

October 27, 2010

To: Faculty and Staff, School of Forest Resources

From: Thomas M. Hinckley, Interim Director



Re: Three Competitive Opportunities

Beverly Anderson and I have worked together to find funding and to define how that funding might be used to support several competitive initiatives within the School. All of these competitions should be viewed as mechanisms to improve our research, teaching and engagement profile as we move ahead. Three categories have been identified and the specific goals, objectives, requirements, and deadlines for each of these categories will be dealt with individually. The three categories are:

1. Research
2. Equipment
3. Student support

Research Competition (\$140,000)

We are making \$140,000 available from McIntire-Stennis funds to a single, successful research team. The proposal should (1) meet one or more of the national needs or priorities outlined by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA),¹ (2) be highly innovative, (3) include the engagement of undergraduate and graduate students, (4) consider defining and then addressing one of several potential compelling future research problems or thrusts, and (5) consider an interdisciplinary focus. For this competition we are limiting the team to faculty and staff in SFR. Using the \$140,000 to leverage additional funds will be looked upon favorably.

¹ National priorities include: “(1) ecological restoration; (2) catastrophe management; (3) valuing and trading ecological services; (4) energy conservation, biomass energy and bio-based materials development; (5) forest fragmentation; (6) carbon sequestration and climate change; and (7) ways of fostering healthy forests and a globally competitive forest resources sector. Additionally, M/S funds should be allocated to the following high priority issues: (1) science of integration (ecosystem or landscape approaches including interdisciplinary multi-state projects); (2) forest ecosystem services; (3) human attitudes and behaviors; (4) conflict, uncertainty, and decision-making; (5) technological advancements (biotechnology, nanotechnology and geospatial technology), productivity, and forest applications; and (6) urban ecosystems.” [McIntire-Stennis Strategic Plan, 2007, 2010]

Some compelling future research thrusts that come to mind, only limited by my imagination and not yours, include (1) in northwest ecosystems, the use of braided indigenous and western knowledge to address stewardship and management issues, (2) climate change and water resources from forest watersheds, (3) bioenergy choices in diverse eco- and human systems, (4) urban agriculture, (5) diverse approaches to incentivizing working land retention, and (6) interfacing multiple disciplines with NEON.

One might think of this award as a Tools for Transformation grant that provides the foundation for a subsequent larger DoD, DoE, EPA, NASA, NSF or USDA research proposal. For example, NSF has multiple programs that might gain your interest, such as but not limited to, programs listed under Biological Infrastructure, or Emerging Frontiers, or the Integrative Organismal Systems subsections of the Biological Sciences Directorate, or the Office of Multidisciplinary Activities, or Discovery Research K-12, or the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship Program.

If a second year of support can be justified, frame your proposal in terms of two phases. We can assure full funding for the first phase (award date – as soon as the project is approved by the national office, to be fully spent no later than September 30, 2011), and our goal would be to provide between \$80,000 and \$140,000 for phase II. Its subsequent awarding would depend on continued McIntire-Stennis funding at our current level. Although we recognize the need for such information prior to critical dates for graduate student recruitment, we likely won't know our allocation for FY12 by that time. This is where leveraging funds would be useful. Proposal evaluation will initially be based upon the strength of the work proposed for Phase I.

Only one proposal will be funded, unless the short time frame poses a problem. In that case it's possible that 2 or 3 smaller projects (think at least 40K) will be funded over a multi-year period.

Proposals should be 6 or fewer pages (1.5 spacing, Times Roman 12, 6 inch wide text area). See attached "Essentials of a McIntire-Stennis Proposal" document for the outline (page 4); all items correspond to fields that are required for submission to the national office. Place references on a separate page; the budget and its justification (single space) should also occupy its own page. Each person involved should provide a **one-page CV. Due November 15, 5 pm.**

Equipment Proposals (minimum \$60,000)

We are making a minimum of \$60,000 available to fund the purchase of research and/or teaching equipment, including computers not available through the STF pathway. Proposals should address what is to be purchased, how this piece of equipment will enable increased productivity, efficiency, novelty, or overcoming a significant technical barrier in one's teaching or research. Both individual and group proposals may be submitted. Individual proposals cannot exceed \$10K whereas group proposals cannot exceed \$30K. Matching funds should be sought and will make the proposal more competitive.

Proposals should be 2 pages (1.5 spacing, Times Roman 12, 6 inch wide text area); references, if appropriate, on a third page and a completed SFR Purchase Order Request form (at <http://www.cfr.washington.edu/sfrTools/forms/index.shtml>) to serve as the budget page. **Due November 15 at 5 pm.**

Student Support Proposals (minimum \$60,000)

We are making a minimum of \$60,000 available to fund the support of undergraduate or graduate students in innovative projects that demonstrate considerable training and public engagement opportunities. One might consider this opportunity as a mechanism to explore undergraduate research or internships or graduate programs that combine hands-on learning and public engagement with traditional research and coursework. Other forms of innovative student support and engagement likely exist and will be supported if competitive.

Proposals should state both the pedagogical approach and values as well as the nature of public engagement. Both individual and group/program proposals are encouraged.

Proposals should be 3 pages (1.5 spacing, Times Roman 12, 6 inch wide text area); references, if appropriate, on a third page and a completed SFR Purchase Order Request form (at <http://www.cfr.washington.edu/sfrTools/forms/index.shtml>) to serve as the budget page. Covering the last five years, faculty submitting proposals should list undergraduate students advised and their capstone projects or theses completed and/or graduate students advised and their theses and dissertations. **Due November 15 at 5 pm.**

Please send all submissions to Beverly Anderson, bj@u.washington.edu, Box 352100. Separate review groups will be established to advise me on each competition. I will consider the School's identified values and strategic actions in making the final funding decisions.

ESSENTIALS OF A M-S PROJECT PROPOSAL

Title. A brief description of the subject of the research. The title, as clearly as possible, should reflect the objectives and scope of the project.

Justification. Present (1) the importance of the problem to agriculture, forestry and rural life of the State or region; (2) reasons for doing the work (such as the needs the project will fill) and doing it at this time; and (3) ways in which public welfare or scientific knowledge will be advanced. In addition, align the project to any of the emerging knowledge areas identified in the 2007 McIntire-Stennis Strategic Plan. Include how you are addressing stakeholders' input.

Previous Work and Present Outlook. A brief summary of the previous research (citing important publications); status of current research; and the additional knowledge needed which the project is expected to provide.

Objectives. A clear, complete, and logically arranged statement of the specific results to be achieved by the project.

Procedure. A statement of the essential working plans and methods to be used in attaining each of the stated objectives. Procedures should correspond to the objectives and follow the same order. Phases of the work to be undertaken currently should be designated. Location of the work and the facilities and equipment needed should be indicated. Wherever appropriate, the procedure should produce data suitable for statistical analysis. The procedure should reflect careful planning and should provide flexibility for changes if changes became necessary.

Duration and Timetable. An estimate of the maximum time likely to be required to complete the project and publish results. For the timetable, list major activities and/or objectives and their corresponding time of completion. For example: Objective 1 will be realized in 7 months time (Jan. 1 - July 31, 2011).

Personnel. The leader(s) and other technical workers assigned must include a brief resume' (no more than a page). Each subject-matter unit in the agricultural experiment station and any other units of the institution contributing essential services or facilities should be identified and the responsibilities of each should be indicated. If there is an advisory, coordinating, or directing committee for the project, the official title of the committee should be listed.