



RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSAL APPLICATION GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

I. GETTING STARTED WITH YOUR RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Here are some tips and recommendations to help you get started with your Proposal:

- Carefully review the [Solicitation](#).
- Refer to the Considerations for Developing Your Proposal Application in Section II of this document for additional information and/or considerations that will aid you in creating a complete Proposal.
- Familiarize yourself with the Ranking Considerations for Reviewers in Section III of this document to identify the criteria that will guide DPR staff and Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) members when ranking Proposal Applications and placing Proposal Applications in rank order.
- Complete all mandatory documents, and any desired optional documents, and submit them with the [Proposal Application](#).
- Please contact the Research Grants Program Lead, Jordan Weibel, with any additional questions you may have by email to Jordan.Weibel@cdpr.ca.gov.

II. CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEVELOPING YOUR PROPOSAL APPLICATION

The following additional information and/or consideration points may assist you in developing a complete and competitive Proposal.

- 1. Proposals must be a good fit to the funding priority stated in the Solicitation.** DPR is soliciting Research Grant Proposal Applications that seek to develop methods or practices that reduce risks associated with pesticides of high regulatory concern, and/or that are considered high-risk, which can be incorporated into an integrated pest management (IPM) system. Examples of projects that may contribute to an IPM system include but are not limited to: refining decision-making for pest management, enhancing integration of pest management practices, improving application technologies, increasing cost effectiveness of reduced-risk practices, and/or using modeling or meta-analyses to advance IPM.

The project must focus primarily on research; however, outreach regarding research outcomes should be a final component included in the overall project. For projects primarily pursuing outreach and/or implementation of IPM, please consider applying to DPR's [Alliance Grants Program](#).

2. The project’s design and methods must be clearly stated in sufficient detail for reviewers to evaluate their feasibility and the likelihood of successful implementation.

Descriptions of key elements of the experimental design and methods should be clear and concise. We recommend including the optional experimental design and methods illustrative graphics, if appropriate.

In general, the experimental design and analytical methods for controlled experiments should include:

- A description of the assumptions underlying the design and methods that must be satisfied to apply the methods and the tests to determine if those assumptions are satisfied;
- Clearly-defined experimental units;
- The number of experimental units for each treatment group;
- Restrictions on the random allocation of treatments to experimental units, such as blocking or split-plots;
- What the random, fixed, and mixed effects in the proposed statistical analysis are;
- Descriptions of main effects and interactions, along with planned comparisons;
- Effect sizes that would likely have biological or practical relevance; and
- Methods for validating and determining the goodness of fit of the model for studies using other types of modeling.

Please note that it is not sufficient to state general methods such as “the data will be evaluated using ANOVA” or “the results will be analyzed using a randomized complete block design.”

3. Ensure the Budget aligns with the work being performed and is fully justified.

Reviewers sometimes find it difficult to reconcile the amount of money being requested with the work proposed to be performed. In some cases, the amount may seem inadequate and in others overestimated. Please be clear and thorough in justifying the project’s Budget in the Budget Justification section of the Scope of Work and Budget Information. Note that DPR cannot fund out-of-state travel.

4. Ensure all personnel and staff belong to the same organization as the Grantee’s Principal Investigator.

To be included as personnel, staff must receive their grant funds through the same organization as the Principal Investigator (see the Terms and Conditions section of the Grant Agreement template for who can be a Principal Investigator). If staff cannot receive funds through the Principal Investigator’s organization, they must instead be listed as Subcontractors.

University of California/California State University System (UC/CSUS) institutions have internal budgeting procedures that classify some personnel within a subawardee category. Please note that personnel classification exceptions may exist for federal agencies that establish Research Service Agreements with state cooperative institutions and other colleges or universities for the acquisition of goods and services. Those classifications and exceptions do not pertain to DPR grants.

5. The proposed project must be ‘stand-alone’ even if it is a component of a larger research endeavor.

If conducted as a component of, or in conjunction with, any other research project endeavor, the DPR-funded portion of the project must be fully able to independently achieve all Objectives and Deliverables with the amount funded under the grant agreement. Additionally, the project Budget should not contain funds that support activities outside of the described Scope of Work. Please note that this requirement precludes any sources of matching funding.

6. The full text of each key cited reference (limited to a maximum of five references) supporting the Proposal’s merits, whether the reference is an unpublished report or a published paper, must be provided as a PDF document.

Key cited documents supporting your Proposal Application are an important way to show the viability of your idea. Key cited documents that show the potential efficacy of an idea, economic feasibility, and potential value to the public can significantly strengthen a Proposal Application’s merits.

III. RANKING CONSIDERATIONS FOR REVIEWERS

The criteria below will be used by DPR staff and the PMAC members when ranking Proposal Applications:

Question 1 – Benefits to Californians (25 percent weight): Is there a need for this project and will the people of California and expected beneficiaries of the IPM systems or practices significantly benefit from the project?

- Does the project align with the Research Grant Program’s goal to advance IPM knowledge in wildland, urban, and agricultural settings?
- Are the pesticides and pests being addressed in the project relevant to California?
- Will California stakeholders benefit from this project?
- If the project findings are adopted, will there be a significant reduction in the usage of pesticides that are of high regulatory concern or are considered high-risk?
- Do Letters of Support come from people who can attest to the quality or effectiveness of the applicant’s similar work?
- Do the Letters of Support come from those who would be involved in adopting the Proposal’s findings if proven effective?

- Are the risks from pesticide use practices clearly identified and described?

Question 2 – Integrated Pest Management Systems (25 percent weight): Will this project aid in the development and enhancement of IPM systems?

- Does the project develop pest management practices and IPM systems that are designed to minimize risk to public health and the environment?
- Does the project address a pest problem or situation that is a significant issue or widespread in California?
- Does the proposed system have the ability to reduce pesticide use and reliance if adopted?
- Does this project help develop or research an IPM system that would otherwise remain unfunded or underfunded?
- Does the public interest of the project outweigh any potential private interests?

Question 3 – Economic Benefits and Feasibility (25 percent weight): Does this project have economic benefits and will it be economically feasible to implement?

- How will the project show economic feasibility?
- What are the economic benefits of the project?
- From an economic standpoint, how do the practices proposed in the Proposal Application compare to current practices?
- How will the project overcome economic barriers to implementation in the relevant agricultural, urban, or wildland setting?
- Does the project involve collecting cost information of the IPM practices it explores? If not, is there an acceptable reason?

Question 4 – Project Details (25 percent weight): Considering all submitted Proposal Application materials, are the materials and methods sufficient to support the completion of the project?

- Are the experimental design (controlled or observational), methods (statistical, modeling, and other), and any software to be employed appropriate for the project's Scope of Work?
- Do the Key Cited Documents and optional illustrative graphics support the project's methods?
- Are the methods adequately described and sufficient to support the completion of the project?
- Are the project Goals, Objectives, Tasks, and Deliverables clearly stated and reasonably achievable within the grant period?
- Will the successful completion of the Tasks achieve the Objectives?

- Do the Principal Investigator and Key Personnel have the background, technical experience, and commitment to complete the project?
- Is the Budget reasonable to complete the project?
- Does the Budget Justification appropriately justify project expenses?