

Northeastern Integrated Pest Management Center's 2011 Request for Applications (RFA)

IPM PARTNERSHIP GRANTS

Due Monday, November 22, 2010

I. SUMMARY

Purpose. Through this Request for Applications (RFA), the Northeastern Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Center requests stakeholder-led proposals that

- form partnerships among growers, scientists, educators, environmental groups, governmental agencies, and other audiences for the purpose of advancing IPM;
- establish or address regional IPM priorities for research and extension;
- tell others how to use IPM to decrease the risks associated with pest management;
- document the status of pest management for a crop or setting.

All projects must further our mission, which is *to foster the development and adoption of integrated pest management, a science-based approach to managing pests in ways that generate economic, environmental, and human health benefits. We work in partnership with stakeholders from agricultural, urban, and rural settings to identify and address regional priorities for research, education, and outreach.*

Extension projects are encouraged. New IPM methods may be developed under this program, but funds for this purpose are limited.

For a comparison of the IPM Partnership and Northeast Regional IPM Competitive grant programs, see <http://northeastipm.org/grants.cfm>. A database of previously funded projects is available at <http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem>.

Available funds. Up to \$450,000, with a maximum of \$40,000 per project is available. Projects are for one year only. Notification of awards will occur in March 2011 and funds must be expended by April 30, 2012. Applicants may submit multiple proposals, and multiple proposals may be funded.

Who may apply. Public and private institutions or organizations, businesses, commodity groups, and private individuals are eligible for these funds. Project Directors (PDs) for IPM Partnership Grants must reside in the Northeast or provide sufficient justification as to why they are seeking funds from outside their own region. Co-PDs may be from outside the region.

Proposal submission. Project types and proposal components are described in more detail throughout this RFA. All proposals must be submitted through the online grant database system, <http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem>, by either the PD or an institutional representative. The online proposal must be submitted to the Northeastern IPM Center by **5:00 p.m. on Monday, November 22, 2010**.

II. BACKGROUND: THE CENTER AND PARTNERSHIP GRANTS

The Northeastern IPM Center is supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA—NIFA). We are a focal point for regional IPM team-building efforts, communication networks, and stakeholder participation. Geographically, we cover the six New England states, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. For information about the RFA that funds the Regional IPM Centers themselves, see <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/fo/fundview.cfm?fonum=1640>.

The Center engages a broad range of people and institutions to set priorities for IPM research, extension, and education projects and then to collaborate on work that will address these priorities. We focus the expertise needed to successfully address emerging IPM issues (e.g., pest resistance, invasive species, regulatory changes, and biotechnology) and improve regional access to information and technology in all settings (agricultural, urban, home, and community). We are enthusiastic about alternative, nonpesticidal strategies that unite several disciplines and lead to sustainable solutions, yet we recognize that reduced-risk pesticides also contribute to sustainability.

III. GENERAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA

Successful proposals are those that comply with the criteria shown in the rating sheet in Part VII. In brief, proposals should

- further the mission of the Northeastern IPM Center (see Part I and Part II), and in particular, decrease the economic, environmental, and/or human health risks associated with a pest and/or existing pest management strategy;
- address priorities identified by IPM stakeholders in the region, or develop new priorities;
- involve multiple states (in paid or unpaid collaboration) and benefit the region at large;
- fulfill the specific criteria of one of the project types listed below (see Part IV);
- be written according to the style and formatting guidelines outlined in this RFA; and
- be submitted online by the deadline.

Especially encouraged are projects that are led by project directors in states with populations under 9 million (CT, DE, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, RI, VT, WV), and Washington, DC.

IV. TYPES OF PROJECTS

The IPM Partnership Grants Program funds several types of projects: (A) IPM Working Groups; (B) IPM Issues; (C) Regional IPM Publications; and (D) IPM Planning and Assessment Documents.

Project types may not be combined into one proposal, but you may submit multiple proposals. The justification and objectives for your separate proposals may be similar.

Some topics could be addressed by a variety of project types. For example, an invasive species problem could be addressed via a research project, publication, focused conference, or working group. If you have an idea for an IPM proposal but are not sure which project type is appropriate, please contact the Center Co-Directors (John Ayers, 814-777-1291; or Carrie Koplinka-Loehr, 607-255-8879).

A. IPM Working Groups

IPM Working Groups (IWGs) are ad hoc organizations formed to work on a set of issues in a specific IPM setting or crop. They develop or update priority lists, plan multistate grant proposals, conduct outreach campaigns across multiple states, and/or help the Center with regional networking. You may apply for up to \$20,000. For a list of current and past Northeastern IPM Center IWGs see http://northeastipm.org/working_groups.cfm.

Co-PDs may be from a single state, but the IWG participants must be multistate and multidisciplinary, with 10-15 members that include IPM stakeholders such as researchers, extension educators, faculty and staff from other colleges and universities (including 1890 land-grant institutions), IPM practitioners, government employees, producers, agricultural consultants, and representatives from grower organizations, environmental groups, consumer groups, or other

nongovernmental organizations. The IWG may be chaired by the PD or the PD and an additional co-chair. IWG proposals must outline a plan of work with outcome-based objectives and milestones. They will not be funded from year to year unless they can demonstrate fresh initiatives. IWGs typically have the following goals; your proposal should speak to as many of them as possible:

- Identify and prioritize specific regional IPM extension and research needs and the expected impacts if these needs could be met. Such IPM priorities guide funding decisions for Center and USDA grant programs. Current priority lists can be found at http://northeastipm.org/regu_regional.cfm. For background on the process of identifying stakeholder priorities, see <http://northeastipm.org/priorities/PrioritySettingGuidelines-WG-2010.doc>
- Represent the views of relevant stakeholder groups to the Center. IWG chairs are invited to attend Center Advisory Council meetings on a rotating basis.
- Represent the Center to relevant stakeholders. Working group members are expected to pass information from the Center to their own organizations and peers, and IWG chairs usually invite a Center Co-Director to working group meetings.

We strongly advise using a portion of working group funds to hire administrative help for such tasks as arranging meetings and creating documents. If the working group will need assistance from the Center on a task, confer with Center Co-Directors in advance of submitting your proposal.

Members of IWGs may apply for additional funding for a specific project (such as a conference) through other Partnership project types and are encouraged to compete for funding through external sources.

B. IPM Issues

These projects are multistate extension, education, and research projects that address regional issues identified by IPM Working Groups and other entities such as the Northeast Region Extension and Academic Program-IPM (NEREAP-IPM) technical committee. Priorities are compiled on the Center's website (http://northeastipm.org/regu_regional.cfm) and included in Pest Management Strategic Plans (http://northeastipm.org/rese_profiles.cfm). Projects may also develop timely IPM responses to critical pest issues (you should explain the nature of the new pest problem in your proposal). Projects may be funded for up to \$40,000 per project. Proposals must

- address *and cite* at least one priority from the Center's website (source, year, link) or document the nature of a critical new pest problem;
- clearly articulate the issue and how it will be addressed; and
- start important new work or promote innovative, effective solutions.

Scientists seeking funding in excess of \$40,000 per research project are encouraged to apply to the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program (see <http://northeastipm.org/grants-ripm.cfm>).

IPM Working Groups or other teams may apply under this category for up to \$10,000 to plan and conduct an IPM conference or workshop of regional interest. Proposals that include conferences must address the bulleted criteria above and also articulate the following:

- contact information for the group members responsible for this activity;
- target audience, purpose, goals, and what impacts you will achieve;
- personnel who could be hired as conference organizers, their tasks, and a timeline;
- potential facilitator(s) for discussions at the conference, if appropriate;

- tasks, if any, to be completed by the Northeastern IPM Center, such as web advertising (confer with Center Co-Directors before submitting your proposal).

C. Regional IPM Publications

We support the development of multistate and regional IPM publications and other media. You may request up to \$20,000 under this project type. Funds may be used to plan, develop, and produce IPM-related materials with multistate or regional applicability. Printed publications, pest alerts, websites, webinars, videos, IPM success stories for public officials, and educational exhibits are acceptable. For examples of pest alerts previously produced by the IPM Centers, see <http://www.ncipmc.org/alerts/>.

Proposals should (1) address priorities identified by IPM stakeholders in the region; (2) fill important existing gaps; (3) have wide applicability within the northeastern region; and (4) facilitate and promote interstate collaboration. Up to 10% of your budget may be used for distribution.

Content and design of all products must meet standards delineated in the Northeastern IPM Center *Guidelines for Center-Funded Communications Projects*, available online at http://northeastipm.org/pubs_guide.cfm.

D. IPM Planning and Assessment Documents

Planning and Assessment Documents help agencies and IPM practitioners by summarizing the status of pest management for a given crop or setting. Past awards for developing these documents have ranged from \$4,000 to \$30,000, depending on the complexity of the task and the number of states involved. Typically, funding is about \$12,000. Proposals should address regional priorities or respond to recent regulatory changes or emerging pests.

The Center is particularly interested in the development of IPM Guidelines (also called IPM elements, protocols, checklists, definitions, and standards), which describe practices that growers and others can follow to implement IPM. These lists typically include point values for each IPM practice implemented. For examples, see http://northeastipm.org/ipm_guidelines.cfm. Some IPM guidelines use point system weighting to indicate which practices are most critical to a successful IPM program (priority practices earn more points). Guidelines help growers and private consultants to identify ways of managing pests that pose the fewest risks to human health, economics, and the environment. When followed and documented, they indicate that a grower has implemented specific practices. The creation of IPM Guidelines should involve land-grant IPM specialists, private consultants, and growers. For details on producing IPM guidelines, see <http://www.ipmcenters.org/ipmelements/IPMElementsGuidelines.pdf>.

Three other types of IPM documents (which are often sequential) may also be funded:

Tactics Surveys, typically sent to growers or other audiences, gather information about the pest management methods being used in a region on a particular crop or setting.

Crop Profiles identify the current status of the methods used to manage pests in a given crop. They gained importance in the 1990s when the U.S. EPA began reassessing tolerances for organophosphates, carbamates, and possible carcinogens. Prepared from a variety of sources, including tactics surveys, these begin to identify gaps and help us to better understand where future research efforts should lead. Crop profiles catalog production information, insect pests, diseases, weeds, and the methods used to manage these. For examples of northeastern crop profiles, see http://northeastipm.org/rese_profbycrop.cfm.

Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs)—the most comprehensive of the three—build on crop profiles by identifying current and emerging pest management tactics and by prioritizing the research, education, and regulatory needs required to properly manage pests. PMSPs may also be written for nonagricultural settings, such as municipal buildings and healthcare facilities. For examples of PMSPs, see http://northeastipm.org/rese_pmspbystate.cfm.

Successful crop profile and PMSP applicants will be guided by the information found at and <http://www.ipmcenters.org/cropprofiles/index.cfm> and <http://www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/index.cfm>. You may propose to revise an outdated document or to develop a new one. Funded documents must conform to the Northeastern IPM Center's standards for content, format, and distribution. Documents are not considered complete until they are approved by Northeastern IPM Center and are included in the National IPM Centers' database.

V. FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

Project directors will be notified about funding decisions in March 2011. Successful applicants will be funded via a subcontract from The Pennsylvania State University. The Center may choose to issue only one subcontract per institution to minimize overall indirect costs to projects. PDs of successful proposals will be contacted to work out the funding mechanism. All funds must be expended by April 30, 2012.

VI. PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

A. Proposal Preparation

Please download required forms and form instructions from the online proposal submission system (<http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem>). You can download forms without being logged into the system, but must be registered and logged in to upload application documents. Because some of these forms change from year to year, please use the 2011 forms. Some documents, such as CVs, do not necessitate forms; in those cases, follow the instructions provided for each required document. For text such as the Project Description, use single-spaced, 12-point type with 1-inch margins and two returns (one blank line) between paragraphs.

You must convert all documents to PDF files before uploading them. For links to free file conversion software, go to <http://northeastipm.org/grants-partnership.cfm#pdf>. If you scan documents such as cover pages, support letters, or appendices, scan them as documents rather than pictures so the text is searchable. Make sure documents are close to 8.5 by 11 inches. We may need to merge documents, so do not apply security settings that prevent document assembly.

B. Proposal Components

1. Proposal Cover Page Form. Download the form, complete it, obtain the necessary signatures, and convert the file to a PDF document. The project title should be descriptive and no longer than 100 characters (letters, punctuation, and spaces between words). Use the IPM acronym rather than writing out Integrated Pest Management. When suggesting your project start and end dates, note that funds will be available by approximately April 30, 2011 (depending on your institution) and must be expended by April 30, 2012.

2. Project Description. While there is not a rigid form for this section, there is a basic document for you to download with headings. Write a concise, complete description that explains the need for your project, how you will achieve impacts, and how you (and the Northeastern IPM Center) will know you have succeeded. Address sections a) through i) below, but do not exceed 8 pages, including references cited. Cite references in the main text by author and year, e.g., (Smith 1999). Upload your Logic Model (see B.2.g) as an Appendix and refer to it here; it will not count

toward your page limit.

a. Project Director(s), Project Title, and Project Type. First, list the PD name, Co-PD name(s), project title, and project type (IPM Working Groups, IPM Issues, Regional IPM Publications, or IPM Planning and Assessment Documents). The PD and Co-PDs must be consistent throughout the proposal.

b. Project Summary. The project summary (approximately 250 words) should briefly explain a) the problem or opportunity; b) your approach, in simple terms that can be understood by the general public, university personnel, private organizations, and budget staff; and c) the anticipated impact of your project. This section will also be copied and pasted into a text field in the online submission database as part of your proposal.

c. Problem and Justification.

1. Describe, in simple terms, the problem or challenge. Consider including the importance of the pest(s), the economic ramifications, and the reason for your study.

2. Address the specific need(s) identified by growers or other stakeholders in the northeastern region. Cite at least one IPM stakeholder priority used to formulate the project (you must provide a link, year, and source). See the Center's web pages for priorities and PMSPs (http://northeastipm.org/regu_regional.cfm; http://northeastipm.org/rese_profiles.cfm). If no priority is posted, say so, and cite a journal review article, proceedings from scientific workshops, or other sources produced by qualified stakeholders. In summary, demonstrate that you are engaged with constituents on some level and that your project addresses their needs.

3. Specify who stands to benefit from your project. Consider environmental, health, or economic benefits or how the project indirectly can feed into these objectives. If it strengthens your case, choose one or two specific members of your target audience as examples and describe their predicament.

4. Review ongoing or completed work (local/regional/national) that is relevant to your project, and include references. If relevant, describe how previous work funded by the Northeastern IPM Center or other sources might contribute to the proposed project (see our database of previously funded projects at <http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem>).

5. If possible, tell us about the applicability of the proposed approach to other regions.

d. Objectives and Anticipated Impacts. Provide clear, concise, and logically numbered statement(s) of the specific aims of the proposed effort. Your objectives should tie directly to the goals of the appropriate project type, as outlined in Part IV of this RFA (you may also want to consult Part VII, Selection Criteria, to understand how the review panels will assess objectives). You will also copy and paste your objectives into a text field in the online submission database.

Then describe the anticipated impacts that could be associated with the fulfillment of your objectives. Your impacts should connect to the purpose of this grants program and the mission of the Northeastern IPM Center (see p. 1). We encourage applicants to review the National IPM Roadmap, available at http://northeastipm.org/whatis_ipmroadmap.pdf, and to briefly discuss how their proposed project will fit those goals. Ideally, the stated project impacts will refer to *measurable* changes that can be substantiated by *data analysis*, as indicated in Part VI.B.2.f., Evaluation Plans, below. The following table poses questions that may help you identify appropriate types of impacts.

Type of Impact	Questions to Help Identify Potential Impacts
<i>Safeguarding human health and the environment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Could new IPM practices be adopted as a direct result of your project? Could your project lead to an increase in the total number of acres (or homes, schools, greenhouses, nurseries) on which these practices could be implemented? b. Could the project reduce risk by changing the use of pesticides on farms, or in homes, schools, etc.? For example, could it result in fewer sprays per season or a switch to lower-risk pesticides? (Since there is no unanimous definition of <i>high</i> and <i>low risk</i>, investigators selecting this indicator are asked to categorize given pesticides as <i>high</i> or <i>low risk</i> according to the particular situation, such as lower risk to natural enemies). c. Might there be public value to your project, that is, value to audiences that may not directly benefit from your extension or research?
<i>Economic benefits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What could be the economic benefit (e.g., dollars saved) for clientele who adopt the IPM strategies and systems you studied? Do you envision potential commercialization or mass production of these systems? b. How many IPM personnel might be employed as a result of your work (e.g., private consulting services, nursery operators, food service growers)? c. How many clients do you anticipate would be satisfied with IPM results (e.g., due to improved yield, quality of yield, reduced pest populations, more effective pest control, greater preservation of non-pest species)? d. Are there other financial benefits—public or private—that might be realized as a result of your project?
<i>Implementation of IPM</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How many IPM strategies and systems will be validated through this project (e.g., through on-farm trials, large plot tests, or other methods used to confirm efficacy)? b. How many educational materials will be delivered? To whom? c. How many growers/personnel will be trained? d. For a website, what volume of traffic and type of use will the site experience (e.g., # visitors per day/month; # page views; # of unique user sessions; change in volume during growing season; average viewing time)? e. How many more people might adopt IPM practices as a direct result of your project, or how many people might adopt new IPM practices? What might the ripple effect be? f. Are there other ways in which your work will result in improved use or increased implementation of IPM strategies in your region or across the Northeast? g. How could your project or study enhance collaboration among stakeholders interested in the development and implementation of improved IPM strategies and systems (e.g., number of growers or other types of stakeholders that have participated in advisory committees, surveys)?

e. Approach and Procedures. Describe in detail how each of the stated objectives will be reached, in the same order as listed above in Objectives and Anticipated Impacts. You should show that the proposed work has the potential of providing data and information that will permit accomplishing the objectives. Construct a timetable for the start and completion of each phase of the project. For multiorganizational or multistate projects, describe how the project will be managed, i.e., who will coordinate the different organizations and states, and how.

f. Evaluation Plans. In this section, briefly describe how you will verify that your project objectives have been met and how you will measure the extent to which any associated impacts have occurred. If measurement of these anticipated impacts will not be possible in the context of the proposed project, describe how the tactic or system you studied, once developed, might be incorporated into an IPM setting. Evaluation plans that include surveys should indicate survey expertise of investigators and/or describe the survey methodology that will be used.


g. Logic Model. Create a Logic Model, such as the one shown on the following page, to summarize your plan for the inputs, audience, activities, and impacts of your project. For samples and templates, see http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/integrated/integrated_logic_model.html and <http://www.ipm.gov/LogicModels/>, <http://northeastipm.org/grants-partnership.cfm>. Upload your Logic Model as an Appendix, refer to it here, and summarize it here or elsewhere in your Project Description.

SAMPLE LOGIC MODEL

Focus Area: Production Agriculture; Impact Area: Environmental Impacts (non-target organisms)

Roadmap Goal: Reduce potential risks to the environment from pesticide use through the use of cost-effective IPM practices

For more examples, see <http://www.ipm.gov/LogicModels/samplelogicmodels.cfm>



h. Cooperation, Institutional Units, and Key Personnel Involved. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the PD, Co-PD, lead institution, and each institutional unit or stakeholder group contributing to the project. Applicants must identify key personnel and their plans of work.

Financial arrangements should be identified here and explained in detail in the budget forms and budget justification. In addition, in part 4 below, provide evidence that contractors have agreed to render the services described (preferably a statement of work, but at minimum, a letter of support).

i. References Cited. If applicable, provide full citations here.

3. Curriculum Vitae (CV). Submit one for the PD and one for each Co-PD. Include education, experience, and relevant publications. Do not include Social Security Numbers. Limit the CV to two pages per person.

4. Documentation of Collaboration. Evidence of support from those involved in—or affected by—your proposal can strengthen it. Use this section to upload letters from stakeholder groups describing the need for the project or willing to participate in it: letters from research facilities willing to host or participate in the project, work plans of contractors to be hired for specific portions of the project, etc. Documents should be addressed to the PD and show the name and affiliation of the sender (letterhead is preferred), the level of commitment or scope of work, and the author’s original or electronic signature. It is assumed that Co-PDs help write or review proposals and thus do not need to submit separate letters of support. Details of roles and responsibilities should be explained in section 2.h. above. Financial arrangements should be generally identified in section 2.h. and explained in detail in the budget forms and budget justification below. The final documents you upload should be PDF files, but they may be scanned images of original letters, or letters created with electronic letterhead and/or signatures (see instructions in Part VI.A. above if you are scanning documents). You may upload multiple letters as a single PDF file or as multiple PDF files.

5. Budget Forms. Download a blank copy of the budget form from the proposal submission website and follow the instructions carefully. It is an Excel file with two tabs, “Form” and “Instructions.” Click the Instructions tab and double-click the instructions to open a PDF of the detailed instructions. For this RFA, projects are limited to 12 months. If your project involves subcontracts you may need to submit multiple budget forms. Convert each form to a PDF file for uploading.

Indirect costs of no more than 22% of Total Funds Awarded (equivalent to 28.205% of Total Direct Costs) can be requested. Matching funds are not required; however, preference may be given to proposals with matching funds.

6. Budget Justification. Include a detailed, narrative, self-explanatory Budget Justification. Follow the order of the budget form. Show the sum of each category, copied from the budget form and explain calculations (e.g., hourly wages, printing estimates, travel expenses). Proposal reviewers should be able to understand how your budget was formulated. Write the justification in complete sentences or a detailed outline; do not just replicate figures from the budget form. For an example of a budget justification see <http://northeastipm.org/grants-partnership.cfm#apply>

If consulting, collaborative, or subcontractual arrangements are included in the proposal, these arrangements should be fully explained and justified. Clearly identify the lead institution, all collaborators, and the role of each in your Budget Justification.

For collaborative arrangements, for the transfer of substantive programmatic work, or for the provision of financial assistance to a third party, provide letters of intent or other evidence that collaborators have agreed to render these services (such as a proposed statement of work and a simple budget for each arrangement).

7. Current and Pending Support Forms. Complete a form for each PD or Co-PD. Include “THIS PROPOSAL” under the Pending heading.

8. Conflict of Interest Forms. Complete a form for each PD and Co-PD. Please include a list that includes your collaborative partners for *only the past four years* except for advisor/advisees. Including outdated collaborations could hinder the review of your proposal.

9. National Environmental Policy Act Exclusions Form. Download a blank copy of this form from the proposal submission website and follow the instructions carefully.

10. Assurance Statement Form. This form is required only if you checked “Yes” to the question at the bottom of the Cover Page, indicating the research project will involve recombinant DNA, human subjects, or vertebrates. If this applies to your project, download a blank copy of this form from the proposal submission website and follow the instructions carefully. Be sure to check a box in each of the three sections (A, B, C).

11. Other Documents. Electronic versions of the NEPA environmental impact statement (if required) and other relevant items, such as reprints or brief reports, may also be uploaded into the proposal system.

C. Proposal Submission

All proposals must be submitted through the online grant database at <http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem>, the same system used to download forms. Further instructions are provided as you move through screens in the proposal submission process. Please contact Amy Galford at the Northeastern IPM Center, aeg1@cornell.edu, (607) 254-8990, with technical questions about proposal submission.

PDs will need to register in the system before submitting an application, so please register well in advance of the deadline. We recommend having each Co-PD register to provide contact information and choose a password. Proposals may be entered in stages, saved, and edited before submitting the entire proposal for review.

In addition to uploading the documents you prepared for your application and converted to PDF files, you will be prompted to copy and paste your project summary and objectives into a pair of online form fields. Formatting in these fields is limited to plain text (including paragraph returns but not bullets, bold, italics, etc.). If your project is funded, these fields will become part of the publicly searchable project database (<http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem>) and will be included in an interagency database of IPM-related projects (<http://projects.ipm.gov>). The project data will also include future project reports.

Proposals must be received by **5:00 p.m. on Monday, November 22, 2010**. Be sure you have clicked the button for “Submit Final Proposal” and received a confirmation message (by email to the PD).

VII. SELECTION CRITERIA

You will receive confirmation of your proposal submission via email. We will notify you of funding decisions in March 2011.

A review panel will judge the merits and technical qualities of the proposals using the criteria in the rating chart below. Given proposals of equal merit, the review panel will select proposals that balance the Center's portfolio of grant types and promote the creation of new partnerships.

IPM PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROGRAM—2010 RATING SHEET	Possible Points
<p>1. Proposal Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is complete and follows the format specified in this RFA. The Project Description does not exceed 8 pages.. 	5
<p>2. Problem and Justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem is important to the Northeast and its residents. • The author cites specific stakeholder priorities from the Center's website or comparable sources. • The author considers the relevance of existing IPM work in the region. • Information is presented clearly. 	15
<p>3. Objectives and Anticipated Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author provides clear, logically numbered statements on the aims of the project. • Objectives are sequential but if the first fails, the others have a chance of standing alone. • The proposal is innovative (new or expands significantly on a previous effort). • The project furthers the mission of the Northeastern IPM Center. • The proposal fits well with the project type chosen (Part IV). • Anticipated impacts show potential to be measurable outcomes—not merely accomplishments. 	35
<p>4. Approach, Procedures, and Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work plan will address the specified objectives and the timetable is realistic. • The procedures are appropriate for the specified outcomes. • The evaluation plan will effectively indicate when the anticipated impacts have occurred in the target audience—that is, when the project has succeeded. • The Logic Model follows summarizes the target audience, activities, impacts, and measures (short-term, intermediate, and long-term). 	20
<p>5. Project Director and Collaborators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CV(s) indicate that the PD and team have the expertise needed to carry out the project; the PD(s) have strong past performance as Center grant recipients, or will be new partners. • The proposal design involves collaboration with stakeholders from more than one state. There is evidence of the team's willingness to partner (e.g., letters of support, statements of work). • The PD is based in a state with a population under 9 million (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, MD, NJ, DE, or WV) or Washington, DC 	15
<p>6. Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget is well-defined, reasonable for the proposed project, and within the project funding limits described in this RFA. • It follows guidelines described in the RFA and on the form instructions. • The justification follows the order of the budget form and explains assumptions in the budget. 	10
TOTAL POINTS	100

VIII. FINAL REPORTS AND PROGRESS REPORTS

Project Directors will be asked to submit a final report, due 60 days after the termination date of the contract. Reports will be submitted via the same online submission system used to apply for grants. PDs will be reminded by email and sent reporting instructions. Current reporting instructions are available in this document:

<http://northeastipm.org/grantsystem/ReportingInstructions/Pship-Reporting-Instructions-2010.pdf>

IX. CONTACT INFORMATION FOR NORTHEASTERN IPM CENTER

John E. Ayers, Co-Director & Grants Manager
The Pennsylvania State University
1752 James Ave
State College, PA 16801-3061
814-777-1291
jea@psu.edu

Carrie Koplinka-Loehr, Co-Director
Cornell University
The Insectary
Ithaca, NY 14853
607-255-8879
ckk3@cornell.edu

Amy Galford, Program Assistant
Cornell University
The Insectary
Ithaca, NY 14853
607-254-8990
aeg1@cornell.edu