IPM Mini-Grant Proposal Evaluation Form - 2011

Project Title Involving Local FFA Members in Monitoring, Collecting, and Distributing Biological Control Agents in Leafy Spurge

Project Leade Clark Israelsen, USU/Cache County Extension, Project Leader
Jake Forsgren , Cache County Weed Department, Cooperator
Joel Merritt , Cache County Weed Department, Cooperator
David Erickson (Vocational Agriculture Instructors, Cache County School District)
Andrea Clark (Vocational Agriculture Instructors, Cache County School District)

Rating Scores:
1=low score, not satisfactory
2=acceptable, but below average quality
3=average quality
4=good quality
5=high score, excellent quality

		Score	
1. Measurable Impact to Stakeholders			
A. Knowledge gained by stakeholders	(clientele trained in IPM/gain knowledge of IPM methods?, will clientele likely increase their use of IPM methods?)	2	Maybe I missed it -- how many students are to be impacted? No target of producers?
B. Impact on pesticide reduction	(will pesticide use likely be reduced or improved?, will IPM strategy likely reduce environmental impact of pesticides?)	3	Not stated that it will be looked at or calculated - would be nice to have though
C. Increased stakeholder profitability/sustainability	(will stakeholders likely increase profits or other economic indicators?)	3	Again not stated that it will be looked at or calculated - would be nice to have though
2. Level of Emphasis on IPM and Sustainable Agriculture Ec			
A. Quality and innovation of training methods	(training workshop or field day included?, on-site/in-the-field demonstrations or clinic included?, one-on-one interactions with stakeholders?)	2	Workshops for the students are great! However, what about some producer invited to attend also?
B. Educational materials will be produced	(development of fact sheet or other educational material?, utilize other media to disseminate IPM information?)	3	Okay but more is always better
C. Presentations or 'Train-the-Trainer' workshops		2	All that they say that they may do really needs to be changed to 'will do' or I don't feel good about the possiblity of funding this
3. Collaborations and Relevance to Utah's Important Ag. & Green Industry Commodities and Situations			
A. Importance of crop/commodity/situation		2	No specifice really mentioned
B. Potential for impact on important stakeholder group(s) (will many clientele or a large area of land be impacted?)		2	No specifics really mentioned
4. Feasibility of Project			
A. Feasibility of completing objectives and methods within grant time period		3	Yes for the training but not so much for the monitoring - will likely require several years
5. Appropriateness and Expertise of Project Leaders			
A. Appropriate, qualified and necessary project leaders, collaborators and cooperators included		4	Yes
6. Appropriateness of Budget			
A. Appropriate and adequate funding request for proposed work		2	I would like to have a breakdown of the BCAs that may be purchased -- some justification here since it half the budget
7. Extent and Magnitude of Potential Impacts in Utah			
A. Information can be used by other Utah counties and stakeholders		3	If monitoring data is long enough to get meaningful numbers
B. Quality and format of proposed outcomes have potential for impact		4	Yes
8. Evaluation of project			
A. Discussion of how project impacts and outcomes will be measured		2	Not really well developed
	Total Score (70 points possible)	37	

Recommendation for funding of project:	********
Fund project at level requested	
Fund project at a reduced level	
Do not fund project	
Suggested funding level $	$2,310