



Urban Urgencies

Application guidance

This document provides extended application guidance for applying to the USF Urban Urgencies grant scheme. This guidance covers proposal content, assessment, and the application process.

This information must be consulted in conjunction with the call for applications, eligibility and terms, and other documentation available at the Urban Studies Foundation website.

After consulting the further guidance, enquiries regarding this grant and application process may be addressed to the Urban Studies Foundation via email: grants@urbanstudiesfoundation.org

Document last modified: October 2025

Table

1 Proposal content.....	3
1.1 Applicants and partners.....	3
1.2 Proposal.....	4
1.2.1 Proposal title and dates.....	4
1.2.2 Partner organisations.....	4
1.2.3 Proposal summary (maximum 1,000 words).....	6
1.2.4 Partnership (maximum 500 words).....	7
1.2.5 Project timeline and feasibility (maximum 500 words).....	8
1.2.6 Equality, diversity, and inclusion (maximum 500 words).....	9
1.2.7 Outputs and dissemination (maximum 500 words).....	11
1.2.8 Future directions and other comments (maximum 500 words).....	12
1.2.9 Bibliography (maximum 750 words).....	12
1.3 Budget.....	12
1.4 Additional documents.....	13
2 Assessment.....	14
3 Application process.....	16

1 Proposal content

The following sections detail precise guidance on the content of proposals.

1.1 Applicants and partners

This section should contain all contact information for all **co-applicants** (at least two, and maximum three), their host organisations, and referees. Please note that the first named applicant will be the nominated Principal Investigator for the grant, but that all co-applicants will be jointly responsible for delivery of the project. CVs must be provided for all co-applicants (two pages maximum per CV), collated as one .pdf file and uploaded accordingly (maximum 2mb file size).

Applicants may optionally name any relevant **team members** who will take an active minor role in delivering the proposed project. For example, research assistants, support staff, trainers/instructors, and other team members, etc. These individuals are not, ultimately, responsible for the delivery of the project, but can be named if this adds useful context in terms of delivering the proposed activities, outputs, and outcomes. CVs are not required for team members, but URLs to online profiles may be added to the team members field where relevant.

Overall, the USF expects to see a **team** of individual applicants, partner organisations, and other supportive actors who can clearly deliver a successful urban studies research project on urban urgencies according to the call for application. The team might include both senior and early career academics and must include academic and non-academic individuals. There is no precise favoured composition in either of these directions (the seniority of the PI does not equate to a greater chance of success). However, it must be clear that the overall team possesses the experience, skills, knowledge, and capacity to deliver the proposal within a reasonable margin of risk. As such, the relevance and role(s) of each partner must be clearly presented. Whilst at least one applicant should be an academic, researcher, or educator working within the field of urban studies, the Urban Urgencies call requires proposals that include non-academic actors in the research team.

Referees listed in the proposal are typically only contacted if a proposal is short-listed. When contacted, the USF will typically ask for a confidential letter of recommendation that details:

- How the referee knows the candidate.
- Their understanding of the candidate's track record in the field.
- Their assessment of whether the candidate will be able to execute the proposal to a high degree of success.

Please **do not** ask the referees to contact the USF independently, though they should be prepared for the USF to contact them during the period of assessment (i.e. up to twelve weeks following the deadline)

1.2 Proposal

This section should contain a detailed outline of the proposed research project and associated activities.

The precise use of the extended proposal text fields should be determined by each primary applicant according to their specific needs, but all content should be logically arranged under the relevant heading(s). A bibliography section is provided for references in the proposal text. All word counts must be adhered to as strict maximums, including references, and any proposals which exceeds the limits will not be considered.

1.2.1 Proposal title and dates

The proposal title should be the name under which the project will be administered and communicated to the relevant wider scholarly community. It should clearly and succinctly communicate the topic and scope of the research project (please avoid very long titles if possible).

The start and end dates should be eligible and reasonable to deliver the full scope of activities proposed.

1.2.2 Partner organisations

All projects must constitute a significant and high-quality collaboration between, at least, two relevant partner organisations, one of which is based beyond the academy (e.g. NGOs, charities, think tanks, community groups, crisis centres, businesses, third sector organisations, etc). One organisation must also act as the host organisation for the receipt and administration of the grant funding. Please see below, including the 'Partnership Statement' section, for guidance on what might be considered a high-quality collaboration. Partner organisations are expected to be research partners, active in the project design, data gathering and analysis, and dissemination of findings.

All partner organisations involved in the proposal should be listed in the table, along with individual contact details for each. The contact named for each organisation should also be the author of any relevant supporting letter provided (see below). Applicants should not be listed as contacts for the partner organisations and should not author supporting letters. It should be clear that at least one partner is a non-academic organisation involved in the project, and any third-party funders should also be listed in this table. Where applicable, the scope and terms of third-party funding should be included.

The primary host organisation (who is willing and capable to receive the total funds from the USF) should be clearly indicated in the table (via the check box). The organisation will be responsible for disbursing the funding to other organisations and individuals involved in the project, as needed and relevant, and will be the primary point of contact for the grant finances with the USF. Applicants should ensure they are confident that the primary host organisation is capable of doing so within the limitations of the activities (e.g. Does the grant require payments overseas, to organisations outside of academia, and/or outside of the mainstream banking system? If so, what is the

bureaucracy involved, and will third parties be able to receive these funds and in a timely fashion?). Detailed budget statements and justifications will be required at the end of the funding cycle.

The USF welcomes applications from host organisations and event programmes based in the Global South (and host organisations based in countries listed on the current [OECD list of ODA recipients](#) may charge up to 10% overheads on the total grant value—see ‘Eligibility and Terms’ document).

Partner organisations should be distinctly independent of one another, but the partnership may be well established or completely new. Regardless of the history of the partnership, in all cases applicants should consider very carefully whether their proposal represents a high-quality partnership or not. For example: are the partners sufficiently independent; does the partnership represent a collaboration which might not have been possible otherwise; and what is different and beneficial about them working together as part of this proposal? Further guidance on this can be found below in the ‘Partnership Statement’ section. Partners must be justified and detailed in terms of the value each will add to the research project. Outlines of specific roles and responsibilities of the individual partners are encouraged.

Supporting letters

At least two supporting letters must be provided with each application, which should at minimum represent (a) the willing and capable support of a primary host organisation (i.e. the organisation hosting and administering the grant funds), and (b) the willing and capable involvement and motivations of, at least, one non-academic partner organisation. If more organisations are nominated in the proposal, then applicants are encouraged to include further supporting letters from each organisation involved (this is encouraged, but optional depending on the context).

Supporting letters are crucial for the USF to assess the willingness, capability, and contributions of research partners.

The support letters should be written by individual contacts at each organisation who have the authority and responsibility to express such support (e.g. research officers, finance officers, heads of department, directors, and other such parties). Under no circumstances should any supporting letters be authored by any of the applicants, without clear justification. Each letter must not exceed two pages, and all letters should be uploaded together as single pdf file, maximum 2mb in size.

Each letter should clearly express the willing and capable contribution of the organisation in a manner **that engages directly with the proposal details**—it should be clear that the author is familiar with the proposal details and is writing in specific terms about the host organisation’s support (i.e. generic letters of support which might be used for any grant will not fulfil these requirements).

Supporting letters may cover details including, but not limited to:

- The primary host organisation’s willingness and ability to host and administer the funds (e.g. referencing specific experience and suitability to perform this role), including their familiarity with the grant award terms (e.g. budget conditions).

- Explanation of the connection between applicant(s), project activities, and partner organisation(s), including details of any past collaborations and the partner organisation(s)'s connection(s) to the proposal topics and themes.
- A partner organisation's specific material contribution(s) to the partnered project activities, for example: space, time, resources, networks, staff, in-kind support, monetary support, logistical or communication support, etc.
- A partner organisation's specific research or knowledge contribution(s) to the partnered project activities, for example: setting the research agenda, understanding of and/or access to study data or populations, disseminating findings, knowledge mobilisation, etc (see Partnership Statement guidance below).
- Other commitments, sentiment, and evidence for the support of the proposed activities, and relevant contextual information as to why the partner organisation(s) are committed to the project being a success (e.g. ongoing complementary projects, relevant staff/community experience and expertise present, relevant networks/audiences present, etc).

1.2.3 Proposal summary (maximum 1,000 words)

The proposal summary must clearly justify how the research falls within the scope of Urban Urgencies—broadly interpreted as addressing pressing urban challenges through innovative, rapid-response research. The theme is deliberately open, allowing applicants to define urgencies as they arise within specific contexts, and to connect *what* is considered urgent to *where* and *how* the research is conducted. Proposals should adopt a reflexive approach that generates new empirical insights while contributing to theory and practice, identifying methods and practices capable of reorienting current urban trajectories towards greater stability, justice, and sustainability.

It is necessary that the proposal's specific connection(s) to the field of urban studies should be extremely clear. Applicants must therefore demonstrate familiarity with the wider urban studies field, and engagement with its most relevant current debates. Reviewing the Urban Studies Journal's active [Call for Papers](#) and/or [Special Issues initiatives](#) may help identify relevant intersections and ensure proposals speak to live urban-studies discussions.

The proposal summary should therefore position the research project within contemporary scholarly literature, which links the proposal theme to current research debates of interest to urban studies. This section should also provide a brief and basic background context explaining how the proposal came about, what types of participants and audiences will be engaged, and how it responds to certain needs in both urban studies research and the wider urban studies community (later fields should be used to expand on specifics where necessary).

The statement should provide a clear and succinct scholarly explanation of the topics and themes that will be covered by the proposed research and provide clear justification for why this is a novel proposal of global significance to the field of urban studies. The statement should therefore begin by clearly justifying the contribution that the proposal will make to the broader fields and communities of urban studies research.

The research proposal must include a knowledge dissemination plan that delivers at least one academic article, and other knowledge products for public dissemination as determined by the issues of interest and research partners. Attention to innovative and relevant outputs that meet the needs of non-academic partners must be prioritised. Projects must plan to make available some of the results and outputs of the research within twelve months of commencing the research, including through blogs and other forms of (social) media (see Eligibility and Terms for specific requirements). If possible, the USF will welcome later collaboration in dissemination between successful awardees (e.g. through shared events, publications or other outreach activities). All such research outcomes should deliver key learnings towards issues of local, national and/or global concern.

Any bibliographic references used in this section (or subsequent sections) should be placed in the bibliography section at the end (see below), using a suitable and established referencing system.

1.2.4 Partnership (maximum 500 words)

Applications must clearly detail the origins, motivation, and nature of the partnered research programme. This statement should include a detailed explanation of the roles and contributions that each partner organisation will make towards the proposed research activities. It should be clear what type(s) of meaningful collaboration will occur, and how this will contribute to the ultimate goals, outputs, and future of the project.

The clarity and quality of the proposed partnership approach will be one criterion for the assessment of applications. Proposals should therefore represent collaborative and innovative partnered research and activities where all applicants and organisations work together to address one or more of the following:

- Contribute to knowledge about urban urgencies.
- Engage in capacity building e.g., building and strengthening organisations and/or networks.
- Increase the relevance and impact of urban urgencies research by:
 - collaborating with those most likely to use or benefit from the research;
 - mobilizing the talent, discoveries and expertise that creates fundamental research;
 - challenges ways of thinking or raising awareness;
 - building the capacity of researchers/intermediaries to strengthen research uptake;
 - impacting upon policy and practice.

Partners should also ideally be organisations that already work to support the development of research on urban urgencies. Key to successful partnerships will be a common understanding of a given problematic or research question, and compatible values that underpin the collaboration even if partners have different mandates. A framework for such partnerships means mutual commitment to the objectives of the collaboration, and a trust-based strategy that is compatible with each

other's mission, values and goals. Applicants should therefore be very clear about what is needed from the partners, such as, for example, funding, time, facilities, equipment, analytical services, knowledge transfer, policy expertise or data, etc. Equally, it should be very clear what the partner(s) gain from and contribute to the project.

Partnership approaches and types of collaboration should ideally be based on one of the following examples:

- **Disciplinary and inter/transdisciplinary research partnerships:** inter-institutional (academic and non-academic) research initiatives designed to make a significant contribution to advancing knowledge and understanding of urban urgencies.
- **Cross-sector co-creation of knowledge and understanding:** cross-sector partnerships that use ongoing collaboration and mutual learning to foster innovative research, training and the co-creation of new knowledge on urban urgencies.
- **Networks for research and/or related activities:** networks designed to advance the innovative co-creation of knowledge, as well as training and mobilization of research, on urban urgencies.
- **Partnered knowledge mobilization:** partnerships designed to synthesize, apply and mobilize new and existing research knowledge relating to urban urgencies in accessible ways. This could either build institutional capacity or increase the national and international impact and stature of the research.
- **Partnered research training initiatives:** partnerships designed to support the creation of innovative approaches that enrich research training experiences for students, PhD candidates, and postdoctoral researchers while enabling their transition to academic or non-academic workplace settings.
- **Partnered research centres:** partnerships to create or support a research cluster designed to advance research and/or related activities on urban urgencies. Partner organizations might pool financial resources and suggest an amount of funds required from the USF.

1.2.5 Project timeline and feasibility (maximum 500 words)

This section should clearly and succinctly explain the proposed timeline and format of the research project, including its location, duration, and intended participants and audience. It should also detail the roles and responsibilities of any potential partners in the delivery of the project (e.g. co-funders, host institutions, etc.), and carefully assess the feasibility of the project with regards to any potential risks and challenges.

Overall, the awarding committee expects this section of the application to demonstrate the capacity of the applicant, and research partner organisation(s) and non-academic partners to run the project successfully.

1.2.6 Equality, diversity, and inclusion (maximum 500 words)

The USF's commitment to values of equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) is detailed in the USF Code of Practice. This commitment reinforces the USF's existing pursuit of equal opportunities for grant applicants, while upholding the wider principle that a diversity of perspectives and lived experiences is also fundamental to achieving research and training excellence.

Accordingly, the USF requires that applicants should clearly state how their proposals actively engage and incorporate EDI in the context of the research and collaboration activities.

For applicants seeking a clearer and expanded discussion on EDI, including definitions relevant to its implementation within a research environment, it is recommended to read further sources (e.g. one of which can be found [here](#)). The USF identifies five important areas of EDI: research conceptualisation, study team, study population, data, and knowledge translation. It is suggested that applicants assess their proposal according to these five areas when completing their statement on EDI for this application.

Applicants are, nevertheless, also free to explain their commitment to EDI in other terms, which will be assessed accordingly by the USF (in terms of the arguments and evidence presented within the application).

It is recommended that applicants consider their proposals in EDI terms according to the following suggested bullet points:

- Factors of **research conceptualisation** might include:
 - How does the background and summary proposal reflect a diversity in research literature? For example: Have the applicants performed a historical review of the relevant field(s) through an EDI lens, and have they assessed any relevant research-related harm to marginalised communities within the field(s)? Amongst others, this might include scientific communities (e.g. as marginalised knowledge producers) and/or non-academic communities (e.g. as socially marginalised communities). In some cases, this might also link to consideration of epistemological and methodological diversity. Here, and below, the term 'marginalised communities' should also be understood as geographically specific—e.g. a proposal from applicants based in one region might interpret this very differently to applicants in another region.
 - How have the key research topics and questions underlying the proposal involved the relevant marginalised communities to inform the approach to the proposed activities? For example: how does the research programme account for the views, positions, interests, and voices of any relevant marginalised communities; and how do the activities avoid perpetuating such marginalisation?
- Factors of the **study team** might include:
 - How diverse and/or representative are the co-applicants and/or research team members?

- How was the team recruited and how was EDI considered when bringing them together?
- If the proposal includes plans to recruit research assistants and/or other paid third parties, what principles of EDI will be involved in the hiring process?
- How will other key selection processes engage with EDI as part of the planned activities?
- Does the wider proposal team include community partners relevant to the research topics and themes?
- How else do the proposals represent an active engagement with EDI in terms of the study team collaborations and/or any relevant marginalised communities?
- Factors of the **study population** and/or **study data** might include:
 - How do the research populations, methods, and data employed in the proposed research activities reflect a commitment to values of EDI?
 - How will EDI considerations be reinforced through the selection process that may be part of the participant invitation process?
- Factors of **knowledge translation** might include:
 - How will the outputs serve the relevant audiences and communities of concern? This should include attention to the accessibility and dissemination of the planned outputs.
 - How might the proposals lead to 'knowledge mobilisation' and/or advocacy on behalf of non-academic communities? How will any knowledge mobilisation strategies factor EDI?
- **Other** factors of EDI (which could also fall under the criteria above) might include:
 - How does the proposal directly engage with disadvantaged and/or underserved audiences, or have strategies for supporting their participation?
 - What role(s) do the partner organisations play in this consideration, and how might they add value to the EDI commitments?

All proposals should provide a relevant and convincing statement that clearly explains where EDI values have been considered, engaged, and implemented as part of the planned research activities. The examples above are not exhaustive, and applicants are also welcome and encouraged to explain their commitments in other terms and/or do not have to cover all of the examples/prompts above. However, the statement will be critically assessed as part of the shortlisting process and applicants should ensure that all statements are clearly accountable and evidenced within the wider context of the application.

1.2.7 Outputs and dissemination (maximum 500 words)

This section should build upon the previous summary to explain in detail what the proposal aims to achieve in terms of research outputs, dissemination of findings, knowledge mobilisation, and overall impact. This should include a clear statement of how the proposed research ultimately responds to the specific needs identified in the EDI section.

Specific attention should be given to the proposed outputs, particularly academic publication plans (which may include journal articles, special issues, books, or any other relevant peer-reviewed publication format). Applicants are expected to outline at least one peer-reviewed journal article and to identify plans for publication in leading urban studies journals—whether in English or other languages—as part of their dissemination strategy. When selecting suitable journals, applicants are encouraged to engage with current calls for papers and other existing publication initiatives. Applicants wishing to explore the [Urban Studies Journal](#) as a potential venue are encouraged to review its [Call for Papers](#) and/or [Special Issues initiatives](#) for thematic synergies when formulating their publication strategies. Proposals must also present a credible, timely, and well-considered post-event publication and dissemination plan, which will be revisited in the final report.

A summary of outputs should include specific reference to all of the following:

- Concrete and achievable publication and dissemination plans that arise directly from the ongoing activities. This should include at least one academic and one non-academic output that will be submitted within twelve months of commencing the research, and a credible proposal for additional outputs by the completion of the initial project.
- Academic article(s) must be positioned for appropriate journals in the field of urban studies. Where possible and appropriate, projects are encouraged to consider the [Urban Studies Journal](#) as a venue for publication, and applicants may benefit from reviewing the journal's [Call for Papers](#) and/or [Special Issues initiatives](#).
- The generation of research or teaching/training resources that can provide long-term benefit to communities beyond the immediate participants, including concrete dissemination plans (if appropriate).
- An explanation of a credible and ongoing communication strategy for the project activities and outputs that begins at the start of the project (e.g. blog posts, web resources, content for the USF website, social media, etc).
- Other non-academic outputs for communicating and disseminating results that are of relevance for project partners and broader audiences, for example: podcasts, zines, exhibitions, op-eds, policy briefs, community tool-kits, creative works, etc.

It is important that any specified outputs listed in this section should be feasible and well-considered. For example, publication plans should be realistic and clearly grounded in the research programming and participation, and proposals for resource-building and dissemination must include a clear and achievable plan of doing so. Modest support costs for such plans may be included in the budget if relevant and justified (see budget terms).

1.2.8 Future directions and other comments (maximum 500 words)

Applicants are free to provide further comments relevant to their proposal, including an explanation of how the project might sustain and continue beyond the proposed activities.

1.2.9 Bibliography (maximum 750 words)

Please list any references from the sections above here, in standard alphabetical bibliography format.

1.3 Budget

The budget section should be used to provide a detailed, eligible, and clearly justified budget for the proposed research activities that lists all the relevant individual costs for delivering the proposal in GBP (British pounds sterling).

Each tabulated cost item in the application must reflect an aggregated category or activity, where costs of a similar type or purpose are grouped together to present a clear and organised breakdown of the project costs by category (e.g. Research Assistance, Travel – Conference A, Translation, Workshop A Delivery). Costs must not be broken down to the level of individual participants or minor items unless they are unique and cannot reasonably be grouped (e.g. do not list separate entries per individual for the same type or category of activity).

All applications are likely to be unique in terms of their activities and parameters, so the USF does not provide a template budget—it is expected that strong proposals will be capable of demonstrating a clear, well-researched, appropriate, and good value budget without further instruction.

Overall, the budget section (both individual items and the statement) should clearly demonstrate why the proposed research is good value for money (in terms of the measured use of funds available in order to achieve maximum impact).

The budget statement (**maximum 400 words**) must clearly explain the rationale for the overall budget requested and detail any third-party funding the proposal may be reliant upon, and address the following questions explicitly:

- How did you determine the costs listed in your budget table?
- Why are these costs essential to achieving your proposed outcomes?
- How does your budget demonstrate value for money?
- What (if any) co-funding or third-party support is included?
- Are there any risks or uncertainties in the budget, and how have they been considered?

Please note that the USF:

- Encourages an international exchange of ideas and will support a limited amount of overseas travel, but all overseas travel needs to be very well justified and should demonstrably add value (i.e. it should be clear why any such activities require attendance in-person, and how they add value to the proposed activities). Proposals involving excessive and/or poorly justified international travel will not be considered.
- Encourages co-funding and/or third-party sponsorship, but this support should be confirmed in principle via additional supporting letters/evidence.
- Welcomes realistic budgets that reflect the genuine needs of each proposal. Applicants may request less than the maximum award amount where appropriate, for example if the project can achieve its intended outcomes with a smaller budget or through complementary co-funding or third-party support.
- Will consider costs according to their relative geographic and/or economic context, and acknowledges that costs can vary significantly between locations (i.e. proposal budgets from different regions and locales are not considered equivalent).

The budget evidence upload section should be used to attach evidence of all cost categories over GBP 1,000, to provide any additional contextual information (e.g. exchange rates, or category breakdowns). One representative quotation, policy document, or institutional rate card per category is sufficient. Evidence and information should be collated as a single pdf, maximum 5mb in size.

Applicants may also, if they wish, include a more detailed breakdown of costs in their budget evidence upload (e.g. a more detailed table with individual per-item costs). This supplemental information is optional and will not replace the requirement to use aggregated categories in the main table.

1.4 Additional documents

Applicants may upload any supplemental documents in the optional file upload field, provided that these documents do not add a substantial volume of text. Example uses for the supplemental documents file might include timetables for projects, images, or other third party materials. The USF reserves the right to discard additional files that contain a substantive amount of additional text, and proposals should stand alone without making use of this upload. Uploads must be single .pdf files, maximum two pages, and no larger than 2mb.

2 Assessment

All assessments are conducted in accordance with the [USF Code of Practice](#) (available on the USF website under About > Aims and Practice). The Code outlines the USF's commitment to transparency, equity, integrity, and confidentiality in all review processes.

For the Urban Urgencies scheme, applications will be assessed under two equally weighted criteria: proposal and planning. Reviewers are asked to provide a balanced and reasoned judgement that reflects both the scholarly and practical strength of each application. The USF seeks to fund projects that combine intellectual ambition, social purpose, and practical credibility in advancing urban research and scholarship.

Proposal

Assesses the intellectual strength, originality, and contribution of the research. Reviewers will consider factors including (but not limited to):

- The significance and urgency of the topic and its contribution to scholarship and current debates in **urban studies**.
- The clarity, rigour, and coherence of the research aims, questions, and design.
- The relevance and innovation of the proposed approach, theory, or methodology.
- The strength and clarity of partnership, and how this partnership enhances the research and its potential impact.
- The quality and reach of proposed outputs and dissemination, including appropriate targeting of audiences and venues.
- The meaningful integration of equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) principles throughout the proposal.
- The intellectual ambition and social value of the project, balanced with realism about what can be achieved.

Planning

Assesses feasibility, organisation, and preparedness for delivery. Reviewers will consider factors including (but not limited to):

- The credibility and coherence of the plan, including timeline, management, and risk awareness.
- Evidence of genuine collaboration and support from partner organisations, as demonstrated in letters and roles.

- The realism and proportionality of the budget and its justification relative to scope and activities.
- The institutional and logistical support available to ensure smooth financial and administrative delivery.
- The project's ability to remain productive and deliver meaningful outputs even if some circumstances change.

3 Application process

Applications should be made via the USF website, using the web form provided, before the deadline for applications. Applicants are encouraged to first complete their application offline using a word file template (along with gathering their supporting documents as .pdf files), before pasting their responses into the form when they are ready to submit the application (with care and attention to remove any formatting issues).

Candidates should ensure they have read this document in full to understand the guidelines for different sections of the application form, and therefore how the assessment criteria can be best fulfilled.

Supporting documents should be uploaded as single collated .pdf files, each of a maximum 2mb in size. Each application should include:

- Applicant CVs (maximum two pages each, collated together as a single pdf file, maximum 2mb in size).
- Project partner support letters (maximum two pages each, collated together as a single pdf file, maximum 2mb in size).
- Budget evidence documentation for all items above GBP 1000 and exchange rates used (collated together as a single pdf file, maximum 5mb in size).
- Where relevant, applications may also include any additional supporting documents (collated together as a single pdf file, maximum 2mb in size).

Please note:

- Do not use BLOCK CAPITALS in any application field, including applicant names or proposal titles.
- Unless indicated otherwise or 'optional', the USF expects every field in the application form to be fully completed and all supporting documents to be provided.
- No extension to the deadline can be granted under any circumstances.
- Applications that have exceeded the maximum word count, or maximum page limit for supplementary documents, will automatically be considered ineligible and discarded.
- Applications, reporting, grant administration and general communication with the USF must be completed in the English language. However, research activities and outputs may be conducted and written in any language.

Following submission, all applicants will be requested to voluntarily complete an anonymous Equality & Diversity Monitoring Form after the application deadline. This form and any information volunteered with it is not used in the assessment process and will be separated from individual

applications; it is only used for monitoring who applies to USF awards on aggregate, so that the USF may regularly assess and improve how it advertises and administers its grant funding.

Decisions will normally be made within twelve weeks of the closing deadline for this award, and all applicants will be contacted regarding their application outcome. The USF regrets that it cannot offer any feedback on applications, and all decisions are final.