

University of Hawaii at Manoa

**COLLEGE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE
AND HUMAN RESOURCES**

Policy and Procedures

for

Hatch Project Establishment and Management

Office of the Associate Dean for Research

May 4, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
Mission of CTAHR.....	3
USDA Policy on Administration of Hatch Funded Projects	4
CTAHR HATCH PROJECT POLICY AND PROCEDURES.....	5
POLICY AND PROCEDURE GUIDELINES.....	6
I. Hatch Projects	6
II. Multistate Projects.....	8
III. Other Procedures	8
A. Dual-Department Projects	8
B. Revised Projects.....	9
C. Extended Projects	9
D. Annual Progress Reports	9
E. Terminating Projects.....	9
F. Special and/or Outside Grant Supported Projects.....	9
TIMETABLE	10
Appendix 1: Project Outline.....	11
Appendix 2: Hatch Integrated Project Cover Sheet.....	14
Appendix 3: Hatch Research Project Cover Sheet.....	15
Appendix 4: Sample Peer Review Memo	16
Appendix 5: Peer Review Questions	17
Appendix 6: Chair/County Administrator Hatch Project Review	18
Appendix 7: Resource Inputs Worksheet	19
Appendix 8: GPRA Goals and CTAHR Priority Areas	20
Appendix 9: CTAHR Program Areas	21
Appendix 10: USDA Current and Pending Support Form	22
Appendix 11: USDA Assurance Statements Form.....	23

INTRODUCTION

The Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES) were established within the Land Grant institutions in each state through the Hatch Act legislation in 1888. The mission of Land Grant agricultural research differs from that in the general sciences at the university level in that there are state clientele who depend on outputs from the AES research system to provide a stable agricultural production/processing environment that enhances the well-being of the state's citizens.

Each year, USDA-CSREES distributes Hatch formula funds to CTAHR to support research in fields related to the agricultural sectors, rural and economic development, and family and consumer-related activities. These appropriations are targeted specifically for activities that (1) are directed toward CTAHR priority areas, (2) incorporate stakeholders priorities, and (3) are designed to demonstrate measurable positive impact on stakeholders. Stakeholders include scientists, industry, growers, producers, community members, and those who will be affected by the research and extension activities.

The Agricultural Experiment Station project system was established through a cooperative effort by the individual states and the USDA as a means for departments to plan and monitor research activities; provide information for effective local, regional, and national planning; and serve as a means to account for Hatch Act funding utilized by the states to support research. AES projects are utilized locally to plan and monitor research activities in a wide variety of research program areas, commodities, and disciplines in order that there are clear research goals and measurements of achievements toward the objectives established for high-priority agricultural research in the state. Reports on research progress and accomplishments are reported annually to USDA and become a part of a national agricultural research database, the Current Research Information System (CRIS), which is accessible by scientists throughout the world.

Mission of CTAHR

The Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station has been the principal agricultural research agency in Hawaii since its establishment in 1901. Although the name "Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station" is not being used today, the tradition and activities of Hawaii AES continue under CTAHR. CTAHR's mission in research is to foster the development of the agricultural, biological, environmental, and social sciences toward the following goals.

1. Diversify and strengthen the state's economy
 - 1.1. Provide knowledge and technologies to generate and improve products and processes for existing and expanded markets
 - 1.2. Provide technical and business management assistance and training to support business growth and development
2. Protect and enhance the environment and Hawaii's resources
 - 2.1. Provide knowledge and technologies to improve the management of Hawaii's resources to support agricultural production and enhance the environment
 - 2.2. Develop and deliver information and technologies to mitigate pests and invasive species that threaten agricultural, natural, and urban ecosystems and the economy
 - 2.3. Protect the state from biological and chemical threats in CTAHR's areas of expertise
3. Strengthen families and communities
 - 3.1. Improve the health and wellness of Hawaii's families and communities
 - 3.2. Promote resiliency and well-being in Hawaii's individuals, families, and communities
 - 3.3. Strengthen individuals, families, and communities in resource management, leadership development, and community action

USDA/CSREES Policy on Administration of Hatch Formula Funded AES Projects

“The State Agricultural Experiment Stations are expected to propose and to conduct research projects, supported with Hatch formula and matching funds, which comply with the purposes of the Hatch Act and the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended, which have relevance to the special conditions and needs of the respective States. Consideration of the priorities and objectives of the Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences and the National Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy ESCOP/CSREES Strategic Plan is to be included in the project selection process. In order to maximize the research effort, States and parent institutions are encouraged to supplement Federal Allotments and the required State matching funds whenever possible.”

COLLEGE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCES HATCH PROJECT POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The rationale for the national policy for updating each project at least every five years reflects the need to re-evaluate individual faculty research priorities. This process enables the principal investigator (PI) to set a new course for the project based on progress made during the previous five years and as a result of advances made in the field by the faculty member and by other scientists working in the research area.

Maintaining an up-to-date Hatch project for each PI is also required by USDA/CSREES for awarding of federal Hatch Act funding for all State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES). SAES are required to report all expenditures for research activities through approved and appropriate Hatch- or state-funded programs. Therefore, it is necessary for all research scientists within CTAHR to have an approved project through which expenditures can be reported for representative program activity areas within the research system.

This CTAHR policy and procedure statement on research program development provides a step-by-step process to assist unit administrators and faculty in developing CTAHR Hatch project proposals and in activating an effective peer-review system to ensure high-quality Hatch projects in CTAHR.

All faculty who hold an FTE assignment in research are responsible for being a PI or a Co-PI on at least one approved Hatch project that represents their area of research responsibility.

New proposals will be considered for funding up to five years from available USDA CSREES allocations. CTAHR faculty with a research appointment are required to submit Hatch research or Integrated project proposals to be accounted and eligible to receive Hatch funds. Integrated projects must have an extension component, in collaboration with one or more extension faculty members, to be eligible to receive both Hatch and Smith-Lever funds. Because of the federal mandate, we are required to have projects that integrate research and extension. Integrated projects require one or more faculty with research and extension appointments on the project. A minimum of 25 percent of our Hatch appropriation must be expended by the integrated projects.

Unit administrators (department chairs and county administrators) are responsible for guiding faculty in the preparation of their Hatch projects, for selecting project proposal reviewers, and for ensuring that only high-quality proposals are submitted to CTAHR and USDA/CSREES for their approval. All written project evaluations must accompany the proposal when submitted to the CTAHR Associate Dean for Research's Office, including an indication by the department chairs that review comments have been considered and appropriate changes have been incorporated into the final project proposal as a result of the evaluation comments.

POLICY AND PROCEDURE GUIDELINES

I. Hatch Projects

Hatch projects are those which are supported by federal Hatch Act funds. Hatch funds supports three types of projects: research, integrated, and multistate projects. Federal mandate requires that a minimum of 25 percent of our Hatch funds support integrated and multistate projects. Therefore, CTAHR encourages the establishment of Hatch integrated and multistate projects. To qualify as integrated a project must have an extension component along with extension FTE included in the project proposal. Integrated projects require approval from the Associate Dean for Extension.

The following policies are applicable to **all** research conducted by **personnel who hold CTAHR professorial rank faculty appointments**.

- A. All research activities, projects, grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements involving CTAHR appointed faculty, staff, facilities, or property must be administered through an approved Hatch (not administrative) project. If the proposed research does not fit logically within the faculty member's or another existing CTAHR project, a new project must be prepared. Arrangements for such matters must be made with the unit administrator (department chair or county administrator) at the time of submitting the new project. CTAHR administration will facilitate program development.
- B. All faculty who have an ongoing CTAHR Hatch project that is in its final year must prepare a new or revised Hatch project for the next five-year period **prior** to the termination date.

Faculty members will be advised by their unit administrator one year in advance of their need to develop either a new or revised Hatch project. The decision to prepare a new or revised project will be determined through consultation with the unit. The Associate Dean for Research Office will send notices as reminders for the need to update the Hatch project to the concerned faculty member.

If no new Hatch project has been fully approved by the Associate Dean for Research Office by the date of termination of the old project, all funds supporting project operations will cease to be approved for expenditure and no travel will be allowed until such time that the Hatch project is fully approved by the Associate Dean for Research Office.

- C. Once an established project reaches its revision date, the decision to prepare a replacement **new** or to **revise** the Hatch project will be based on the following criteria:

Faculty who have made a significant change in direction of their research should prepare a replacement **new** Hatch project. For example, if a faculty member had been working with one type of commodity or process and expects to change to another, if a move is made to alter the emphasis to more basic or more applied research, if the new research direction entails a new enzyme system or focuses on a different species, organ, or tissue, etc., then it would be necessary to prepare a new, replacement Hatch project. However, if as in many genetics/breeding projects, the general direction of the research will be a continuation of the previous project, a project **revision** would be appropriate, with recognition that scientific progress has been made during the previous five years.

- D. If a faculty member conducts research through the objectives of a multistate project (but not a coordinating committee or ERA) or USDA/CSREES National Research Initiative Competitive Grant Research Project, development of a Hatch project which relates to their specific area(s) of responsibility within the project is required.

- E. The following process shall be used to prepare and gain approval of a Hatch project:
1. The PI(s) are expected to prepare a detailed proposal of the research they intend to pursue during the next five years. The proposal must follow the prescribed format (see Appendix I: Project Outline), including title, duration, CTAHR program area, and knowledge area(s), relationship to the Hawaii plan of work, stakeholder input, introduction and justification, previous work and present outlook, objectives, procedures and methods, personnel resources, institutional units involved, cooperators, and literature cited.
 2. It is recommended that prior to preparation of a new Hatch project a thorough literature search of the [Current Research Information System](#) (CRIS) database be made by the PI in order to ensure that the proposed research objectives represent the most current technological approach to the problem and are not duplicative of other reported research. Information on any research project covered by the CRIS system throughout the United States can be retrieved via Web access. For example, the CRIS system can be searched by activity, commodity, and/or research problem area. This information retrieval is a valuable part of Hatch project development prior to its preparation and peer review.
 3. Department chairs have the responsibility of guiding their faculty in the preparation of their Hatch projects on a timely basis. They have responsibility to guarantee a high-quality and appropriate peer review. The purpose of project proposal reviews is to assist faculty in developing high-quality research programs, to enable prudent allocation of resources to those projects of high priority that have a good chance of success, and to encourage interdisciplinary and cooperative research when possible.
 4. New CTAHR faculty are to submit a fully reviewed project proposal within a period of three (3) months after they take up official duties at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. It is the responsibility of the unit administrators to ensure that the preparation of the new Hatch project is deemed a high priority by each new faculty member.
 5. Hatch proposals prepared according to the outline in Appendix I must be submitted by the investigator to the unit administrator along with names of prospective reviewers, both from within and outside the unit. The department chair shall select from the list supplied or other lists of appropriate reviewers (at least three) and request an evaluation of the proposal. The proposal reviewers selected will represent the same or related areas of science and will provide a critical review of the project proposal. Each project is to be reviewed by one qualified UH faculty member from within the unit in which the PI is located (not a cooperator on the project). In the case of joint unit submissions, select at least one from each unit. Also, to ensure high-quality research, two qualified peer reviewers from outside University of Hawaii at Manoa are required in order to get a broader perspective about the merits of the proposed research and the methods used to accomplish the objectives. The department chair is responsible for maintaining quality standards here. Final proposals must be submitted to the CTAHR Associate Dean for Research Office with peer reviews attached.
 6. The University of Hawaii must provide a certification regarding the use of human subjects (includes interviews and surveys), recombinant DNA, and live vertebrate animal subjects. If the PI plans to involve activities concerning any of these three topics in the research, the forms should be completed and submitted to the appropriate UH review boards (Appendix 11). Once approval is received, include the authorization letter(s) with the project package when it is forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research Office.
 7. The department chair will return the comments from the peer reviewers to the investigator for discussion and project revision as necessary to improve the presentation of the proposal.
 8. The final proposal text will then be submitted, with a copy of the peer review comments, and the animal subjects, human subjects, and recombinant DNA clearances where necessary, to the department chair, who will decide on approval of the project. The department chair has the responsibility to review the revised proposal and to determine if it is in satisfactory condition to

forward to the Associate Dean for Research. The department chair shall send the package to the Associate Dean for Research Office with a transmittal letter.

9. CRIS forms AD-416 and AD-417 are necessary parts of any new or revised research project proposal. NOTE: CRIS forms should be prepared **after** the project proposal is approved and in final form. Staff in the CTAHR Planning and Management Systems Office (PMSO) will provide instructions on how to prepare and where to submit these two forms.
10. The Director of PMSO will forward the approved project proposal to USDA/CSREES for federal approval.
11. USDA/CSREES will then conduct its own evaluation of the project proposal for completeness and compliance with USDA/CSREES provisions and appropriate federal legislation that regulate Hatch Act funding for the State Agricultural Experiment Stations.
12. An approved CTAHR Hatch project will be assigned a project number by PMSO. The department chair will be notified of this number by copy of the transmittal letter to CSREES. Approved copies of the CRIS forms will be supplied to administrative units and to the PI(s) involved in the project.

II. Multistate Projects

The mission of the multistate research program is to enable research on high-priority topics among the State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) in partnership with the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, other research institutions and agencies, and the Cooperative Extension Service. In this way, technological opportunities and complex problem-solving activities that are beyond the scope of a single SAES can be approached in a more efficient and comprehensive way. [Multistate Research Guidelines](#) contain detailed information for those who are interested in becoming a member of a multistate project. The Western Research Coordination and Implementation Committee (RCIC) is responsible for evaluating each new or revised project proposal, and the AES directors approve or disapprove them based on the recommendations from the RCIC. CTAHR makes no attempt to evaluate any of these multistate research activities, as that is accomplished through the efforts of the scientists and the administrative advisors in each program, and RCIC. CTAHR is actively encouraging our scientists to participate in multistate activities. [The National Information Management and Support System \(NIMSS\)](#), is a Web-based application that allows participants of multistate research projects and activities to submit proposals and reports online. You can also search the NIMSS database to identify existing projects of interest to you. Please contact Associate Dean for Research Office for more information and directions on how to join a project.

III. Other Procedures

A. Dual-Department Hatch Projects – Research or Integrated

These involve research with co-investigators from two or more departments and/or research and extension centers.

1. The Hatch proposal shall designate one administrative unit as having primary responsibility or leadership in the program. The unit designated as having primary responsibility shall:
 - a. submit an approved research proposal and CRIS forms as outlined in Part I of the Hatch Project Policies and Procedures.
 - b. summarize the results of the cooperative research in only one cooperating faculty annual progress report (CRIS form AD 421).

2. Cooperating administrative units are listed on CRIS form AD-416, Fields 10 and 11. The unit having primary responsibility shall submit the CRIS forms and the research proposal and prepare the annual progress report.

B. Revised Projects

If an investigator plans to continue to pursue objectives that are similar those in the previous Hatch project, it is still necessary to submit a new project proposal. Even if one intends to work toward the objectives and use the same general approach, a new project proposal is required. The revised project must reflect that progress has been made in the research area and the new challenges that are presented to the investigator(s). It is also necessary to complete new CRIS forms AD-416 and AD-417 for the revised project. The same general procedure as required for a new project is to be followed.

C. Extended Projects

Projects may be continued beyond the estimated termination date shown on the CRIS forms only on the basis of submission of written justification by the department chair to the CTAHR Associate Dean for Research. The request will be forwarded to CSREES indicating the new termination date. A one-time project extension shall be for a maximum of one additional year during the life of a five-year Hatch project.

D. Annual Progress Reports

Notice to file annual progress report forms (AD-421) are sent to each department/county for their projects by the CTAHR Associate Dean for Research Office. These are usually received from CSREES during October and are due back in the Associate Dean for Research Office by December 1 each year. These reports must be filed online directly to CRIS.

It must be emphasized that these annual reports serve an important purpose not only for local monitoring and planning but also as an important part of the USDA-CRIS reporting system. Their contents are also important in keeping UH administrators and researchers informed about program affairs. Decisions concerning priority-setting and fund allocations are aided by review of these documents. These reports are used by the Associate Dean for Research Office to prepare our plan of work annual accomplishment report, which must be filed by April 1 each year to receive the following year's formula funds. It is therefore imperative that a good annual report be submitted by each project leader.

E. Terminating Projects

When a project is terminated, completed, or discontinued, a CRIS form AD-421 (progress report) must be completed at the termination of the project. The AD-421 should summarize the accomplishments **for the entire life** of the project. The AD-421 should be entered on the CRIS website. The CTAHR Associate Dean for Research Office will approve and transmit the AD-421 termination report to CRIS.

F. Special and/or Outside Grant Supported Projects

The primary responsibility for grant review rests with the department chairs for grant proposals intended for support by extramural grants, contracts, or gifts.

1. A proposal is for extramural funding prepared by a faculty member following the format specified by the granting agency. The final grant proposal is reviewed and approved by the department chair and by the CTAHR Associate Dean for Research Office. After the AD's approval, the proposal will be forwarded to the Office of Research Service (ORS). The PI is responsible for forwarding the appropriate number of copies of the proposal to the granting agency.
2. When the extramural proposal is funded, the research should be within the domain of the PI's existing umbrella Hatch project. If the new grant award is outside the scope of an existing Hatch project, a new project may be required. If the objectives of the existing project are changed, revised CRIS forms AD-416 and AD-417 must be submitted along with a revised Hatch proposal, in the format in Appendix I, for the existing project. If the new grant does not change the objectives of the existing project, new CRIS forms are not required. This is the responsibility of the PI.

TIMETABLE

February 1	Request for proposals announced.
April 15	Hatch, Integrated, McIntire-Stennis project proposals due to department chairs (or county administrators for county-based faculty).
May 1	Department chairs send proposals to external reviewers for peer evaluation.
June 1	Department chairs endorse and forward projects to the Associate Dean for Research Office for approval.
June 15	Associate deans for research and extension approve establishment of new projects; final decisions will be sent to faculty and chair/county administrator. Associate deans make funding decisions and inform department chairs.
July 1	Approved Hatch and Integrated proposals will be forwarded to PMSO office for preparation to submit to via CRIS to CSREES in Washington, D.C., for final approval.
July – September	After electronic submission via CRIS, it generally takes 2–3 months for USDA/CSREES to approve the project. Revise and resubmit projects not approved by CSREES.
October 1	Approved Hatch, Integrated, and McIntire-Stennis projects activated and eligible to receive formula funds from department chairs.

Appendix 1

PROJECT OUTLINE

The required components of a project proposal are as follows:

1. **Department or County:**

2. **Title.**

Provide a brief, descriptive title (less than 80 characters). The title should reflect the objectives and scope of the project. Accurately describe the research contemplated in 80 characters or less. The title of contributions to multistate projects shall be identical to that of the multistate project. In cases where the project is funded principally from a grant, contract, or agreement, the title of the funded project should be used.

3. **Duration.**

All proposals will be limited to a five-year term. Proposals may be approved for a minimum of three years; however, proposals of all durations must be able to demonstrate the potential to yield measurable economic, community, social, and/or environmental impacts. All projects should begin October 1 and terminate on September 30. New faculty may establish a new project any time of the year; however, the termination date remains September 30.

4. **Project Summary. *Limit to half a page.***

5. **Relationship to CTAHR STRATEGIC PLAN:** Describe how the project relates to the CTAHR Strategic Plan (<http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/SP2005.pdf>).

6. **Relationship to Hawaii Plan of Work.**

Describe how the project relates to the Hawaii Plan of Work (<http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/POW2007.pdf>). Please indicate CTAHR Program Area, and the Knowledge Area Classification Systems (KACS) here. Some projects may have components that could fit into more than one KACS area. If more than one KACS area is selected, please assign appropriate % to each. The KACS online manual at <http://cris.csrees.usda.gov/star/manualvii.pdf> provides a more detailed description of each Knowledge Area. Select the Knowledge Area(s) that best fit your projects.)

7. **Statement of Issues.** A clear picture of the issue to be addressed. *Limit to two pages.*

8. **Stakeholder Input.** Who are the stakeholders who will benefit from this work? Examples of stakeholders are families, consumers, farmers, processors, other scientists, etc. Check the activity process used to obtain stakeholder input. If there is an industry research priority list, please attach it.

Indicate appropriate methods used:

- Traditional stakeholder groups: Meeting_____ Survey_____
- Traditional stakeholder individuals: Meeting_____ Survey_____
- Meeting with general public (open to all): Meeting_____ Survey_____
- Non-traditional stakeholder groups: Meeting_____ Survey_____
- Non-traditional stakeholder individuals: Meeting_____ Survey_____
- Meeting with selected individuals from general public: Meeting_____ Survey_____
- Advisory committee _____
- Internal focus groups _____
- External focus groups _____
- Needs assessments _____
- Other _____

Write a brief explanation for method(s) used.

9. **Multi-State and Multi-Institution Collaboration.** Describe the collaboration with other states and other institutions. If this is a multi-state project, provide the regional project number and describe the merit and necessity of the collaboration.

10. **Extension and Research Integration.** Describe any integration of research and extension activities for this project. **For integrated project only.**
11. **Objectives.** List the project objectives arranged in a logical order. Keep in mind that objectives must be measurable. (See Outcome Indicators, item 15.) **Limit to half a page.**
12. **Procedures.** Describe the procedures to be used for each objective and provide a plan of action and timeline. **Limit to three pages.**
13. **Literature Cited.** List the references cited in the project outline according to a style used in your own field.

Examples:

Mustapha, A., and Y. Li. 2006. Molecular detection of foodborne bacterial pathogens. In: J.H. Maurer (ed), *PCR Methods in Foods*, pp. 69-90, Springer, New York.

Rubinoff, D., and W.P. Hanies. 2005. Web-spinning caterpillar stalks snails. *Science*. 309:575.

Vargo, E.L., C. Husseneder, D. Woodson, M.G. Waldvogel, and J.K. Grace. 2006. Genetic analysis of colony and population structure of three introduced populations of the Formosan subterranean termite (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae) in the continental United States. *Environmental Entomology* 35: 151–166.

Yu, R. 2006. "The Economics of Area-Wide Pest Management." Ph.D. Dissertation, Univ. Hawaii at Manoa. p.167.

14. **Expected Outputs.** Provide outputs that are appropriate measures of the success of the project, e.g., publications, patents, new products, new methodologies, new varieties, etc. Outputs are activities, products, services, and participation that are the result of the inputs or program investments. They describe what is done and who is reached, e.g., conduct training, classes, workshops, meetings, camps; develop curricula; write publications, handouts; create videos, PowerPoint presentations, Web sites (or updates); install test plots; or conduct field days. Outputs can be thought of as the means, processes, or procedures used to accomplish the project's performance objectives. Progress evaluation will be made based on the expected outputs submitted.
15. **Expected Outcomes and Outcome Indicators.** Describe measurable outcomes and indicators that can reflect **impacts** on industries, communities, families, and/or the state of Hawaii. Outcome indicators may be thought of as evidence that certain outcomes have been completed or achieved. They document the effectiveness or value of outputs conducted and inputs invested. Indicators can be measured in a variety of ways, including retrospective surveys, behavior checklists, interviews and data (pre- and post-test scores, sales records, production records, etc.). Each outcome may have more than one indicator. Progress evaluation will be made based on the expected outcomes and outcome indicators submitted.
16. **Internal and External Linkages.** List linkages with other CTAHR faculty and other UH faculty as well as other institutions, organizations, and individuals that will be used to strengthen the project.

17. **Personnel Qualifications and Their Efforts.** On separate pages, principal investigators should include an updated copy of their resume for the last five years (limit to two pages per PI). Brief bio-sketches should be included for non-CTAHR personnel. These should be attached to the end of the application. It is important that the roles and responsibilities of all project personnel are clearly defined. The PIs and other technical or program personnel assigned, with their proposed time allocation in full-time equivalent (FTE), should be listed as follows:

Classification*	Time Allocation in FTE (indicate R or E for integrated project)	Role and Responsibility
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

*PI, graduate student, technician, APT, other

18. **Resources Inputs:** A separate resource inputs worksheet (Appendix 7) should be completed for the project. Separate inputs by research (Hatch) and extension (Smith Lever) for integrated project.

a. **Personnel Salaries and Wages:** Salaries of technical positions, research associates, graduate student fellowships, post-doctoral fellows, lab assistants, or student assistants may be listed. List PI salary first, use FTE commitment to this project to calculate for salary plus OPE. The funding source for this item should be either Hatch or Smith-Lever fund. If a technician or graduate student is supported by grant funds, list accordingly. This information is useful for filing our annual plan of work report.

b. **Operating:** This is the amount the funds needed for completion of the proposed project, including items such as materials and supplies, travel, and publication costs or page charges. Any miscellaneous expenses should be listed as "Other."

c. **Equipment:** This category is for special-purpose equipment, which is defined as any item with a unit cost equal to or exceeding \$5,000. Since we will not fund any equipment purchase through this process, this information is being collected to provide for future equipment investment suggestions.

1. **Total Project Cost:** Sum of the totals for items a–c.

2. **Total Request from CTAHR:** Sum of the budget items that list the sources of funding from CTAHR.

3. **Sources of Funding:** Please list sources of potential funding for your budget.

19. **Current and Pending Support.** Principal investigators should use CSREES Form 2005 (Appendix 10) to list all actively funded projects in which they are presently involved. Include the title of the project, supporting agency or CTAHR projects, the total dollar amount, the effective dates including expiration date, and the percentage of time committed to each project. This form is required for all USDA funded projects, and allows the faculty to keep an updated list for other grant proposals.

20. **Assurance Statement(s).** If the proposed project involves human subjects, animals, recombinant DNA, biohazardous substances, or radioactive substances, the PI(s) must so indicate and must obtain approval from relevant institutional committees (Appendix 11).

HATCH INTEGRATED PROJECT COVER SHEET

COLLEGE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Project No. _____

PI Name: _____ **Unit:** _____ **FTE to project:** R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Co-PI Name: _____ **Unit:** _____ **FTE to project:** R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Co-PI Name: _____ **Unit:** _____ **FTE to project:** R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Co-PI Name: _____ **Unit:** _____ **FTE to project:** R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Indicate Collaborating State(s) if applicable: _____

Please check one: This project is: NEW REVISED

CTAHR Program Area: _____

KNOWLEDGE AREA (s) (KACS): _____
Use three digit KACS codes; Use more than one if applicable

Project Title:

Project START Date: _____ END Date: _____ (5 year Maximum)

APPROVALS:

County Administrator Recommendation:

Approved Not Approved **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____

Department Chair Recommendation:

Approved Not Approved **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____

Assoc. Dean/Assoc. Dir. Research:

Approved Not Approved **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____
Comments:

Assoc. Dean/Assoc. Dir. Extension:

Approved Not Approved **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____
Comments:

HATCH RESEARCH PROJECT COVER SHEET
COLLEGE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Project No. _____

PI Name: _____ Unit: _____ FTE to project: R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Co-PI Name: _____ Unit: _____ FTE to project: R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Co-PI Name: _____ Unit: _____ FTE to project: R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Co-PI Name: _____ Unit: _____ FTE to project: R _____ E _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Indicate collaborating state(s) if applicable: _____

Please check one: This project is: NEW REVISED

CTAHR Program Area: _____

KNOWLEDGE AREA(s) (KACS): _____
Use three-digit KACS codes; use more than one if applicable.

Project Title:

Project START Date: _____ END Date: _____ (5-year Maximum)

APPROVALS:

County Administrator Recommendation:

Approved Not Approved Signature: _____ Date: _____

Department Chair Recommendation:

Approved Not Approved Signature: _____ Date: _____

Assoc. Dean/Assoc. Dir. Research:

Approved Not Approved Signature: _____ Date: _____

Comments:

APPENDIX 4

SAMPLE PEER REVIEW MEMO

MEMORANDUM

DATE:

TO: (Reviewer's name)

FROM: Department chair

SUBJECT: Review of CTAHR Hatch project proposal

I would appreciate your serving as a member of a committee to review the attached CTAHR project proposal, "(title)."

The purpose of the review is to evaluate the justification, objectives, and methodology of the research. Relevance, interrelationships, chance for success, and overall quality are important factors. Please do not take time to emphasize grammar and word usage unless clarity is insufficient.

All comments should be returned to me by (deadline date). I will coordinate the responses and will advise the principal investigator of all comments and recommendations.

Thank you very much for assisting our research program in this project review process.

Enclosures

Appendix 5

PEER REVIEW QUESTIONS

The following questions shall be used to constructively evaluate the merits of research project proposals. Please provide a brief, clear statement of response to each question after careful study of the project proposal. (Use an additional page for responses.) Please provide a more complete response than simply writing in a "yes" or "no."

1. Does the program proposal clearly state the problem to be solved or specify the nature of the knowledge to be sought? If needed, please suggest improvements.
2. Are clear and definable benefits being sought? If so, can they be attained from the successful pursuit of the proposed objectives and methods in this research proposal? If not, how might they be improved?
3. Are the objectives clearly stated and sufficiently specific so that they could be accomplished within the five-year duration of the proposed program? If not, how might they be improved?
4. Do you judge that the proposed procedures or methods suggest reasonable and sound scientific approaches to accomplish each objective? If not, how might they be improved?
5. Are the experimental methods (materials, samples, measurement, criteria, etc.) likely to provide reliable and interpretable results? If not, how might they be improved?
6. Does the proposal give evidence of the investigator's familiarity with the essential literature concepts and methods relevant to the research? If not, how might this area be improved?
7. Does the investigator appear to have the scientific competence essential to complete the research?
8. Is the project likely to contribute significantly to new knowledge in the discipline? Please explain why, or why not.
9. Are output indicators and methodology for measuring output indicators clear?
10. Are outcome indicators and methodology for measuring outcome indicators clear?
11. Suggest possible cooperative research that might be established within and/or outside University of Hawaii via this proposed research.
12. Add relevant comments and suggestions for the improvement of any deficiencies deemed to be important to help ensure that this will be a successful program.

Appendix 6

Chair/County Administrator Hatch Project Review

Project Title: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Chair/County Administrator Recommendation:

- Acceptable as written.
- Acceptable with modification; no further review needed.
- Major revision required.

Signature of Chair/County Administrator: _____

Print Name: _____

Date: _____

If it is determined that this project requires major revision, how can the project be strengthened and improved?

Appendix 7

RESOURCE INPUTS WORKSHEET

Please provide a detailed budget for your project. A separate resource inputs worksheet must be prepared for each year of your project duration, along with a **summary budget sheet for all years combined**. This information is useful for research office to write our plan of work report and for the department chair to fund your project. Hatch funds will be appropriated by the department chair. For integrated projects, identify resources by research or extension

YEAR(S) _____

1. PERSONNEL

	Amount	Source of funding
a. Salaries (List requests for student assistants, casual hires, graduate students, or APTs)	\$ _____	_____
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$ _____	_____

2. OPERATING

a. Materials and supplies	\$ _____	_____
b. Travel	\$ _____	_____
c. Publication costs/page charges	\$ _____	_____
d. Other (please detail)	\$ _____	_____
TOTAL OPERATING	\$ _____	_____

3. EQUIPMENT

Special-purpose equipment (any item with a unit cost equal to or exceeding \$5,000).	\$ _____	
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	\$ _____	

4. TOTAL PROJECT COST \$ _____

5. TOTAL RESOURCES FROM CTAHR \$ _____

Appendix 8

CTAHR Priority Areas

The following areas should be viewed as high priorities as they relate to the POW. See the CTAHR Web site for details: http://www2.ctahr.hawaii.edu/internal_val.asp
High-priority areas for CTAHR's research and extension programs were described in three White Papers (http://www2.ctahr.hawaii.edu/internal_val.asp) that addressed the following goals:

- Revitalize agriculture and Hawaii's economy
- Improve and sustain Hawaii's natural resources and environment
- Strengthen communities

Appendix 9

CTAHR Program Areas

(<http://cris.csrees.usda.gov/star/manualvii.pdf>)

See link for more detailed listings of individual KA.

- 1. Sustain, Protect, and Manage Hawaii's Natural Resources and Environment
(KAs 101-141, 401-405)**
- 2. Hawaii's Diversified Tropical Crop Systems for Sustainability and Competitiveness
(KAs 201-210, 216)**
- 3. Hawaii's Livestock and Aquaculture Systems for Sustainability and Competitiveness
(KAs 301-315)**
- 4. Invasive Species Education and Management
(KAs 121-123, 136, 211-214)**
- 5. Youth, Family, and Community Development
(KAs 801-806)**
- 6. Health and Wellness of Hawaii's Families and Communities
(KAs 701-724)**
- 7. Generate and Improve Hawaii's Products, Processes, and Market
(KAs 501-512, 601-611)**

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE
CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT**

Instructions

1. Record information for active and pending projects, including this proposal. (Concurrent submission of a proposal to other organizations will not prejudice its review by CSREES.)
2. All current efforts to which project director(s) and other senior personnel have committed a portion of their time must be listed, whether or not salary for the person involved is included in the budgets of the various projects.
3. Provide analogous information for all proposed work which is being considered by, or which will be submitted in the near future to, other possible sponsors including other USDA programs.

NAME (List/PD #1 first)	SUPPORTING AGENCY AND AGENCY ACTIVE AWARD/PENDING PROPOSAL NUMBER	TOTAL \$ AMOUNT	EFFECTIVE AND EXPIRATION DATES	% OF TIME COMMITTED	TITLE OF PROJECT
	Active:				
	Pending:				

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0524-0039. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.00 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

Form CSREES-2005 (12/2000)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE
ASSURANCE STATEMENT(S)

OMB approved 0524-0039

STATEMENT OF POLICY - Institutions receiving CSREES funding for research are responsible for protecting human subjects, providing humane treatment of animals, and monitoring use of recombinant DNA. To provide for the adequate discharge of this responsibility, CSREES policy requires an assurance by the institution's Authorized

Organizational Representative (AOR) that appropriate committees in each institution have carried out the initial reviews of protocol and will conduct continuing reviews of supported projects. CSREES also requires AOR certification by citing a timely date that an appropriate committee issued an approval or exemption.

NOTE: Check appropriate statements, supplying additional information when necessary.

1. INSTITUTION
University of Hawaii
Office of Research Services
2530 Dole Street, Sakamaki D-200
Honolulu, HI 96822
2. CSREES PROJECT NUMBER OR AWARD NUMBER (if known)
3. PROJECT DIRECTOR(S)

4. TITLE OF PROJECT

A. BIOSAFETY OF RECOMBINANT DNA

- [] Project does not involve recombinant DNA.
[] Project involves recombinant DNA and was either approved () or determined to be exempt () from the NIH Guidelines by an Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) on (Date).

This performing organization agrees to assume primary responsibility for complying with both the intent and procedures of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), DHHS Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules, as revised.

B. CARE AND USE OF ANIMALS

- [] Project does not involve vertebrate animals.
[] Project involves vertebrate animals and was approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) on (Date).

This performing organization agrees to assume primary responsibility for complying with the Animal Welfare Act (7 USC, 2131-2156), Public Law 89-544, 1996, as amended, and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture in 9 CFR Parts 1, 2, 3, and 4. In the case of domesticated farm animals housed under farm conditions, the institution shall adhere to the principles stated in the Guide for the Care and Use of Agricultural Animals in Agricultural Research and Teaching, Federation of Animal Science Societies, 1999.

C. PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

- [] Project does not involve human subjects.
[] Project involves human subjects and
[] Was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) on (Date). Performing Institution holds a Federal wide assurance number; if not, a Single Project Assurance is required.
[] Is exempt based on exemption number.
[] Specific plans involving human subjects depend upon completion of survey instruments, prior animal studies, or development of material or procedures. No human subjects will be involved in research until approved by the IRB and a revised Form CSREES-2008 is submitted.

This performing organization agrees to assume primary responsibility for complying with the Federal Policy for Protection of Human Subjects as set forth in 45 CFR Part 46, 1991, as amended, and USDA regulations set forth in 7 CFR 1c, 1992. All nonexempt research involving human subjects must be approved and under continuing review by an IRB. If the performing organization submits a Single Project Assurance, supplemental information describing procedures to protect subjects from risks is required.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE TITLE DATE

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0524-0039. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average .50 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

CSREES-2008 (12/02/00)

