The University of Maine System (UMS) is pleased to announced the ***2016 Research Reinvestment Fund (RRF) Planning Grants Program***. The purpose of this program is to encourage the formation of new collaborative research teams spanning UMS campuses in an effort to prepare these teams to submit competitive applications to the recently announced ***UMS RRF Seed Grant*** competitions. Faculty creative input and participation is highly valued in the planning grant process, particularly those of a "high-risk or boundary-stretching" nature.

The RRF Planning Grant Program is designed to provide support for each of the following planning activities:

1. Researchers to meet and discuss common research, development and commercialization interests;
2. Plan a research and development initiative; and
3. Initiate efforts to seek extramural and intramural funding.

Groups of faculty at the intersections of disciplines are encouraged to apply for planning grant support in their pursuit of UMS RRF Seed grant funding. The Research Reinvestment Funds Advisory Board has set aside $50,000 available for the RRF Planning Grants Program. Future RRF grant competitions will be held on an annual basis through FY 19. Long-term goals of the RRF program are to increase the workforce and economic development of Maine and to stimulate the intellectual scientific "life" of UMS faculty, students, and staff.

A competitive process will be employed to identify the highest quality and most viable research and development groups. Research groups are encouraged to collaborate across UMS campuses, and/or to include external partners in order to form competitive teams. Eligible projects will propose research and economic development activities that directly benefit Maine industries and enhance Maine’s economic well-being.

Interested UMS faculty members should submit the grant application package (including a 2-page concept paper) using the guidelines that follow this overview. Proposed projects will be funded for up to 6 months. Funds must be expended in the proposed 6 month project period. No-cost extensions will be considered. Project budgets of up to **$5,000** may be requested and should be well justified. Allowable expenses include travel, food, lodging, and other reasonable meeting and planning costs.

## Questions about the planning grants can be directed to Jason Charland at: [jason.charland@maine.edu](mailto:jason.charland@maine.edu) or 581-2461. Proposals are accepted on a rolling basis and can be submitted at any time.

**Proposals will be reviewed and funds allocated as received until the funds for this program are exhausted. Please expect at least two weeks for funding decisions and plan the start dates of your events with this review timeframe in mind.**

# COVER PAGE

Please fill in the blanks with information about the Principal Investigator (PI) and any Co- Investigators below. The PI is responsible for obtaining appropriate signatures.

Principal Investigator Department/Center Campus

Co-Investigator Department/Center Campus

Co-Investigator Department/Center Campus

Campus Address & Phone of **Principal Investigator**: $

Amount of Request

TITLE OF PROPOSAL:

MOST RELEVANT PART OF MAINE’S ECONOMY ALIGNED WITH THIS PROJECT

Endorsement:

It is understood that this grant will be administered in accordance with the guidelines that accompany this request.

The Department(s)/College(s)/Campus(es) indicated above will make available the additional necessary supplies, facilities, and/or equipment not covered in the proposal to support the research described.

Signature of Principal Investigator Date

Signature of Department Chairperson(s) Date

Signature of Dean(s)/Provost Date

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSALS:

2016 RRF Planning Grant Program applications will be reviewed and approved/declined by the RRF Advisory Board on a rolling basis until the funds for this program are exhausted.

## THE FOLLOWING FORMAT MUST BE USED FOR PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM. ONLY PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE FORMAT REQUIRED WILL BE ACCEPTED FOR CONSIDERATION.

Aspects of the body of the proposal (concept paper) are detailed in items 1-5 below. The concept paper is limited to 2 page, single-spaced, using Times New Roman 12pt font and 1” margins.

1. Abstract: Prepare this section to clearly summarize for non-specialized readers the significance and objectives of the proposed research. Indicate the potential impact on the economic and workforce development for the state. Abstracts must be no longer than 100 words.
2. Specific Goals or Objectives of the Proposed Research, Scholarship or Technology Development: The meeting should bring together a number of researchers from across the UMS to discuss common research interests that will impact Maine’s economy. The research focus, goals and metrics to measure success should be clearly stated and include clear statements on the proposed research and development area and the link to Maine’s economy. Note that metrics of success will be required for these objectives in Section 4 below. Indicate the specific market segment that will benefit from the research and development activities, including potential workforce development, products commercialized and/or companies formed.
3. Background Information: Provide information regarding the research and scholarly collaborations that may result from the proposed planning effort and the relevance of the proposed project to Maine’s economy.
4. Metrics of Success: Describe clearly the procedures of information/data collection, analysis, and interpretation, associated with measuring the success of developing the proposed collaborations. Anticipated outcomes of the project (e.g., specific funding opportunities to target, new collaborations with a Maine business, publications) should be indicated. A final report to the RRF Advisory Board documenting the outcomes of supported RRF Planning grant activities for is required. This report should detail outcomes during the funded period as well as 6-months post-funding.
5. Economic/Commercial Impact of the Research, Scholarship, or Technology Development Being Proposed: The applicants are requested to summarize how this RRF Planning Grant will develop better leverage and collaboration across the UMS and/or external partners to increase the likelihood of successful economic/commercial impact.

*\*\*\*Items 6-8 are required, but do not count toward the 2 page limit for concept papers\*\*\**

1. Bibliography. Include only those references cited in the text.
2. Biographical Sketch(es) of Principal Investigator and Co-Investigator(s):

Attach a 2-page biographical sketch for the PI and each Co-Investigator that includes:

* + Professional positions, including title, organization, and time periods (current listed first)
  + Educational background (Begin with baccalaureate/associates degrees first)
  + List of grant proposals submitted and awards received from external sources during the past five years (indicate status, amount, dates, funding agency, project title, collaborations, & role)
  + List of publications, presentations, showings, performances, etc., from the last five years.

1. Budget

Please use the table provided below to detail your requested planning grant budget. Add specific names and time commitments for administrative staff, if applicable. Applicants may choose to use the University of Maine ORSP budget template for this

section: <http://www.orsp.umesp.maine.edu/orspdocs/Info/ORSPBudget.xls>

Allowable expenses include student support, lodging, participant support, travel, food, and meeting expenses. No faculty salary support is allowed for this program.

Administrative staff wages must include fringe benefits at 52.4%.

*Budget Table*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Personnel** | **Detail** | **Total** |
| Faculty | N/A | N/A |
| Administrative Staff | Limited to 10% |  |
| Fringe |  |  |
| Student Support |  |  |
| Lodging |  |  |
| Food |  |  |
| Venue |  |  |
| Materials/Supplies |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |

1. Budget Justification:

(Please limit to 1 page, single spaced, Times New Roman 12pt font, 1” margins). In this section please discuss in narrative form the details of your budget, including all of the following related to the budget areas above:

1. *Personnel Support:* How much of the personnel support requested is to be spent on:
   1. student assistance; (2) administrative staff salary(ies);
      * How does your personnel support relate to the work to be done? For faculty salaries, please distinguish whether summer salary or release time will be requested.
2. *Materials/Supplies:* NOTE: Only those supplies that are not generally available in your department, and therefore are unique to this project, should be requested.
3. Lodging/Venue/Food: Quotes for these items should be included
4. Evaluation Criteria: Final funding decisions will be made by the Research Reinvestment Fund Advisory Board using the evaluation rubric on page 5.

**GRANT SUBMISSION CHECKLIST**

1. COVER PAGE – completed information and appropriate signatures (see page 2)
2. CONCEPT PAPER – 2 page, single-spaced, Times New Roman 12pt font ,1” margins (see page 4)
3. BIBLIOGRAPHY – include only those references cited in the text (see page 4)
4. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH(ES) – as per template provided (see page 4)
5. BUDGET – provide a budget table/sheet and a 1-page justification for proposed costs (see page 4)
6. E-MAIL ALL GRANT MATERIALS AS A SINGLE PDF to: [jason.charland@maine.edu](mailto:jason.charland@maine.edu)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATION** | **CRITERIA** |  |  |  |  |
| **Intellectual merit 35 POINTS** | **Poor**  **( 0 POINTS)** | **Good**  **( 15 POINT)** | **Very Good**  **( 25 POINTS)** | **Excellent**  **( 35 POINTS)** | **Score** |
| **Evaluation Criteria for Intellectual merit** | Proposal has no compelling evidence that the intellectual merit of the research and development area proposed for the new collaboration is sufficient to eventually lead to an extramurally funded and successful project. | Proposal has some evidence that the intellectual merit of the research and development area proposed for the new collaboration is sufficient to eventually lead to an extramurally funded and successful project. | Proposal has good evidence that the intellectual merit of the research and development area proposed for the new collaboration is sufficient to eventually lead to an extramurally funded and successful project. | Proposal has strong evidence that the intellectual merit of the research and development area proposed for the new collaboration is sufficient to eventually lead to an extramurally funded and successful project. |  |
| **Relevance to Maine’s economy 30 POINTS** | **Poor**  **( 0 POINTS)** | **Good**  **( 10 POINT)** | **Very Good**  **( 20 POINTS)** | **Excellent**  **( 30 POINTS)** | **Score** |
| **Evaluation Criteria for Relevance to Maine’s economy** | No clear link of the proposed activities to Maine’s economy.  Likelihood of job creation, workforce and economic development low | Proposed activities somewhat linked to Maine’s economy. Likelihood of job creation, workforce and economic development moderate | Proposed activities well linked to Maine’s economy. High likelihood of job creation, workforce and economic development | Proposed activities intimately linked to Maine’s economy. Likelihood of job creation, workforce and economic development very high |  |
| **Likelihood of additional funding 20 POINTS** | **Poor**  **( 0 POINTS)** | **Good**  **( 10 POINT)** | **Very Good**  **( 15 POINTS)** | **Excellent**  **( 20POINTS)** | **Score** |
| **Evaluation Criteria for Likelihood of additional funding** | Proposed research unlikely to lead to external funding | Proposed research somewhat likely to lead to external funding; Targets lacking | Proposed research likely to lead to external funding; Targets given | Proposed research highly likely to lead to external funding; specific RPG targets given |  |
| **Extent of Collaboration 15 POINTS** | **Poor**  **( 0 POINTS)** | **Good**  **( 5 POINT)** | **Very Good**  **( 10 POINTS)** | **Excellent**  **( 15 POINTS)** | **Score** |
| **Evaluation Criteria for Extent of Collaboration** | Proposal has no evidence of collaboration across the UMS and/or external partners, collaborations are not clearly linked to the proposed activities, roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined | Proposal has some evidence of collaboration across the UMS and/or external partners, collaborations are linked to the proposed activities, roles and responsibilities are somewhat defined | Proposal has good collaboration across the UMS and/or external partners, collaborations are well linked to the proposed activities, roles and responsibilities are defined | Proposal has strong evidence of collaboration across multiple and/or external partners, collaborations are clearly linked to the proposed activities, roles and responsibilities are clearly defined |  |
| TOTAL POINTS |  |  |  |  |  |