

**Call for Proposals:  
NSF EPSCoR RII: Climate Change  
Western Tri-State Consortium**

**Innovation Working Groups 2010**



---

---

Please Note: This Call for Proposal document specifically addresses requests for Innovation Working Groups among the three states of the Western Tri-State Consortium: Idaho, Nevada, and New Mexico.

<b>OVERVIEW AND DEADLINES</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INNOVATION WORKING GROUPS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>WHAT IWG FUNDS WILL SUPPORT</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>WHO SHOULD APPLY</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROPOSAL DEADLINES</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>EXPECTATIONS FOR IWG SCIENTISTS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>WRITING AN IWG PROPOSAL</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>FORMATTING AND SUBMISSION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>PROPOSAL PREPARATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>PROPOSAL BUDGET AND FINANCE INFORMATION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PROPOSAL REVIEW</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CONTACT INFORMATION</b>	<b>6</b>

## Overview and Deadlines

### Innovation Working Groups

The Idaho, Nevada and New Mexico NSF EPSCoR-funded programs have formed a consortium of EPSCoR states with similar research agendas related to climate change and water resources, and cyberinfrastructure. The **Western Tri-State Consortium** significantly increases opportunities for scientific collaboration and enhances each state's ability to secure competitive funding and tackle complex climate change research and cyberinfrastructure agendas. In keeping with the Consortium mission, Innovation Working Group (IWG) funds are being made available to support collaborative, trans-disciplinary work by the three member states. The Western Tri-State Consortium IWG program is managed by a three-state team of Project Directors and EPSCoR staff.

**IWGs** provide a venue for engaging scientists and educators, along with key nationally and internationally recognized experts, to address the grand challenges that can transform science and education. This program supports working group activities that are modeled after those hosted by the highly successful NSF-supported National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS). Direct involvement in an EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement (RII)-funded project is NOT a prerequisite for participation in this program. **A strategic final objective of the IWGs is the submission of proposals that target NSF cross-cutting programs and/or the publication of synthesis papers in peer reviewed journals.**

### What IWG Funds Will Support

IWG funds are designated for projects that are clearly related to the research and education scope of the current EPSCoR Track 1 programs or cyberinfrastructure development (Track 2 or C2), as described in the original proposal of each Consortium state. Track 1 proposals and project information are available at:

Nevada: <http://www.nevada.edu/epscor/programs-nsf.html>  
 New Mexico: <http://www.nmepscor.org/>  
 Idaho: <http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/epscor/>

IWG support is aimed at working groups that emphasize the collaborative development and testing of important ideas and theories, cutting-edge analysis of recent or existing data and information, the use of sound science policy and management decisions, and investigation of social issues. An IWG typically will support 8-12 scientists, engineers, or educators who work collaboratively for 3-5 days on their proposed challenging issues. IWG topics will be distributed among the climatological, hydrological, and socioeconomic sciences, as well as cyberinfrastructure and research topics related to engineering, education, communication and outreach, and diversity. At least one IWG each year will focus on education, diversity, and communication and outreach.

### Who Should Apply

- Any individual (faculty and/or postdocs) from an Idaho, Nevada or New Mexico institution or national laboratory may submit proposals.
- IWGs are not intended to fund the collection of new data or field research.
- IWGs do not provide overhead or funds to be spent by the investigator at the investigator's home institution.

### Proposal Deadlines

Proposals are solicited twice a year (July and December). **Due dates are July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010 and December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.** Proposals may be submitted at other times after consultation with the EPSCoR Director of that state. Proposals submitted in July will be given a response by early August, and those submitted in December by early January.

## **Expectations for IWG Scientists**

**Funding Source Acknowledgement.** Acknowledgement of the funding sources is requested and should be formatted as: “This work was conducted as a part of an Innovation Working Group supported by the [insert State names] EPSCoR Programs, and funded by NSF (Grant # NSF- [for Track 1, insert NM 08814449, ID 0814387 and/or NV 0814372 as applicable)”.

**Reporting and Evaluation.** The IWG lead investigator must write a summary report of the IWG efforts and outcomes. IWGs resulting from the July solicitation must convene and complete reports to EPSCoR prior to December 1<sup>st</sup> of the same year. IWGs resulting from the December solicitation must convene and complete reports to EPSCoR prior to July 1<sup>st</sup> of the following year. In addition, it will be the responsibility of the lead investigator to ensure that NSF required data regarding IWG participants have been given to the designated EPSCoR person collecting the data. Evaluation and assessment questionnaires will be requested of participants and should be returned before the IWG meeting ends.

**Tracking of Science Products.** NSF requires that EPSCoR track science products resulting from the IWGs. The IWG lead and all participating scientists will need to provide their state EPSCoR Program with proposal submissions related to the IWG topic, the result or success of proposals, and relevant publication citations.

## **Writing an IWG Proposal**

### Content:

- IWGs should focus on topics related to the research and education agenda of the Consortium’s Track 1 projects, or cyberinfrastructure development (Track 2 or C2).
- IWG activities should be question-driven and product oriented.
- Proposals are evaluated on the collaborative and synthetic nature of the ideas.
- Proposals addressing crosscutting areas of science or engineering, or specific NSF cross-disciplinary programs are sought.
- Proposals should specify publication outcomes, especially journals targeted for special issues.
- IWGs should specify whether proposal development is a goal, and state the specific grant or NSF program targeted.
- IWGs should consider how to share their experience and results through campus seminars, broadcast seminars, online materials at the State EPSCoR websites, public media and other approaches.

### Requesting more than one convening:

- Proposals should request only one IWG convening session. In some cases, a face-to-face planning session prior to the IWG may be justified. A successful IWG may request funds in a subsequent proposal solicitation to convene again for follow up or continued development on the topic.

### Participants:

- IWGs of 8 – 12 individuals working for 3 - 5 full days have been shown to be the most productive.
- IWGs should include a diverse array of participants and pay attention to gender balance and participation by underrepresented institutions or groups.
- Two consortium states must be represented and participation from three consortium states is encouraged.
- Postdocs are encouraged to serve as Co-Leads
- One or more graduate students and/or post docs should be involved.

### Location:

- IWGs meeting off-campus are preferred
- Field stations and LTER sites are possible meeting locations and help keep budgets reasonable. (e.g., NM – Sevilleta, Valles Caldera; Idaho – Priest River, McCall Outdoor School; NV –Sagehen Field Station (near Reno); Walking Box Ranch (near Las Vegas). Please discuss options with the State NSF EPSCoR Project Director.

### Management

- IWGs should designate who will be responsible for: managing participant information, evaluation and assessment materials, and submission of the final report

## Guidelines for Proposals

### Formatting and Submission

Proposals should be submitted in digital format in MS Word or as a PDF file. They should be submitted as a single complete document with graphics embedded in the document and should be less than 5MB in size. Please submit the proposal document by email to:

Attention: Pam Levins, NSF Project Administrator, Nevada EPSCoR (copies will be distributed to each participating state's EPSCoR office).

**Email:** pam\_levins@nshe.nevada.edu **Phone:** 702-522-7079

### Proposal Preparation

IWG proposals are relatively short but must include the information requested below. A maximum of 6 pages is allowed using 12pt font. Please include all of the information requested for the Project Description section below.

<b>I. Proposal Title Page</b>	1 p.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal Title</li> <li>• <i>Please state: "Western Tri-State Consortium IWG Proposal"</i></li> <li>• Lead Investigator, Co-Investigator(s)</li> <li>• All affiliation and contact information for the above people</li> <li>• Date of Submission</li> </ul>
<b>II. Project Summary</b>	1 p.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Half-page summary statement</li> </ul>
<b>III. Project Description</b>	2 – 3 ps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem statement</li> <li>• Scientific questions/hypotheses addressed</li> <li>• Proposed IWG topic and activities</li> <li>• Participating states</li> <li>• IWG convening dates and location</li> <li>• Name of individual participants, including institutional contacts and <i>whether confirmed</i></li> <li>• Name of person designated to collect participant demographics and evaluation and assessment questionnaires</li> <li>• Timetable of activities including pre-meeting coordination, tentative working group agenda, and post-meeting deliverables</li> <li>• Statement of anticipated outcomes and benefits</li> </ul>
<b>IV. Budget</b>	1 p.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget</li> </ul>

## **Proposal Budget and Finance Information**

IWG support includes reimbursement for actual travel and per diem (meal, lodging, and incidentals). Lodging and meal per-diems are reimbursed using GSA rates (<http://www.gsa.gov>). Meeting facility costs are also allowable. If a proposal is approved, the IWG leader is expected to remain within the proposed budget. The granted budget must be expended during the specific period of the proposal. IWGs do not support salary for participants. All international travelers must adhere to NSF travel guidelines. Although there is no set limit on an IWG budget request, the EPSCoR Director's anticipate that well-justified budgets will not exceed the \$12,000 - \$15,000 range.

The budget should include all of the information below. Please put the budget in a table (or Excel) format. Clearly state the grand total amount requested.

Note: Nevada has an additional budget template as noted on the next page (Appendix A). In addition, Nevada submissions must also include a table containing the information requested below.

<b>I. Travel</b>	Domestic	Number of domestic participants Travel amount per domestic participant (airfare, mileage, ground transportation)
	International	Number of international participants Travel amount per international participant (airfare, mileage, ground transportation) <i>Total travel expenses</i>
<b>II. Daily Expenses</b>	Lodging	Number of participants Lodging rate per night and number of nights <i>Total lodging expenses</i>
	Per Diem	Number of participants Full-day per diem rate and number of days Travel-day partial per diem rate and number of days <i>Total per diem expenses</i>
<b>III. Meeting Facility Expenses</b>		Meeting rooms, AV or computer equipment, etc. Beverages or snacks <i>Total meeting facility expenses</i>
<b>IV. Total</b>		<b>Total amount requested</b>

### **Important state-specific information regarding the budget:**

New Mexico Institutions: There is no transfer of funds to the IWG lead institution; support is on a reimbursement basis from the New Mexico EPSCoR Office, without exception. Indirect costs cannot be included.

Nevada Institutions: In addition to the budget table requested above, Nevada institutions should complete the Nevada Budget Template (Appendix A). Funds are subawarded to the institution and F&A is allowed

Idaho Institutions: There is no transfer of funds to the IWG lead institution; support is on a reimbursement basis from the Idaho EPSCoR Office, without exception. Indirect costs cannot be included.

## Proposal Review

Proposals will be reviewed by a team of Project Directors from all three states. In addition, up to three anonymous external reviewers may be sought for each proposal. Proposals are reviewed for merit, novel approaches, and rationale related to the Consortium's Track 1 research and education goals. Review criteria include:

- **Topic aligned with EPSCoR Track 1, or cyberinfrastructure (e.g., Track 2 or C2) research and education agendas**
- **Question driven**
- **Product and outcome oriented**
- **Diversity of Institutions (minimum of two states being represented)**
- **Significant participation by women and members of underrepresented groups**
- **Participation of graduate students or postdoctoral scholars**
- **Multi-and trans-disciplinary participation**
- **Intellectual merit and transformative nature of the project**

## Contact Information

### 2010 Innovation Working Group Program Chair:

Gayle Dana, Project Director, Nevada NSF EPSCoR  
Email: [Gayle.Dana@dri.edu](mailto:Gayle.Dana@dri.edu) Phone: 775-674-7538

### State NSF EPSCoR Project Directors:

Nevada: Dr. Gayle Dana ([Gayle.Dana@dri.edu](mailto:Gayle.Dana@dri.edu); 775-674-7538)  
New Mexico: Dr. William Michener ([wmichener@LTERnet.edu](mailto:wmichener@LTERnet.edu); 505-277-2769)  
Idaho: Dr. Peter Goodwin ([pgoodwin@uidaho.edu](mailto:pgoodwin@uidaho.edu); 208-364-6164)

APPENDIX A:

Please Note: The following budget template is ONLY to be used for Nevada Institutions:

### NEVADA BUDGET TEMPLATE

BUDGET CATEGORIES	YEAR 1
<b>A. SENIOR PERSONNEL</b>	
<b>TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL</b>	\$ -
<b>B. OTHER PERSONNEL</b>	
1. Post Doctoral Associates	
2. Other Professionals	
3. Graduate Students	
4. Undergraduate Students	
5. Secretarial - Clerical	
6. Other	
<b>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; WAGES (A + B)</b>	\$ -
<b>C. FRINGE BENEFITS</b>	
<b>TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES, &amp; FRINGE BENEFITS (A+B+C)</b>	\$ -
<b>D. EQUIPMENT</b>	
<b>TOTAL EQUIPMENT</b>	\$ -
<b>E. TRAVEL</b>	
1. Domestic	
2. Foreign	
<b>TOTAL TRAVEL</b>	\$ -
<b>F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS</b>	
<b>TOTAL PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS</b>	\$ -
<b>G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS</b>	
1. Materials & Supplies	
2. Publication Costs/Documentation/Dissemination	
3. Consultant Services	
4. Computer Services	
5. Subawards	
6. Other	
Indirect Rate	
<b>TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS</b>	\$ -
<b>H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)</b>	\$ -