bids *may be* disclosed should JISC receive a relevant FOI request prior to destruction taking place.

Terms and Conditions of Grant

86. JISC will oversee and monitor the progress of projects. All projects will be expected to follow JISC's Generic Terms and Conditions of Grant. A copy of this is attached at Appendix B to this document. It is the bidders' responsibility to read this.
87. All projects will be managed following JISC project management guidance, which can be found at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/proj_manguide. These guidelines may also be of use to bidders when putting together a project proposal.
88. It is intended that the deliverables created as part of this programme will, as appropriate, be deployed by JISC as part of a long-term strategy for providing access to community resources, and where this is possible, arrangements for archiving of deliverables will be set in place. However, wherever possible, projects will be encouraged to set in place mechanisms to ensure the continued availability and currency of deliverables after funding has ended. In the majority of cases JISC will not be able to commit to the long-term delivery or maintenance of project outputs after the end of the programme, though guidance will be given about any opportunities for continuation funding and embedding within institutions.

Intellectual Property Rights

89. As a general rule, JISC does not seek to retain IPR in the project and/or service outputs created as part of its programmes. However, funding is always made available on the condition that project outputs are made available, free at the point of use (or 'at cost' where appropriate), to the UK HE, FE and Research community in perpetuity and in accordance with JISC's Open Access and/or JISC's Open Source Software Policy wherever possible, and that these outputs may be disseminated widely in partnership with JISC. Further information is available in Appendix B.
90. JISC, however, reserves the right to acquire all Intellectual Property Rights, including, without limitation, copyright, database right, performers rights, patents and trade marks, whether registered or unregistered, in any works created as a result of the funding either indefinitely or for a certain fixed period of time on behalf of HEFCE. JISC also reserves the right to request that all Moral Rights are waived. This ability to acquire the Intellectual Property Rights will only be used under exceptional circumstances and in any such case where JISC considers this necessary, the JISC will explain in writing to you the reasons for the transfer. This includes the situation where JISC is funding the creation of a national service for the community and there may be a need for HEFCE, on behalf of JISC's funding partners, to retain ownership of certain rights in order to maintain flexibility of future provision and availability of the service.
91. For all project and/or service outputs, acceptance of the terms and conditions of the grant will provide JISC or its representatives with an irrevocable, non-exclusive royalty-free licence in perpetuity to exploit the outputs in any way it sees fit, including enabling the JISC to use, archive, preserve and disseminate the outputs.

Open Access

92. JISC supports unrestricted access to the published output of publicly-funded research and wishes to encourage open access to research outputs to ensure that the fruits of UK research are made more widely available. JISC firmly believes in the value of repositories as a means of improving access to the results of publicly-funded research and is investing significantly in this area. JISC expects that the full text of all

published research papers and conference proceedings arising from JISC-funded work should be deposited in an open access institutional repository, or if that isn't available, a subject repository. Deposit should include bibliographical metadata relating to such articles, and should be completed within six months of the publication date of the paper. Further details are provided in JISC's Terms of Conditions of Grant (see Appendix B).

Submitting a Bid

93. A guide to bidding for JISC projects can be found at: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/bidguide>
94. The deadline for receipt of submissions is **12:00 noon UK time on 1 March 2012**. Late proposals will **NOT** be accepted. It is the responsibility of the bidder to ensure that the proposal has arrived by the deadline stated. The JISC Executive will strictly adhere to this policy. **There will be no appeals process for late bids**. In light of this, it is recommended that bidders plan to submit proposals several days before the deadline in case of any technical difficulties or other extenuating circumstances.
95. Proposals should **NOT** exceed **six single-sides of A4 pages** (including the cover sheet) and should be typeset in Arial or a similar font at 11-point size. **All** key information as outlined in the guidance on structure of proposals **MUST** be included within the six-page limit unless otherwise indicated. Do not include **any** additional appendices to the six page proposal. **Any bids exceeding the six-page limit will be rejected by the Executive prior to the evaluation stage**. See below for additional information which should be supplied but which does not count towards the page limit.
96. Proposals **MUST**:
 - Include a completed bid cover sheet (the template at Appendix D must be used) **which is included in the page limit for the proposal**;
 - Include a completed FOI Withheld Information Form (see Appendix A) in a separate pdf file which also includes the letters of support **which is not included in the page limit for the proposal**;
 - Be accompanied by a letter(s) of support from an authorised senior manager at the lead institution and senior representatives from the partner institutions to which BCE impact analyst and the information management belong in a separate pdf file which also includes the completed FOI Withheld Information Form. **These are not included in the page limit for the proposal**.
97. This is an electronic-only submission process, therefore all documentation must be submitted in PDF format. **Two PDFs are required as part of the submission: one to include the main proposal (including bid cover sheet); and one to include the FOI Withheld Information Form and letter(s) of support**. The size of the overall submission should not exceed 10Mb; a zipped folder should be used if the size of the files exceeds 10Mb (note: any files exceeding 10Mb are likely to be returned by the mail server).
98. Bidders must ensure their proposals have paragraph and section numbers in case of any queries or FOI requests. No additional security settings should be activated for PDFs to allow JISC to redact information if necessary prior to any release under FOI.
99. All proposals must complete the *FOI Withheld Information Form* (see Appendix A) indicating those sections or paragraphs of your proposal which you believe should be exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. It should be noted that whilst JISC will actively consider withholding any of the information indicated within

this appendix, it is ultimately JISC's decision (as the holder of the information) and JISC may not be able to uphold such decisions in all cases. JISC will consult with the lead institution prior to the release of any information listed in the *FOI Withheld Information Form*.

100. The types of information which *may* be considered exempt from disclosure include (but may not necessarily be limited to):
- Information, which if disclosed, would materially damage the commercial interests of the institution or its partners;
 - Information, which if disclosed, would break the principles of the Data Protection Act 1998.
101. Bidders are encouraged to consult with their institutional FOI officer for further information if required. Failure to fill in or submit this information will be construed as consent for disclosure and/or publication on JISC's website should your proposal be successful.
102. Bids should be submitted to **BCE-BIDS@JISC.AC.UK**
103. All bids should include the name of the lead institution in the subject line of the email. It is the responsibility of the bidder to ensure that the bid is sent to the correct email address. Bidders will receive an automatic confirmation of receipt of any proposal sent to the relevant email address. The email address should not be used for general enquiries. Separate contact details for enquiries are provided below. Bidders submitting more than one bid in response to this call must submit these in separate messages to the relevant email address(es).
104. If no automatic confirmation is received, it is the responsibility of the bidder to contact JISC within one day of submitting the bid to confirm whether the proposal has been received. In case of any dispute about the submission of proposals, it is the responsibility of the bidder to provide evidence that the proposal was emailed to the correct address prior to the deadline.

Evaluation Process

105. A selection panel will be established to review the bids received. A standard marksheet and guidance for markers is prepared for each evaluation process. This is to help to ensure a common approach from evaluators and to clarify the evaluation criteria, and definitions for the different marks it is possible to award. There are a number of sections which the evaluator is required to complete to inform decisions: a score for each evaluation criteria; detailed comments to clarify the mark awarded for each criteria; a section to describe overall impressions of the bid; and a recommendation. Further information about JISC's procedure for evaluating bids can be found at: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/bideval>.
106. JISC will endeavour to notify successful bidders by 20 April 2012. Projects should commence from May 2012. All projects must be complete by 30 October 2012.
107. JISC will expect to work with the selected projects to agree the workplan and to ensure that the project budget is appropriate and suitably profiled. It may be necessary to negotiate some aspects of the project objectives and content with the project teams in the interest of maximising the expected benefits of the programme as a whole.

108. Notwithstanding the weightings of the evaluation criteria, proposals that fail badly on any one criterion may be rejected, and proposals showing exceptional strength in one or more areas with serious weaknesses in others may be funded. In making awards under this call, JISC will take into account the need for an appropriate, varied and affordable portfolio of projects and partners. It is not, therefore, necessarily the case that the projects with the highest raw scores will be those funded in all instances.

109. JISC reserves the right not to commission the full amount of funding outlined in this call, and to issue a subsequent call to address any remaining work.

Checklist for Bid Submission

110. When submitting your bid, we recommend you check the following points:

- i. Have you completed the bid cover sheet (see relevant appendix for the template which must be used)?
- ii. Have you followed the bid format outlined?
- iii. Have you paragraph- and section-numbered your proposal?
- iv. Have you read JISC's Generic Terms and Conditions of Grant (see relevant appendix)?
- v. Are you clear about the evaluation criteria on which your bid will be judged?
- vi. Have you looked at the Example Budget and guidance (see relevant appendix) to help you present your costings?
- vii. Have you provided a summary of the qualitative and quantitative benefits the lead institution and any project partners as a whole expect to receive from the project and clarified the nature of the institutional contributions?
- viii. Have you kept within the page limit for the main body of the proposal (do NOT include any appendices to your bid unless specifically requested in the call)? The page limit for this call is 6 pages.
- ix. Is your bid in a PDF format with no additional security settings switched on?
- x. Have you completed the FOI Withheld Information Form (see relevant appendix) as part of a separate PDF file with the letter(s) of support?
- xi. Have you included a letter(s) of support from the lead site and each project partner and included these in a separate PDF with the FOI Withheld Information Form?
- xii. Is your bid in a zipped folder if the size of the files exceed 10Mb?
- xiii. Are you aware of the email address to which you need to submit your bid and the need to include the name of the lead institution in the subject line of the email?
- xiv. Are you aware of the deadline for submitting bids? **(12:00 noon UK time, 1 March 2012).**

111. To summarise, a bid will be automatically rejected if:

- i. It is received after the stated deadline;
- ii. A bid cover sheet (completed according to the template attached) is not included;
- iii. The bid exceeds the page limit outlined in the call;
- iv. An additional appendix/appendices is/are provided that are not requested in the call (as these will be considered to count towards the page limit outlined in the call).

Further Information

112. Enquiries about the content of this call should be addressed to Simon Whittemore (s.whittemore@jisc.ac.uk).
113. General enquiries about the bid submission process should be sent to: Laura Smyth (l.smyth@jisc.ac.uk, 0117 931 7451).

Appendices

- Appendix A: FOI Withheld Information Form**
- Appendix B: JISC's Generic Terms and Conditions of Grant**
- Appendix C: Example Budget**
- Appendix D: Bid Cover Sheet**

NB: All appendices should be read in conjunction with the main body of JISC Grant Funding 20/11.

All appendices and the main body of JISC Grant Funding 20/11 can be found at:
<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities.aspx>

Appendix A

FOI Withheld Information Form

We would like JISC to consider withholding the following sections or paragraphs from disclosure, should the contents of this proposal be requested under the Freedom of Information Act, or if we are successful in our bid for funding and our project proposal is made available on JISC's website.

We acknowledge that the FOI Withheld Information Form is of indicative value only and that JISC may nevertheless be obliged to disclose this information in accordance with the requirements of the Act. We acknowledge that the final decision on disclosure rests with JISC.

Section / Paragraph No.	Relevant exemption from disclosure under FOI	Justification

Please see <http://www.ico.gov.uk> for further information on the Freedom of Information Act and the exemptions to disclosure it contains.

Example:

Section / Paragraph No.	Relevant exemption from disclosure under FOI	Justification
2.4	s.43 Commercial Interests	Contains detailed description of our proposed system design which would damage our commercial interests if disclosed, by making this information available to competitors.

Appendix B

Annex to JISC Grant and Contract Letters for Projects Generic Terms and Conditions of Funding

Preamble

1. JISC funds a wide variety of projects on behalf of its funding bodies. These projects include supporting studies where the main deliverable is a report, and projects where the deliverables include products or services as well as reports. These generic terms and conditions apply to all projects and define the responsibilities of the lead institution and its project partners.

Adherence to Project Management Guidelines

2. The institution and its partners must adhere to the Project Management Guidelines available electronically at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/proj_manguide.aspx. The Guidelines provide initial advice on project planning, project management, the relationships between JISC programmes and projects, evaluation, and dissemination. However, the institution and its partners should refer to the designated JISC programme manager for details of how these guidelines are to be interpreted. The Guidelines will be updated from time to time, and the lead institution will be notified of any major changes. It is the responsibility of the lead institution to inform its project partners accordingly.

Submission of Agreed Deliverables

3. The institution and its partners must supply all deliverables specified in the agreed project proposal. The schedule for submitting deliverables must be included in the Project Plan and agreed with the JISC Executive. Any changes to this schedule must be agreed in writing with the JISC Executive.

4. Project deliverables are subject to approval by the JISC Executive, and the framework for approval is outlined in the Project Management Guidelines.

5. Project deliverables will be deposited in the appropriate JISC data centre or managed repository, where appropriate.

Core Project Document Set

6. The lead institution must also supply a core set of documents to indicate how the project work will be planned and implemented, to report on progress, and to inform future auditing and evaluation. It is the responsibility of the lead institution to agree these documents with its project partners prior to submission.

7. The core project documents are listed below and further information about each document is provided in the Project Management Guidelines and by reference to the designated JISC programme manager.

8. Core project documents are subject to approval by the JISC Executive, and the framework for approval is outlined in the Project Management Guidelines.

9. Core project documents will be deposited in the JISC records management system and/or project information management system so they are accessible to the JISC Executive.

Core Project Document	Timing
Project Plan (including an Evaluation Plan, QA Plan, Dissemination Plan, and Exit/Sustainability	Within 1 month of start date

Plan)	
Project Web Page on JISC Web Site (including copy of accepted Project Plan)	Within 1 month of start date
Project Web Site at Lead Institution	Within 3 months of start date
Consortium Agreement (for projects involving more than one institution)	Within 3 months of start date
Progress Reports (including financial statement)	Default 2 per year; schedule to be agreed with Programme Manager for projects of less than 12 months
Technical and Supporting Documentation (for projects creating technical deliverables)	Timing to be agreed with Programme Manager
Final Report	Draft version 1 month before project end date; final version at project end date
Completion Report (including financial statement)	Project end date

Intellectual Property Rights

10. As a general rule, JISC does not seek to acquire or retain IPR in any outputs created as part of the project and/or service. IPR ownership shall therefore vest with you [and your partners, as laid out in your Consortium Agreement]. However, if this is not the case for the particular piece of work you are undertaking, the correct IPR position will be documented in the grant/contract letter.

11. The funding is made available on condition that outputs from the project are made available, free at the point of use (or 'at cost' where appropriate) and under Open Access or Open Source principles where possible, to the UK HE, FE and Research communities in perpetuity in accordance with JISC's Open Access Policy and/or JISC's Open Source Software Policy wherever possible.

12. A condition of funding is that you grant JISC, on behalf of HEFCE, an irrevocable, non-exclusive royalty-free licence in perpetuity to exploit the outputs in any way it sees fit, including enabling the JISC to use, archive, preserve and disseminate the outputs. This may include, where appropriate, the delivery of project outputs to the community under a suitable open access and/or Open Source licence. In all cases, JISC will also retain the right to modify or adapt the project outputs. The purpose of this is to give JISC the ability to ensure outputs are available to the UK education and research community for non-commercial use should you fail to fulfil this condition of funding. You further agree to ensure that any licence you enter into in order to acquire third party materials for the purposes of this project may legally be transferred to a third party, nominated by HEFCE, to enable such continued availability of outputs to the UK education and research community.

13. JISC may terminate this Agreement immediately without further obligation in the event of:

- (i) any breach of this Agreement which cannot be remedied or is not remedied within thirty (30) calendar days of you being requested to do so; or
- (ii) any resolution being passed or petition being presented to wind up your business (otherwise than for reconstruction or amalgamation) or a receiver being appointed of the whole or part of your assets; or a failure to complete a satisfactory Consortium Agreement, where required, in the time required by your JISC project manager; or where, in the reasonable opinion of the JISC, any of the terms or conditions of funding have not been fulfilled.

If termination occurs under any of these circumstances, all rights in any works created by you as a result of the funding shall revert to the JISC on behalf of HEFCE.

14. You [and your partners] must ensure that outputs do not infringe the copyright or any other Intellectual Property Right existing at the time the project is completed (including, but not limited to, database rights, moral rights, performers rights, unregistered or registered trade marks, patents, or registered designs) of any third party. Where necessary, copyright and other Intellectual Property Rights should be cleared before digitisation or incorporation into outputs begins. You must obtain written permission for any third party rights that you incorporate, using a standard clearance letter whose wording has been agreed with your JISC Programme Manager. You must also document all attempts to identify the owner of works where the rightsholders cannot be located (so-called "orphan works".) It is a condition of funding that you must discuss any orphan works you encounter with your JISC Programme Manager and must follow your programme manager's advice regarding how to deal with such orphan works.

15. It is a further condition of grant that you respect the Moral Rights of those individuals who contribute to the project outputs and in particular requires that you (1) acknowledge them by listing the names of those individuals who made a significant contribution to the project outputs in such project outputs, (2) that the text or content of any outputs should be checked by those individuals before release.

16. JISC, however, reserves the right to acquire all Intellectual Property Rights, including, without limitation, copyright, database right, performers rights, patents and trade marks, whether registered or unregistered, in any works created by you as a result of the funding, as appropriate, either indefinitely or for a certain fixed period of time on behalf of HEFCE. JISC also reserves the right to request that all Moral Rights are waived. This ability to acquire the Intellectual Property Rights will only be used under exceptional circumstances and in any such case, the JISC will explain in writing to you the reasons for the transfer.

Open Access

17. JISC supports unrestricted access to the published output of publicly-funded research and wishes to encourage open access to research outputs to ensure that the fruits of UK research are made more widely available. JISC firmly believes in the value of repositories as a means of improving access to the results of publicly-funded research and is investing significantly in this area. A national support project is available to help institutions develop repositories and share practice (http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_rep_pres/reps_support.aspx).

18. JISC requires that all project or service outputs and the full text of all published research papers and conference proceedings arising from the funded work to be deposited into an institutional or subject open access repository. Deposit should include appropriate bibliographical metadata relating to said articles, and the deposit should be completed within six months of the first publication date of the paper. JISC mandates the deposit of the native version (Word, PPT, etc.), with PDF as well if wanted, but certainly with a format from which usable xml can in principle be derived (not PDF).

19. Which version of the article should be deposited depends upon publishers' agreements with their authors but JISC mandates that articles should be made available through publishers that adopt the RoMEO "green" approach as a minimum (for further information see <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeoinfo.html#colours>). Authors should go to another journal if the journal chosen does not adopt the RoMEO "green" conditions.

20. Jorum (<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/services/jorum.aspx>) is a free national repository that provides a long-term solution for hosting and registering the availability of learning and teaching materials. It contains two collections each supporting a different type of licence for use. JorumOpen provides access to resources licensed under Creative Commons that are

free to anyone worldwide to use; JorumUK provides access to resources from those who prefer to share their work only within UK Further and Higher Education institutions. Deposit into both collections is, initially, by staff only in UK Further and Higher Education. Information about each collection and how to deposit can be found on the Jorum website. It is mandatory that all learning and teaching materials produced by JISC projects and services should be represented (deposited or linked to) in JorumOpen together with the appropriate metadata. JISC strongly encourages use of Jorum by all JISC-funded projects.

Open Source

21. It is highly desirable that any software components of the outputs are released under appropriate open source licences to ensure that they can also be freely shared with organisations and communities with which the JISC has close working arrangements, see JISC's Open Source Software Policy

(<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/opensourcepolicy.aspx>)

and advice from JISC's Open Source Software (OSS) Watch
(<http://www.oss-watch.ac.uk/resources/adviceforprojectbids.xml>)

Adherence to Standards

22. The institution and its partners must use the technical standards stipulated by JISC and where unstipulated open standards wherever possible. Any deviation should be justified in the proposal and any alternative be designed with re-use by others in mind. Ease of interoperability between systems is key to the provision of next generation technologies for education and research, and projects are expected to work with JISC to address this issue. It is the responsibility of the lead institution to inform its project partners accordingly. Relevant standards can be found in the JISC Standards Catalogue <http://standards.jisc.ac.uk/>.

Charging

23. Funding is made available on the condition that the institution and its partners shall make available deliverables developed by the project free of charge to the teaching, learning, and research communities during the period of funding, except for a handling and/or usage charge which must be agreed in writing with the JISC Executive.

Programme Meetings and Events

24. Programme meetings and other events are organised by JISC to brief project staff and share knowledge. Two major programme meetings are held per year, and attendance at programme meetings is mandatory. Projects should allocate staff time to participate in programme activities, and the Project Management Guidelines provide guidance on days per year to allow. The project will be provided with a schedule of meeting dates.

25. Projects should also allocate time to liaise with the Programme Manager on a regular basis, and institutions should provide access to the Programme Manager at any reasonable time.

Dissemination

26. The institution and its partners must commit to disseminating and sharing learning from the project throughout the community. The institution and its partners must develop a Dissemination Plan as part of the overall Project Plan and report on dissemination activities in Progress Reports and the Completion Report. Further information about dissemination is available in the Project Management Guidelines.

Project Web Site

27. The institution and its partners must create a web page and web site to explain the project aims and objectives and to disseminate information about project activities and

results. The Project Management Guidelines give guidance on the scope, content, and design of web sites.

28. Where appropriate, project deliverables and core project documents may be posted on the project web site. As the project web site is primarily a dissemination vehicle, deliverables and documents posted are considered to be copies, and the masters will be deposited in the appropriate repository (see paragraph 18 above).

29. The lead institution or one of its partners must agree to host the web site on their server for a minimum of 3 years after the end of the project and to assist JISC in archiving it subsequently.

Publicity

30. In any publicity material or public presentation about the project it is essential to include an indication that the project was made possible by funding from JISC. Projects and services must adhere to JISC PR Guidelines and to any additional advice established by the JISC Communications and Marketing team in due course. The current JISC Communication and Marketing Toolkit can be found at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/aboutus/marketing_toolkit.aspx.

Evaluation

31. JISC undertakes evaluation of its development projects and programmes to ensure that knowledge and results are shared with the wider community and to improve the development programme itself. Projects are required to participate in programme evaluation activities organised by JISC.

32. The institution and its partners are also required to undertake evaluation of their work. The institution and its partners must develop an Evaluation Plan as part of the overall Project Plan and report on evaluation results in Progress Reports and the Final Report. Further information about evaluation is available in the Project Management Guidelines.

Exit/Sustainability Plan

33. Funding is for a limited term as set out in the letter of grant. The institution and its partners must develop an Exit/Sustainability Plan as part of the overall Project Plan to document the planning needed to get the best value from the work that has been funded. This will include an assessment of what should happen to deliverables and options for sustainability after funding ceases. Where the institution and its partners wish to exploit deliverables on a commercial basis after funding ceases, they should submit a business plan with economic models that demonstrate how the product or service will be self-sustaining. Further information about exit/sustainability is available in the Project Management Guidelines.

Quality Assurance

34. The institution and its partners must put in place appropriate formal quality assurance procedures to ensure that deliverables are fit for purpose and comply with specifications, JISC guidelines on standards and best practice, and accessibility legislation. Projects must develop a QA Plan as part of the overall Project Plan describing the QA procedures they will put in place and supply evidence of compliance when deliverables are submitted. Further information about QA is available in the Project Management Guidelines.

Payment Schedule

35. The schedule of payments will be indicated in the letter of grant. If more than one institution is involved in a project or service, payments will be made to the lead institution. It is the responsibility of the lead institution to disburse the funds to its project partners.

36. Payment is conditional upon satisfactory progress with milestones and deliverables. The institution and its partners must supply deliverables and core project documents on schedule or subsequent payments may be withheld.

37. At the end of the project, any unspent funds should be returned to JISC unless a formal agreement is reached with the JISC Executive about how these funds may be spent to further support the work of the project.

38. For financial audit, the procedures of the lead or fund-holding institution will apply. In general, JISC does not intend to send financial auditors to projects. However, there remains the possibility that JISC's auditors may wish to audit projects. Project fund holders are required to make themselves available for a visit by members of the JISC Executive or nominees on reasonable notice.

Staff Development

39. Funding is for a limited term as set out in the letter of grant. Near the end of the project funding, institutions should inform project staff about career development opportunities. These might include information about job vacancies within the institution or opportunities for training and career guidance.

Compliance with UK and EU Legislation

40. The institution and its partners must comply with any UK or EU legislation or any international Treaty obligations currently in force or introduced during the timescale of the project that has implications for the conduct of projects or the deliverables/documents they supply. JISC will endeavour to inform the lead institution of relevant legislation and supply guidance for compliance. It is the responsibility of the lead institution to inform its project partners accordingly. Further advice and guidance is available from the JISC Legal Information Service (<http://www.jisclegal.ac.uk/>), email: info@jisclegal.ac.uk, tel: 0141 548 4939.

Accessibility

41. In line with Government legislation and social inclusion initiatives, JISC is committed to providing resources that are accessible to a diverse range of users. In order to achieve this, JISC advise that all resources including the project web site meet good practice standards and guidelines pertaining to the media in which they are produced, for example HTML resources should be produced to W3C html 4.01 strict (<http://www.w3.org/TR/1999/REC-html401-19991224/>) and use W3C WAI guidelines to double A conformance (<http://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG20/quickref/>). Further advice and guidance is available from the JISC TechDis Service (<http://www.techdis.ac.uk/>), e-mail: helpdesk@techdis.ac.uk, Tel: 01904 754 530.

Data Protection

42. The institution and its partners must accept responsibility as the data controller or Joint Data Controllers as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998 ('the Act') for the personal data collected and processed as a result of this project. Neither HEFCE nor the funding bodies accept responsibility for any breaches of the Act which occur due to the actions of project staff or agents directed by them.

43. HEFCE is the recognised data controller for JISC. In line with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998, the institution and its partners hereby grant HEFCE permission to hold the names, job titles, and work contact details of project staff to enable administration of

the programme that the project is part of and to keep project staff up to date with information pertinent to it.

44. The institution and its partners also grant HEFCE permission to hold these contact details as part of the main JISC Contacts Database and Project Information Management System. They will be used to contact staff or send them information from other JISC sources relating to forthcoming events or initiatives which may be of interest.

45. This information is made available to the JISC Executive, staff within the Regional Support Centres and staff within other JISC-funded services and initiatives only for the purposes described above. Contact details held within the Project Information Management System are also published on the project pages on the JISC web site (<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/projects>). This data will be held until such time as the institution instructs HEFCE otherwise or for the lifetime of HEFCE.

46. Any institution which prefers that project details were not held as part of the JISC Project Information Management System or Contacts Database, or would like any further information about how this data will be processed, should contact the JISC Executive.

Freedom of Information

47. The institution and its partners should be aware that educational institutions are listed as public authorities under Schedule 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the Act'). The information created by project staff during the course of the project and as described in their original bid is therefore covered by the provisions of the Act.

48. Neither HEFCE nor the funding bodies accept any responsibility for the project's compliance with the Act for information held by the project staff. This is deemed to be the responsibility of their host institution(s).

49. HEFCE will comply with the terms of the Act for information relating to the project or programme of which it is part that is held by the JISC Executive. Project staff should therefore be aware that any contracts, information or communications in written form (including email) which are sent to the JISC Executive (including the Programme Manager) may be made available to the public on receipt of a valid request and unless covered by one of the classes of exempt information listed in Part 2 of the Act.

**JISC Executive
September 2011**

Appendix C: Template Budget²⁰

Directly Incurred Staff	August 11– July 12	August 12 – July 13	TOTAL £
Post, Grade, No. Hours & % FTE	£		£
Etc.	£		£
Etc.	£		£
Total Directly Incurred Staff (A)	£		£
Non-Staff			
	August 11– July 12	August 12 – July 13	TOTAL £
Travel and expenses	£		£
Hardware/software	£		£
Dissemination	£		£
Evaluation	£		£
Other	£		£
Total Directly Incurred Non-Staff (B)	£		£
Directly Incurred Total (C) (A+B=C)			
	£		£
Directly Allocated			
	August 11– July 12	August 12 – July 13	TOTAL £
Staff	£		£
Estates	£		£
Other	£		£
Directly Allocated Total (D)	£		£
Indirect Costs (E)			
	£		£
Total Project Cost (C+D+E)			
	£		£
Amount Requested from JISC	£		£
Institutional Contributions	£		£
Percentage Contributions over the life of the project			
	JISC X%	Partners X%	Total X%
No. FTEs used to calculate indirect and estates charges, and staff included			
	No FTEs		Which Staff

²⁰ See overleaf for further guidance and an explanation of the terms directly incurred, directly allocated and indirect costs.

Explanation of Terms

All applications from UK HE institutions for development funding from JISC should be costed on the basis of full economic costs (fEC). fEC is the total cost of a project.

Projects should be costed using the TRAC Research indirect and estates charge-out rates, and TRAC fEC methods for Research. However, this does not affect their classification as Research or Other/Other Services Tendered for reporting in annual TRAC, HESA, the financial statements or with regard to Customs and Excise (VAT) treatment.

If a project is not classified as Research under annual TRAC the Research charge-out rates should still be used. However, there is no need to amend the denominator or the numerator of the charge-out rate calculations to try to incorporate these projects.

Academic-related staff who lead or work directly on a project should be classified as 'researchers' when costing the project and should be allocated indirect/estates costs. They should be included in the annual TRAC time allocation collection exercises when those are carried out, and their time on projects should be included in the denominator of the indirect and estates charge-out rate calculations when they are next calculated.

Further guidance on fEC for JISC-funded research and development projects can be found at: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/bidguide/fulleconomiccosting.aspx>.

Cost Headings

Directly Incurred

These are costs that are explicitly identifiable as part of the project, are charged at cash value actually spent and can be supported by an audit record. They include:

Staff – payroll costs requested for staff, full- or part-time, who will work on the project and whose time can be supported by a full audit trail during the life of the project. Directly incurred staff should be completing timesheets if they are not 100% chargeable to the project.

Unless a member of staff will be spending 100% of their time on a project, all estimates of time on a project should be made in numbers of hours or days, for each year of the project. This should then be converted to a FTE for use in calculating the indirect and estate costs charges.

Where a post graduate research (PGR) student is carrying out some of the work on a project, the fEC associated with that student should be included on the project application.

This will include:

- Stipends/maintenance costs
- The principal investigator's (PI) supervision/training time
- Indirect and estates costs on the PI time
- Indirect and estates cost on the PGR FTE (weighted by 0.2 for indirect costs, and 0.5 or 0.8 for estates).

Tuitions fees should not be included in the fEC.

Travel and Expenses – funds for travel and subsistence for use by staff who work on the project where these are required by the nature of the work. This should include attendance at programme meetings (two per year) and other relevant meetings dependent upon the project/programme.

Equipment – the cost of individual items of hardware or software dedicated to the project, including VAT, e.g. a computer for a newly recruited member of staff for the project.

Dissemination – the cost of any dissemination activities proposed for the project.

Evaluation – the cost of any formative or summative evaluation activities proposed for the project.

Other Costs – costs of other items dedicated to the project, including consumables, recruitment and advertising costs for staff directly employed on the project.

Directly Allocated

These are the costs of resources used by a project, which are shared by other activities. They are charged to projects on the basis of estimates rather than actual costs and do not represent actual costs on a project-by-project basis. They include:

Staff – proposals will need to show the costs of any principal investigators/project directors and any co-investigators/co-directors if their time charged to the project is based on estimates rather than actual costs. This may also include the costs of technical and clerical staff, and if a project is buying a small amount of one or more of a person's time.

Estates – these costs may include building and premises costs, basic services and utilities, and any equipment maintenance or operational costs not already included under other cost headings. Institutions should use the non-laboratory estates rate if desk-based work (not requiring specialist computing facilities) is done by staff in laboratory departments. Work carried out by academic-related staff such as librarians or IT managers would normally be categorised as non-laboratory but this would depend on the type of project.

Other Directly Allocated – these costs may include, for example, access to institutional research facilities such as equipment and IT systems.

Indirect Costs

These include non-specific costs charged across all projects based on estimates that are not otherwise included as Directly Allocated costs. They include the costs of administration, such as personnel, finance, library and some departmental services.

NB: The budget section of the proposal should clarify the FTEs used to calculate the indirect and estates charges, and indicate which staff have been included.

Indexation

Costings for subsequent years should factor in inflationary increases for salaries and other costs. All costings should be inclusive of any VAT applicable.

Project Partners

Funding for project partners, e.g. staff time, should be clearly identified in the proposal under the relevant heading. Resources to be provided by project partners, whether cash or in-kind contributions, should also be clearly identified in the proposal.

Justification of Costs


All costs associated with the project must be fully justified.

Virement

Directly Incurred Costs can be vired within the overall Directly Incurred budget heading, however, Directly Allocated and Indirect Costs cannot (they do not vary from the estimates made on project application).

Appendix D - Bid Cover Sheet

JISC Grant Funding 20/11

Cover Sheet for Bids <i>(All sections must be completed)</i>			
Embedding impact analysis in research using BCE practitioners – Second Round			
Name of Lead Institution:			
Name of Proposed Project:			
Name(s) of Project Partners(s) (except commercial sector – see below)			
This project involves one or more commercial sector partners YES / NO (delete as appropriate)		Name(s) of any commercial partner company (ies)	
Full Contact Details for Primary Contact: Name: Position: Email: Tel: Address:			
Length of Project:			
Project Start Date:		Project End Date:	
Total Funding Requested from JISC:			
Funding requested from JISC broken down across Financial Years (Aug-July)			
Aug11 – July12:		Aug 12-July 13	
Total Institutional Contributions			
Type 'A' Bid	<input type="text"/>	Type 'B' Bid	<input type="text"/>
			Tick relevant box
Outline Project Description			
I have looked at the example FOI form at Appendix A and included an FOI form in this bid		YES / NO (delete as appropriate)	
I have read the Funding Call and associated Terms and Conditions of Grant at Appendix B		YES / NO (delete as appropriate)	
My bid does not exceed the 6 page limit (including this cover sheet)		Tick box to confirm	<input type="checkbox"/>