Proposal Preparation Guide - Updated 6-16-2005

Contents of this Guide

Kent State University
Division of Research and Graduate Studies (RAGS) and Technology Transfer
Sponsored Programs Office

Introduction
This pamphlet is intended primarily for use by faculty and staff who need to know how to write a proposal for submission to a potential funding source. Proposals are submitted on a competitive basis; essentially all proposals vie for limited funds; those which are successful result in grants. Regardless of the field of interest which it reflects or prospective recipient to which it is submitted, the proposal typically consists of many of the same components.

Some extramural funding sources specify that a particular format be used for the writing of the proposal and that special forms be attached. Other sources leave the presentation entirely to the writer. Foundations are usually less formal than are

governmental agencies and rarely require a highly standardized presentation. Contained within this pamphlet are general guidelines for the preparation of an acceptable proposal as well as for the development of a proposal budget. Under no circumstances should these guidelines substitute for a desired format requested in guidelines issued by a particular agency.

Format

Where no format has been specified by a funding source, the following outline is suggested for use; it includes all that is generally required in a proposal. This outline is only a model to be adjusted to the needs of a particular type of project. **A typical proposal outline consists of the following:**

- **Title Page**
- **Abstract**
- **Table of Contents with List of Tables and/or Illustrations**
- **Project Description**
  -
    - **Introduction**
    - **Problem Statement**
    - **Objectives**
    - **Methodology**
    - **Personnel**
    - **Facilities**
    - **Evaluation Plan**
- **Budget**
- **List of References**
- **Bibliography**
- **Appendices**

Title Page

Generally the title page should identify:
The proposed project's title, which should be simple and brief;

1. the name and address of the submitting organization (Kent State University, Attention: Sponsored Programs, Division of Research and Graduate Studies, PO Box 5190, Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
2. the date of the proposal submission
3. the desired starting date for the project
4. the duration of the project, which should be consistent with the project's nature and complexity
5. the signature, name, title, and academic department of the principal investigator
6. the signature, name, and title of the official authorizing submission on behalf of the submitting organization
7. the total amount requested

Requirements for the title page will vary slightly according to agency. Information additional to that presented in the above list may be requested by a particular sponsor. It is therefore advisable to check any specific stipulations mandated by the funding source to which one is applying.

Abstract
Following the title page is the abstract or summary which should synthesize the body of the proposal. Although the abstract is the first section to appear, it is commonly the last to be written. A reviewer who must read a large number of proposals obtains initial information by reading the abstract, thereby making the abstract a significant aspect of the review process. While limiting the number of words to that allotted by the sponsor (often two hundred to two hundred fifty words), the proposal writer should clearly and concisely state the nature of the problem to be researched, the measurable objectives, the procedures for implementation of the project, the anticipated results, their significance, and their beneficiaries. If the project has a unique component such as its research or methodology, this should be indicated in the abstract.

Table of Contents with List of Tables and/or Illustrations
The table of contents should immediately follow but not include the abstract page. It should locate each section and major subdivision of the proposal. In most circumstances the table of contents should remain simple; no division beyond the first subheading is needed. If several illustrations or tables appear in the body of the proposal, they, too, should appear in the list of tables/illustrations which is incorporated into or follows the table of contents.

Project Description
Introduction
Setting forth the major focus of the proposal, the introduction to the project description should tell the reviewer what the principal investigator wants to do and should demonstrate the relationship of the proposed project to the interests of the potential funding source. It is this section which presents the proposal's background information and demonstrates to the reviewer the basis from which the principal investigator plans to begin his/her project.

How does this proposal relate to previous projects? Appropriate references to prior research in the field, including that of the principal investigator, should be summarized in the introduction, thereby conveying to the reviewer the investigator's knowledge of the field. The introductory review of literature should be selective, not overwhelming. If the principal investigator has received previous awards pertaining to the project, it is in the introduction that he/she should mention them and should delineate the progress made, discussing briefly the particular publications resulting from the awards. Here, too, he/she can describe how previous research or preliminary projects have suggested the need for further study of the problem.

Moreover, this section should present background information illustrating the strengths of the applicant institution, relative to the proposed project. The introductory section might briefly portray staff qualities and facilities that make the applicant institution well suited for the project. A complete description of personnel and facilities should occur later in separate sections.

The introduction should remain succinct, essentially establishing the credibility of the principal investigator and his/her project team. It should, in short, supply the proper framework for the rest of the proposal and should lead smoothly into a description of the proposed project which has as its first component an analysis of the problem to be studied.

Problem Statement
Why do funding sources contribute money? Primarily a funding source wants to purchase better conditions, or, in the case of research studies, to improve the state of the art. In the proposal's problem statement section, therefore, the principal investigator should present a detailed analysis of the problem which he/she intends to explore, a statement of the work to be undertaken, and, more explicitly, documentation of the need for that work. Throughout the analysis, one question should prevail: Can the principal investigator's research, demonstration, or training improve what now "is"? In sum, the principal investigator must document a need, demonstrate sufficiently that this particular project meets that need, and convince the reader that what is proposed is worthy of financing.

Whereas the Introduction told the reviewers where the proposal is headed, what the principal investigator wants to do, and why he/she and his/her institution are qualified to do it, this section should now validate the problem and substantiate the need for study by citing authoritative sources known to be knowledgeable about the situation Furthermore, if the problem to be studied involves, in addition to the applicant institution, cooperation with another organization which sees a need for the study, the proposal should include a support letter from the latter. The letter may be placed in an appendix, but should be referred to in this section.

For additional corroboration of the need, the principal investigator should provide appropriate statistical data. If data is limited, the narrative could incorporate it. If tables, charts, graphs, or line drawings are essential, they should appear in an appendix and only be referred to in the narrative itself.

Presumably the proposed project will build upon past work, complementing and extending what has already occurred. A few previous studies might be discussed in detail so that a reviewer easily comprehends the relevance of the new work to the old. Moreover, the principal investigator should point out the proposed project's new ideas and contributions to new theories. While indicating their uniqueness, he/she should adequately substantiate their significance.

Is this study replicable? The significance of a proposed project depends, in part, on its ability to be duplicated. Results of the project described should be transferable.

There is, however, a happy medium between presentation of a project too broad in its application and one that is transferable but sustains the strength of a particular focus. A project should be manageable. Given the parameters of a circumscribed time element and restricted financial sources, the principal investigator should preserve his/her credibility by narrowing his/her focus to a readily accomplishable project. It is that focus which should be adequately justified.

While denoting the rationale for the project's boundaries and for the specified choice of focus as to the exclusion of others, the principal investigator should allude to the next or Objectives section and, additionally, to that of Methodology. It is essential that the latter two are consistent in magnitude with the need that is stated, with the distinct focus of the problem to be studied.

Objectives
Adequately reflecting the problem statement are the objectives showing what will be done to solve the problem. Objectives are anticipated outcomes of a project. The problem has been stated; the objectives should offer some relief of that stated problem.

As expected results, objectives should be specific and achievable. In this section the principal investigator should state who (among his/her staff) will do what and how much (in numerical terms) at what cost for whom (population to benefit if pertinent) in what time frame. In research proposals, particularly in surveys or in exploratory research, objectives might be phrased as questions to be answered, or, if there is a basis for predicting, they might take the form of hypotheses. However phrased, they should be so explicit and readily identifiable that they are measurable. The principal investigator should, in fact, briefly allude to the Evaluation Plan section and to the measurement indicators which will be used to determine the extent to which objectives have been achieved.

The presentation of these objectives might take a form as simple as a list, with each objective consisting of just a few sentences to include only enough technical detail necessary for explanation of what will be done. Arrangement of the list might be in chronological order as to when objectives would be fulfilled or it might be in order of importance as to those objectives offering a solution to the defined problem.

Furthermore, these objectives which so neatly fit the problem statement must, too, foreshadow the remainder of the proposal. The objectives should be consistent with the ability of available personnel as well as facilities and should be reflected in the methodology, evaluation, and budget sections to follow. The methodology section, which is the first to follow, is the counterpart of this section for, as the objectives denote what will be done, the methodology section must tell how it will be done.

Methodology

Thus far, the proposal has identified a particular problem, ascertained the need for its study, and presented desired objectives aimed at its solution. Now, in the methodology section, it is time to tell both how and when the anticipated objectives will be accomplished. A thoroughly detailed plan of attack including, if possible, a demonstration of its uniqueness, will enable a reviewer to evaluate more accurately the principal investigator's capabilities.

Initially this proposal should summarize the theoretical case for the selected methodology and present a synopsis of the overall design. Next should come a pint by point description of specific activities leading to the solution of the problem. Using graphs, charts, figures, or tables wherever necessary for clarification, the proposal should present in logical and chronological sequence a reasonable scope of activities to be accomplished within a certain time frame. The methodology may be set upon in a variety of ways, including by functional categories such as planning, development, and implementation; or by time blocks. Whatever the preferred procedure, the interrelationship of the activities should be discussed and deadline dates for the completion of each should be designated. The proposer should assure that the work proposed can be done within the time proposed.

The proposer should separate each procedural phase into a distinct and manageable activity and, in so doing, should incorporate a summary statement of the expected objective that each phase will produce. Objectives and procedures should be consistent; the proposal should include neither objectives for which there are no procedures, nor procedures unrelated to particular objectives.

Within the detailed statement of methodology, there should appear a discussion of the logistics involved, of techniques, planning tools, data gathering, and data analysis. This section should be naturally adapted to the purpose of the study. If, for example, the project encompasses the planning of a seminar, the proposer should list, among other details, methods of organizing, conducting, and disseminating results from the seminar. If the project is collaborative, the proposer should list the names and addresses of collaborators and should refer to appended letters of support from collaborating individuals or agencies. If the project is to serve participants, the basis for their selection as well as for the securing of their cooperation should be described. If the project is a case study of a particular population, the proposal should contain a description of the population, information on sampling procedures, on site selection, on the obtaining of the participants' consent to participate, on protection precautions, on possible risks and potential benefits to participants, and on provisions for withdrawal of participants. If the proposal is for experimental research, the principal investigator should pose hypotheses to investigate or questions to be asked and design well-controlled experiments for obtaining the data which will answer these questions. There should be a discussion of control of variables and a confirmation of the validity of instruments to be used. A discussion of expected results should accompany each described step of the experiment.

Often experiments do not work. The choice of methodology should, therefore, be justified perhaps by other projects which, through their use of similar methods, suggest that the selected methodology is appropriate. In addition, well-known standard

techniques should be referred to. If the methodology contains intrinsic limitations, the principal investigator should alert reviewers to his/her cognizance of them and should provide, where necessary, alternative possibilities. A plan should be included for review by the staff as the project proceeds so that necessary modifications can be made in the remaining part of the experiment.

Regardless of the type of study, the proposer should, in this section, justify the funds needed for various items such as the use of consultants, supplies, equipment, or travel, so that the budget, rather than appearing as a surprise, logically mirrors these methodological needs.

The final part of the methodology section should recapitulate the anticipated results, their contribution to the state of the art, their potential impact and application. Plans for dissemination of these results should be included. Most commonly an agency requires a final report denoting a project's results. Publication is the ordinary vehicle for disseminating results. There may be, however, some unusual ways of dissemination (such as through films, videotapes, websites, workshops, and conferences), ways which should be fully delineated in this section.

Stating the expected results does not signify that one is able to predict the findings exactly. Nevertheless, by stating a probable result, the principal investigator signals the reviewer that he/she has thought through his/her problem and is maintaining control over the testing of hypotheses. Measuring of these results should be described in a subsequent or Evaluation Plan section.

Personnel
In discussing how and when objectives will be accomplished, it is important to denote clearly the responsibilities of the various personnel involved in the proposed project. The Personnel section should describe all professional staff, state how much time each of the staff will spend on the project, and what the specific role of each will be.

In describing personnel, the proposer should carefully point out the competence and experience of each related to his/her project assignment. The proposal should include resumes for key personnel, emphasizing background and relevant current publications which substantiate personnel ability to conduct the particular project. Those papers which are in preparation, submitted, or in press, and which pertain to the project should also be listed. Preprints may be included in an appendix. It may, in fact, be necessary to prepare resumes suitable for the specific project. Although resumes need not be included for support staff who play minor roles, it is essential to explain their tasks and to justify their appointments.

If the project involves collaboration with other organizations or individuals, it would be beneficial to present evidence of past successful cooperation and to list, if possible, collaborative publications. If the proposed work requires the use of consultants, their potential contribution to the project's success should be elucidated and their willingness to participate should be documented. No person should be listed without his/her

permission. It would be extremely unwise to attempt to strengthen a proposal by inserting the name of a well-known expert, unbeknownst to him/her, as a consultant only to find that the latter is a reviewer.

Provided that their consent is obtained, consultants might be used advantageously, especially for their technical competence. In some cases a new investigator might improve his/her chances by working with an inveterate researcher, but, balance should be maintained; too many consultants could portend an incompetent staff.

The Personnel section, detailing key project positions, support positions, collaborative efforts, and use of consultants, should recount to the funding agency those who will be responsible for the project and its various activities. Furthermore, this section should partially form the requisite justification for budget requests.

Facilities
The proposer should prepare a section on facilities available for the project. A list of adequate facilities confirms the capabilities of the proposing institution's strength in the intended field of study. The description of facilities should include that of any special equipment or unusual asset in the institution's physical plant which might enhance the project's success. Indicating their accessibility, the proposal should describe such items as specialized computers, pertinent library collections, laboratories, space, and unusual services. Mention should be made of and justification provided for additional items needed to complete the work, but, to state that a proposing institution is lacking enough to need excessive equipment would be to suggest weakness leading to a proposal's poor evaluation. On the other hand, an institution's willingness to commit equipment and space to a project's use could only serve to heighten the proposal's chance for award.

During the course of the project, if it is necessary at times to use another organization's facilities or equipment, the proposal must document their availability to the project. The choice of a project site which is not home based would require substantial explanation as to its attributes and appropriateness.

Evaluation Plan
If objectives of the proposed project have been, as should be, specific, concrete, and measurable, they are then the precursors of an effective evaluation section. The final stage of the proposal's project description should contain some indication of how the project will be evaluated. This evaluation determines whether or not the project's objectives have been met and to what degree. The four basic types of proposal evaluation design are summative, formative, impact, and context. The principal investigator should discuss his/her choice of design, should provide the rationale for its selection, and should demonstrate an awareness of any pitfalls which he/she may encounter.

A summative evaluation is probably the one most commonly used by those submitting to funding agencies for support; it is this type of design which is directed toward those

interested in results. Conducted at the conclusion of a project, the summative evaluation measures the outcomes of a project and tells the funding source whether or not a project has been successful. This type of evaluation tends to justify past activities. Because generally the project is, at the time of evaluation, complete, its procedures cannot usually be corrected; the project staff is, therefore, not the primary beneficiary. The funding source as the beneficiary should be given annual or final reports (depending upon requirements) to measure results. As evidence of earnestness, the principal investigator might place in the proposal a brief preliminary outline of the contents of intended reports.

Unlike summative evaluation, formative evaluation is not directed simply toward measuring results; it is an information instrument to be used during a project to indicate the necessity for adjustments in the project as it progresses. Particularly helpful to the project staff, formative evaluation tells them about the soundness of their materials and the efficacy of their procedures, and can signal the need for changes in order to effect the stated objectives. The proposer should indicate exactly how and when the staff will be apprised of evaluation discoveries, be it in an oral presentation or in a written briefing.

Impact evaluation judges rather than measures a project's effects. Occurring either during the course of a project or at its end, this type of evaluation could benefit both staff and funding source. Essentially, impact evaluation determines the value of a project's results.

Context evaluation is a fourth type which analyzes those variables in a project's background bearing upon the project's conduct or results. This type may be valuable during both the procedural phase of a project and in determining the worth of its results but is probably of greater interest to the project staff than to the funding source. In both impact and context evaluations as with summative and formative evaluations, the principal investigator should identify his/her users and describe the method of disseminating the evaluation information to them.

The principal investigator should specify who will conduct the evaluation. Will it be an outsider who is hired and listed in the proposal budget? Would an outside evaluator be truly unbiased or would he/she be compromised by the possibility of obtaining a future contract if the evaluation is positive? On the other hand an insider could be so sensitive to deleterious effects of a poor evaluation upon the project staff and proposer's organization that the evaluation could be unduly positive and possibly invalid. These are issues that should be considered.

The proposer should also address the questions of how evaluation data information will be collected and analyzed and in what timeframe these activities will take place. The applicant should discuss techniques for collecting evaluation data such as interviews or pre-testing and post-testing, as well as the measurement instruments to be used. The proposal should include a justification for these data collection mechanisms, a defense of the appropriateness of the chosen instruments, and a statement of the conditions

under which the instruments will be used. As for analysis, the proposer should denote its treatment, be it theoretical or statistical. A discussion of techniques to be applied in the analysis will demonstrate the proposer's technical competence. Furthermore, all data collection and analysis should be performed in accord with a simple time schedule (activity phases to occur in specified months of the project) which is carefully illustrated in the proposal.

Throughout the proposed evaluation process, a set of measurement standards should be apparent for each objective. It should be clear that upon completion of the evaluation, a project's effectiveness will be ascertained. Any doubts about the project's effectiveness should be dissipated.

Budget
The proposal's last section is usually the budget. All costs of a project should be alluded to in the project description; no budget item should surprise a reviewer. Furthermore, all project necessities should be itemized in detail as well as justified in a narrative component of a budget section.

Honesty is the budget's essential characteristic. The budget should be neither padded nor insufficient. Although by necessity only an estimate, the budget should nevertheless be a fairly accurate estimate. As a projection of future costs, allowances for cost increases in future years should be made. A realistic estimate of project costs is a good indication of a proposer's managerial ability. It is also highly unlikely that an agency will, upon the award, increase the proposed budget.

Generally an agency provides information as to the size of an acceptable budget. There are also restrictions as to its components. Kent State University's Division of Research and Graduate Studies (the Sponsored Programs office) has current agency guidelines and must be consulted during the preparation of a budget. Sponsored Programs' staff will make certain that fiscal mandates of both agency and university are adhered to, including the requirement by some agencies for a contribution on the part of Kent State University.

Most sponsors provide their own formats for proposal budgets; in some cases, however, the format is left to the proposer's discretion. **Whatever the case, the budget usually includes the following categories of budget items which should be taken into account during preliminary budget preparation:**

I. Direct Costs
A. Personnel (KSU)

- Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator(s), Faculty/Research Associates
- Postdoctoral associates
- Graduate students
- Undergraduate students

- Technical assistants

B. Fringe Benefits

- Personnel retirement; worker's compensation; medical/dental/life insurances; Medicare, etc
- Graduate student tuition

C. Consultant Fees

- Honorarium
- Transportation (air, ground)
- Per diem

D. Equipment
E. Materials and Supplies and Services
F. Travel (Domestic or Foreign)

- Transportation (air, ground)
- Per diem

G. Other

- Subaward
- Communications (telephone, postage)
- Shipping, courier
- Publication costs
- Printing and duplicating
- Equipment maintenance
- Other (with explanation)

II. Indirect Costs – (Facilities and Administrative Costs)
III. Kent State University Cost Share

Direct Costs

Personnel
In calculating personnel costs, the proposer should list the title and name of all professionals and nonprofessionals involved in the project and should justify each of their roles. The phrase "To be named" should, if possible, be avoided. If used, the proposer should discuss the type of individual to be recruited and should describe his/her qualifications desired.

For each of the project personnel, the percentage of time spent on the project should be stated and quantified as per his/her Kent State University salary or stipend (if a

graduate assistant, the stipend varies according to department and must follow established rates within a given department). According to federal regulations, no Kent State employee is permitted a scheduled effort in excess of one hundred percent of his/her time. The effort during academic-year months and that during summer months should be specified separately. No amount of salary exceeding the normal full-time, academic year contractual salary may be paid to Kent State faculty. Summer salary may be paid only to those on academic year contracts. Salary for summer months must be budgeted at a rate based upon the preceding academic year salary. Even in relation to summer salary, there are some limitations. Some agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, limit summer support to 2/9 of the academic year salary. Sponsored Programs will provide information pertaining to any such stipulation. For those Kent State employees on calendar year contracts, no amount may be added to their contractual salaries.

In budgeting personnel costs for future years, it is wise to project annual increments allowing for eventual salary increases. These increases, even if approved in a grant, may be implemented only in accord with Kent State University salary increases.

Fringe Benefits
Fringe benefits for Kent State University project personnel are calculated as a percentage of salaries and wages.   Benefits include retirement; worker's compensation; medical, dental, and life insurance; and Medicare, for example. Because the allowable percentage is subject to change, it is advisable to contact Sponsored Programs for current rates. For graduate students, the tuition benefit must follow established university rates.

Consultants
Normally grantee institutions use the services of their own personnel in performing project activities. There are times when an individual or firm must be hired to provide professional advice beyond the capacity of project personnel. These individuals or firms receive compensation on a consultant basis.

Generally, those paid as consultants on a university grant should not be employees of the applicant institution. Sponsors view intra-university consulting as a university obligation, whereby no compensation in addition to full-time salary is allowable.   Only in unusual circumstances may an educational institution pay consulting fees to one of its salaried faculty members. According to federal regulations (Circular A-21 of the Office of Management and Budget), intra-university consulting is reimbursable if consulting is across departmental lines or involves a separate or remote operation and if work performed by the consult is in addition to his/her regular departmental workload. In such cases, intra-university consultants may be commensurate with their university salaries (not to exceed sponsoring agency limitations).

Should a proposer anticipate the need for consultant services, he/she should, in the budget justification, refer to the rationale for their use as already stated in the narrative and should (if this has not yet been done) provide documentation as to the consultants' willingness to participate in the project. In arriving at figures, the proposer should in no

case exceed a sponsor's or the federal government's maximum daily personal compensation rate (check with S Sponsored Programs) but should include also on the budget's consultant line an amount to cover travel and per diem allowance for those hired on a consultant basis.

Equipment

Equipment requires documentation and justification.   Permanent equipment is defined as property having a particular acquisition cost (which varies with each agency) and a particular useful life (also varying according to agency). Included in the budget for equipment should be an amount sizable enough to cover freight and installation charges as well as the cost of maintenance (listed under budget section "Other"), accessories, or ancillary apparatus necessary to make the equipment usable for the proposed project. Estimates inflated for delayed start and quoted by particular manufacturers should be included. A principal investigator's statement as to the critical need for the particular equipment should be incorporated. In some cases, the request for extremely expensive equipment will require a statement by the University's authorized organizational representative certifying that this equipment is essential and not already available, and that the university will maintain it properly.

Equipment requests are limited to special purpose equipment, that which is usable only for research, medical, scientific, or technical activities. Examples of such equipment are X-ray machines, spectrometers, gas chromatographs, and the like. In no case may money be allocated for general purpose equipment.

Materials and Supplies and Services

Unlike permanent equipment, materials and supplies and minor equipment are considered expendable property and should be listed by general types. Among these may be office, laboratory, field, and data processing supplies. Extraordinary amounts for any one item should be clearly justified. The cost of animals for laboratory experiments may appear on the supply line (as in Public Health Service Grant Application Form 398). The unit purchase cost and the unit care for these animals should be specified.

Travel

Most sponsors will pay requested travel costs where such travel will be of direct benefit to a project, but, travel can be a sensitive issue. Domestic and foreign travel should be presented separately. It is advisable to give details about travel plans if known, to explain the relationship of the budgeted travel to the proposed program, and to justify the planned travel adequately. Funds may be requested for travel, for example, to professional meetings (specify which meeting, if possible, and indicate whether presentation of a paper is anticipated); to collect samples or data; or to supervise trainees in the field. Costs of air and ground transportation, hotels, meals, and conference registration fees should reflect both sponsoring agency regulations and fall within university policy governing travel expense reimbursement. In the case of foreign travel, per diem rates should not exceed the federal government's allowable rates.

Other Direct Costs
The last direct cost category, "Other Direct Costs," may contain several subcategories, such as:

Subawards
If the proposed project necessitates work on the part of a subcontracting organization, that organization should prepare and submit to Kent State University (the potential prime contractor) a budget signed by the subcontracting organization's authorized institutional official. Sponsored Programs will review the subcontract figures, incorporating them into the Kent State budget. Sponsored Programs must authorize entry into any subcontract agreement with another agency.

Communications
This line should contain the charges for long distance telephone calls and postage. If a separate telephone line is needed dedicated solely to this project, the principal investigator should contact the appropriate university office for estimates of the installation charge plus monthly rental fee.

Shipping
If the nature of the project involves shipping of items such as artwork, animals, or scientific specimens from one location to another, estimates should be obtained and entered into the budget.

Publication Costs
Sometimes there are page charges for publishing in scientific journals. It is advisable to check current charges for the journal in which publication is anticipated; to project, if possible, the number of pages necessary for intended publications and to calculate accordingly. Charges for preparation of article illustrations along with the cost of ordering article reprints should be added to the publication line.

Printing and Duplicating
All costs for duplicating of materials associated with the project should be placed on the printing and duplicating line unless agency guidelines indicate otherwise. In addition to routine duplicating, a project may necessitate the printing of brochures, flyers, or instructional materials. An estimate of such work should be obtained from the appropriate university office. Moreover, the amount recorded on this budget line should provide for the cost of future reports or final reports required by the sponsoring agency.

Other
Any other budget elements required by the project and not covered elsewhere should be described here.

II. Indirect Costs - Facilities and Administrative Costs

Indirect costs are actual costs; they are those costs which, unlike direct costs, are not easily associated with a specific project but are, in fact, incurred in the conducting of sponsored programs. These costs include such items as plant operation and

maintenance (utilities, custodial services, repair, etc.), administrative services (Comptroller's Office, Governmental Reporting, Accounts Payable, Personnel Department, Payroll Office, Purchasing and Distribution, RAGS), departmental administration, library facilities, laboratory space, and general equipment use.

Basic regulations for establishing indirect costs are postulated in the Office of Management and Budget circulars. Kent State University negotiates its indirect cost rate with representatives of the federal government. The proposal's budget must include this rate as chargeable to the granting agency; the particular indirect cost rate, its date of negotiation, and Kent State's cognizant audit agency should be cited on proposed budgets. In some cases a sponsor may require an indirect cost rate different from the established rate or may eliminate such costs entirely. Accurate information relating to both established rate and sponsor restrictions may be obtained from Sponsored Programs.

III. Kent State University Cost Share

Kent State University may be expected by particular sponsors to share in the proposed project's costs. Generally agency program announcements will specify the cost-share level permitted or required. Kent State's cost-sharing requirement is frequently met through the faculty salary equivalent of academic year released time, combined with related fringe benefits and indirect costs amounts applicable. The amount of cost sharing and what it represents should be detailed in the budget.

List of References
If the proposal contains a limited number of references, footnotes may be used in the text to cite them. If references are used extensively, they should appear after the budget and in separate list form where they are numbered as they occur in the text; they should be referred to accordingly in the text itself. Each reference listed should include the name of the author, title, publication or publisher, volume and issue number, page numbers, and date of publication.

Bibliography
Literature which has not been referred to in the proposal text, yet has served as source material, should be enumerated separately in a bibliography section. This section too consists of a list alphabetized by author and following the format of the list of references. A bibliography should cite the field's most current and relevant literature.

Appendices
Documentation additional to that in the proposal text should be attached in appendices. The proposal should present a list of appendix items either in the proposal's table of contents or immediately preceding the appendices themselves. Items incorporated into various appendices should be referred to in the text and might include: background charts, tables, graphs and line drawings; resumes of personnel if not included in the personnel section; preprints of publications prepared by project personnel and pertaining to the proposed project; letters from consultants or collaborative agencies

expressing willingness to participate in the project; letters of endorsement from organizations or individuals familiar with the problem to be studied or with previous work of the project staff; and any other information corroborating staff competence.

Submission
Proposals are competitive; consequently there is no special consideration or treatment given to anyone; this includes the waiving of deadlines. A deadline is designated by the sponsor as either a postmark date or a receipt date. The proposer must abide by the designation; there are no exceptions.

It is the responsibility of the university Sponsored Programs office to assist faculty members with submission of proposals. Only designated Sponsored Programs staff may submit proposals for the university. Sponsored Programs aims to assure that all proposals submitted in the name of Kent State University comply with university and sponsor regulations and conform to the sponsor-required format. Sponsored Programs, upon completion of review, will authorize submission of the proposal.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to allow Sponsored Programs enough time to review the proposal. The proposal must have received approval of the department chairperson/school director and the dean of the college as evidenced by the signed internal Transmittal Form. Prior to submitting the proposal, the university also requires that key project personnel to complete sign a "Conflict of Interest Screening Form." Each investigator involved in sponsored activities must disclose a list of significant financial interests (including that of his/her spouse and dependent children) that could compromise the objectivity of the proposed activities.

Finally, it is important to note that the average time interval between submission of a proposal and receipt of a grant award is approximately nine months. In planning submission of a proposal and the beginning of a project, this time span must be considered.

Conclusion
Proposals generally follow a recognized format. Although a good idea and sound working plan for implementing the idea are foremost requisites to a proposal's success, a weak presentation can camouflage even the excellent idea. For presentation, the afore-described proposal format is one commonly follows. It should under no circumstances replace that format requested by a sponsor. The latter should be followed precisely.

Basically, all sponsors want to know is what an investigator wants to do; why it is important to do so; how he/she intends to do it; what his/her qualifications are for doing what is proposed; how much it will cost; how its effectiveness will be measured; and how the activities fit sponsor priorities. A good proposal will, in well-organized fashion, explain all of this clearly and concisely.

Finally, it is the proposal which represents the principal investigator in the competition for funding. If the proposal is poorly prepared, it instills doubt in the reviewers about the investigator's ability to conduct the proposed project. The well-prepared proposal which reflects both a sound idea and well-planned problem-solving approach and is within the scope of the grant program has a far better chance of obtaining funding.

Selected Bibliography

1. David G. Bauer Associates, Inc. <u>The How-To Grants Manual</u>. Utica: David G. Bauer Associates, Inc., 1981.
2. Fitz-Gibbon, Carol T., and Morris, Lynn L. <u>How to Design a Program Evaluation</u>. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications, 1978.
3. Hall, Mary. <u>Developing Skills in Proposal Writing</u>. 2nd ed., Portland: Continuing Education Publications, 1977.
4. Krathwohl, David R. <u>How to Prepare a Research Proposal</u>. 2nd ed. Syracuse University Bookstore, 1977.
5. Kritz, Norton J. "Program Planning and Proposal Writing." The Grantsmanship Center News, 1981, pp. 1-48.
6. Kurzig, Carol M. <u>Foundation Fundamentals</u>. New York: The Foundation Center, 1981.
7. Reif-Lehrer, Liane. <u>Writing a Successful Grant Application</u>. Boston: Science Books International, 1982.
8. White, Virginia, <u>ed</u>. <u>Grant Proposals that Succeeded</u>. New York and London: Plenum Press, 1983.
9. <u>Grants</u>. New York and London: Plenum Press, 1983.