



**North Central Region Integrated Pest Management Center
Working Groups Request for Applications FY2018**

Due Date: November 17, 2017

Project Start Date: 3/1/2018

SUMMARY

The North Central Integrated Pest Management Center (NCIPMC) announces the availability of funds and requests proposals for Working Groups that support the NCIPMC and regional IPM priorities.

The Center's mission is to improve health, environment, and economic benefits by providing leadership and cooperating with our partners to facilitate the development and adoption of IPM solutions, based in the North Central region. This mission directly serves the goals of the IPM Roadmap. The NCIPMC fulfills its mission through competitive grants and other programs and projects. The NCIPMC programs address pest management needs for production agriculture, natural resources and recreational environments, and residential and public areas. North Central region IPM priorities, as identified by regional IPM stakeholders, are available on the Center's web site at http://ncipmc.org/grants/stakeholder_priorities.php.

Desired outcomes for the NCIPMC's Working Group Grants Program include:

- Improved understanding of current IPM issues across disciplines, crops and states
- Increased/new IPM knowledge
- Increased collaboration among diverse scientific and extension communities in addressing IPM challenges/priorities
- Increased adoption of IPM practices
- Improved information exchange and knowledge sharing
- Improved economic impacts
- Improved environmental impacts
- Improved human health

Proposals are **not limited to these desired outcomes**, as long as they **address the IPM Roadmap and NCIPMC priorities**. Proposals **must** be submitted in PDF format no later than **Friday, November 17, 2017 (5:00 p.m. CT)** through the online system using the forms provided (<http://projects.ipmcenters.org/Northcentral/>).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Funding in the amount of approximately \$300,000 is available for this competitive subcontracts program. The lead project investigator submitting the proposal must reside in the North Central region (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin) although project participants may reside outside the region. The NCIPMC's programming supports broad participation and diversity of funding opportunities and proposals originating from or including small, mid-sized and minority-serving institutions or organizations are particularly encouraged. Project directors should propose a March 1, 2018 start date and an end date of February 28, 2019.

Proposals for Working Groups may request funding **up to \$20,000** annually for a term of 12 months. Working Groups that wish to continue past a single year must apply for continuation each year and **funding will be based on merit of proposal and accomplishments** from prior funding periods. Current funding awards (carryover) and funds requested from this funding opportunity **cannot exceed \$20,000 total for continuing Working Groups**. **Incomplete proposal packages will not be reviewed.**

If you are unsure about your budget, contact Susan Ratcliffe at 217-333-9656 or by email at sratclif@illinois.edu. Current Working Group projects that do not require additional funds may request a no cost extension that should be submitted to Susan Ratcliffe **along with a progress report**. Please contact Lynnae Jess at jess@msu.edu for your Working Group progress report form, which includes updates on your objectives and evaluation efforts. **The no cost extension must be submitted by 5:00 p.m. CST on November 17, 2017.**

Continuation applications must be received by the application due date and will be evaluated in competition with new applications, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation process as new applications. **Renewal applications MUST include a progress report.**

SCOPE

Working Groups are to support collaboration among diverse groups to collaboratively address a regional IPM priority. Multi-state/tribal nation Working Groups address information, resource, and research needs in region-wide or broad areas to enhance communication and collaborations for the IPM topic area addressed by the Working Group. A Working Group could also coordinate efforts to develop proposals for additional funding to address critical issues within the North Central region.

All Working Groups are encouraged to include a project in their proposal that meets the priorities of the group. A project includes collaborative activities that lead to specific outputs (such as a publication, an app, a regional Pest Alert, a survey, etc.), which in turn are intended to contribute to desired outcomes. **Working groups are not required to include a project**, but projects that complement the objectives of the WG may

strengthen the proposal.

Working Group proposals outline a plan of work with outcome-based objectives and milestones. All Working Groups, new and continuing, typically have the following goals and your proposal should address as many as possible:

- Identify and prioritize specific regional IPM extension and research needs and the expected outcomes or 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://ncipmc.org/grants/stakeholder_priorities.php.**
- Represent the views of relevant stakeholder groups to the Center. Working Group chairs are invited to be on the Center's Stakeholder Panel.
- Represent the Center to relevant stakeholders. Working Group members are expected to share information from the Center to their own organizations and peers, and Working Group chairs usually invite Center staff to their meetings.
- Continuing Working Group proposals should include a list of members and letters of support. Use your best judgment for the number of letters to include.
- New Working Group proposals should include letters of support from individuals who will participate on the Working Group, if funded. Also include a list of all those who have committed to serving as members, if funded.

EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA

All proposals received will be acknowledged. A panel composed of **non-North Central region** reviewers will be convened to review all the proposals. Do not assume the reviewers are familiar with your program, abilities, and past accomplishments. You must clearly identify your objectives and how each objective will be accomplished. The review panel will score applications using the Proposal Score Sheets below for Working Group proposals. The first table shows the score sheet for NEW Working Groups; the second table shows the score sheet for CONTINUING Working Groups.

NEW WORKING GROUP PROJECT EVALUATION SCORING CRITERIA

Proposal Preparation: 10 points

Proposal is complete and follows the format specified in this RFA.
Project Description does not exceed 10 pages
Information is presented clearly

Problem and Justification: 20 points

Problem addresses the North Central IPM Center desired outcomes listed in this RFA
Problem is important to the North Central region and its residents
Project fits the North Central IPM Center priorities
Grower or other stakeholder needs are addressed

Likelihood of Success (Objectives, Outcomes & Milestones): 25 points

Clear link between the proposed activities and expected outcomes
Identified milestones provide detail to demonstrate a clear and well thought out plan
Timeline and scale of project are appropriate

Evaluation: 25 points

Evaluation plan identifies appropriate indicators for expected outcomes
Evaluation plan clearly describes the specific methods and/or sources of data for measuring indicators; methods and data sources are appropriate for specified indicators
Evaluation plan contains:
(1) collection of data to evaluate change in learning, action, or condition during the proposed project **AND/OR**
(2) collection of baseline data that can be used later to measure future changes in learning, action, or condition

Expertise (Cooperation & Institutional involvement): 10 points

CV(s) indicate the PD and team have the expertise needed to conduct the project
Collaborators have agreed to participate through a letter of support
Majority of project members are located within the NC region
Project has potential to catalyze solutions to complex IPM issues

Budget: 10 points

Budget is appropriate for the proposed project; within the funding limits
Budget includes appropriate funds to carry out evaluation efforts
Budget follows guidelines described in the RFA and instructions on the budget form
Budget narrative follows the order of the budget form and fully justifies budget items

CONTINUING WORKING GROUP PROJECT EVALUATION SCORING CRITERIA

Proposal Preparation: 10 points

Proposal is complete and follows the format specified in this RFA.
Project Description does not exceed 10 pages
Information is presented clearly

Problem and Justification: 20 points

Problem addresses the North Central IPM Center desired outcomes listed in this RFA
Problem is important to the North Central region and its residents
Project fits the North Central IPM Center priorities
Grower or other stakeholder needs are addressed
Reviewer recommendations for improvement from most recent proposal review have been adequately addressed

Likelihood of Success (Objectives, Outcomes & Milestones): 25 points

Progress report demonstrates evidence of advancement toward completing objectives and achieving outcomes, or provides sufficient reasons for not doing so
Objectives are either new or significantly expand a previous effort
Clear link between the proposed activities and expected outcomes
Identified milestones provide detail to demonstrate a clear and well thought out plan
Timeline and scale of project are appropriate

Evaluation: 25 points

Evaluation plan identifies appropriate indicators for expected outcomes
Evaluation plan clearly describes the specific methods and/or sources of data for measuring indicators; methods and data sources are appropriate for specified indicators
Evaluation plan contains:
(1) collection of data to evaluate change in learning, action, or condition during the proposed project **AND/OR**
(2) collection of baseline data that can be used later to measure future changes in learning, action, or condition

Expertise (Cooperation & Institutional involvement): 10 points

CV(s) indicate the PD and team have the expertise needed to conduct the project
Collaborators have agreed to participate through a letter of support
Majority of Working Group members are located within the NC region
Working Group has potential to catalyze solutions to complex IPM issues

Budget: 10 points

Budget is appropriate for the proposed project; within the funding limits
Budget includes appropriate funds to carry out evaluation efforts
Budget follows guidelines described in the RFA and instructions on the budget form
Budget narrative follows the order of the budget form and fully justifies budget items

MATCHING FUNDS

Matching funds are not required.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

Submission of Proposals. All required materials for each proposal must be submitted online in PDF format at <http://projects.ipmcenters.org/Northcentral/> by **5:00 p.m. CST Friday, November 17, 2017.**

APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE:

COVER SHEET AND SF-424 FORM

PROJECT SUMMARY/ABSTRACT

The summary should be a self-contained, specific summary of the desired outcomes of the project and the resources and activities that will lead to the desired outcomes. The summary should not exceed 250 words. This project summary should be suitable to use on the NCIPMC website to describe the project.

PROJECT NARRATIVE

The Project Narrative shall not exceed 10 pages, 1-inch margins on all sides, font size no smaller than 12 point. Tables may be in 11 point. For renewal applications, 'Progress Reports' in section (I) Background will not be included in the 10 page limit. The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

Problem & Justification. Provide a brief summary discussing the problem or challenge, why it is important to the North Central region, how it fits within the NCIPMC priorities (be explicit), and how addressing the problem will contribute to or enhance the NCIPMC's desired outcomes for the Working Groups program. Address the specific need(s) identified by growers or other stakeholders in the North Central region, who will benefit from your Working Group, and how they will benefit. After reading this section, reviewers should have a clear understanding of why this proposed Working Group is important, and why the NCIPMC should invest in it.

Objectives and Anticipated Outcomes. Complete the table below for your proposed Working Group activities/outputs (your primary objectives). Add or delete rows as necessary. Remember that this proposal is for only one year of funding with a maximum grant of \$20,000. Do not overcommit with too many objectives. Most Working Groups should have about 3 to 4 objectives.

What you intend to do	Why you intend to do it	When it will be completed
→ Proposed activities/outputs	→ Expected outcomes	

<i>E.g. meetings, conference calls, publications, apps, joint presentations, etc.</i>	<i>Include IPM Roadmap goals, North Central regional IPM priorities, and NCIPMC desired outcomes of Working Group program</i>	<i>Month & Year</i>
1.		
2.		

Outputs are *activities, services, events, or products that you develop*, such as field days, presentations, training materials, websites, services, data, meetings held, reports, papers, and services.

Outcomes are the *changes among individuals, groups, communities, systems or society* that your outputs contribute to.

Outcomes are often divided into Short-, Medium- and Long-term:

- **Short-term Outcomes** are often related to **Learning**: Changes in awareness, knowledge, attitude, skills, opinions, aspirations, and motivations of the target audience.
- **Medium-term Outcomes** are often related to **Actions**: Behaviors, practices, decisions made, policies affected, or social actions taken by members of the target audience.
- **Long-term Outcomes**, also called **Impacts**, are often related to **Conditions**: Social, economic, or environmental conditions “in the world” that may ultimately change as a result of actions taken by end-users in the medium-term. For IPM, changes in economic, social, or environmental conditions would be long-term outcomes.

For additional help and guidance on this section, consult the *Toolkit for Assessing IPM Outcomes and Impacts* at <http://ipmimpact.ucanr.edu/>.

Milestones

Create a table or tables **like the one below** for each of the objectives identified in section 4.b. (above). Milestones are identifiable and documentable activities that need to take place in order to achieve an objective. Think of them as mile markers along the route to success. These milestones do not need to include every minute detail, but enough detail to demonstrate that the objective has been well thought through. The final milestone will be the objective itself.

Indicators of success or completion will range from simple emails or agendas to results from an evaluation activity (such as a survey of meeting participants or growers). For each milestone, a person responsible for the milestone should be identified. We understand that not all “jobs” can be assigned right away, and that this may sometimes be one of the important milestones. Where possible, identify people by name. Use a separate table for each objective.

Objective 1. *E.g., Annual meeting*

Milestones	Indicator(s) of success/completion	Who is responsible	Completion Date
<i>1. Secure meeting space</i>	<i>Contract or agreement</i>	<i>John Smith</i>	<i>June 2016</i>
<i>2. Call for presentations</i>	<i>Email confirmations</i>	<i>Meeting chair</i>	<i>July 2016</i>

Evaluation Plans

Evaluation plans should specifically address the outcomes identified in the Objectives & Outcomes sections. Ideally, every funded project would include a plan to measure its own impact. That can be problematic with short-term, small-budget projects. Therefore evaluation plans may be either:

- 1) data to evaluate **change in learning, action, or condition** during the proposed project
- 2) **baseline learning, action, or condition** data related to the proposed project

Proposals that include more than one outcome may contain a combination of both evaluation data collection strategies. Working Groups are not required to select one direction for all objectives and outcomes.

Please use the table below, or something similar that connects indicators and evaluation methods to the expected outcomes.

Objective 1. *E.g, Annual meeting*

Outcome(s)	Indicator(s)	Evaluation methods or sources of data	Who	When
<i>Increased/ improved knowledge of meeting participants</i>	<i>Self-assessment scores of meeting participants</i>	<i>Meeting feedback survey that includes pre-meeting & post-meeting understanding of topics</i>	<i>Meeting chair</i>	<i>Final 15 minutes of the meeting</i>

Cooperation of Key Personnel and Institutional Units Involved

Identify key personnel and each institutional unit contributing to the project. In multiple-institutional proposals, each institution should be identified and the lead institution designated. Applicants should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each person and institutional unit of the project team, if applicable.

If the project includes consulting, collaborative or sub-contractual arrangements, such arrangements should be fully explained and justified. In addition, evidence should be provided that the collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. Acceptable documentation for this purpose includes letters of intent or statements of work from the individual or organization. Copies of either letters or email messages from the collaborators will suffice for this purpose.

LITERATURE CITED. This section is not part of the 10 page Project Narrative section. Only those publications cited should be listed in this section; 15 literature citations should be the maximum for most projects. To provide uniformity, the following format should be used: Author(s). Year. Title. Journal. Volume: Pages.

OTHER ATTACHMENTS

Appendices to Project Narrative, attached as PDFs, are allowed if they are germane to the proposed project. There is no limit to the number of appendices, but **they should not be used to circumvent page limitations.**

SENIOR/KEY PERSON PROFILE

Senior/Key Person Profile must be completed, and a biographical sketch and current and pending support must be included for individuals who will receive salary support. **Note: Even if no other funding is reported under the current and pending ‘Active’ section of this attachment for a senior/key person, you must still list information for this grant application under the ‘Pending’ section.**

BUDGET FORMS

Use the budget forms provided. Indirect Costs: Section 709 of the FY 2006 Consolidated Appropriations Act (Public Law 109-97) limits indirect costs of the modified total direct funds (MTDC) provided under each award. Therefore, when preparing budgets, applicants should limit their requests for recovery of indirect costs to the lesser of their institution’s official negotiated indirect cost rate or the equivalent of 30 percent of total federal funds awarded for this proposal.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

Upload in PDF format.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

Submit a Conflict of Interest form for all PD/Co-PDs.

CURRENT & PENDING FORM

Submit a Current & Pending Form for all PD/Co-PDs.

PROGRESS REPORT FORM

Principal Investigators for a continuing Working Group that is requesting additional funding must submit a progress report. **This document should be submitted as an Excel file. Do not convert to PDF.**

FINAL REPORT

A final report must be submitted to the NCIPMC within 60 days of the end of the grant. Reports will be submitted via the same online submission system for grant proposals. PDs will be reminded by email and sent reporting instructions.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals **must** be submitted in PDF format. Submit proposals through the following web page: <http://projects.ipmcenters.org/Northcentral/> using the forms provided. Proposals must be submitted no later than Friday, November 17, 2017 (5:00 p.m. CT) through the online system.

Questions regarding the NCIPMC Working Group RFA should be directed to:

Susan Ratcliffe, Ph.D.
Director
North Central Integrated Pest Management Center
Department of Crop Sciences
1102 S. Goodwin Avenue University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801
217-333-9656

The University of Illinois, in accordance with applicable Federal and State law and University policy, does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age, medical condition (cancer-related), ancestry, marital status, citizenship, sexual orientation, or status as a Vietnam-era veteran or special disabled veteran. Persons with disabilities who require alternative means or communications of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact the NCIPMC Director. Inquiries regarding the University's nondiscrimination policies may be directed to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, University of Illinois, 100 Swanlund Administration Building, 601 East John Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820, (217) 333-0885.