The M. J. Murdock Trust grant
Preproposal Template

A. PROJECT TITLE:

B. ITEMIZED PROJECT BUDGET:

b.1. Project cost and project dates

Project start date:		Project end date:	
Item (equipment, technician, maintenance, other, etc.)	Cost	Requested from Murdock	WSU Cost Share
TOTAL			

Note: as of Feb 27, 2014 WSU may request up to 12% of the cost of the proposed equipment as monies to seed new research projects and bring in new users. These monies do not require cost share. These funds are intended for use o purchase supplies, pay or research assistantships, purchase small equipment…)

b.2. Description of the instrument (and its capabilities)

b.3. Availability of similar equipment on campus (or at nearby institutions) and anticipated level of use. Provide strong justification for the need for another instrument.

B. PROJECT FUNDING STRATEGY AND GOALS

Institutions are expected to provide a cost-share of at least 50 percent of the total equipment cost for all proposals. List anticipated financial support for this project (include cost-match), along with sources and amounts.
Note: in here that 'plans' are okay, not everything needs to be finalized and they should not contact the Office of Research at this point for match – I think we have the text on the old limited submission call for pre-proposals).

C. INSTITUTIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL PRIORITIES
Describe the appropriate research priorities of your institution and participant departments for the next decade and how the proposed research project relates to these. Compare this project with any others that are related or similar at institutions in the United States and, in particular, the Pacific Northwest. How will the requested instrument position this research program, department, college and/or WSU to be unique in the nation for its program, capabilities and creativity?

D. RESEARCH & PROJECT DESCRIPTION

d.1. Research Background
Provide both an institutional and a research context out of which this project arises. What events, circumstances, conditions, etc. have served as the springboard for this project? What are the present strengths of your department that make it suitable to carry out this project? What areas need improvement or strengthening to better equip it for the task? How does this project build on your experience, strengths, and priorities? If pertinent preliminary results have been obtained, describe them here.

d.2. Research Approach
Outline the experimental approach that will be employed. Depending upon the nature of your project, this may be the heart of your proposal. Be sure to develop this with sufficient detail and precision so that it can be evaluated by experts in the field. Be clear about the objectives and the expected measurable outcomes.

d.3. Scientific Significance
Discuss the scientific significance of your proposed line(s) of research. By significance, we mean the importance of this research for the scientific world, for researchers beyond the confines of your institution as well as for your own research group.

E. PROJECT STAFF

List principal investigators and collaborators, in the table below.

Name	Role (PI, Co-PI, Collaborator)	Department/college	Area of Research

F. FUTURE OF THE PROJECT

Describe how you anticipate this research area will develop in the future and how this project and future projects will participate in that development. How will this project be financially sustained beyond the period of Trust support?

The M. J. Murdock Trust grant
Review Criteria

The M.J. Murdock Trust seeks to fund ONE large critically-needed instrument (this may include two closely related components of an instrument that serve a single research purpose). Pre-proposals will be evaluated by an internal review committee and one proposal will be recommended to the VPR for advancement.

When evaluating internal pre-proposals for the M.J. Murdock Trust, reviewers will consider:

1. Scientific Merit: Is the science compelling? Does the idea have the potential to advance knowledge?

2. Technical Merit: Is the plan for carrying out the proposed research well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale?

3. Quality of the team: Is the team identified in the proposal capable right for executing the proposed work?

4. Uniqueness: Will this instrument bring a unique capability to WSU?
   Note: If the instrument is already available locally, is there strong justification for the request.

5. Range of impact: What impact will this instrument have on the research program of the PI and on WSU's visibility and reputation? Will this instrument enable significant collaborations within WSU and/or with other institutions?