

## **Joint Fire Science Program Proposal Submittal and Preparation Tips And Hallmarks of a Good Proposal**

### *Top Reminders to Ensure a Smooth Submittal Process*

1. Read the Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOA) carefully.

In particular, pay close attention to the requirements section of the FOA. By taking the time to understand fully what is required, it will make the submittal process go smoother.

2. Use the check requirements button to determine if information is missing.

The check requirements button on the **Details** and **Submit** tabs enables you to determine if you have entered all required information.

3. Plan ahead and establish required JFSP profiles well before the proposal deadline.

The Principal Investigator (PI) is responsible for ensuring that all relevant project personnel are entered on the **Contacts** tab. To be added each individual first must have a profile established.

4. To establish a profile use the new user registration link on the sign-in page.

Establishing a profile requires assistance by Program Office staff. Don't wait until the last minute to request assistance. Providing what you may need occurs only during office hours and can take up to 24 hours (or longer if the request occurs on weekends/holidays). Plan ahead.

5. You can start a proposal and save it, if not yet ready to submit.

The JFSP proposal submittal system enables you to start a proposal and save it, but not submit it until you are ready.

6. Your proposal cannot be submitted without proper certification of your budget information.

Those individuals identified by the PI as the budget contact and agreements contact must sign in and certify they have reviewed the budget before the PI can submit the proposal. To enable this, when the PI adds them on the **Contacts** tab, their role must be identified explicitly.

7. Passwords expire every 60 days whether you have signed in or not.

If you request a password reset, you must change your password the next time you sign in. Ensure you remember the new password.

8. Make sure you attach the correct document before you submit your proposal.

9. Do not wait until the last minute to submit.

No exceptions will be made for proposals submitted beyond the closing date and time.

10. Use the templates provided and read them carefully.

You must use the templates provided and provide the information requested in each template. Provide the level of detail instructions and examples asked for.

11. ***For GRIN proposals only***: The proposal must be submitted by the student's advisor, not the student.

The Principal Investigator (PI) for a GRIN award must be a faculty member and also the advisor for the student requesting funding support. Proposals to JFSP must be submitted by the PI.

### ***Hallmarks of a Good Primary Research Proposal***

1. Adheres to the scope and intent of the task statement.

It should not take a lot of interpretation on the part of a reviewer to determine that a proposal meets the intent of a task statement and falls within its scope. Innovation and perhaps a new perspective on an issue are welcome; however, it still behooves the proposer to make a clear connection between the research that is requested and what is proposed.

2. Clearly indicates how proposed work is responsive to the required research need(s).

Task Statement Relevancy is a distinct and important section of the proposal. Proposals that do not demonstrate relevancy will not be considered for further review. It is incumbent on the proposer to clearly state how proposed work will address the specific required research need(s) articulated in the task statement. Simply repeating the research needs does not constitute an adequate demonstration of relevancy.

3. Conveys succinctly the state of the science relative to the task statement as a basis for proposed work.

Proposers should make use of the Technical Background section, in particular, to provide in a concise manner and based on the extant literature the underlying scientific basis for proposed work. Narrative should include, as appropriate, what is known and what is not known about the issue(s) raised in the task statement and what scientific innovations (methods or theory) are the building blocks for proposed work.

4. Clearly describes proposed methods and analyses and their rationale.

Methods and analyses, and their rationales, should be stated clearly so that a reviewer can

follow the flow of the methods, their relationship to research objectives, and their overall integration. Complex experimental designs and associated sample sizes should be conveyed using tables or graphics, as appropriate.

5. Demonstrates the management or policy relevance of proposed work.

The Joint Fire Science Program funds use-inspired science. Whether proposed work is of a fundamental or applied nature, as determined by the objectives of the task statement, it should always be clear how such work will contribute to addressing the underlying management or policy issues that are embodied in the scope and intent of the task statement.

6. Provides a thoughtful plan for science delivery.

Again, whether proposed work can be considered fundamental or applied research, it is important that proposers give considered thought as to how the outcomes of their work will be delivered to intended audiences. Moreover, proposed delivery mechanisms should be appropriate to the audience(s) that is (are) being targeted.

7. Integrates the main proposal body and the science delivery and data management templates, as applicable, and avoids providing redundant information.

Given the space limitations imposed on proposers when preparing their proposal package, it is important the pieces of the package fit well together: they are integrated, consistent, and non-redundant.

8. Addresses task statement-specific deliverables.

On occasion a task statement may include specific deliverables unique to that task statement beyond the standard JFSP final report and associated metadata (when the latter is applicable). Proposers should ensure they include and address appropriately any task statement-specific deliverables when applicable.

9. Ensures requested budget and personnel are appropriate to proposed work.

The requested budget should be commensurate with proposed work. An overestimated budget does not provide good value to the government, whereas an underestimated budget could result in sub-par performance. Complex projects often require a mix of appropriate discipline expertise and experience.

### ***Hallmarks of a Good GRIN Proposal***

1. Adheres to the scope and intent of the task statement.

It should not take a lot of interpretation on the part of a reviewer to determine that a proposal meets the intent of a task statement and falls within its scope. Innovation and perhaps a new perspective on an issue are welcome; however, it still behooves the

proposer to make a clear connection between the research that is requested and what is proposed. In sum, a clear linkage must be demonstrated to at least one of the stated task statement topic areas.

2. Relation to Approved Thesis or Dissertation Research

Again, it should be clear how proposed research builds off the students already approved graduate student research. Simple extensions of existing research (i.e., increasing sample sizes) or research that is seemingly tangential to existing research are discouraged.

3. Conveys succinctly the state of the science relative to the task statement as a basis for proposed work.

Proposers should make use of the Technical Background section, in particular, to provide in a concise manner and based on the extant literature the underlying scientific basis for proposed work. Narrative should include, as appropriate, what is known and what is not known about the issue(s) raised in the task statement and what scientific innovations (methods or theory) are the building blocks for proposed work.

4. Clearly describes proposed methods and analyses and their rationale.

Methods and analyses, and their rationales, should be stated clearly so that a reviewer can follow the flow of the methods, their relationship to research objectives, and their overall integration. Complex experimental designs and associated sample sizes should be conveyed using tables or graphics, as appropriate.

5. Demonstrates the management or policy relevance of proposed work.

The Joint Fire Science Program funds use-inspired science. Whether proposed work is of a fundamental or applied nature it should always be clear how such work will contribute to addressing the underlying management or policy issues that are embodied in the scope and intent of the task statement and its topic areas.

6. Provides a thoughtful plan for science delivery.

Again, whether proposed work can be considered fundamental or applied research, it is important that proposers give considered thought as to how the outcomes of their work will be delivered to intended audiences. Moreover, proposed delivery mechanisms should be appropriate to the audience(s) that is (are) being targeted.

7. Integrates the main proposal body and the science delivery and data management templates, as applicable, and avoids providing redundant information.

Given the space limitations imposed on proposers when preparing their proposal package, it is important the pieces of the package fit well together: they are integrated, consistent, and non-redundant.

8. Addresses task statement-specific deliverables.

On occasion a task statement may include specific deliverables unique to that task statement beyond the standard JFSP final report and associated metadata (when the latter is applicable). Proposers should ensure they include and address appropriately any task statement-specific deliverables when applicable.

9. Ensures requested budget is appropriate to proposed work.

The requested budget should be commensurate with proposed work. Regardless of award limits an overestimated budget does not provide good value to the government, whereas an underestimated budget could result in sub-par performance.