



## MHI and CICMHE Research Funding Program

# Research Spark Grants

## 2014 Guidelines for Proposal Development and Submission

**Proposal Due Date: August 15, 2014**

These guidelines are modeled after, and substantially borrow language from, the 2008 version of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) publication:

*Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide, Part I - Proposal Preparation & Submission Guidelines (GPG).*

**Purpose:**

MHI, through its College Industry Council on Material Handling Education (CICMHE), is dedicated to the support of material handling and logistics research and teaching. MHI seeks to develop the faculty of tomorrow by supporting the development of research careers today that focus on topics important to development of the industry. To meet this objective, MHI provides a three-part MHI research grant program:

- Type 1: Research Start-up Grant
- Type 2: Research Spark Grant
- Type 3: Research Partnership Grant

This document is intended to support the development and submission of research proposals. These guidelines are closely modeled after and substantially borrow language from the 2008 version of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) publication, *Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide, Part I - Proposal Preparation & Submission Guidelines (GPG)*.

Questions about the Spark Grant program should be directed to the CICMHE Managing Director, Daniel Stanton at [dstanton@mhi.org](mailto:dstanton@mhi.org).

MHI is the international trade association that has represented the material handling and logistics industry since 1945. MHI members include material handling and logistics equipment and systems manufacturers, integrators, consultants, publishers, and third party logistics providers. Member companies come from all areas of material handling and various parts of the world, making MHI a strong national and international representative for the material handling industry. Much of the work of the industry is done within its product-specific sections, councils and affiliates. MHI also sponsors trade events, such as ProMat and MODEX, to showcase the products and services of its member companies and to educate industry professionals on the productivity solutions provided through material handling and logistics.

The College Industry Council on Material Handling Education (CICMHE) is an independent organization which prepares and provides information, teaching materials and various events in support of material handling education and research. Founded in 1952, CICMHE is composed of college and university educators, material handling equipment manufacturers, distributors, users and consultants, representatives of the business press, and professional staff members of organizations concerned with material handling education.

MHI / College Industry Council on Material Handling Education  
8720 Red Oak Blvd. Suite 201  
Charlotte, NC 28217  
[www.MHI.org](http://www.MHI.org) / [www.CICMHE.org](http://www.CICMHE.org) (email: [CICMHE@mhi.org](mailto:CICMHE@mhi.org))

# Table of Contents

## Research Spark Grants

### 2014 Guidelines for Research Proposal Preparation and Submission

A. MHI Spark Grant Program Intent .....	1
B. Proposal Structure.....	1
C. Assessment Criteria .....	2
D. Review, Award and Contract Process .....	2
E. Proposal Format Specifications .....	3
F. Cover Sheet Specifications.....	3
G. Executive Summary Specifications.....	4
H. Student Involvement Specifications.....	4
I. Budgeting Specifications.....	4
1. Salaries and Wages .....	4
2. Fringe Benefits .....	5
3. Equipment.....	6
4. Travel.....	6
5. Participant Support .....	6
6. Other Direct Costs.....	6
7. Indirect Costs .....	7
8. Cost Sharing .....	7
9. Unallowable Costs.....	8
J. Current and Pending Support Related to Proposal.....	8
K. Guidelines for Reviewer Selection.....	8
L. Guidelines for Projects Involving Human Subjects .....	9
M. Primary MHI/CICMHE Contact .....	10
N. Proposal Submission .....	10
O. Withdrawals and Non-Award Decisions .....	10
1. Proposal Withdrawal .....	10
2. Return Without Review .....	11
3. Declination .....	11
4. Resubmission .....	11

EXHIBIT: Definitions of Categories of Personnel..... 12

- A. Senior Personnel ..... 12
- B. Other Personnel ..... 12

## **A. MHI Spark Grant Program Intent**

The MHI Spark Grant program is targeting professors having a novel high-value research idea with potential high-impact to the material handling and logistics community.

The funding intent of the program is to help researchers:

- Launch and initiate momentum with their research endeavor during a 12-to-18 month horizon;
- Connect with the material handling industry and align with the industry's needs so that their research develops into a win-win situation for the industry players and the researchers;
- Leveraging power so they can get access to other means of financing from agencies and/or industry;
- Train highly qualified personnel at the forefront of the material handling and logistics domain.

Awarded proposals are to be funded either \$25,000, \$50,000, \$75,000, or \$100,000 depending on proposal quality and research needs as well as on the overall funds available for the program. It is the responsibility of principal investigators to specify which combination of the four options they are applying for and to delineate their proposed activities, resources and budget depending on the awarded funding option.

Principal investigators (PIs) must be professors actively teaching and/or performing research at qualified academic institutions in the U.S.A. or Canada. Co-investigators from around the world are welcome.

**Proposals are due by 5:00 p.m. EST on Friday, August 15, 2014.**

## **B. Proposal Structure**

The proposal should be structured as follows, constructed with the discrete funding options in mind:

- Cover page identifying the project, the principal investigator(s) and their institutions
- Executive summary
- Research context and background
- Research idea
- Research goals and objectives
- Research methodology
- Research plan
- Budget and justifications
- Current and Pending Support Related to Proposal
- Qualifications of the research team
- Plans for connecting with material handling and logistics industry and/or end users
- Potential impact on the material handling and logistics community
- Plans for leveraging the Spark Grant funding
- Plans for training highly qualified personnel
- Plans for disseminating the research results
- Key references

- When pertinent, description of prior research funding from MHI within the last five years, and relationships with the current proposal

MHI and CICMHE aim for proposals that are well-written, clear, and lean. Thus, **proposals exceeding 20 pages will be rejected without review**. The cover page and the executive summary should be first and are limited to one page each. The length and order of all other sections is left as a decision for the principal investigators. The proposal is to be self-contained, with no requirements to consult external documents, web sites, or other resources.

No explicit curriculum vitae are to be included in the proposal or joined to it, as the proposal section on qualifications should provide the essentials for assessing the excellence of the research team. Key publications of investigators can be listed in the references section.

The following documents are complement to the proposal, not counted in the 20-page limit:

- Mandatory list of three-to-five suggested reviewers should be provided, optionally coupled with a list of reviewers to be avoided.
- Letters of support from industry and end users to be directly involved in the research can be added. These letters should be directly and clearly focused on the proposal.

### **C. Assessment Criteria**

The following six criteria are used for assessing the proposals:

- Impact potentiality on material handling and logistics industry and end users
- Academic value of the proposed research
- Feasibility of the research plan and budget options
- Excellence of the dissemination and leveraging plans
- Excellence of the research team
- Excellence of the planned training of highly qualified personnel

### **D. Review, Award and Contract Process**

MHI and CICMHE strive to conduct a fair, competitive, and transparent merit-review process for the selection of projects using the assessment criteria stated in section C. To do so, the proposal review process is structured according to three successive stages.

In the first stage, proposals are to be sent to a set of reviewers by the Managing Director of the College Industry Council for Material Handling Education (CICMHE). The reviewers are to evaluate proposals relative to each of the six assessment criteria.

In the second stage, proposals and reviews are to be examined by an academic panel put together by CICMHE. The committee is to provide (1) a group evaluation of each proposal relative to each of the six criteria and (2) a ranked set of proposals recommended for potential funding.

In the third stage, an industry panel put together by MHI is responsible for the final evaluation and ranking of the proposals among those recommended by the academic panel, based on its examination of the proposals and their evaluation and ranking from the academic panel. The panel is responsible for recommending the funding level of each proposal.

After the completion of the three-stage review process, the Chief Executive Officer of MHI is responsible for making the final award decisions on behalf of CICMHE and MHI and authorizing the expenditure of funds.

No commitment on the part of CICMHE or MHI should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with MHI Staff. A PI or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the Chief Executive Officer of MHI does so at its own risk.

MHI reserves the right to reject any and all proposals and to reissue any request for submission of research proposals at any time prior to the execution of a final contract funding a Proposal. MHI may issue addenda to these Guidelines and may request additional information or clarification of proposal contents.

When a decision has been made (whether an award or a declination), the PIs will receive a summary of the academic and industry (if applicable) panel discussions. General descriptive information will be available on the MHI and CICMHE website for any proposals receiving support.

Upon notification of selection, funding of proposals will be subject to a separate contract with each participating institution that will be negotiated after the decision to award funding has been made. That agreement will incorporate the provisions of these Guidelines but will also contain additional terms and conditions to be negotiated between the parties. If the parties are unable to agree to the terms of such a post-award contract, MHI reserves its right to cancel the funding of the Proposal and to select a different Proposal.

Awardee institutions shall not assign or delegate any investigator responsibilities and shall not transfer any interest in any aspect of the proposal regardless of its status to any other person without the prior written consent of MHI and CICMHE.

#### **E. Proposal Format Specifications**

The following format specifications should be strictly respected in order to avoid automatic reject of the proposal:

- Each page of the proposal beyond the cover page should be consecutively numbered;
- A font size of 11 points should be used for the main body of the proposal. A font size of less than 11 points may be used for mathematical formulas or equations as well as for caption of figures, tables or diagrams, provided they readable;
- Margins, in all directions, must be at least an inch;
- Use a single-column format for the text, with single-space and a six point spacing between paragraphs.
- Each reference must include the names of all authors (in the same sequence in which they appear in the publication), the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. If the document is available electronically, the website address also should be identified.

## **F. Cover Sheet Specifications**

The major components of the proposal Cover Sheet are as follows:

(1) Title of Proposed Project

- The title of the project must be brief, scientifically or technically valid, intelligible to a scientifically or technically literate reader, and suitable for use in the public press. MHI and CICMHE, in consultation with the PIs, may edit the title of a project prior to making an award.

(2) Budget and Duration Information

- The budget funding options for which the proposal should be considered. The options are \$25,000, \$50,000, \$75,000 and \$100,000. For example, PIs may select only the \$25,000 and \$50,000. As another example, they could indicate that they want to be considered only for \$75,000 and \$100,000 options.
- The proposed duration for which support is requested must be consistent with the nature and complexity of the proposed activity. Grants are normally awarded for a twelve to eighteen month period, but may be up to two years. PIs are encouraged to request awards for durations of two years only when such durations are necessary for completion of the proposed work and are technically and managerially advantageous. Except in special situations, requested effective dates must allow time for review (typically three months), processing and decision.

(3) Principal Investigator(s) and Institution(s)

- A single principal investigator or two co-principal investigators may be identified.
- The name and e-mail address of each PI should be provided.
- The name, address, and Employer Identification Number of the institution or organization of each PI.

## **G. Executive Summary Specifications**

The executive summary should be suitable for stand-alone publication, not more than one page in length. It should not be an abstract of the proposal, but rather a self-contained description of the activity that would result if the proposal were funded.

It should be informative to other persons working in the same or related fields and, insofar as possible, understandable to a scientifically or technically literate lay reader. It should notably provide insights relative to the value and impact of the proposed research.

## **H. Student Involvement Specifications**

Proposals must clearly identify significant involvement of one or more graduate students working with the Principal Investigator(s). The nature of the research work undertaken by the graduate student should be clearly described.

Beyond the minimal requirements for graduate students, the involvement of undergraduate students is welcome.

## **I. Budgeting Specifications**

Each proposal must contain a budget for each year of support requested, this for each selected budgeting option. The amounts requested for each budget line item should be documented and justified in the budget justification as specified below.

The proposal may request funds under any of the categories listed below so long as the item and amount are considered necessary, reasonable, allocable, and allowable under the applicable cost principles. Amounts and expenses budgeted also must be consistent with the proposing organization's policies and procedures and cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting costs.

When there are two co-principal investigators from distinct institutions, the budget should have a column for each institution and a total column.

### **(1) Salaries and Wages**

The exhibit at the end of this document provides definitions for each category of personnel that have to be explicitly accounted for in the budget.

The names of the PI(s), faculty, and other senior personnel and the estimated number of full-time-equivalent academic-year, summer, or calendar-year person-months for which funding is requested and the total amount of salaries requested per year must be listed. For postdoctoral associates and other professionals, the total number of persons for each position must be listed, with the number of full-time-equivalent person-months and total amount of salaries requested per year. For graduate and undergraduate students, secretarial, clerical, technical, etc., whose time will be charged directly to the project, only the total number of persons and total amount of salaries requested per year in each category is required. Salaries requested must be consistent with the organization's regular practices. The budget justification should detail the rates of pay by individual for senior personnel, postdoctoral associates, and other professionals.

The budget may request funds for support of graduate or undergraduate research assistants to help carry out the proposed research. Compensation classified as salary payments must be requested in the salaries and wages category.

As a general policy, MHI and CICMHE recognize that salaries of faculty members and other personnel associated directly with the project constitute appropriate direct costs and may be requested in proportion to the effort devoted to the project. Individuals included on salaries/wages budget lines should be employees of the proposing institution(s). These lines should not include compensation related to consultants or sub-awardees.

MHI and CICMHE regard research as one of the normal functions of faculty members at institutions of higher education. Compensation for time normally spent on research within the term of appointment is deemed to be included within the faculty member's regular organizational salary.

Grant funds may not be used to augment the total salary or salary rate of faculty members during the period covered by the term of faculty appointment or to reimburse faculty members for consulting or other time in addition to a regular full-time organizational salary covering the same general period of employment.

Up to one month of summer salary may be budgeted for faculty members at colleges and universities on academic-year appointments.

In most circumstances salaries of administrative or clerical staff are included as part of indirect costs (also known as Facilities and Administrative Costs (F&A) for Colleges and Universities). Salaries of administrative or clerical staff may be requested as direct costs for a project requiring an extensive amount of administrative or clerical support and where these costs can be readily and specifically identified with the project with a high degree of accuracy. Salaries for administrative or clerical staff shall be budgeted as a direct cost only if this type of cost is consistently treated as a direct cost in like circumstances for all other projects and cost objectives. The circumstances for requiring direct charging of these services must be clearly described in the budget justification. Such costs, if not clearly justified, may be disallowed.

## **(2) Fringe Benefits**

If the proposer's usual accounting practices provide that its contributions to employee benefits (social security, retirement, other payroll-related taxes and time off including vacation, sick, and other leave, etc.) be treated as direct costs, grant funds may be requested to fund fringe benefits as a direct cost. These are typically determined by application of a calculated fringe benefit rate for a particular class of employee (full time or part-time) applied to the salaries and wages requested.

## **(3) Equipment**

Equipment is defined as an item of property that has an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more (unless the organization has established lower levels) and an expected service life of more than one year. It is important to note that the acquisition cost of equipment includes modifications, attachments, and accessories necessary to make the property usable for the purpose for which it was purchased. Items of needed equipment must be adequately justified, listed individually by description and estimated cost.

Allowable items ordinarily will be limited to research equipment and apparatus not already available for the conduct of the work. General-purpose equipment, such as a personal computers and office furnishings, are not eligible for support.

## **(4) Travel**

Travel and its relation to the proposed activities must be specified and itemized by destination and cost. Funds may be requested for fieldwork, attendance at meetings and conferences, and other travel associated with the proposed work, including subsistence. In order to qualify for support, however, attendance at meetings or conferences must be necessary to accomplish proposal objectives, or disseminate its results. Allowance for air travel should not exceed the cost of round-trip, economy airfares.

## **(5) Participant Support**

Costs of transportation, per diem, stipends and other related costs for participants or trainees (but not employees) are allowed in connection with MHI and CICMHE-sponsored conferences, meetings, symposia, training activities and workshops. For some educational projects conducted at local school districts, however, the participants being trained are employees. In such cases, the costs must be classified as participant support if payment is

made through a stipend or training allowance method. The school district must have an accounting mechanism in place (i.e., sub-account code) to differentiate between regular salary and stipend payments. Generally, indirect costs (F&A) are not allowed on participant support costs. The number of participants to be supported must be entered on the proposal budget. These costs also must be justified in the budget justification section of the proposal.

#### **(6) Other Direct Costs**

Any costs proposed to a grant must be allowable, reasonable and directly allocable to the supported activity. The budget must identify and itemize other anticipated direct costs not included under the headings above, including materials and supplies, publication costs, computer services, consultant services, and tuition. Examples include aircraft rental, space rental at research establishments away from the grantee organization, minor building alterations, payments to human subjects, service charges, and construction of equipment or systems not available off the shelf. Reference books and periodicals may be charged to the grant only if they are specifically allocable to the project being supported.

##### **a. Materials and Supplies**

The proposal budget justification should indicate the general types of expendable materials and supplies required. Materials and supplies are defined as tangible personal property, other than equipment, costing less than \$5,000, or other lower threshold consistent with the policy established by the proposing organization. Cost estimates must be included for items that represent a substantial amount of the proposed line item cost.

##### **b. Publication/Documentation/Dissemination**

The proposal budget may request funds for the costs of documenting, preparing, publishing or otherwise making available to others the findings and products of the work conducted under the grant. This generally includes the following types of activities: reports, reprints, page charges or other journal costs (except costs for prior or early publication); necessary illustrations; cleanup, documentation, storage and indexing of data and databases; development, documentation and debugging of software.

##### **c. Computer Services**

The cost of computer services, including computer-based retrieval of scientific, technical and educational information, may be requested only where it is institutional policy to charge such costs as direct charges. A justification based on the established computer service rates at the proposing organization must be included. The proposal budget also may request costs for leasing of computer equipment. General purpose (word processing, spreadsheets, communication) computer equipment should not be requested. Special purpose or scientific use computers or associated hardware and software, however, may be requested as items of equipment when necessary to accomplish the project objectives and not otherwise reasonably available.

d. **Sub-awards**

Except for the procurement of such items as commercially available supplies, materials, equipment or general support services allowable under the grant, no significant part of the research or substantive effort under a grant may be contracted or otherwise transferred to another organization without prior MHI/CICMHE authorization. The intent to enter into such arrangements must be disclosed in the proposal, and a separate budget should be provided for each sub-awardee, if already identified, along with a description of the work to be performed. Otherwise, the disclosure should include a clear description of the work to be performed, and the basis for selection of the sub-awardee (except for collaborative/joint arrangements).

e. **Tuition**

Tuition for students should reflect the percentage of time spent on the research.

f. **Other Costs**

Any other direct costs not specified above must be itemized, detailed and justified in the budget justification.

**(7) Indirect Costs**

Indirect costs are also known as Facilities and Administrative Costs (F&A) for Colleges and Universities. MHI and CICMHE's applicable indirect cost rate(s) is 25%. The amount for indirect costs should be calculated by applying the indirect cost rate(s) to the approved base(s). Indirect cost recovery for colleges, universities, and other organizations of higher education are additionally restricted using the negotiated F&A rates that are in effect at the time of the initial award throughout the life of the sponsored agreement.

**(8) Cost sharing**

There is no expectation that proposals submitted for funding will include a cost-sharing component. When cost sharing is included, it is solely at the discretion of the proposing institution, but may be a distinguishing or supporting factor in the decision to make an award. However, once cost sharing is proposed on Line K, and accepted, the commitment of funds becomes legally binding and is subject to audit.

Failure to provide the level of cost sharing reflected in the approved grant budget may result in termination of the grant, disallowance of grant costs and/or refund of grant funds to MHI and CICMHE by the grantee.

**(9) Unallowable Costs**

The following categories of unallowable costs are highlighted because of their sensitivity:

a. **Entertainment**

Costs of entertainment, amusement, diversion and social activities and any costs directly associated with such activities (such as tickets to shows or sporting events, meals, lodging, rentals, transportation and gratuities) are unallowable. Travel, meal and hotel expenses of grantee employees who are not on travel status are

unallowable. Costs of employees on travel status are limited to those allowed under the governing cost principles for travel expenses.

**b. Meals and coffee breaks**

No MHI or CICMHE funds may be spent on meals or coffee breaks for intramural meetings of an organization or any of its components, including, but not limited to, laboratories, departments and centers.

**c. Alcoholic beverages**

No MHI or CICMHE funds may be spent on alcoholic beverages

**J. Current and Pending Support Related to Proposal**

This section of the proposal calls for required information on all current and pending support for ongoing projects and proposals related to the proposed project, including subsequent funding in the case of continuing grants. All current related project support from whatever source (e.g., federal, state, local or foreign government agencies, public or private foundations, industrial or other commercial organizations) must be listed. The total award amount for the entire award period covered (including indirect costs) must be shown as well as the number of person-months per year to be devoted to the project, regardless of source of support. Similar information must be provided for all proposals already submitted or submitted concurrently to other possible sponsors. Concurrent submission of a proposal to other organizations will not prejudice its review.

If the project now being submitted has been funded previously by a source other than MHI or CICMHE, the information requested in the paragraph above must be furnished for the last period of funding.

**K. Guidelines for Reviewer Selection**

The guidelines for the selection of reviewers are designed to ensure selection of experts who can give MHI and CICMHE the proper information needed to make a recommendation in accordance with the approved criteria for selection of projects. Ideally, reviewers should have:

- Special knowledge of the subfields involved in the proposals to be reviewed to evaluate competence, intellectual merit, and utility of the proposed activity. Within reasonable limits, reviewers' fields of specialty should be complementary within a reviewer group.
- Broader or more generalized knowledge of subfields involved in the proposals to be reviewed to evaluate the broader impacts of the proposed activity. Reviewers with broad expertise are required for proposals involving substantial size or complexity, broad disciplinary or multidisciplinary content, or significant national or international implications.
- Broad knowledge of the infrastructure of the science and engineering enterprise, and its educational activities, to evaluate contributions to societal goals, scientific and engineering personnel, and distribution of resources to organizations and geographical areas.
- To the extent possible, diversified representation within the review group. The goal is to achieve a balance among various characteristics.

Here are some conditions that must be avoided, unless a waiver has been granted:

- Having a reviewer who has a personal relationship with a PI, such as his/her spouse, minor child, close relative, current or former collaborator, former thesis student/advisor or business partner; from an organization where the reviewer is employed has an arrangement for future employment or is negotiating for employment; or from an organization where the reviewer is an officer, director, trustee, or partner has a financial interest in the outcome of the proposal.
- Having a reviewer having a connection with an institution or other entity. Examples include a reviewer's recent former employer; an organization in which the reviewer is an active participant; an institution at which the reviewer is currently enrolled as a student, or at which he/she serves as a visiting committee member; or an entity with which the reviewer has or seeks some other business or financial relationship (including receipt of an honorarium).

A PI proposing a reviewer represented by the above conditions leads to a proposal disqualification.

#### **L. Guidelines for Projects Involving Human Subjects**

Projects involving research with human subjects must ensure that subjects are protected from research risks. MHI and CICMHE follow the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) policy, requiring conformance with the relevant federal policy known as the Common Rule (*Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 45 CFR 690*). All projects involving human subjects must either (1) have approval from the organization's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before issuance of an MHI or CICMHE award or, (2) must affirm that the IRB has declared the research exempt from IRB review, in accordance with the applicable subsection, as established in section 101(b) of the Common Rule.

The following information regarding the organization's intention to utilize human subjects as part of the project should be provided on the Cover Sheet:

- The proposal Cover Sheet should clearly indicate the envisioned use of human subjects.
- If human subject activities are exempt from IRB review, provide the exemption number(s) corresponding to one or more of the exemption categories. The six categories of research that qualify for exemption from coverage by the regulations are defined in the Common Rule for Protection of Human Subjects.
- If the research is not designated as exempt, the IRB approval date should be identified in the space provided. This date, at minimum, should cover the period at which the project is initiated. If IRB approval has not been obtained prior to submission, the proposer should indicate "Pending" in the space provided for the approval date.
- Enter the Federal Wide Assurance (FWA) Number that the proposer has on file with the Office of Human Research Protections, if available.

#### **M. Primary MHI and CICMHE Contact**

All questions, requests for clarification, and request for additional information about this request for research proposals must be submitted via e-mail to [CICMHE@MHI.org](mailto:CICMHE@MHI.org) or in writing to Daniel Stanton, CICMHE Managing Director, MHI, 8720 Red Oak Blvd. Suite 201, Charlotte, NC, 28217. No written or oral response by any other employee or agent of MHI or CICMHE shall be binding or shall in any way constitute a change to these Guidelines or a commitment by MHI or CICMHE. If a

Proposer finds any inconsistency or any ambiguity in these Guidelines of this RFP, the Proposer should notify MHI via this primary contact.

#### **N. Proposal Submission**

The Proposal must contain the signature of a duly Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) of the institution of each principal investigator, who has the power to bind the investigators to the requirements, terms and conditions in these Guidelines. Proposals submitted without such authorized signatures may, in MHI's sole discretion, be rejected without further consideration.

The electronic version of the proposal must be provided in PDF format and should be in a single file. The allowed complement documents should be provided as separate PDF files.

The electronic version may be included with the paper version or may be emailed to [CICMHE@MHI.org](mailto:CICMHE@MHI.org). The paper version of the proposal with the original signature of the AOR shall be sent directly to the MHI Primary Contact via courier or U.S. mail only; no submissions should be faxed or only e-mailed.

A request for a proposal file update will be automatically accepted once if submitted prior to the deadline date specified in the solicitation or the initiation of review, and rejected otherwise.

#### **O. Withdrawals and Non-Award Decisions**

##### **(1) Proposal Withdrawal**

A proposal may be withdrawn at any time before a funding recommendation is made. Withdrawals may be initiated by the PIs or the organization(s) Sponsored Projects Office (SPO). In the case of collaborative proposals, all PIs or SPOs must support the request before the entire proposal is withdrawn. Portions of the collaborative proposal that are not withdrawn may have an opportunity to be reviewed following consultation with the CICMHE Managing Director.

MHI and CICMHE must be notified if any funding for the proposed project is received from another source or sponsor. If it is brought to MHI and CICMHE's attention that funding for a proposal has been accepted from another sponsor, MHI and CICMHE will send a notice of pending withdrawal to the PI and the SPO, providing thirty (30) days to respond. Any response must demonstrate why such funding is justified and does not duplicate funding provided by MHI and CICMHE.

MHI and CICMHE provide notice of a withdrawal, return, declination, or reconsideration to both the PI and the SPO.

##### **(2) Return Without Review**

Proposals may not be considered, leading to its return without review for the following reasons:

- Inappropriate for funding by MHI or CICMHE;
- Submitted with insufficient lead-time before the activity is scheduled to begin;
- Duplicate of, or substantially similar to, a proposal already under consideration from the same submitter;
- Does not meet proposal preparation requirements, such as page limitations, formatting instructions, and electronic submission, as specified in this guide;
- Does not meet an announced proposal deadline date;

- Previously reviewed and declined and has not been substantially revised; and
- Duplicates another proposal that was already awarded.

**(3) Declinations**

A PI whose proposal for support has been declined will receive information and an explanation of the reason(s) for declination. If that explanation does not satisfy the PI, he/she may request additional information from MHI and CICMHE.

**(4) Resubmission**

A declined proposal may be resubmitted, but only after it has undergone substantial revision. A resubmitted proposal that has not clearly taken into account the major comments or concerns resulting from the prior review may be returned without review. MHI and CICMHE will treat the revised proposal as a new proposal, subject to the standard review procedures.

## **Exhibit : Definitions of Categories of Personnel**

Personnel categories to be differentiated in the Proposal Budget are defined as follows:

### **A. Senior Personnel**

1. (co) Principal Investigator(s) -- the individual(s) designated by the grantee and approved by MHI and CICMHE who will be responsible for the scientific or technical direction of the project. If more than one, the first one listed will have primary responsibility for the project and the submission of reports.
2. Faculty Associate (faculty member) -- an individual other than the Principal Investigator(s) considered by the performing institution to be a member of its faculty or who holds an appointment as a faculty member at another institution, and who will participate in the project being supported.

### **B. Other Personnel**

1. Postdoctoral Scholar -- An individual who has received a doctoral degree (or equivalent) and is engaged in a temporary and defined period of mentored advanced training to enhance the professional skills and research independence needed to pursue his or her chosen career path. Postdoctoral scholars not identified under Senior Personnel above should be listed as Other Personnel.
2. Other Professional -- a person who may or may not hold a doctoral degree or its equivalent, who is considered a professional and is not reported as a Principal Investigator, faculty associate, postdoctoral scholar or student. Examples of persons included in this category are doctoral associates not reported under B1, professional technicians, physicians, veterinarians, system experts, computer programmers and design engineers.
3. Graduate Student (research assistant) -- a part-time or full-time student working on the project in a research capacity who holds at least a bachelor's degree and is enrolled in a degree program leading to an advanced degree.
4. Undergraduate Student -- a student who is enrolled in a degree program (part-time or full-time) leading to a bachelor's or associate's degree.
5. Non-research personnel -- include persons working on the project in a non-research capacity, such as secretaries, clerk-typists, draftsmen, animal caretakers, electricians and custodial personnel regardless of whether they hold a degree or are involved in degree work.

Any personnel category for which funds are requested must indicate, in the parentheses provided on the Proposal Budget, the number of persons expected to receive some support from those funds and, where called for in the budget format, person-months to the nearest tenth.