

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURAL
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
BUREAU OF SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION
AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
(850) 617-7917
(850) 617-7949 FAX



THE CONNER BUILDING, No. 6
3125 CONNER BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-1650

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES

COMMISSIONER WILTON SIMPSON

February 13, 2026

Dear Madam or Sir:

The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) is initiating a Request for Proposals (RFP) for mosquito control research *in anticipation* of the Governor's support of research by Florida public universities and colleges for the 2026-2027 fiscal year.

The grants to be awarded by FDACS are competitive and are ranked by the Research Selection Subcommittee of the Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control (FCCMC). Funds appropriated for mosquito control research must be used for *applied and basic research into the practical methods of control* that can be used by local mosquito control agencies. FDACS strongly encourages you to present the results of your study at mosquito control forums such as the Florida Mosquito Control Association and/or American Mosquito Control Association's annual meetings. The Department will also be providing an opportunity through an online webinar towards the end of the contract period. It is highly encouraged that all funding recipients participate in this event.

Enclosed with this letter is the "*Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control's Research Proposal Review and Selection Process for Principal Investigators*," which was last revised May 2025 by the FCCMC. This document provides guidelines for grant applicants as well as information on the review and ranking process. Please take time to review this document prior to submitting a proposal as the priority rankings have changed from a numerical to banded scale.

By way of process, the FCCMC has identified and ranked mosquito control research priorities for the 2026-2027 funding year, should funding be granted by the Legislature. The *FCCMC Research Priorities* can be found in "*Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control's Research Proposal Review and Selection Process for Principal Investigators*". The Research Selection Subcommittee and FDACS evaluate proposals in accordance with priorities identified by the FCCMC. The Research Selection Subcommittee considers all proposals, but those focusing on higher ranking priorities may receive higher scores and are more likely to be funded.

Those submitting proposals for consideration must be aware that FDACS is subject to the Public Records Law, Chapter 119 of the Florida Statutes (F.S.). Any documents that you submit in response to the attached RFP will be considered public records subject to disclosure. If you assert that any records or documents that you submit to FDACS contain trade secrets as defined by Section 812.081, F.S., or are otherwise exempt from disclosure under Chapter 119, F.S., you must conspicuously mark each page

containing the information you wish to protect "Trade Secret" or "Confidential" at the time of the submission. Failure to do this will mean that the documents are not protected from disclosure.

In the event, that there is a request for material that you submitted, FDACS will contact you using the information provided in your proposal to notify you of the request and to provide you reasonable time to respond and explain why marked documents should be protected from disclosure. If it is determined that the documents are exempt from disclosure, FDACS will not disclose them. However, if the documents are determined not to be exempt, FDACS will notify you that the material will be disclosed but will afford you reasonable time to take legal action to prevent disclosure.

Please submit your proposal **in a Portable Document Format (PDF) via email** to Caitlin Gill at **Caitlin.Gill@FDACS.gov**. Please place your respective P.I. last name and proposal title in the **subject line**. Remember to follow the "Guidelines for Proposal Submission" found on page four of the enclosed "*Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control's Research Proposal Review and Selection Process for Principal Investigators*," document.

Proposals must be received by Caitlin Gill no later than close of business on April 15, 2026.

It is important to note that all research projects must be satisfactorily completed within one year of contract execution. If you have questions related to contracting and require further instruction on completing the budget section of the proposal, please email AES_CAP@FDACS.gov.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact my office at 850-617-7918 or email Marah.Clark@FDACS.gov.

Sincerely,



Marah Clark, Environmental Administrator
Entomology and Pest Control Section
Bureau of Scientific Evaluation and Technical Assistance
Division of Agricultural Environmental Services

MSC/cg

Enclosure (1)

FLORIDA COORDINATING COUNCIL ON
MOSQUITO CONTROL
RESEARCH PROPOSAL REVIEW AND
SELECTION PROCESS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Revised

May 22, 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose	3
Guidelines for Proposal Submission	4
Proposal Format.....	4
Request for Proposals Timeline	5
FCCMC Research Priorities.....	6
FCCMC Research Proposal Review and Selection Process.....	7
Initiating	7
FCCMC Research Selection Subcommittee Appointment Overview	7
Proposal Review Process	7
FDACS Sample Cost Analysis Form.....	10
Appendix I	11

Introduction

This document provides established procedures and guidance to the Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control's (FCCMC), Research Selection Subcommittee (RSS) when reviewing proposals for mosquito control research submitted by Florida public universities and colleges. In addition, this document also provides guidelines for prospective researchers on how to format proposals for consideration and funding. This document was initially created when the FCCMC appointed a subcommittee of its members to respond to the need for a transparent process by which research into practical methods of mosquito control would be evaluated.

In 2013, the Florida Legislature amended Chapter 388.261, Florida Statutes, thereby providing the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) authority to distribute mosquito control funding provided through legislative appropriations from the State's Solid Waste Trust Fund. This section of the law was further amended to include a provision which would provide a portion of the funds appropriated by the legislature for mosquito control and which specifically supported research into practical methods of mosquito control for the benefit of all Florida mosquito control programs. **In doing so, the legislature also opened the door to all Florida public universities and colleges to compete for funding that would benefit public health mosquito control operations statewide.**

Purpose

The primary purpose of this document is to detail the outline and proper format for individuals submitting research proposals for review. In addition, this document provides an overview of the peer review process based on guidelines with established criteria that will select the highest quality research in practical methods of public health mosquito control in identified areas of concern in Florida.

It is important to note per state appropriations, recommended projects should focus on "applied and basic research into the practical methods of control to be used by local mosquito control agencies, including research into the prevention of mosquito-borne illnesses. The research may be conducted by any public university or college in Florida."

Guidelines for Proposal Submission

All proposals submitted by principal investigators (PI) for consideration must adhere to the following format for proposals.

- Research proposals will be submitted electronically via email in .PDF format.
- Word limits on sections and page limitations are provided as maximum allowed for each section. Limitations do not apply to tables or figures.
- Proposal submission must be made in accordance with the deadline established in the *Proposal Process Timeline* on page 5.

Failure to adhere to this format will result in the return of the proposal with no review or consideration for funding during that review cycle.

Proposal Format

COVER PAGE

Title
Name of PI
Names of Co-PIs
Institutional Affiliations of PI and Co-PIs
Contact information of PI and Co-PIs
Mailing address
Email address
Phone number

RESEARCH TOPIC PRIORITIES

List of priorities being met by the proposed research
Brief overview of how research addresses proposed priorities (350 words)

ABSTRACT (maximum 350 words)

Provide an overview of the entire project

INTRODUCTION (maximum 1200 words)

State the objectives clearly.
State hypotheses that will be tested if appropriate.
State the importance to Florida mosquito control.
Provide background information with references on the magnitude of the problem and relevant other research that bears on the problem.
Provide references of preliminary or related work bearing on the problem previously done by the investigators demonstrating expertise and ability to accomplish the proposed research.

PLAN OF RESEARCH (maximum 2000 words)

State the plan of research.
Provide materials and methods to be used.
Provide how data will be analyzed and the statistical approaches if appropriate.
Justify how the objectives will be met using the plan.
Summarize any potential pitfalls and how these will be addressed.

LITERATURE CITED (maximum 2 pages)

COST ANALYSIS (maximum 1 page)

Budget for projects must fit the *FDACS Example Cost Analysis Form* on page 10 below. If submitting a multi-year project, include an additional column assigning cost for each cost element for each year.

RESOURCES (maximum 1 page)

Briefly describe organizational structure, available equipment, collaborations, space, etc. already in place in the parent institution that will be available for use in the project.

CVs OF PI AND CO-PIs (maximum 1 page each)

Name

Position title

Affiliation

Highest degree (degree, date awarded, institution)

Current and pending extramural support

Other projects linked (if any) to current proposal

Provide title, role, dates, total cost and objectives.

Previous Publications (give career total of peer reviewed publications)

List 5 most recent publications relevant to the proposal.

Previous FDACS funding and resulting publications

List previous FDACS funding (as PI or Co-PI) during the last 5 years and include all peer reviewed publications resulting from each project.

LETTER(S) OF COLLABORATION

Must be on collaborating organization's letterhead.

Request for Proposals Timeline

Procedure Action	Date / Deadline ¹
Request for project proposals (RFP) sent to institutions (email)	February 15 th
Project proposal deadline for submission (email)	April 15 th
FDACS sends proposals for review to RSS Chair (email)	April 16 th
RSS Peer review deadline. Reviews and score sheets sent to FDACS (email)	May 30 th
Contracts issued to PIs awarded funding (dependent on appropriated funds)	July 1 st

¹ Dates listed are proposed target dates for the actions listed.

FCCMC Research Priorities

Research Funding Prioritization Exercise Results*

January 8, 2026

HIGH Range Priorities	Disease – Surveillance / Control / Risk Prediction
	Emerging Pathogens
	Mosquito Ecology / Biology / Population Dynamics
	Pesticide – New Products
	Pesticide – Non-Target Effects: Chronic or Acute
MID Range Priorities	Application – Adulticides
	Application – Larvicides
	Domestic Mosquito Control
	Mosquito Surveillance / Trapping Systems
	Non-Pesticide Control / Products
	Pesticide – Efficacy / Resistance
LOW Range Priorities	Application – Residual Vegetative Barriers
	Attractants / Repellents
	Environmental Residue Monitoring
	Public Education / Risk Communication
	Storm water

**listed alphabetically by priority range*

FCCMC Research Proposal Review and Selection Process

Initiating Procedures for Proposal Review

- 1) **Initiating the RFP:** FDACS initiates the process by sending a formal letter announcing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to state public universities and colleges in accordance with the timeline established in the *Request Proposals Timeline* on page 5. Guidelines delineated in the *FCCMC Research Proposal Review and Selection Process* document contain instructions to PIs on the format that must be followed for the proposal to be considered for support. In addition, a listing of the research priority areas as determined by FCCMC, FDACS and FMCA is provided with the letter requesting proposal submissions from competing universities and colleges. Principal investigators must provide FDACS with their research proposal via email in .PDF format in accordance with the established timeline.
- 2) **Submit RFP to FDACS:** Refer to letter to researchers submitted along with this document. Researchers must follow guidelines established and listed above.

FCCMC Research Selection Subcommittee Appointment Overview

The membership of the Research Selection Subcommittee (RSS) shall be based on previous scientific expertise in research, service as a peer reviewer on research proposals for other agencies and/or participation in research that has resulted in peer reviewed publications.

- a) Constitute a subcommittee of 7 to 9 members.
- b) Select a Chair person responsible for guiding stimulating discussion, distributing review materials, compiling evaluation scores, communicating with RSS members, but will not act as one of the peer reviewers conducting evaluations or making actual selections of proposals unless otherwise determined by the Department.

Proposal Review Process

- 1) **FDACS Submission to RSS:** FDACS sends all proposals, submitted by the established deadline, to the Chairperson for his/her initial review and dissemination to RSS members.
- 2) **Initial Review by the RSS Chair:** Chair will provide instructions to each reviewer as written guidelines on the criteria to evaluate proposals and a review scoring sheet for each proposal. Subcommittee members must review each proposal independently.
 - a) Chair provides reviewers with a conflict-of-interest form and requests completed form to be returned from reviewers who will be recused from an evaluation of specific proposals due to a conflict of interest.
 - b) Chair uses a streamlining system for proposals based on FCCMC established priorities (see included *Research Topic Priorities Table*). Chairperson uses abstracts and provided research priorities of the proposals to verify an **initial assignment** of each proposal into one of the following three categories:
 - i) **Green:** Proposals that address the high priority topics
 - ii) **Blue:** Proposals that address midrange priority topics
 - iii) **Yellow:** Proposals that address low priority topics
- 3) Once grouped as outlined in Proposal Review Process, Section 2(b), the Chairperson sends all proposals in an email to each RSS member with instructions for conducting reviews with a list of those proposals in each category.

- a) Reviewers are allowed 7 days after receipt of proposals to review and use proposal abstracts to inform the Chairperson of any proposal representing midrange or low priorities which they believe should be selected for further review.
 - b) The Chair receives this information and instructs all reviewers to consider for review any of the proposals in the blue or yellow category that any member has asked to be considered.
 - c) Reviewers must use the provided electronic (Word/fillable PDF) evaluation sheet to assign a priority score, research score, and an overall evaluation score (based on the formula guidelines) for every proposal under full consideration.
 - d) Each reviewer is required to return completed electronic evaluation sheets for each proposal reviewed, with comments, to the Chair, who compiles the scores for the proposals, including the average for priority score, research score, and overall score for each reviewed proposal, and provides a spreadsheet of all reviewer scores for each of the three evaluation segments in all reviewed proposals so that individual scoring can be viewed.
 - e) The Chair convenes a conference (meeting in person or teleconference) to discuss proposals and scoring.
 - f) Proposal Evaluation: The Chair then evaluates each grant individually in accordance with the criteria listed below:
 - i. Chair points out scores for each grant, focusing on clear consensus and agreements.
 - ii. Chair asks reviewers whose scores disagree with the consensus scores on any reviewed grant to explain their reasons for the scoring.
 - iii. The reviewers discuss the merits of the divergent scores.
 - iv. The reviewers are asked to reconsider their scores based on the discussion.
 - v. The Chair makes any scoring changes according to the reviewer's instructions.
 - vi. The Chair seeks to establish a consensus scoring range for the grant based on the overall scores seeking to have all scores within this range.
 - vii. The group will work to avoid having any proposal receive an overall negative review based on a clearly divergent score on the part of 1 or 2 reviewers.
 - viii. If any reviewer scores a proposal more than 2 or more (unit) scores above or below the average consensus scores of the other reviewers, that reviewer must provide a written justification for their score. For example, if the average score is 1.2 (without the disagreement score), any scores at 3.3 or higher require written justification.
 - ix. After discussion and if there is a failure to arrive at a consensus, a vote is taken with yea's voting to drop the score in contention from the overall scoring of the proposal. Passing the motion requires a super majority of the RSS including a vote by the Chairperson. Defeating the motion requires 3 nay votes.
 - g) All proposals considered for full review will be evaluated, scored; and presented in rank order of their overall scoring.
 - h) The RSS will come to consensus on the overall ranking and the associated expenditure of funding. Budgets will be discussed at this point to achieve consensus that the RSS members agree the rankings are the optimal use of the funds.
 - i) If a proposal was not considered for full review, it will not be evaluated and scored.
- 4) **FDACS Review and Acceptance of Proposals Recommended for Funding:** After the review process, the Chair will provide FDACS with the recommended proposals for funding, a listing of proposal rankings and a brief synopsis of the overall review process. In addition, the Chair will also provide the scored evaluation sheets that include written comments from each RSS member for each

proposal reviewed, completed conflict of interest forms, and any justification of scoring documentation (Section 3(f)(viii) of the *Proposal Review Process*).

- a) FDACS will review the recommendations of the RSS for acceptance, denial or amendment of any of the proposals recommended for funding.
- b) If a proposal requires an amendment or is unacceptable for any reason, FDACS must discuss these changes with the RSS Chair prior to making a final decision on funding. If the recommendations by the RSS are acceptable, no additional action is necessary.

5) Funded/Not Funded/Not Reviewed Notification

The principal investigator for each proposal will receive a short email communication/letter from FDACS indicating whether or not their proposal was chosen for funding by the review committee. Any reviews that the proposal received will be sent to the PI. This decision in no way reflects future priority considerations. **NOTE: To ensure reviewer anonymity, FDACS will eliminate the reviewer's name from reviewers' evaluations, save the evaluation as a .PDF file, and provide the reviews to the principal investigators submitting the proposal.**

6) Funding Multiyear Proposals: Consideration for multiyear proposals will be determined based on the following criteria:

- a) The project is considered by the RSS during their review process (Sections 2 and 3 of the *Proposal Review Process*) using FCCMC established priorities.
- b) The project is within one of the top 3 priorities assigned by the FCCMC in a funding year.
- c) The selection of a multiyear project in a particular year automatically encumbers funds for future years.
- d) Continuance of funding for a multiyear proposal is contingent on annual legislative appropriations.

FDACS Sample Cost Analysis Form

Contractor University name
Proposal Title Project title
Period of Service To be determined upon contract execution

Budget	Total amount funded by the Contractor (i.e., university)	Effort/Time percentage allocated to this project only	Amount allocated to conduct this project by FDACS
Salaries ^{a)}			
Dr. Hollywood, PI	\$85,000	5%	\$4,250
TBD Biologist	\$61,286	14%	\$8,580
Dr. California, Co-PI	\$0	1%	\$0
TBD Graduate Student	\$9,960	100%	\$9,960
TBD Post Doc	\$42,263	8%	\$3,381
Fringe Benefits ^{b)}			
Dr. Hollywood, PI	\$24,310	5%	\$1,216
TBD Biologist	\$17,528	14%	\$2,454
Dr. California, Co-PI	\$0	1%	\$0
TBD Graduate Student	\$1,594	100%	\$1,594
TBD Post Doc	\$12,087	8%	\$967
Equipment ^{c)}			
5 Microscopes	\$0	100%	\$10,000
Travel ^{d)}			
UF - USDA Campus	\$0	100%	\$6000
Miscellaneous ^{e)}			
Lab supplies	\$0	100%	\$15,500
Computer supplies	\$0	100%	\$4,000
Contractual services	\$0	100%	\$7,500
Indirect cost / overhead ^{f)}		100%	\$7,590
TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE			\$83,492

Cost Elements: The proposed budget must be broken down by the following cost elements; salaries, fringe benefits, equipment, travel, miscellaneous and indirect cost/overhead.

- a) Salaries: List each proposed position that will perform the tasks needed to complete this project. For each position, the total salary should be indicated as should the percent of salary requested from this project budget.
- b) Fringe Benefits: List each proposed position that will perform the tasks needed to complete this project. For each position, the total value of fringe benefits should be indicated. Then, indicate the value and percentage of the fringe benefit that is contributed from this contract.
- c) Equipment: List each proposed piece of equipment to be purchased from monies from this contract (i.e., computers, microscopes, etc.).
- d) Travel: List each proposed meeting, travel destinations, etc. the contractor will request reimbursement for as part of this project.
- e) Miscellaneous: List each proposed item the contractor will request reimbursement for (i.e., lab and field supplies, computer supplies, contractual service, etc.).
- f) Indirect Cost/Admin Overhead: These costs have already been negotiated (i.e. 5% or 10%). Refer to your respective finance or fiscal department for your university or college.

Appendix I

Revision History

Rev	Approved Date	Description	Author
0	May 2, 2005	Original Document	Ed Fussell, Thomas Loyless, Dr. John Mulernnan, Michael J. Page, Dr. John Smith, and Dr. Walter Tabachnick
1	February 10, 2015	See Page 3, Introduction	Adriane Rogers et al.
2	January 20, 2016	Updated timeline process	Adriane Rogers et al.
3	September 15, 2020	Updated clarifications for the requirements for submitting proposals	Marah Clark, Caitlin Gill and Dr. Dan Kline
4	January 18, 2024	Priority rankings updated to a banding ranking style system	Marah Clark, Caitlin Gill and Alden Estep
5	May 22, 2025	Remove hard copy request for proposals requirement and adding revision history table in Appendix	Marah Clark and Caitlin Gill