

**National Pork Board Research Proposal
2025
Proposal Cover Page**



It is our policy to honor the confidentiality of each research proposal to protect investigators from having their ideas exposed to unnecessary critique and discussion. However, during review, the reviewer may make discrete inquiries on protocol mechanics if it improves the quality of his/her evaluation, so long as the source and nature of the work is undisclosed.

IS THIS A REQUEST FOR SECOND OR THIRD YEAR FUNDING? _____
IF SO, PLEASE INDICATE ORIGINAL PROJECT NUMBER: _____

Category:			
Project Title:			
Requested Funding Amount:		Project Duration:	

Principal Investigator and Title:			
Institution:			
Address:			
City, ST ZIP			
Phone:		FAX:	
Email:			

Co-Investigator(s)	Institution, City, State	Email address
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Contracts/Grants Administrator name: <i>(person to receive contracts, if funded)</i>					
Title		Organization			
Street Address					
City		State		Zip	
Phone		Fax		E-Mail	

☐ I (Principal Investigator) certify that the Grants and Contracts Administrator has reviewed this proposal prior to it's submission to National Pork Board for possible funding.

Standard Format & Required Sections

All research proposals submitted to the National Pork Board should include the standard 13 sections described on this page. Each section should be clearly marked with subheads.

Please note:

- Microsoft Word format is preferred. 12-point font.
- Please include all materials in one document. This includes all sections, letters of cooperation, and curriculum vitae.
- File name format: *last name-first initial-proposal.doc* example: *smith-a-proposal.doc*
- The title of the proposal must match the title of the posted RFP.
- Include first name, last name and institution.
- Length requirements are specified for each section.
- Please check each RFP for additional requirements unique to that proposal.
- All proposals must be submitted via the [Pork Checkoff Research Portal](#) unless otherwise indicated in the RFP.

Research Proposal Summary *Length: two pages max, single-space, 12-point font*

Decision makers (including pork producers and subject matter experts on the appropriate task force) will review the summary to judge the proposal for scientific soundness and assign industry priority.

The summary should answer the following questions.

1. Describe the objectives of the research project.
 - a. What deliverables will this research provide to the industry?
 - b. List or describe the intended outcomes of the project, not the experimental design or statistical analysis.
2. Describe how the proposed project fits with the research priorities as stated in the call for proposals.
3. Outline how this research will assist the Pork Checkoff in addressing our mission of improving swine production in the U.S. as outlined in the [Pork Act and Order](#).
 - a. According to section 1230.23: “Research means any action designed to advance, expand, or improve the image, desirability, nutritional value, usage, marketability, production, or quality of porcine animals, pork, or pork products, including the dissemination of the results of such research.”
4. Describe why U.S. pork producers should fund this proposal.
 - a. For example, how does it advance basic or applied scientific information? How does it improve the competitive advantage of the U.S. pork industry? What are the short and long-term economic implications for pork producers? What makes this research unique and important? What other descriptions or reasons are there for pork producers to highly prioritize this research?

Budget *Length: two pages*

Budget Format

- Please create a project budget using [this template](#). Single space required.
- Budget must be indicated in a 3-column format that itemizes costs for the National Pork Board vs the university plus the sum of both.
- Other funding requested or anticipated in support of this project must be indicated in an additional budget column.
- If preparing a budget for a multi-year project, please include columns for each year of funding, even if only requesting one year of funding at this time.

Approved Costs for Research

- Overhead and indirect costs are not typically covered by Pork Checkoff research funds.
- Graduate student support, student and other hourly labor, and post-doctoral support is allowed.
- Partial support for a principal investigator (PI) on less than a 12-month salaried appointment will be allowed if a detailed budget narrative addressing the amount of requested support in relation to the PI project time commitment justifies the expense.
- Equipment, except for disposable equipment such as test tubes, etc., is not allowed unless explained in the proposal, included in the budget and approved in advance by the Board.

Budget (add lines as required):

Category	Description (if needed)	NPB	Other Support	Total
1) Personnel (include name where appropriate)				
2) Contracted Services (diagnostic fees, computer access, etc)				
3) Assay and Testing Fees ("per sample" costs not included under Supplies)				
4) Travel				
5) Equipment (non-disposable items, please contact NPB if greater than \$500)				
6) Supplies (disposable items and reagents)				
7) Animal Cost (list only net cost if animals will be salvaged)				
8) Animal Care (per diem care, housing, and feed)				
9) Shipping, Handling, Mailing Expenses				
10) Other expenses (list)				
11) Indirect Cost Recovery (NPB does not pay ICR, please contact NPB with questions)				
12) TOTAL				
Explanation (if req'd):				

Literature Review *Length: two pages*

Describe the current status of the problem with a brief literature review.

Related Research by Principal Investigator *Length: one page*

Include previous related research in this area or a closely related field by the principal investigator (not more than five citations).

Project Objectives *Length: one page*

Clearly explain the research questions to be answered. List multiple objectives separately.

Procedures to Achieve Objectives *Length: 12 pages max*

Include the details of the experimental design and methods. Discuss and reference all assays, procedures and statistical tests used in the study. Document demonstrated expertise with proposed lab procedures.

Description of Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan *Length: one page*

QA/QC basically refers to all those things good investigators do to make sure their measurements are right on (accurate; the absolute true value), reproducible (precise; consistent), and have a good estimate of their uncertainty.

In the regulatory arena, this aspect of data collection is as crucial to the final outcome of a confrontation as the numbers themselves. It specifically involves following established rules in the field and lab to assure everyone that the sample is representative of the site.

Proposed Timeline *Length: one page*

Include a schedule for the proposed research project.

Value of Proposed Research *Length: one page*

Describe the value of the proposed research to the swine industry and its relevance to producer priorities.

Certification *Length: one page*

Most institutions require approval of proposals before submission. Please indicate this step has been completed by supplying the names, titles, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers of the personnel from the grants office, college and department who have approved your proposal for submission.

Proposals may be rejected if this information is not included.

Dissemination Plan *Length: one page*

Include a brief description of the plan to disseminate research results to appropriate audiences.

Letters of Cooperation *Length: Two pages max for each letter*

Include letters of cooperation from project co-investigators and other collaborators.

Curriculum Vitae *Length: Two pages max for each individual*

Include curriculum vitae for the primary investigator and each co-investigator.

Appendix

Research Integrity Guidelines

As part of its congressional mandate established in 1985, the Pork Checkoff is tasked with advancing the pork industry through research that covers all areas of pork production, processing, and human nutrition.

Checkoff funding is a key mechanism to make independent, scientifically sound research possible for the benefit of America's pig farmers and domestic and global pork consumers.

With a focus on continuous improvement from farm to fork, Checkoff research funds are investing in independent research studies focused on multiple key areas, including animal welfare, disease prevention, genetics, production, the environment and human health and nutrition. This focused, yet multi-pronged approach enables farmers to meet the challenges of responsible, ethical, and sustainable pork production today and for the future.

In order to maintain integrity and transparency in the conduct of this research, and to help minimize the potential for bias due to funding source, the National Pork Board (NPB) abides by the below research integrity guidelines informed by accepted scientific practice and guiding principles:

- NPB requires control of the study design, the research itself, and the interpretation of findings remain with scientific investigators;
- NPB requires that if and where relevant, researchers must disclose if the funder advised on the study design, conduct of research, and/or the development of the manuscript;
- NPB requires supported researchers, either acting within contract research entities/organizations or as contract researchers, disclose in publications and conference presentations, full written or oral disclosure, all relevant relationships (financial and non-financial competing interests);
- NPB ensures that prior to the commencement of studies, there is a written agreement that the investigative team has an obligation to attempt to publish the findings within some specified timeframe and the freedom to choose the journal to which the work will be submitted and that the research team submit results from all completed studies for publication regardless of outcomes;
- NPB guarantees that payment of research is not contingent on the outcome of a research project;
- NPB requires that researchers not participate in undisclosed authorship arrangements in publications or presentations;
- NPB requires that academic researchers, when they work in contract research organizations or act as contract researchers, make clear statements of all their affiliations; require that such researchers publish under the auspices of the contract research organization;
- NPB's Human Nutrition Research Program issues a formal request for letters of intent that is open to the entire

research community and selects and supports only the highest quality research proposals;

- NPB utilizes external subject matter experts in nutrition science and related fields to guide its selection of scientifically sound research proposals;
- NPB requires the conduct or sponsorship of research that is factual, transparent, and designed objectively; according to accepted principles of scientific inquiry, the research design will investigate an appropriately phrased hypothesis and/or question, rather than favor a particular outcome;
- NPB guarantees accessibility to all data and control of statistical analysis by investigators and appropriate auditors/reviewers, and that as relevant, projects are registered with appropriate internationally-accepted databases (e.g., ClinicalTrials.gov, etc.) and adhere to applicable reporting guidelines (e.g., CONSORT, PRISMA, etc.);
- NPB is committed to the responsible communication of the studies it funds across mediums (e.g., media interviews, blog posts, etc.). Nutrition communications materials produced by NPB are reviewed by a team of internal and external nutrition experts and all efforts are made to ensure that study results are put in the appropriate context of the broader body of scientific evidence.

The National Pork Board reviews these research integrity guidelines on an annual basis to ensure they remain relevant, appropriate and useful.

References:

- Alexander N, Rowe S, Brackett RE, et al. [Achieving a transparent, actionable framework for public-private partnerships for food and nutrition research](#). *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2015;101(6):1359-1363.
- DeTora LM, Toroser D, Sykes A, Vanderlinden C, Plunkett FJ, Lane T, Hanekamp E, Dormer L, DiBiasi F, Bridges D, Baltzer L, Citrome L. [Good publication practice \(GPP\) guidelines for company-sponsored biomedical research: 2022 update \[published online ahead of print August 30, 2022\]](#). *Ann Intern Med*. 2022. doi: 10.7326/M22-1460.
- Garza C, Stover PJ, Ohlhorst SD, et al. [Best practices in nutrition science to earn and keep the public's trust](#). *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2019;109(1):225-243.
- Larrick BM, Dwyer JT, Erdman JW, D'Aloisio RF, Jones W. [An updated framework for industry funding of food and nutrition research: Managing financial conflicts and scientific integrity](#). *J Nutr*. 2022;152(8):1812-1818.
- Reporting guidelines for main study types. EQUATOR Network website. <https://www.equator-network.org/>. Accessed January 14, 2022.
- Rowe S, Alexander N, Clydesdale F, et al. [Funding food science and nutrition research: financial conflicts and scientific integrity](#). *Nutr Rev*. 2009;67(5):264-272.
- Rowe S, Alexander N, Kretser A, et al. [Principles for building public-private partnerships to benefit food safety, nutrition, and health research](#). *Nutr Rev*. 2013;71(10):682-691.

CONFIDENTIAL