CAES Grants on the Edge

Research Proposal Resubmission Grants - Announcement for FY 2019

The CAES and the Office of Research announce the availability of funding to aid investigators who have had external research proposals narrowly miss falling within the funding range, which were rejected for lack of sufficient preliminary data or a specific identified weakness that can be addressed. Small grants will be provided to help an investigator strategically improve the proposal's viability upon resubmission. The **funding is available for July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 (FY19)**.



Typical Funding

We anticipate funding grants in the range of \$2,000 to \$15,000. The faculty member's home department(s) or institute or center is strongly encouraged to contribute 20% of the total final budget. Funding will normally be for just one fiscal year.

Application Format and Requirements

- 12 point font, 1 inch margins
- 1 page Cover/signature page containing proposal title, investigator names and affiliations, investigator e-mail and other contact information, budget total of the initial (rejected) proposal submission, funding agency and program to which the rejected proposal was submitted, signatures of the investigator(s) and department heads or directors.
- 1 page Cover page from the initial rejected submission.
- 1 page Project Summary or Abstract from the initial rejected submission.
- Multiple pages Complete copies of the panel summary and any reviews from the rejected proposal which indicate the need for additional preliminary data or highlight a weakness that could be addressed with some additional funds.
- 2 pages Description of the work proposed as part of the resubmission mini-grant and a clear articulation of how it will address the rejected proposal's shortcomings. Include a description of how the money will be spent, and indicate the anticipated date and agency of proposal resubmission.
- There should also be a sentence identifying potential expert external or internal reviewer or advisor. If the request is funded, the PI will be expected to send the revised proposal to an expert reviewer for comments prior to resubmission. Funds of up to \$500 may be included in the budget as honorarium for the proposed advisor/reviewer.
- 1 page Detailed budget page showing projected expenses and departmental or unit contribution. Proposal budgets which are split across two fiscal years must indicate the amount requested in each of the fiscal years.

Rolling Submission

The required pages should be assembled into a **single PDF** file and submitted to **agresch@uga.edu**. Proposals are accepted and reviewed **on a rolling basis**. Investigators may submit at any time, and the proposals will be reviewed as quickly as the staff involved can process them.

Review Process

The proposals will be reviewed by at least two CAES faculty members or others knowledgeable in the subject area of the proposal. The following review criteria will be used:

- Closeness of the proposal to the funding cutoff, based on panel summary (10 points)
- Strategy and approach to address the reviewers' specific concerns and to make the proposal more competitive (15 points)
- Itemized budget adequate to accomplish goals (5 points)

Reports

1-year report – One year after funding, a one-page progress report should be submitted, including results to date and proposal submission plans or sponsor results/reviews, if known. State the UGA proposal ID number for a proposal which has been resubmitted to the external funding agency.

2-year report – Two years after funding a one- or two-page final report should be submitted, including the fate of the resubmitted proposal and any additional results not shared at the one-year report date. State the UGA proposal ID number for a proposal which has been resubmitted to the external funding agency.

Publication Acknowledgment

Any publication resulting from funding or partial funding by this program should acknowledge that funding was received from the home department or unit, the CAES, and the Vice President for Research:

The research in this article was partially supported by a grant jointly funded by the University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Office of Research, and Department of XYZ.