

## Haywood Foundation Criteria for Support of PhD and other Research Proposals

The committee will review new applications against the following criteria. Thus, applications addressing many/most of these criteria are more likely to be reviewed favourably.

- Decisions are based on adherence to these criteria and available funding.
- Decisions are reached by quorate committee voting.
- Committee members with direct conflicts of interest (e.g. named on proposals) are not included in votes.
- Meeting these criteria does not guarantee funding and the decision of the committee is final.

### **1. Does the research question address an important problem, and thus potential benefit to, our local community?**

Evidence of this being a local research priority might be demonstrated by local clinician and public involvement, or public health statistics relative to West Midlands/North Staffordshire.

### **2. Does the research address a novel area?**

Evidence that the proposal is novel is demonstrated by a clear description of how this builds on existing literature and addresses an evidence gap.

### **3. Does the proposal demonstrate a collaborative approach to working with the local community?**

The Haywood Foundation is a local charity for local people. This could be demonstrated by recruiting from our local population, involving local people as lay advisors (PPIE), working with local clinicians.

### **4. Does the proposal represent value for money and is it costed realistically?**

This includes whether PPIE is costed appropriately and whether open access fees have been considered. We will not pay PhD fees.

### **5. Does the proposal demonstrate consideration of how impact and dissemination can be maximised?**

This might be evidenced by working with local NHS, experts in knowledge mobilisation and impact, and is expected to go beyond the customary publishing of research papers and presenting at conferences.

### **6. Does the proposal adequately involve and engage with patients and the public?**

This includes seeking public and patient involvement in the proposal itself and an adequate plan for PPIE throughout the proposal.

### **7. Does the proposal consider implications for under-served communities in any of the research question, design, involvement and engagement, or dissemination and impact?**

While we do not expect every application to consider and address implications on all of these levels, there should be some acknowledgement of the implications of the research for underserved communities.

### **8. Is this proposal likely to support recruitment and/or retention of excellent clinicians, researchers or other professionals to work in our local area?**

This may not be appropriate for PhD proposals that do not have a named student, although we acknowledge that supervising a PhD is helpful for retention of early and mid-career researchers who may have a commitment to working in and improving the health of our local population. This might be evidenced by personal statements from research applicants/ supervisors.