



# ERCL-GREAT

## Proposal Submission Guidelines

### Submission Guidelines in Nutshell

The following sections outline the structure of the proposal and the key components that must be submitted as part of a complete application to the ERCL-GREAT call.

- (a) **Part A** covers administrative and summary information about the project, including the detailed budget table, a description of resources, and the time commitment of the Principal Investigator
- (b) **Part B** contains the **Research Proposal**, including objectives, methodology, expected impact, and project structure
- (c) **Part C** provides information about the **Applicant**, including a CV, track record, and relevant background

Applicants must merge all three parts into a single PDF file and upload it using the [ERCL online grant submission form](#). Ensure that all sections are completed accurately and in the required structure.

While no specific formatting style is prescribed, applicants must strictly follow the section structure and character limits as outlined in the [Proposal Submission Guidelines](#).

A checklist of required elements is available on the [ERCL website](#) to assist applicants in verifying the completeness of their submission.



## Part A

Part A covers administrative and summary information about the project.

### 1. General Information

This section contains information about the research proposal, including the project acronym, title, duration, keywords and research area.

Proposal title:	A concise and descriptive title of the research project (max. 150 characters including spaces)
Acronym:	A short, memorable acronym for the project
Duration:	The proposed duration of the project, usually in months
Scientific area:	Economics and Business Studies / Psychological and Learning Sciences
Keywords:	5-7

### 2. Project Abstract (max. 1,100 characters including spaces)

The abstract should provide a clear understanding of the objectives of the research proposal and how they will be achieved. The abstract will be used as a short description of your research proposal in the evaluation process.

### 3. Budget

Applicants must submit a preliminary project budget as part of their application. The budget must cover the entire proposed project duration and provide an estimated breakdown of the following categories:

- (a) **Direct personnel costs** (e.g. Principal Investigator, researchers, postdoctoral researchers, students, technical or support staff)
- (b) **Purchase costs** (e.g. travel and subsistence, equipment, consumables, dissemination and publication, including Open Access)
- (c) **Internally invoiced goods and services** (eligible internal direct costs only; indirect costs are not covered)

Applicants must also provide a brief justification for the requested resources in the corresponding **Resources** section.



The budget submitted with the proposal is considered **preliminary** and **non-binding**. However, it is a required part of the application and will be **assessed by the expert evaluation panel** as part of the overall scientific review. The panel will consider whether the proposed costs are realistic, well justified, and proportionate to the project's objectives and scope. A clear and coherent budget will be viewed as evidence of the applicant's ability to plan and manage the project effectively.

The GREAT scheme may fund **up to 100% of the total eligible direct costs**. The final amount awarded may be lower and will be determined by the panel based on the quality of the proposal and the appropriateness of the requested resources.

For selected projects, a **final version of the project budget** will be developed following the panel's recommendation and prior to the conclusion of the **Grant Agreement**. This final budget will form an integral part of the contractual documentation.

#### 4. Resources

In this section, applicants are expected to justify the requested funding in relation to the project's scientific objectives (max 8,000 characters including spaces). The cost estimation should be as accurate and realistic as possible and must reflect the actual needs of the proposed research.

This justification is based on the **preliminary budget submitted as part of the application**. Applicants should clearly describe each cost category considered necessary for the implementation of the project and explain how the requested resources are proportionate to the scope and methodology of the proposed work.

The evaluation panel will assess the justification of requested resources as part of the scientific review. A well-reasoned resource plan will be seen as evidence of the applicant's ability to manage the project effectively. **Budgets that are considered excessive, inconsistent, or insufficiently justified may lead to a recommendation for partial funding.**

#### 5. Time Commitment

The GREAT holder will have a full-time position at ERCL and the place of work will primarily be London.



## Part B

Part B includes detailed information about the research proposal. In fairness to all applicants, the page limits of max. 27,000 characters including spaces will be strictly applied. References are not counted towards these page limits. Failure to comply with these conditions is a ground for elimination of the project proposal from the competition.

### **1. Extended Synopsis of the Research Proposal** (max. 5,400 characters including spaces; references should be included – they do not count towards the page limit)

Extended Synopsis should be a concise presentation of the research project containing all essential information, with particular attention to (a) the ground-breaking nature of the research project and (b) the feasibility of the outlined scientific approach. References should be included.

### **2. Research Project** (max. 21,600 characters including spaces; references should be included – they do not count towards the page limit)

This section has a prescribed structure and the Applicant has to:

- (a) specify the proposal objectives in the context of the state of the art in the research field
- (b) describe their contribution to research in the given or a thematically related field
- (c) clearly state a research gap
- (d) express the nature and relevance of the topic of the grant project - it should be clear how and why the proposed work is important for the field, and what impact it might have when completed
- (e) formulate objectives, the method of solution, including conceptual and methodological approaches
- (f) provide a comprehensive work plan including timelines, milestones and deliverables (the stages of solution and the fulfilment of individual objectives must be linked to the expected results)
- (g) specify any particularly challenging or unconventional aspects of the proposal, including multi- or inter-disciplinary aspects
- (h) list references to the literature used including the DOI (Digital Object Identifier) where possible



## Part C

Part C provides information about the Applicant in detail.

### 1. Curriculum Vitae and Track Record (max. 5,400 characters including spaces)

The applicant is **expected** to include their

- (a) personal details
- (b) education
- (c) key qualifications
- (d) current position
- (e) relevant previous positions
- (f) a list of up to ten research outputs that showcase the applicant's contributions to advancing knowledge in their field, with a focus on recent achievements
- (g) list of selected examples of significant peer recognition (e.g., awards)

The applicant may also include a short, factual explanation of the significance of the selected outputs, the applicant's role in producing each of them, and how they demonstrate the applicant's capacity to successfully carry out their proposed project may be included, as well as a short explanation of the importance of the listed examples of significant peer recognition. The applicant may also include relevant additional information on career breaks, diverse career paths, and life events, as well as any particularly noteworthy contributions to the research community they have made other than research achievements and peer recognition and a short explanation of these contributions. Applicants are expected to report their publications and any other research outputs correctly, including all authors in the same order as published. Joint authorships (e.g. co-first author, multiple corresponding author) must also be properly indicated.

### Evaluation Process and Criteria

All proposals submitted to the ERCL-GREAT scheme will be evaluated by an independent international expert panel composed of established researchers with recognised subject-specific expertise. The panel will be selected to ensure a fair, balanced, and high-quality review process.

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with internationally recognised peer-review standards. Proposals will be assessed based on their



scientific merit and the excellence of the applicant. Only proposals that meet the threshold of scientific excellence will be considered for funding.

The panel will assess each proposal against the following criteria:

### **1. Scientific Excellence**

- (a) originality, ambition, and potential to advance the state of the art
- (b) clarity of objectives and research questions
- (c) soundness and appropriateness of the proposed methodology
- (d) internal coherence and overall quality of the research design

### **2. Applicant Profile**

- (a) scientific achievements appropriate to career stage
- (b) independence, creativity, and capacity to lead the proposed research
- (c) contribution to the field and engagement with the international research community

### **3. Implementation**

- (a) feasibility and clarity of the research plan, including allocation of time and resources
- (b) suitability of the proposed research environment, including integration into ERCL's infrastructure

The expert panel will prepare a qualitative consensus report for each proposal. Proposals deemed fundable will be ranked, and grants will be awarded to the most competitive submissions. If no fundable proposal is identified in one of the research areas, the grant may be reallocated to a high-quality proposal from the other area.

**The awarded grant amount will be determined by the panel based on the overall quality of the proposal, the profile of the applicant, and the appropriateness of the proposed budget. The maximum available funding is £180,000 per year; however, the final awarded amount may be lower.**