

## Michigan Sea Grant Full Proposal Guidelines For Integrated Assessments (2011)

Applicants who submit successful pre-proposals will be invited to submit full proposals for Integrated Assessments. All proposed projects MUST address the following four goals:

1. Clarify the history, causes and consequences of the focal issue;
2. Promote collaboration and build consensus;
3. Identify and evaluate (including economic assessments of) potential options for addressing the issue; and
4. Develop tools and information that can guide decision making and support the implementation of potential options.

Michigan Sea Grant is particularly interested in projects that integrate the expertise of social and natural scientists. Concerns about the economy and on-going budget constraints elevate the importance of economic analyses and cost/benefit assessments during discussions about potential policy options.

The collaborative process is an essential component of an Integrated Assessment (IA). Michigan Sea Grant will seek expert review of the proposal's overall approach to outreach and stakeholder engagement. The participation of stakeholders, including local and state decision makers, natural resource managers and other intended users of the assessment, can improve the research team's understanding of the issue, ensure that the project is useful and relevant, and promote application and implementation.

We encourage research teams to talk with Sea Grant outreach staff and relevant state and local government personnel. Please contact Chuck Pistis, Program Coordinator, for an initial discussion of your proposal and contact information for additional outreach personnel. Chuck's contact information: 616.458.6805; [pistis@msu.edu](mailto:pistis@msu.edu)

When developing topics for Integrated Assessment projects, Michigan Sea Grant identifies a single policy contact for each topic included in our RFP. The policy contact is potentially able to help the proposal development process in several ways:

- Serve as a contact for the research team that is invited to submit a full proposal, providing further explanation of the issue, the policy context and the key players as needed. Offer feedback about the full proposal to ensure that the proposal is strong and targets the needs of the state or area.
- Help the research team engage stakeholders, develop partnerships and identify additional resources that could support the project.
- Serve as an advisor or collaborator for the research team during their project, attending project meetings as relevant, reviewing documents and providing guidance as needed. Some policy contacts (or their staff) become involved in the analytical or outreach components of the project.

- Provide guidance to research team and Sea Grant about how to best package and share the project results.

Because the policy contact helped develop the topic descriptions in the RFP, conflict of interest guidelines prevent Sea Grant funds for this project from supporting project activities in the policy contact's government unit or organization. The policy contact for specific IA topics was provided in the invitation to full proposal.

## PROPOSAL PREPARATION

**Deadline:** Full proposals are due to Michigan Sea Grant **on Friday, April 22, 2011** via web form at: <http://www.miseagrant.umich.edu/research/rfp>

**Full Proposal Elements:** (12 pp total, excluding title page, non-technical summary, list of peer reviewers, references, current and pending support, bios, budgets and letters of support. One-inch margins, 12 point font.)

### 1. Title Page with:

- a) **Project Title:**
- b) **Principal Investigator:** (primary contact for the project)
  1. Title / Position:
  2. Institution:
  3. Telephone Number:
  4. Postal Mailing Address:
  5. E-mail Address:
- c) **Additional Team Members:** name, institution, telephone and e-mail.
- d) **Date:** of submittal
- e) **Non-Technical Summary:** Provide a 200 word summary suitable for a non-technical audience.

2. **Peer Reviewers:** Identify at least three potential reviewers for the proposal from institutions other than those represented by the project team, external to the state of Michigan. Include name, institution, phone number, email address, and mailing address.

### 3. Problem Statement:

Describe the issue your assessment will address, demonstrating an understanding of the context and underlying issues. Identify previous and on-going attempts to address this problem and the technical and non-technical barriers that hinder an effective response. Indicate the geographic focus of your assessment and the type of potential options that will be considered, e.g., management actions, legislation, regulations, education/outreach programs, or other initiatives. Include your draft IA question.

**4. Objectives:**

Describe the objectives of this integrated assessment. Do not describe how you will conduct the assessment but convey what you will attempt to accomplish with the project.

**5. Project Approach:**

Describe each stage of the proposed Integrated Assessment (IA). If your proposal relies on developing new methods, give the reviewers ample information about the starting point for those new methods and how they will evolve over the course of the project. Indicate how you will access or generate the needed data and information for the technical analysis. Be sure to identify specific methods and tools, e.g., models, special analytical approaches, to be used. Make it clear how the proposed methods are appropriate and how they will succeed. Useful guidance can be found on the Michigan Sea Grant website at

<http://www.miseagrant.umich.edu/research/integrated-assessment.html>

Typical Integrated Assessment stages include:

- a) Define and refine the policy-relevant IA question.
- b) Clarify the history, causes and consequences of the issue.
- c) Identify and evaluate potential options.
- d) Develop tools and information that can guide decision making

**6. Stakeholder Process:**

Provide a detailed overview of the stakeholder engagement process. Questions to consider include: what will be the role of stakeholders, who will be involved, how will you determine that you have all the right entities engaged, what specific methods or will you use to engage stakeholders, how will you maintain stakeholder involvement, how will the stakeholder process be integrated with technical aspects of the assessment?

Research teams are encouraged to discuss their outreach plans with Michigan Sea Grant's Extension Program Coordinator, Chuck Pistis. Contact: 616.458.6805, [pistis@msu.edu](mailto:pistis@msu.edu)

**7. Project Timeline:**

Provide a detailed timeline of the Integrated Assessment steps above, including the stakeholder process, by project quarter. Identify project task, team leader, and support for each element.

**8. Overview of IA Team:**

Describe how the Principal Investigator's previous accomplishments are relevant both to leading a multidisciplinary team and to this specific project. Indicate why the IA team is appropriate for this project and whether individuals, sub-units or the entire team have worked (together) on similar projects. Specify the roles and responsibilities of each team member, including who will be involved in day to day project activities.

**9. References** as cited in the proposal body above.

10. Two page **Bios of Principal and Co-Investigators**, including five most relevant publications.
11. List of **Current and Pending Support** of Principal Investigator and co-Investigators. Indicate if any projects are complementary to the Integrated Assessment.
12. **Supporting Documentation**: This should include *at least a letter of endorsement from a representative of the appropriate management or policy agency*. Additional letters indicating stakeholder willingness to participate and contribute are valuable. Projects that demonstrate significant support from collaborators or stakeholders, including contributions of staff time, funding or other resources for analytical or outreach work, will be more competitive.
13. **NOAA Budget Form**: Provide a detailed budget and budget justification using the 90-4 form available on the proposal submission web page. Submit the budget as a separate excel file; it also includes a page for your budget justification. Do not exceed the preliminary budget request identified in your pre-proposal.  
Link: [http://www.miseagrant.umich.edu/downloads/research/RFP/Form\\_90-4\\_Budget.xls](http://www.miseagrant.umich.edu/downloads/research/RFP/Form_90-4_Budget.xls)

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals must comply with all submission instructions and proposal guidelines in order to be considered for funding. Each compliant full proposal will be peer-reviewed by three experts in the field of the proposed project. Reviewers provide both written comments and a proposal rating by employing the criteria below. All written peer-reviews will be provided to an expert panel which will review the proposals and provide advice on funding priorities to the Michigan Sea Grant Management Team. All recommendations must be approved by NOAA National Sea Grant prior to the project being awarded.

Applicants should directly and explicitly address the following criteria as part of their proposal. Each submittal will be rated under a point system, with a total of 100 points possible. Applicants will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which they address the criteria; failure to provide applicable information in the application may affect the score assigned for a criterion.

### 1. Problem Statement – 5 points

To what extent does the proposal address the issue identified in the Request for Proposals and explain the context, underlying issues and potential options.

### 2. Project Approach – 30 points

**A. Technical Aspects:** To what extent does the proposed project adhere to the goals and approach of integrated assessment? (See page one above) How well does the proposal explain the data sources and analytical methods involved in the technical aspects of the assessment? (15 points)

**B. Collaborative Process:** To what extent does the list of potential decision makers, intended users and relevant stakeholders reflect a holistic understanding of the defined problem? To what extent does the proposal describe appropriate methods for collaboration related to each stage of the Integrated Assessment? (15 points)

**3. Roles, Responsibilities and Qualifications – 20 points**

To what extent do the PI and project team members possess the skills, experience and qualifications to execute the proposed activities? How suitable is the PI to leading a multidisciplinary assessment process and will he/she be involved in day to day project activities? To what extent have individuals or the team addressed similar issues and/or taken a similar approach to addressing natural resource problems? How well defined are roles within the team?

**4. Synergy – 15 points**

To what extent will the research team leverage complementary projects, existing data sources and the time and support of stakeholders or government units? Does the proposal demonstrate significant support from stakeholders or collaborators?

**5. Feasibility – 30 points**

**A. Practicality:** How feasible is the approach given the available data, expertise of the team, and proposed methods? How realistic is the timeline in terms of completing the proposed work and activities? Is the budget appropriate for the work proposed? (15 points)

**B. Potential Impact:** To what extent will the project address the technical and non-technical barriers to effective resolution of the issue? How likely is the project to influence policy, planning, natural resource management or other types of decision making? (15 points)