Connecticut Sea Grant 2022-2024 Omnibus RFP

FULL PROPOSAL GUIDANCE

Full Proposal Guidelines for the **February 1, 2022 - January 31, 2024** funding period.

Eligibility: Only those who submitted a pre-proposal are eligible to submit a full proposal. The pre-proposal review process identified those pre-proposals with the highest likelihood of success and encouraged the submission of a full proposal.

IMPORTANT REMINDERS:

- Full proposals must be sent as three electronic files: the 90-2 (Word file), the 90-4 form (Excel file) and the rest of the proposal including the budget justification compiled in one Adobe PDF file. These three files have to be submitted by e-mail to SeaGrantResearch@uconn.edu and **received no later than 4:30 p.m. EDT June 7, 2021 (Monday)**. **Note that the deadline will be strictly enforced. Also note that time stamps from the sender's computer may vary slightly from that of the recipient's inbox, in which case the latter will be considered. Early submission is strongly suggested.**

- **Proposals that are received after 4:30 PM EDT, sent to a different email account, contain more or less than the 3 required files, fail to follow the required format, or are incomplete will <u>not</u> be processed.**

- Mailed and faxed submittals are <u>NOT</u> allowable.

- **IMPORTANT:** *<u>CTSG requires that all full proposals be reviewed and approved by the submitting program's Sponsored Programs office prior to submittal.</u>* Proposals that have not been approved, with appropriate signatures from an authorized institutional representative (the principal investigator is generally NOT an authorized institutional representative), will be returned to investigators without review. Scanned signed pages are acceptable.

- Notice of projects selected for funding will be communicated to PIs on or around October 1, 2021.

INTRODUCTION

Connecticut Sea Grant supports applied research, education, and outreach activities to achieve healthy coastal and marine ecosystems and consequent public benefits, focusing on Connecticut, Long Island Sound and its watershed. Applied projects with clear relevance to Connecticut's marine and coastal resources will be given priority. All proposals will be subjected to a thorough external review process. Connecticut Sea Grant strives to fund the highest quality research, education, and outreach that is also

relevant to Connecticut and the region and consistent with the Connecticut Sea Grant Strategic Plan for 2018-2023, which can be accessed at: https://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2020/11/CTSG-strategic-plan-2018-2023-final_optimized.pdf.

A full proposal should provide relevant background information and significance of the proposed study, clearly define the hypothesis(es) to be tested and associated objectives, methodology and outreach/education component of the project, identify the expected results and potential benefits that may be derived over the short, medium, and long term from the project, as well as the qualifications of the investigators who would perform the work. Proposals for Sea Grant activities should respect the page limits (see below), with emphasis on clarity. Justifications should be specific, not couched in generalities. Objectives and methods should be clear and concise.

Note: In preparing the full proposal, it is essential to take into account the comments of the preliminary proposal panels.

RESEARCH PRIORITIES

As noted in the Preliminary Proposal RFP, CTSG seeks proposals for coastal/marine research, outreach, and education of the highest quality and relevance within the focus areas identified in the Connecticut Sea Grant Strategic Plan for 2018-2023. Based on these thematic areas, additional strategic guidelines and priorities of NOAA and the National Sea Grant College Program (reflected in their respective strategic plans), and input from our external advisory committees, CTSG solicits proposals in the following topic areas:

1. Coastal ecosystems and watersheds
a.   Changing coastal and marine ecosystems and effects on the services they provide
b.   Coastal and marine habitat and species conservation, management and restoration
c.   Watershed management, storm water management and low impact development measures that minimize impact on Long Island Sound
d.   Water quality impacts on Long Island Sound and relevant mitigation measures

2. Fisheries and aquaculture
a.   Management and changing environmental conditions related to fisheries, marine aquaculture or marine resources
b.   Public health and socioeconomics related to fisheries, marine aquaculture or marine resources

3. Resilient communities
a.   Resilience of coastal and watershed communities in the face of changing climatic conditions, ecosystem services and land use

b.   Capacity of communities / stakeholders to prepare for and respond to coastal and watershed hazards of natural or human origin

c.   Resilience of maritime economies (defined broadly, including recreational and commercial opportunities) to changing socio-economic and environmental conditions

4. Environmental literacy

Educational research, assessment and evaluation strategies to develop and enhance the teaching and learning of ocean and coastal science content

***Please note that it is anticipated that additional federal funding will become available specifically for research projects focused on aquaculture and thus, we encourage research proposals focused on topical areas of relevance to marine aquaculture.

CTSG seeks research projects that give serious consideration to the best means of sharing the results with a variety of audiences, including those outside the specific scientific discipline who may, nonetheless, be interested in the information. Community engagement and societal relevance are critical to CTSG. Therefore, it is required that proposals provide substantive evidence of the inclusion of an **effective outreach or education plan** that complements the research component. This outreach/education plan must be an integral part of the proposal development and not simply appended to an already completed proposal.

PIs are encouraged to provide details on how activities will contribute to the achievement of socially relevant outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and underrepresented minorities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; development of a diverse, globally competitive STEM workforce; and increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others.

The outreach or education component may involve collaborators whose expertise is in outreach or education, or may be carried out by the principal investigators. Connecticut Sea Grant staff members are available to provide input or assistance as appropriate on this aspect of the proposal; see "Outreach and Education as an Effective Component of a Research Project" (http://media.ctseagrant.uconn.edu/funding/integrate.pdf).

FULL PROPOSAL COMPONENTS
A Full Proposal consists of THREE files:
a. Sea Grant Summary Form 90-2 in MS Word format; please name this file "last name 90_2 CTSG 2022 Omnibus submission" (http://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2017/04/90-2.docx)

b. One PDF file containing all full proposal components including the budget justification but NOT the 90-2 or 90-4 budget; please name this file "last name CTSG 2022 Omnibus submission"

One or more Excel-based 90-4 worksheet(s) in one file, (https://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2019/01/Copy-of-Multiyear-90-4-ver-1.3-dc-01-31-19.xlsm); please name this file "last name 90_4 CTSG 2022 Omnibus submission"; if you have subawards on your proposal, please provide an individual 90-4 worksheet (and budget justification) for each subaward, in addition to the overall 90-4 (and budget justification) in the EXCEL file and label each tab appropriately.

A Full Proposal must include:
1. Cover page
2. Sea Grant Summary Form 90-2 (to be submitted as a separate MS Word file)
3. Narrative (12 page max; 12 point font or larger), with specific subheadings for:
   a. Background and Significance
   b. Relevance to priorities of this RFP
   c. Hypothesis and Objectives
   d. Methodological Approach
   e. Outreach and/or educational plan(s)
   f. Anticipated broader societal impacts on the coastal community
   g. Timetable
   h. Expected Results and Benefits
   i. Coordination with other program elements
4. References Cited
5. Budget Justification
6. Sea Grant 90-4 Budget Sheet(s) (to be submitted as one separate MS Excel file)
7. Current and Pending Support
8. Supporting Documentation (e.g., SIGNED Letters of Support or Commitment)
9. Two-page CV of each investigator
10. Data Sharing Plan (use form found at: http://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2017/04/Full-Proposal-DMP-Form.docx)
11. Videos or multimedia Project Workplan (if applicable)

Investigators may provide a list of potential reviewers who do not have a conflict of interest with the PIs, and may also choose to provide a list of potential reviewers they would prefer not be included in the review of the proposal (to be included in the submitting e-mail NOT in the proposal itself)

**Although a completed NOAA NEPA Questionnaire is not required to be included as part of the full proposal submission, the investigator will be required to submit a completed NEPA questionnaire if the proposal is selected for funding.

FULL PROPOSAL DETAILS
Each full proposal should include the following information in the order listed below:

1. Cover Page

Prepare a cover page that includes the project title, together with the names, titles, and full contact information (including affiliation, telephone and e-mail) for all investigators and associate investigators. Make sure to specify the contact investigator to which correspondence should be sent, as well as the primary institution. For each year include the federal funds requested and match for the project. The cover page should also include the signature of the principal investigator, as well as an authorized institutional representative. There is no required form for the cover page, as long as all information is provided.

2. Sea Grant Project Summary Form (90-2): Not to exceed 2 pages; 1 page preferred.

The Sea Grant Project Summary Form (90-2 short form) may be found as a Word file at: https://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2019/01/90-2.docx

You must complete one Project Summary Form for the entire project period. The requested federal funds and the matching funds should be broken out by year, and then totaled.

Sea Grant Funds Year 1: $*   *State Matching Funds Year 1:$
Sea Grant Funds Year 2: $ *State Matching Funds Year 2: $*
Total Sea Grant Funds: $ *Total State Matching Funds: $*

Institution: Connecticut Sea Grant College Program

Title: Give your project an appropriate, descriptive title. Your title should be clear, informative and no more than two lines, or 125 characters -- preferably less.

Project Numbers: Leave blank.

Project Status: Leave blank.

Sub-Program: Leave blank.

I-Code: Leave blank.

Revision Date: The date (month/day/year) on which the summary is written.

Initiation Date: The date (month/day/year) on which Sea Grant funding for the project is proposed to begin, February 1, 2022.

Completion Date: The date (month/day/year) on which it is estimated your project will be completed: January 31, 2024 for two-year projects.

Principal Investigator (P.I.): The name of the principal investigator(s), followed by the time the P.I. will devote to the project in the grant year covered (e.g., Maris, H.O. [5.0 man-months]; Jones, F.L. [2.5 man-months]). **Please note that NOAA Grants considers 1 FTE to equal 12 months, therefore please convert your man-months requested for AY or summer to CY percentages. Example: 9-month AY man-months should be multiplied by 0.75 for the equivalent # of CY man-months.**

Affiliation: The academic affiliation of the P.I. (e.g., Department of XXX, University of XXX).

Affiliation Code: Leave Blank.

Associate Investigator: Names and man-months planned effort of associates whose efforts are significant to the success of the project (e.g., Jackson, J.L. [6 man-months]).

Affiliation: Same as for P.I.

Affiliation Code: Leave Blank.

Sea Grant Funds and Matching Funds: For a new or continuing project, the amount of money requested for each project year.

Last Year's Sea Grant Funds and Last Year's Matching Funds: For ***new*** proposals, enter "0" for the first year summary form. For the second year project summary, enter the first year's funds in appropriate spaces.

Pass-Through Funds: The grant funds (if any) committed to this project from federal agencies other than Sea Grant (e.g., Navy, EPA, National Marine Fisheries Service, etc.).

Related Projects: The project number(s) and name(s) of other Sea Grant funded projects begun (or completed) earlier, from which this project was derived. The intent is to build a record of continuity. For example, the project may be to establish economic feasibility of an idea, and the follow-up, to establish technical feasibility.

Sea Grant Classification: Leave blank.

Objectives: Include a one-page maximum Project Abstract comprised of the rationale of the project, the scientific and technical objectives and/or hypotheses to be tested, a brief summary of work and accomplishments to be completed, to be used for public dissemination. Descriptions should be clear and concise, and written such that they may be generally understood by a well-educated layperson. In keeping with Sea Grant's mission, appropriate verbs include (but are not limited to): test (the hypothesis), develop, provide, determine, isolate, characterize, identify, restore, implement. Less desirable but sometimes appropriate, verbs include: promote, conduct, analyze, apply, investigate, examine, describe. Some verbs, such as study, consider, or continue should not be used at all, since failure to do these cannot be determined.

Methodology: State the methods to be used to accomplish your objective, in no more than 150 words. Descriptions should be clear and concise, and written such that they may be generally understood by a well-educated layperson.

Rationale: (Not to exceed 150 words.) Indicate why this project is appropriate for Sea Grant support (e.g., relevancy). The project need not promise to fully solve a problem, but you should show that it is a logical step towards a solution. Avoid long, involved background statements. Where potential users of the information developed have been identified, state who they are.

Note: The project summary as prepared up to this point should print out on no more than two 8-1/2 by 11-inch pages—one page is preferable but not required.

3. Project Narrative

Limit the narrative to a **maximum** of 12 single-spaced pages. Use **1 inch margins, 12 point font, with <u>no more than 6 lines per inch</u>**. Number all pages. The list of references cited is **not included** in the 12-page limit. All graphs and figures are included in the 12-page limit. Proposals in excess of this page limit, or that fail to comply with content or format requirements (e.g.; < 12 point font, < 1" margins) will be returned without review.

a. Background and Significance - This is the introduction to your proposal. Readers should obtain a complete understanding of the context in which the effort is being proposed, and the importance, urgency and nature of the specific problem being addressed. This section should also demonstrate your familiarity with previous and ongoing work relevant to the proposed effort.

b. Relevance to priorities of this RFP
Explicitly explain the <u>connection</u> of the proposed research to the priorities identified in the RFP and the CTSG Strategic Plan.

c. Hypothesis and Objectives – Provide a clear, testable hypothesis, along with a concise statement of the project objectives or goals.

d. Methodological Approach - Describe the experimental designs, techniques, and analyses to be used. Be specific. This includes an explanation of how the data will be analyzed using appropriate statistical and/or graphical procedures. In addition, you should discuss new methods and their advantages over previous methods, potential pitfalls and alternative approaches to achieve your goals. Readers should be able to determine the appropriateness of the proposed approach for achieving the stated objectives. This section and the previous section should convince peer reviewers of your understanding of the state-of-the-art and the merit of your technical approach to conducting the research.

e. Outreach (Extension/Communication) and/or Education Plans - All research proposals will be evaluated with regard to clear linkages between the activities to be conducted and the public benefits that will result, in terms of improving the understanding, assessment, use, management, conservation, or restoration of marine and coastal resources.   A demonstrated commitment to outreach (extension and/or communications) and/or education targeting appropriate audiences will be an important consideration during proposal evaluation. This commitment may be demonstrated in a number of ways, including pre-planned and detailed linkages to: (a) CTSG education, extension or communication programs, (b) other Sea Grant research, education and outreach programs in New England, (c) other federal, state, NGO, or private partners, or (d) other established avenues of outreach, education, and/or communication. It is strongly suggested to identify target audiences and how they will be reached and include sufficient funds in the budget for the outreach/education component, as applicable. Include details on how COVID might alter these plans or how they could be adapted to work under COVID constraints. ***Publication of results in academic journals alone is insufficient evidence of a successful outreach, education, or communication strategy.***

We urge investigators who wish to integrate proposals with CTSG extension, education or communication programs to plan such integration in advance, and in coordination with CTSG staff. CTSG staff will not accommodate last minute requests, and perfunctory or last-minute additions of outreach, education, or communication plans or personnel are generally not perceived as an appropriate commitment to such activities through the review process.

f. Anticipated broader societal impacts – describe broader societal impacts on the coastal community, especially how the project will impact underrepresented or underserved communities or members of these communities

g. Timetable – Describe project milestones and expected dates when they will be met.

h. Expected Results and Benefits - State what results you expect and describe the benefits and implications of the anticipated results. This section should respond to questions such as:

  • How does this research advance this field of science?
  • Who will put it to use?
  • Have you communicated with potential users? (It is strongly recommended that you do so before submitting the proposal.) Letters of support appended to your proposal are most appropriate.
  • What future applications do you foresee?
  • How do you suggest the results of this research might be applied to the management of Connecticut's coastal environments and its resources?
  • Who will benefit from your proposed outreach and/or education effort?

i. Coordination with other program elements- Outline any interactions or activities planned in coordination with CTSG programs or staff, if relevant.

4. References Cited: (NOT included in 12-page limit) – List all references cited, using a standard bibliographic form.

5. Budget Justification

The budget justification should explain the rationale for each line-item included in the final budget. The numbering used in the Budget Justification should mirror that in the 90-4, to make it easier for the NOAA Grants Office to review the numbers, should the proposal be selected for funding. Personnel needs must show names/positions (brief responsibilities), percentage of time (months of effort), and best estimates of salaries, Federal (requested from CTSG) and non-Federal (match). **Please note that NOAA Grants considers 1 FTE to equal 12 months, therefore please convert your man-months requested for AY or summer to CY percentages. Example: 9-month AY man-months should be multiplied by 0.75 for the equivalent # of CY man-months.** Fringe benefit rates should be explained. Equipment must be listed with explanation of need for larger items (items greater than $5,000 in cost). Categories of supplies should be shown. Be sure that your annual budget totals conform to the totals stated in your pre-proposal submission and do not exceed the budget cap specified in the RFP.

For guidance on the content and format of the budget justification, you should refer to: http://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-

content/uploads/sites/1985/2017/04/budget-justification-guidance_revised2015.pdf

For a sample budget justification refer to: http://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2017/04/Sample-Budget-Justification_revAPR2015.pdf

6. Sea Grant 90-4 Budget Sheet

Use the Excel-based 90-4 Budget Worksheet to prepare a detailed budget sheet (Year 1, Year 2 and Total). Note that this is a summary only; it does not fulfill the requirement for justification of individual budget items. Please add additional worksheets in the EXCEL file for any subaward budgets and label the tabs appropriately.

NOTES ON MATCH REQUIREMENTS
Sea Grant is a matching funds program, which requires that at least 50% of the aggregate federal dollars received be matched by non-federal (state or private) funds. CTSG therefore requires that proposals include at least 50% match (i.e., $0.50 match for every $1.00 of requested funds) from non-federal sources.

In a multi-year award, **the first year must contain at least 50% or more of the required match**. If over 50% match was applied in the first year, then subsequent years must contain enough match to **keep the cumulative match at or above 50%** of the total amount of federal funding that has been received up to that point.

- Example 1: Acceptable - 50% match in Yr 1 and Yr 2
    Yr 1 Fed Funding = $100,000, Match = $50,000;
    Yr 2 Fed Funding =$100,000, Match = $50,000
    Total Fed Funding = $200,000, Total Match = $100,000

- Example 2: Acceptable - overmatch in Yr 1 keeps cumulative match above 50% overall despite undermatch in Yr 2
    Yr 1 Fed Funding = $100,000, Match = $75,000;
    Yr 2 Fed Funding =$100,000, Match = $25,000 (acceptable)

- Example 3: **Unacceptable** - undermatched in Yr 1
    Yr 1 Fed Funding = $100,000, Match = $49,000;
    Yr 2 Fed Funding =$100,000, Match = $51,000
    Total Fed Funding = $200,000, Total Match = $100,000

- Example 4: **Unacceptable** - undermatched over 2 years

Yr 1 Fed Funding = $50,000, Match = $45,000;
Yr 2 Fed Funding =$100,000, Match = $25,000
Total Fed Funding = $150,000, Total Match = $70,000

Documentable in-kind matching from University or other sources is often acceptable, as long as the Institution's grants office signs off. Possible sources of matching funds include salaries, benefits, ship time, indirect costs, and cash or in-kind contributions from non-federal partners. (Additional information regarding match/cost sharing may be provided by the Office of Sponsored Programs at your institution.) Matching funds are scrutinized very closely for legitimacy by both the University of Connecticut and the federal government.

7. Current and Pending Support

List any current and pending support. For each investigator and other senior personnel, include the title of the project, the funding agency, the amount awarded, the duration of the award, and the number of person-months/year committed to the project.

8. Supporting Documentation

Each project narrative is expected to be complete. *This section is NOT to be used for additional project description or discussion of investigators' qualifications or publications; such materials will be discarded prior to review.* Allowable supporting documentation includes signed letters of support and/or collaboration.

9. Biography of Each Investigator

Submit a two-page maximum biosketch for each investigator or associate investigator named on the Sea Grant Project Summary Form. Be sure to include the following information, as applicable:

- A list of prior Sea Grant support received.
- A list of recent products acknowledging Sea Grant support (these include books, papers, reports, patents, etc.).

Previous support under Sea Grant is not a consideration in the selection process. However, if there has been previous Sea Grant support, the documentation of the outcome of that support is an important consideration.

10. Data Sharing Plan

Data and information collected and/or created under NOAA grants and cooperative agreements must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users, free of charge or at minimal cost, in a timely manner (typically no later than two years after the data are collected or created), except where limited by law, regulation, policy or by security requirements. The requirement has two basic parts: (1) environmental data generated by a grant project must be made available after a reasonable period of exclusive use, and (2) the grant application must describe the plan to make the data available.

Each full proposal must include a complete Data Management Plan Form (http://seagrant.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1985/2017/04/Full-Proposal-DMP-Form.docx), outlining the Data Sharing Plan and include descriptions of the types of data and information created during the course of the project; the tentative date by which data will be shared; the standards to be used for data/metadata format and content; policies addressing data stewardship and preservation; procedures for providing access, sharing, and security; and prior experience in publishing such data.

The Data Sharing Plan (and any subsequent revisions or updates) must be made publicly available at time of award and, thereafter, will be posted with the published data. Failing to share data and information collected using the grant funds may lead to disallowed costs and be considered by CT Sea Grant in making future award decisions. If your proposed activities do not generate any data, you are still required to include a data sharing plan. Such a data sharing plan could include the statement that "this project will not generate any data".

11. **Videos or multimedia Project Workplan**

If you are proposing to produce videos or multimedia as part of your project, include a brief workplan for each video or multimedia component, addressing: why you are producing it; what is it communicating; what is the work schedule; how will it be distributed? If available, include the script. Please contact Syma Ebbin, Connecticut Sea Grant Research Coordinator at syma.ebbin@uconn.edu for more information and requirements if your project includes these types of media components.

List of Potential Reviewers

Submit a list of 3-5 potential reviewers with recognized expertise in the field(s) covered by the proposal. For each reviewer, please provide a name, title, mailing address, telephone, and e-mail. You should not submit names for which

you have a known conflict of interest.[1] PIs may also choose to include a list of peer reviewers that they would prefer not be considered in the review of the proposal. **Please submit the list in the body of your e-mail submission—do not attach to proposal copies.**

SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

CTSG requires that all proposals be reviewed and approved by their Sponsored Programs Office prior to submittal.   Proposals that have not been approved, with appropriate signatures from an authorized institutional representative, will be returned to investigators without review.

Proposals must be sent as ONLY three electronic files (an Adobe PDF file for the entire proposal (excluding budget), a word file for the 90-2 form, and an EXCEL-based 90-4 budget Worksheet), by email to SeagrantResearch@uconn.edu for receipt no later than 4:30 p.m. EDT on Friday, June 7, 2019. Note that the deadline will be strictly enforced. Also note that time stamps from the sender's computer may vary slightly from that of the recipient's inbox, in which case the latter will be considered. Early submission is strongly suggested. Mailed (hard-copy) and fax submittals are NOT allowable. Proposals received after 4:30 PM EDT on June 7, 2019, those sent to a different email account, contain multiple files, do not follow the required format, are incomplete, or are submitted in hard copy or via fax will not be processed.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND REVIEW

All full proposals will be peer reviewed by at least three experts in the field (external peer reviews). Proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria:
1. **Scientific and technical merit:**
    o   Clarity and attainability of the objectives detailed in the project description;
    o   Adequacy of the proposed methodology to test hypotheses and accomplish stated objectives, including the soundness of the technical approach, scientific design, methods, and data interpretation;
2. **Significance** of the problem, or rationale and importance of the work, as well as relevance to CTSG priorities identified in this RFP;
3. **Technical capacity** of the applicant to successfully carry out the proposed project taking into account such factors as the applicant's:
    o   Past performance in successfully completing projects of similar size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project,

---

[1] Conflict of interest includes the following: (1) co-authors on publications within the past five years, including pending publications and submissions; (2) collaborators on grants or projects within the past five years, including current and planned collaborations; (3) thesis or postdoctoral advisees/advisors; (4) persons in your field with whom you have had a consulting/financial arrangement/other conflict-of-interest in the past five years

- o PI expertise/qualifications, PI knowledge, and resources to successfully achieve the goals of the project.
4. **Integration/Inclusion** of effective outreach and/or education targeting appropriate audiences.
5. **Broader Societal Benefits** on the coastal community especially focused on stakeholders from underrepresented or underserved communities.
6. **Expected Outputs and Outcomes:**
   - o Adequacy of the applicant's description of outputs and outcomes, which must be well-defined, relevant and results oriented.
7. **Appropriate and Cost-effective Budget:**
   - o Adequacy of the proposed budget to accomplish objectives and of the budget justification in explaining the need for resources,
   - o The proposed scope of work and benefits will be assessed against funding levels requested.
8. **Data Management Plan**
   - o Adequacy of the Data Management Plan to meet NOAA data sharing requirements.

Connecticut Sea Grant will provide the opportunity for PIs to read and respond to the (anonymized) peer reviews prior to the Independent Technical Review Panel meeting. On or around August 6, 2021, PIs will be provided with copies of blinded proposal peer reviews and offered the opportunity to respond with up to three pages of rebuttal. These responses are due by 4:30 PM via email on August 16, 2021. If you will not be in the office during this time period, please ensure that you leave instructions with the Sea Grant Office regarding where to direct blinded peer reviews, so that you may respond appropriately. Rebuttals are encouraged but not required.

All full proposals will also be evaluated by an Independent Technical Review Panel. Proposals will be evaluated by the Panel, in addition to the criteria above, on the basis of their:

1. **Scientific and technical merit (including outputs, outcomes, and research team qualifications) (30%)**
2. **Significance (20%)**
3. Integration/Inclusion of **effective outreach and/or education** targeting appropriate audiences **(20%)**
4. **Broader societal impacts** on the coastal community especially focused on stakeholders from underrepresented or underserved communities **(20%)**
5. **Appropriate and Cost-effective Budget (10%)**

All applications that meet the eligibility and minimum requirements will be evaluated and scored by a panel of independent reviewers, who are federal or non-federal

experts, each having expertise in a separate area so that the panel, as a whole, covers the spectrum of activities covered by the applications received. A panel of reviewers will read and provide comments on the applications using the evaluation criteria provided above. The panel will then meet to discuss the applications. After discussing a particular application, each panelist, with the benefit of the panel deliberations, will score the application, and a summary of their comments will be compiled. Each Full Proposal Review Panel member will rate each of these criteria on a 5-point scale: Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), Very High (5).

"Low" or "Very Low" indicates proposals that should not be recommended for funding consideration. A rating of "High" or "Very High" indicates proposals that should be recommended for funding consideration. These assessment scores will be summed into an indicator of Overall Priority score. These Overall Priority scores will be averaged over all members of the Panel and the proposals will be ranked. The Full Proposal Technical Review Panel will also discuss and determine whether, regardless of ranking and available funding, proposed projects are fundable, or not, as written. The panel will give no consensus advice. Sea Grant staff that serve as ex officio members of the Full Proposal Review Panel (Director, Associate Director, Research Coordinator) will neither vote nor score applications as part of the review process.

The CTSG Management Team will recommend applications for funding in the rank order unless an application is justified to be selected out of rank order based upon one or more of the following selection factors: 1. Availability of funding; 2. While CTSG will consider multiple pre-proposals from the same lead PI in a given competition, no more than one proposal from a given lead PI will be funded in a given competition; 3. Whether this project duplicates other projects funded or considered for funding by other programs; 4. Applicant's prior award performance. In its letter of intent, CTSG will convey whether, regardless of ranking and available funding, the proposed projects are fundable, or not, as written.

Proposal Review Timeline:
June 7, 2021	Full proposal submission deadline
August 6, 2021	Blinded peer reviews sent to PIs for feedback
August 16, 2021	PI rebuttal letter submission deadline
October 1, 2021	Notification of funding decision sent to PIs
October 12, 2021	Final adjusted proposals due in program office
February 1, 2022	Project initiation (subject to the availability of funds)

FOR MORE INFORMATION
See https://seagrant.uconn.edu/funding/grants/, or contact:

Questions regarding eligibility or submission requirements may be directed to:
Dr. Syma A. Ebbin, Research Coordinator
Connecticut Sea Grant College Program

The University of Connecticut
1080 Shennecossett Road
Groton, CT 06340-6048
E-mail: syma.ebbin@uconn.edu
Please note that due to Covid-19 pandemic precautions, I am working remotely for the foreseeable future and do not have access to my office phone. Please correspond with me by email and we can connect by phone call, WebEx or other virtual meeting platform, as appropriate.