National IPM Coordinating Committee, March 2026 [minor updates July 2026]

IPM COORDINATOR HANDBOOK

This handbook is maintained by the National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) as a resource for IPM coordinators and the broader IPM Enterprise. NIPMCC will lead a formal review and update of the handbook every three years, timed to coincide with the International IPM Symposium. Comments and suggested revisions should be collected in advance of the Symposium so that an updated version can be completed and posted prior to Symposium-related meetings. The current version will be posted in the NIPMCC Basecamp workspace and on the NIPMCC website to ensure that IPM Enterprise members and partners have access to the most recent guidance.

PART I. Orientation & context

Introduction

This handbook provides state integrated pest management (IPM) coordinators with a comprehensive guide to their roles, responsibilities, and best practices for leading effective IPM programs. It offers practical tools, templates, and strategies to help coordinators manage grants, foster collaboration, and enhance program impact at the state, regional, and national levels.

Intended for IPM coordinators within land-grant universities and Extension programs, this resource is helpful for both new and experienced coordinators, as well as for Extension staff and researchers who work closely with IPM programs. Organized around the primary responsibilities of an IPM coordinator, each section includes actionable guidance, tools, and templates. Some sections focus on foundational skills for new coordinators, while others address advanced program development and leadership. Because funding plays a central role in sustaining statewide IPM programs, this handbook also includes detailed guidance on federal and complementary funding sources—see *Part III: Funding* for more information.

Use this handbook to strengthen partnerships, improve program performance, and expand the reach of IPM across your state.

IPM and the land-grant mission

The IPM network is embedded within the land-grant mission of research, teaching, and Extension. IPM coordinators ensure that IPM principles are reflected in Extension programming and that research outputs become valuable tools for practitioners. They also connect universities with federal agencies and community partners that shape pest management policy and funding.

How IPM fits within Extension, research, and federal agencies

Within universities, IPM programs involve researchers, Extension specialists, educators, and diagnosticians. At the federal level, agencies such as **USDA-NIFA** (United States Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and Agriculture), **EPA** (Environmental Protection Agency), **HUD** (Housing and Urban Development), **APHIS** (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service), **ARS** (Agricultural Research Service), and the **Forest Service** provide funding, policy direction, and technical guidance. Coordinators serve as the primary liaison between these entities and state programs.

Overview and key entities of the IPM Enterprise

IPM is a holistic, environmentally sound approach to pest management that integrates biological, cultural, mechanical, and chemical methods. IPM coordinators play a central role in promoting IPM practices, securing funding, and building partnerships with stakeholders, including farmers, urban planners, researchers, government agencies, and environmental

organizations. Coordinators are not only leaders within their states but are also key participants in a broader national IPM network.

The IPM network is multi-layered and involves several key components:

Regional IPM Centers

Regional IPM Centers (Southern, Northeastern, North Central, and Western) foster collaboration and support outreach across states.

As part of their mission to support IPM within their regions, the Regional IPM Centers help support state IPM programs. A central role of the Centers is to foster coordination and networking across the region. They help maintain strong communication among IPM coordinators, organize and/or support regional meetings and working groups, and create opportunities for peer exchange. They also help connect coordinators with subject-matter experts, evaluators, and communication professionals who can support specialized needs.

Centers also provide valuable guidance in planning, evaluation, and reporting. They offer templates, examples, and clear instructions for developing logic models, evaluation plans, impact documentation, and annual or final reports. When coordinators need deeper evaluation support, Centers can sometimes provide consultation or direct them to experienced evaluators within the region.

Another important function is helping states align their work with broader regional and national IPM priorities. Centers communicate priorities emerging from IPM related Hatch Multistate Research Projects and help interpret national IPM goals, such as those described in the National Road Map, within a regional context. Their support promotes consistency across states while still respecting each program's unique needs and flexibility.

Regional IPM Centers also assist with proposal development. They can offer guidance during the development of Extension Implementation Program proposals. When multistate collaboration is appropriate, Centers can help facilitate coordination across institutions. Within their capacity, they also provide feedback on draft concepts or early-stage ideas.

In addition, Centers maintain and support shared information technology and infrastructure used across the region. This may include pest and disease monitoring platforms, mapping tools, alert systems, project coordination, and data sharing. They often provide web hosting or technical support for program tools and may manage platforms used by national initiatives.

See Part IV for a listing of tools provided by the Southern IPM Center.

Hatch Multistate Research Projects (SERA-3, NCERA-222, WERA-1017, NEERA-2104)

Hatch Multistate Research Projects bring together experts to address a wide variety of regional priorities. You may also hear these committees referred to as Hatch Projects, multistate projects, or NIMSS committees. They go by a variety of acronyms and numbers, with NE standing for northeast, S for south, W for west, and NC for north central. There is a group within each region just for IPM coordinators (NEERA-2104, SERA-3, NCERA-222, WERA-1017). All Hatch Multistate Research projects can be found on NIMSS.org.

Every IPM coordinator is expected to become a member of the IPM Coordinator related Hatch Multistate Research Project in their region. These committees set priorities and develop collaborations for proposals and programs. They are also venues for reporting on funded work and identifying emerging pest threats. To join the appropriate committee you should contact your institutions Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station (AES). If you are having problems determining who to contact your Regional IPM Center may be able to help as well. Coordinators should also ask their institution whether travel support is available for annual meetings.

See Understand your obligations within Hatch Multistate Research Project in Part II.

National IPM Coordinating Committee

The National IPM Coordinating Committee coordinates national strategies and advocates for IPM funding.

The National IPM Coordinating Committee serves as a national representative body for the land-grant based IPM network. The committee advocates for IPM by communicating its value to the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities leadership, Extension and research directors, federal agencies, and policymakers. Through impact statements and program outcomes, the National IPM Coordinating Committee advocates for sustained or increased funding and elevates the visibility of IPM within the broader land-grant system.

The National IPM Coordinating Committee disseminates updates from federal agencies, the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, and national leadership. It communicates issues that may influence funding structures, reporting obligations, or program expectations. It often provides summaries or guidance following national discussions, helping IPM coordinators stay aligned with evolving expectations and opportunities.

The National IPM Coordinating Committee supports consistency and collective messaging by encouraging shared language, themes, and framing when states communicate the value and impact of IPM. By aggregating state-level impact statements, the National IPM Coordinating Committee helps tell a unified national story—one that strengthens advocacy efforts and reinforces the importance of IPM across diverse audiences.

The AgInnovation platform (operated by the Experiment Station section of the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities) serves as the home for the National IPM Coordinating Committee materials—providing visibility, national context, and alignment with broader agricultural research and innovation goals.

More information on the National IPM Coordinating Committee and membership information can be found at this website and in the rules of operation.

Federal IPM Coordinating Committee

The Federal IPM Coordinating Committee, composed of USDA, EPA, and other agencies that shape federal policies and priorities. This committee updates the IPM Roadmap.

The Federal IPM Coordinating Committee, led by the USDA Office of Pest Management Policy, includes representatives from federal agencies involved in pest management, aligns federal IPM priorities, updates the National IPM Road Map, and coordinates across agencies.

Summary

As an IPM coordinator, you connect local efforts with national and regional priorities, helping ensure that IPM strategies are adopted across diverse agricultural, natural resource, and urban landscapes.

Follow links for the National IPM Road Map and the brief and full versions of the Public IPM Enterprise Strategic Plan.

PART II. Being an IPM coordinator

Core responsibilities of the IPM coordinator

Land-grant universities in every state and territory have a designated IPM coordinator (states with more than one land-grant institution may have multiple IPM coordinators). Although institutions structure the role differently, most coordinators share a standard set of responsibilities. These include guiding statewide IPM programming, supporting the translation of research into practical pest management solutions, and identifying stakeholders and determining their needs. Many IPM coordinators also serve as principal investigators for the USDA-NIFA Extension Implementation Program grant and ensure the program outcomes are measured and communicated to stakeholders, administrators, and partners.

Getting started

Starting in the role of IPM coordinator can feel overwhelming, but taking a systematic approach to your responsibilities will help you establish a solid foundation. The following steps are recommended to help set you up for success.

Your statewide IPM vision

Effective statewide coordination begins with a clear articulation of what IPM represents within the state; both as a science-based management framework as well as a coordinated program supporting its implementation across agricultural, urban, and natural resource systems. As the IPM coordinator, you are responsible for helping define and communicate this vision in collaboration with faculty, Extension colleagues, administrators, and stakeholders. This work includes identifying the most pressing pest management needs, aligning them with state and regional priorities, and ensuring that program activities reflect IPM principles.

Equally important is understanding what IPM-related activities, research, and outreach are already occurring in your state. This includes recognizing what has been successful, what gaps remain, and where additional support is needed. This support may take many forms, including personnel, funding, infrastructure, evaluation capacity, program development, and communication strategies, and it should be revisited regularly to reflect emerging issues, stakeholder needs, and new opportunities.

Your institutional context

Before diving into program management or funding applications, take time to understand the broader context of your institution. This includes identifying your reporting structure and understanding where the IPM coordinator role fits within the university's Extension and research framework. Establish clear lines of communication with key administrative leaders, such as department heads and deans, to ensure alignment on expectations and priorities. If your institution has a formal job description for the role, review it carefully. If the role is informally assigned, seek clarification about your administration's expectations of your duties and the resources available to you. Some administrators may have very little knowledge of the

IPM coordinator role and may need to be educated on state, regional, and federal responsibilities of the role.

Make sure you understand how decisions are made within your institution, particularly around resources and approvals. Ensure there is agreement within your institution on the broader vision for IPM in your state and how success will be measured. Proactively aligning on goals, communication pathways, and needed support will help ensure you have the institutional backing required to effectively lead the program.

Your colleagues

Schedule meetings with Extension specialists, researchers, and campus partners that work in IPM in order to understand their needs, priorities, and ongoing efforts. Use these conversations to share your vision for the IPM program and explore where individual and programmatic goals overlap. Identifying areas of alignment early helps build buy-in, reduces duplication of effort, and creates a shared sense of ownership in the statewide IPM program, setting the foundation for effective collaboration and long-term impact.

IPM strategic plan resources

Many coordinators rely on state, regional, or national IPM strategic plans to guide program direction, communicate priorities, and align with funding opportunities. These plans outline long-term goals, recommended actions, and research and Extension needs.

Access to current versions of the National IPM Road Map, regional priority documents, and state strategic plans helps coordinators position their work within broader frameworks.

Strategic plans are also valuable communication tools for demonstrating how statewide efforts contribute to national goals and serve stakeholder needs. IPM coordinators may work with Regional IPM Centers or national committees to stay updated on revisions or new strategic documents.

Build your IPM support network

Internal team

Build a team of collaborators within your institution who can support program objectives. This may include Extension specialists, researchers, faculty members, graduate students, and/or support staff. Establish regular communication so that everyone understands their roles and responsibilities and how their work aligns with the goals of the IPM program. Creating mechanisms for feedback and regular check-ins will help keep the program responsive and adaptive.

Communicate with your Regional IPM Center

Your Regional IPM Center is an important resource for support, training, and collaboration. Contact your center early to introduce yourself and discuss your goals for the program. Learn about the services they offer and how they can help you with networking, outreach, funding opportunities, and technical assistance. Regional centers often coordinate regional meetings,

provide small grants, and support multistate collaboration, all of which can strengthen your IPM efforts.

Understand obligations and benefits of the Hatch Multistate Research Project

One of the best ways to get a handle on what it is to be an IPM coordinator is to meet with fellow IPM coordinators and learn about other state programs. As a member of your region's Hatch Multistate Research Project (e.g., NEERA-2104, SERA-3, NCERA-222, WERA-1017), you will be expected to participate in annual meetings, share program updates, and contribute to the development of regional priorities. Familiarize yourself with the committee's goals and how your state's priorities fit within the broader regional efforts. These meetings provide excellent opportunities to build relationships with other coordinators, exchange ideas, and learn about emerging pest management issues across the region.

At some point, you may be asked to serve as chair of your regional Hatch Multistate Research Project. This is typically a three-year commitment. In the first year, you serve as chair-elect and are responsible for meeting notes and helping prepare for the upcoming meeting. In the second year, you serve as chair and take the lead in organizing the annual meeting, including setting the agenda, location, and dates, often with assistance from the Regional IPM Center. In the third year, as past chair, you help support and advise the incoming leadership to ensure continuity. Throughout all three years, you are also expected to attend or be involved in the National IPM Coordinating Committee.

Connect with other IPM coordinators

While each state IPM program is unique, it is invaluable to build relationships with IPM coordinators in other states. These peers provide not only professional support but also practical resources, sharing strategies, templates, and examples of successful approaches. Your Regional IPM Center can help connect you with other coordinators in your region, and national networks and listservs can further expand your network. Coordinators often find that regional meetings and national forums are the most productive settings for exchanging information and learning from each other's experiences.

Regional meetings are designed to foster collaboration and provide opportunities to discuss shared challenges, successes, and emerging issues. Whether through formal meetings or informal peer exchanges, these networks help coordinators stay current with best practices and gain insights from other coordinators.

National networks or meetings offer additional opportunities for collaboration and influence. Become familiar with the National IPM Coordinating Committee, the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee, and other national groups involved in IPM. National gatherings such as the IPM Symposium (typically held every 3 years) provide valuable opportunities to network, connect with national partners, and stay engaged in multistate efforts. Also, members of the regional Hatch Multistate Research Project typically meet the day before the International IPM Symposium. *See a list of contacts in Part IV.*

Rather than relying on informal or ad hoc communication, new coordinators should intentionally plug into the primary platforms used by regional and national IPM leadership

groups. One of the most important early steps is ensuring you are added to the most current communication platform for your regional Hatch Multistate Research Project. This is likely to be a listserv, Google group, or something similar where most ongoing coordination, announcements, and document sharing now occur. You can find out how to stay connected by connecting with your Regional IPM Center Director. Coordinators should also get added to the National IPM Coordinating Committee Basecamp when appropriate. Being connected to these platforms helps reduce information gaps, supports alignment across scales, and ensures coordinators receive timely and consistent information.

Identify your stakeholders

Internal stakeholders

Statewide IPM programs rely on collaboration across disciplines, departments, and geographic areas. Faculty researchers, Extension specialists, county educators, diagnosticians, Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) coordinators, and Master Gardener or conservation coordinators may all contribute to IPM efforts. As the IPM coordinator, your role is to be a bridge between these programs, ensure they have their IPM information needs met, reduce duplication, and encourage collaborative problem-solving within a shared program framework. Establishing regular communication channels helps align program goals, coordinate activities, and identify emerging needs.

External stakeholders

Strong statewide IPM programs extend beyond the university by engaging external stakeholders who help shape priorities, adoption, and support for pest management efforts. These partners may include organizations such as IR-4, NRCS, SARE, commodity boards, 4-H, farmers, schools, non-profits, and state or federal agencies. As IPM coordinator, identify stakeholders whose missions and activities align with IPM goals, and establish regular communication to explore opportunities for joint programming, information exchange, and shared initiatives. Meaningful engagement with external partners helps ensure IPM efforts remain responsive to stakeholder needs, increases opportunities for collaboration and co-funding, and strengthens the overall visibility and impact of the IPM program.

Typical activities

Supporting education and outreach to stakeholders

As the statewide leader for IPM, you are responsible for ensuring that IPM education reaches all relevant stakeholders across agricultural, urban, and natural resource systems. These audiences may include farmers and the agri-businesses that support them, urban residents, schools, housing authorities, environmental organizations, tribal partners, and the general public. Because stakeholder needs vary by system and location, outreach efforts should be tailored to ensure information is practical, timely, and accessible.

Effective outreach may include traditional approaches such as workshops, fact sheets, demonstration plots, webinars, and field days, as well as intentional use of communication and marketing tools to increase awareness and reach. Social media, email newsletters, websites,

and other digital platforms can extend the impact of IPM programming, reinforce key messages, and connect stakeholders to timely resources and alerts. Working closely with Extension agents, community partners, and communication specialists helps ensure outreach efforts are well coordinated, responsive to local needs, and visible to the audiences they intend to serve.

Communications

Effective communication is central to the IPM coordinator role. Coordinators serve as a bridge among researchers, Extension faculty, stakeholders, federal agencies, national committees, and institutional leadership, sharing statewide updates while communicating regional and national priorities to local partners. They provide timely information on emerging pests, management strategies, funding opportunities, and educational programs, and often serve as the primary point of contact between their institution and external partners such as USDA NIFA, EPA, HUD, APHIS, ARS, the Forest Service, community groups, non-profits, and industry. Because IPM operates within a broader administrative framework that includes Extension and research directors and the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, coordinators must also keep leadership informed to support funding decisions and priority setting. Proactive, clear, and consistent communication strengthens partnerships, aligns goals across organizations, increases program visibility, and ensures IPM remains integrated into institutional and national conversations.

Basic evaluation for IPM coordinators

Statewide IPM programs can use a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods to document impact and guide continuous improvement. Common approaches include pre- and post-knowledge assessments, surveys of farmers and pest management professionals, follow-up interviews, Extension agent reports, and, in some states, diagnostic lab records, digital analytics, or pesticide use data to track trends in pest pressure and management practices. While approaches vary, the shared goal is to capture meaningful changes in awareness, behavior, and outcomes related to IPM. Tools such as the IPM Impact Assessment Toolkit (*see Part IV for examples of effective evaluations*) offer practical starting points and adaptable models that can be tailored to state priorities.

Building strong evaluation systems creates opportunities to expand skills in impact assessment, survey design, qualitative methods, data management, and outcome reporting. Pre- and post-surveys can document changes in knowledge or intended behavior, diagnostic clinic records can highlight emerging issues or shifts in management questions, and secondary data—such as pesticide use reports, state agricultural statistics, or environmental monitoring data—can provide broader context for statewide outcomes. When combined thoughtfully, these sources generate a more complete and compelling picture of program effectiveness.

Collaboration further strengthens evaluation efforts. Partnering with Extension evaluation specialists, social science faculty, or institutional evaluation offices can improve instrument design, data collection, and analysis, while also supporting logic model development and alignment of inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes. Coordinators who engage these partners early often find evaluation more integrated into program planning and reporting. Regional IPM

Centers may also provide templates, training, and technical assistance that streamline the process. By leveraging available expertise and resources, coordinators can enhance their evaluation results while showing the impact of IPM programs.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) clearance

When collecting information directly from stakeholders through surveys, interviews, or focus groups, it is important to work with your institution to determine whether Institutional Review Board approval is required. Securing appropriate Institutional Review Board clearance in advance helps ensure that data collection is conducted ethically and legally and avoids delays when evaluation activities are already underway.

Writing and submitting IPM impact statements

Evaluation is essential for demonstrating the value of IPM programs, guiding improvements, and communicating outcomes to administrators, funders, and stakeholders. Because IPM programs span multiple disciplines and address complex ecological, economic, and social issues, evaluation provides a structured way to document progress, identify what works, and determine where additional resources or adjustments are needed. For federally funded programs such as the Extension Implementation Program, evaluation is also required for reporting and accountability. Coordinators often use a logic model to link inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, clarifying what should be measured, when data should be collected, and how short-, medium-, and long-term results connect to program activities. Collaborating with evaluation specialists, social scientists, or Regional IPM Centers can strengthen evaluation design and ensure findings are translated into reports, dashboards, and impact statements.

Impact statements are concise summaries that highlight program outcomes and public value. They document achievements, demonstrate progress toward national priorities, and communicate results to institutional leaders, policymakers, and federal agencies. High-quality impact statements help the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities advocate for federal support, assist the National IPM Coordinating Committee in tracking national priorities, and provide evidence of IPM's public benefits.

How to write and collect impact statements

- For guidance on writing an impact statement – Annotated impact statement, Steve Elliott, Western IPM Center
- Focus on outcomes, not activities. Explain the problem addressed, the actions taken, and the measurable benefits for stakeholders, communities, or ecosystems. Include numbers when possible (e.g., acres affected, reductions in pesticide use, or improved knowledge).
- Use clear, jargon-free language emphasizing public value.
- Provide templates, examples, or brief training to faculty and staff. Incorporate submission into annual reporting or grant requirements. Shared folders or electronic forms simplify collection. Recognize contributions in newsletters, annual reports, or websites to motivate participation.

- See Part IV for examples.

Submitting impact statements

Impact statements are submitted through the national database maintained by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. Coordinators should be familiar with the submission platform, formatting requirements, and deadlines. Some states submit centrally; others ask contributors to submit directly. Consistent submission ensures program accomplishments are visible nationally and supports continued federal investment.

Peer mentoring and support networks

IPM coordinators may enter the role with limited onboarding or formal guidance, making peer mentoring an essential resource. Engaging with experienced colleagues provides practical advice on statewide program coordination, proposal development, evaluation, committee participation, and navigating regional and national structures. Mentoring accelerates learning, fills knowledge gaps, and reduces the isolation that can accompany a statewide role.

Peer support can take many forms. Informal networks can emerge through regional meetings, working groups, or introductions facilitated by Regional IPM Centers. Coordinators are encouraged to proactively connect with senior mentors—whether inside or outside their region—who are willing to share insights and lessons learned.

Some regions also organize structured mentoring circles in which new coordinators meet with experienced peers. These small groups support problem-solving, provide diverse perspectives, and foster long-term professional relationships. Coordinators may also participate in cross-regional mentoring groups to gain exposure to different program approaches and innovations. Regional IPM Centers can assist by organizing meetings, suggesting discussion topics, and providing relevant resources. Successful mentoring relies on a balance of structure, commitment, and flexibility, ensuring participants gain meaningful guidance while contributing to collective learning.

Professional development

Honing coordinator skills. Effective IPM coordinators continually develop skills that support leadership and program management, including people management, time management, communication, grant writing, and evaluation. Coordinators should also continue learning in their primary discipline and in complementary IPM fields, such as entomology, plant pathology, weed science, or urban IPM, to broaden their understanding and enhance collaboration. Opportunities to develop these skills can include workshops or sessions at professional society meetings or the International IPM Symposium.

Site visits and field tours. Visiting well-established IPM programs provides practical insights into program design, staffing, and communication strategies. Site visits to states with strong urban or agricultural IPM programs, or mature evaluation systems, allow coordinators to see proven approaches in action. Regional IPM Centers can help arrange site visits or multistate field tours, offering exposure to diverse models and supporting professional growth.

Building continuity and institutional memory

Because IPM coordinators may enter the role with limited onboarding, intentional documentation is critical to the long-term stability of statewide IPM programs. One of the most valuable contributions a coordinator can make is creating and maintaining clear transition materials that enable future staff to step into the role with minimal disruption.

Transition documentation should include an overview of program responsibilities, key annual tasks, ongoing projects, reporting requirements, committee memberships, major partnerships, and institutional expectations. Where appropriate, it should also describe budget structures, sources of administrative support, and internal processes that are not captured elsewhere. Keeping this information current reduces reliance on informal knowledge and prevents loss of institutional memory during personnel transitions.

Strong programs also depend on organized records of stakeholders and collaborators. Maintaining a statewide stakeholder database supports efficient communication with growers, Extension staff, commodity groups, public agencies, schools, and community partners. These records facilitate outreach, training announcements, pest alerts, and priority-setting efforts, while also documenting program reach for reporting purposes.

Finally, institutional memory is strengthened by maintaining centralized records of program structure, budgets, and deliverables. This includes past Extension Implementation Program proposals, logic models, evaluation tools, progress and final reports, curricula, outreach materials, and relevant analytics. Storing these materials in accessible, well-organized locations improves continuity, streamlines proposal development and reporting, and supports long-term program planning.

PART III. Funding

USDA NIFA CPPM: Extension Implementation Program

The Crop Protection and Pest Management (CPPM) program, administered by USDA NIFA, provides the primary federal support for many state IPM programs. Within CPPM, the Extension Implementation Program is the main funding mechanism available to land-grant universities for statewide IPM coordination.

Each institution may submit only one Extension Implementation Program proposal per cycle, and the IPM coordinator serves as the lead principal investigator (PI). Extension Implementation Program grants can provide up to $300,000 per year for three years, with no indirect costs, making them a significant resource for sustaining and expanding state IPM efforts.

Roles and responsibilities of the IPM coordinator as lead PI

When institutional support structures are aligned with program goals, IPM Coordinators are typically positioned as lead principal investigators on IPM initiatives, given their responsibility for integrating research, Extension, and stakeholder engagement across the state. The IPM coordinator is responsible for guiding proposal development, ensuring alignment with state and regional priorities, and managing the funded program. This includes identifying collaborators, shaping objectives, developing budgets, and incorporating evaluation components.

Once funded, the coordinator oversees implementation, monitors progress toward goals, ensures compliance with reporting requirements, and maintains communication with project partners and administrators. While many coordinators work with teams of faculty, staff, and Extension agents, the coordinator remains accountable for the grant's overall success.

Aligning the proposal with regional priorities

Extension Implementation Program proposals must demonstrate strong alignment with regional and national IPM priorities. Regional priorities are developed annually through the Hatch Multistate Research Project and often serve as the foundation for many USDA NIFA NOFOs (Notifications Of Funding Opportunities). Understanding these priorities early in the proposal cycle is critical for planning objectives and identifying partnerships.

Many coordinators collaborate with peers across their region during proposal development to identify opportunities for multistate efforts or to ensure activities address shared needs. Strong alignment improves proposal competitiveness and helps ensure projects contribute to broader IPM goals.

Budget

A successful Extension Implementation Program proposal includes a budget that reflects the scope of work. Budgets typically support personnel time, travel, educational materials, stakeholder engagement, and evaluation, and may request up to $300,000 per year for three years. Indirect costs are not allowed, so all requested funds must be directly tied to project activities. Coordinators should plan budgets collaboratively with project team members and

engage department staff and business offices early to avoid delays and ensure compliance with institutional policies. Clear, well-justified budgets also simplify financial tracking during the project and improve communication with leadership about resource needs.

Logic models and evaluation plans

All Extension Implementation Program proposals require a logic model (examples in Part IV) that links project inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes. Reviewing logic models from past projects—either within your institution or from other states—can be extremely helpful. Strong logic models provide a clear framework for project design, showing how planned activities lead to measurable outcomes and guiding evaluation.

Evaluation plans should include both quantitative and qualitative measures and benefit from consultation with evaluation specialists whenever possible. Regional IPM Centers often provide templates, examples, and technical assistance (*see Part IV*). Templates help coordinators define inputs, activities, outputs, and expected outcomes; articulate evaluation questions; identify indicators; and determine data collection methods. They also simplify collaboration with faculty who may be less familiar with evaluation frameworks and ensure statewide programs follow consistent approaches to tracking outcomes.

Managing project implementation

Once funded, successful project management requires consistent communication, clear role definitions and expectations, and regular progress monitoring. Coordinators may use periodic check-ins, shared workspaces, or project timelines that track milestones. Successful management also involves flexibility. Weather events, personnel changes, or shifts in stakeholder needs may require adjustments to planned activities. Coordinators should also ensure that all changes remain consistent with IPM principles and USDA requirements.

Reporting requirements and timelines

Federal funding comes with specific reporting obligations, such as annual progress reports, financial reports, and final project reports submitted through the NIFA system. These reports summarize activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact, and often inform national program assessments.

Although the Extension Implementation Program grant provides 3 years of funding, money is awarded each year separately. Each year, you will be required to submit a report of activities and request the subsequent year's budget.

The timing of reporting requirements may change from year to year and is communicated directly to IPM coordinators by the USDA NIFA National Program Lead for IPM. Coordinators should pay close attention to these communications to ensure compliance with current expectations. Annual reports are typically due several months (often in June) before the next round of Extension Implementation Program funding will be released, making timely submission especially important for maintaining continuity and eligibility.

Coordinators should communicate reporting timelines and information needs to project team members so that data can be gathered well in advance of submission deadlines. Consistent, high-quality reporting not only meets federal requirements but also helps demonstrate the value of statewide IPM programs and supports future funding opportunities.

Common barriers to writing strong proposals and how to overcome them

Many coordinators note that writing competitive Extension Implementation Program proposals can be challenging due to limited time, competing responsibilities, unclear expectations, or insufficient supporting documentation. These constraints can make it difficult to clearly articulate program scope, partnerships, and anticipated impacts, even when strong IPM work is already underway.

Balancing infrastructure and new projects. Proposals often need to strike a balance between supporting existing IPM infrastructure and introducing new or expanded activities. Reviewers generally view the inclusion of new activities favorably, particularly when they build on established programs rather than operating in isolation. Regardless of approach, collecting letters of support from key partners and stakeholder groups can strengthen the proposal. Effective letters describe existing collaborations, confirm stakeholder needs, and explain how the proposed work will enhance or extend current efforts. When used strategically, these letters provide external validation of program relevance, demonstrate readiness for implementation, and reinforce the link between infrastructure, stakeholder demand, and proposed outcomes.

The importance of a strong evaluation plan. Proposals with weak or incomplete evaluation plans are often viewed as high risk, even when program ideas are strong. An unclear evaluation strategy makes it difficult for reviewers to assess feasibility, accountability, and potential impact, and can raise concerns about whether outcomes can be documented and reported. A well-developed evaluation plan signals preparedness, strengthens credibility, and demonstrates a commitment to measuring and communicating program success (*see Part IV*).

Balancing collaboration and competition. Collaboration across state, regional, and national IPM programs is strongly encouraged and often essential for addressing complex pest management challenges. However, coordinators also face the reality that these programs may compete for limited funding. Navigating this tension requires being strategic about partnerships—clearly defining roles, contributions, and outcomes while ensuring that your state's priorities, impacts, and leadership are visible within collaborative efforts. Effective proposals highlight collaboration as a strength without diluting accountability, clearly articulating how shared work advances IPM broadly while delivering measurable benefits to stakeholders in your state.

Using regional centers for resources and support

Regional IPM Centers provide practical support for the development and implementation of Extension Implementation Program proposals and maintain shared infrastructure that enables multistate coordination. Centers support national and regional efforts such as the Crop Protection Network (CPN) and Ag Pest Monitor, and provide collaborative tools, including Basecamp and CONNECT, to facilitate communication, data sharing, and documentation of

outcomes. These resources allow coordinators to participate in multistate efforts without assuming leadership roles and align well with Extension Implementation Program priorities.

Seeking additional funding

While Extension Implementation Program funding provides core support, IPM coordinators often seek additional funding sources to expand program reach and enhance long-term sustainability. These may include federal grants, commodity checkoff funding, and support from external partners. In some states, IPM programs also receive funding through state legislative appropriations or institutional contributions, such as in-kind support or shared staff. Diversifying funding can support complementary activities, pilot projects, or infrastructure needs that fall outside the scope of a single grant while increasing program resilience. Coordinating these efforts with institutional leadership and partners helps ensure alignment with program goals and reduces administrative complexity.

PART IV. Resources and Glossary

Resources

Background reading

- National IPM Road Map
- The Public IPM Enterprise Strategic Plan: Brief version, full version
- 50 years of federal support pub
- IPM adoption and impacts in the US.

Checklist of questions coordinators should ask administrators in their first 60-90 days

- Where does my position reside - in a department/extension?
- Who do I report to?
- What does success look like as an IPM coordinator (how will I be evaluated)?
- What resources will the university provide to help me as an IPM coordinator?
- What resources will the university provide to help me write the EIP proposal?
- Who will review and be familiar with the IPM coordinator handbook to ensure shared understanding of the role, expectations, and scope of responsibilities?
- How will compensation, workload, and advancement be reviewed to reflect the scope and impact of my role as IPM coordinator?

Directory of key contacts across regions and national committees

The following resources help IPM coordinators identify the primary national, regional, and federal groups involved in IPM coordination, funding, priority setting, evaluation, and implementation. Coordinators should use these sites to locate current contacts, committee materials, funding opportunities, and program resources. Because personnel and committee leadership change regularly, this handbook should link to authoritative websites rather than listing individual names whenever possible.

Resource	Use for IPM coordinators	Website
National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC)	National committee information, rules of operation, shared resources, handbook updates, and coordination across the IPM Enterprise.	https://escop.info/committee/nipmcc/
Regional IPM Centers landing page	Overview of the four Regional IPM Centers and their role in multistate partnerships and communication networks.	https://www.ipmcenters.org/about/regional-ipm-centers/
USDA NIFA Crop Protection and Pest Management Program	Primary federal program information for CPPM, including Extension	https://www.nifa.usda.gov/grants/programs/crop-protection-pest-management-program

	Implementation Program context and funding announcements.	
USDA Office of Pest Management Policy / Federal IPM Coordinating Committee	Federal IPM leadership, National IPM Road Map, and federal coordination across agencies involved in pest management.	https://www.usda.gov/about-usda/general-information/staff-offices/office-chief-economist/office-pest-management-policy-opmp/integrated-pest-management
agInnovation	Experiment Station Section information, national land-grant research system context, and broader agricultural innovation resources.	https://www.aginnovation.info/

Logic models

- **USDA NIFA Logic Model Planning Process:** A primary USDA resource explaining the logic model as a planning and evaluation tool for science-based programs. https://www.nifa.usda.gov/grants/grant-training/logic-model-planning-process
- **Generic Logic Model for NIFA Reporting:** Illustrative USDA/NIFA model for reporting on research, education, and Extension activities. https://www.nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/Generic%20Logic%20Model%20for%20NIFA%20Reporting.pdf
- **Northeastern IPM Center Logic Model Planning and Evaluation Tools:** IPM-centered resource page with logic model and evaluation planning materials, including an option to request evaluation assistance. https://www.northeastipm.org/grant-programs/ipm-center-grants/logic-model-planning-and-evaluation-tools/

Evaluation plans

Evaluation plans should identify what the program is trying to change, who will be reached, what evidence will be collected, and how results will be used for program improvement and reporting. For IPM coordinators, strong evaluation plans often combine short-term measures such as knowledge gain and intended behavior change with longer-term indicators such as adoption of monitoring practices, pesticide-risk reduction, improved profitability, avoided losses, reduced pest damage, diagnostic use, or strengthened decision-making capacity.

- **Northeastern IPM Center Evaluation resources:** A web-based toolkit for assessing IPM outcomes and impacts, designed for researchers and Extension scientists working in agriculture and related IPM settings. https://www.northeastipm.org/ipm-planning/evaluation/
- **IPM Centers Research Tools: Impact Assessment resources:** Resources for planning IPM programs so that they can be evaluated and their value documented. https://ipmimpact.ucanr.edu/.

Examples of impact statements

- Alfalfa mosaic virus in Colorado chile production
- Integrated pest management is vital to American agriculture

Program management templates

Program management benefits greatly from standardized templates that support planning, communication, and accountability. A core set of templates can help IPM coordinators organize meetings, track progress, and maintain documentation across multi-year projects.

Templates may include agenda templates, annual work plans, stakeholder engagement plans, program logic models, and internal reporting forms for project collaborators. Clear templates reduce duplication, create consistency across program components, and make it easier to orient new faculty and staff to statewide efforts. IPM coordinators often develop these templates over time or adapt existing models from peers or Regional IPM Centers.

- **Integrated Pest Management Strategic Planning: A Practical Guide.** https://extension.oregonstate.edu/catalog/em-9238-integrated-pest-management-strategic-planning-practical-guide

Communication templates for faculty, stakeholders, and partners

Since communication is central to an IPM coordinator's role, templates for email announcements, stakeholder updates, newsletters, and impact summaries can streamline outreach. These templates help ensure messaging remains consistent and that important details, such as meeting times, reporting deadlines, or program updates, are clearly communicated. IPM coordinators may also develop templates for internal communications, including requests for annual reporting, calls for impact statements, or guidance for project collaborators. Providing these templates to faculty and Extension staff helps reduce confusion and encourages timely responses.

Glossary

IPM Enterprise (https://www.ipmcenters.org/partners/ipm-enterprise/): This is the overarching term to be used.

IPM Network: This term should be used for the interacting people and groups that exist within the IPM Enterprise.

Part V: Appendices

APPENDIX 1: HANDBOOK MAINTENANCE AND UPDATE PROCESS

Purpose

This appendix establishes a regular process for reviewing, revising, approving, and distributing the IPM Coordinator Handbook. The goal is to ensure that the handbook remains current, useful, and accessible to IPM coordinators and the broader IPM Enterprise while preserving continuity across leadership transitions.

Stewardship and responsibility

The National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) is responsible for stewarding the handbook and leading the formal update process. NIPMCC may delegate specific tasks to the Executive Committee, an ad hoc handbook review team, Regional IPM Center representatives, or other members of the IPM Enterprise as needed. However, NIPMCC retains responsibility for ensuring that revisions are completed, approved, and posted in the appropriate locations.

Update frequency

The handbook should be reviewed and updated every three years, coinciding with the International IPM Symposium. This three-year cycle provides a predictable schedule for incorporating changes in funding programs, reporting expectations, committee structures, communication platforms, IPM Enterprise priorities, and resources for new and continuing IPM coordinators.

An updated version should be prepared prior to the Symposium so that the handbook can be shared with IPM coordinators and partners during Symposium-related meetings and discussions.

Recommended update timeline

The following timeline is intended to guide each three-year update cycle. Dates may be adjusted as needed to align with the timing of the International IPM Symposium and NIPMCC meetings.

Timing	Responsible party	Recommended action
12 months before Symposium	NIPMCC Executive Committee or designated handbook lead	Confirm the update schedule; identify a handbook lead or review team; announce the upcoming review process to the IPM Enterprise.
9-10 months before Symposium	Handbook lead/review team	Invite comments, corrections, and suggested updates from IPM coordinators, Regional IPM Centers, NIPMCC members, and other relevant partners.

6-8 months before Symposium	Handbook lead/review team	Compile suggested edits; identify outdated content, missing resources, broken links, or sections needing substantive revision.
4-5 months before Symposium	Assigned reviewers and contributors	Draft revisions and solicit targeted input from subject-matter experts as needed, including on funding, reporting, evaluation, communications platforms, and national or regional structures.
2-3 months before Symposium	NIPMCC Executive Committee or full NIPMCC, as appropriate	Review the revised draft; resolve substantive comments; approve the version that will be posted and shared.
Prior to Symposium	NIPMCC or designated posting lead	Post the updated handbook to Basecamp and the NIPMCC website so the latest version is available before Symposium-related meetings.
At or immediately after Symposium	NIPMCC	Brief the IPM Enterprise on major updates; archive or label prior versions to avoid confusion; begin a running list of future updates for the next cycle.

How comments and updates should be collected

Comments and suggested revisions should be collected before the Symposium cycle begins in earnest, allowing sufficient time for review, editing, approval, and posting. NIPMCC should use a transparent and accessible process that allows contributors across the IPM Enterprise to suggest updates without requiring them to rewrite entire sections.

- Post a call for comments on Basecamp with clear instructions, a deadline, and the current handbook attached or linked.
- Provide a simple comment form, shared document, or structured template that asks contributors to identify the section, proposed change, rationale, and suggested replacement text when available.
- Invite Regional IPM Centers and regional IPM coordinator groups to identify outdated information, missing resources, and regionally relevant updates.
- Track comments in a single location so that decisions, unresolved issues, and accepted revisions are visible to the review team.
- Prioritize corrections to time-sensitive content, including funding guidance, reporting requirements, committee contacts, communication platforms, URLs, and descriptions of national or regional structures.

What should be reviewed during each update

Each review should include, at minimum, the following elements:

- Accuracy of descriptions of NIPMCC, Federal IPM Coordinating Committee, Regional IPM Centers, Hatch Multistate Research Projects, USDA NIFA programs, and other national IPM structures.
- Currentness of funding guidance, especially USDA NIFA Crop Protection and Pest Management Extension Implementation Program expectations, budget guidance, reporting timelines, and evaluation requirements.
- Validity of links, resources, examples, templates, and contact information.
- Usefulness of onboarding guidance for new IPM coordinators, including institutional questions, communication platforms, peer mentoring, and professional development.
- Completeness of program-management guidance, including evaluation, impact statements, stakeholder engagement, continuity documents, and records management.
- Consistency of terminology, especially use of IPM Enterprise, IPM network, IPM coordinator, NIPMCC, Regional IPM Centers, and related committee names.
- Accessibility and readability for new coordinators, experienced coordinators, Extension partners, administrators, and others who may consult the handbook.

Version control and archiving

Each version of the handbook should include a clear date or version label, preferably on the cover page and in the file name. Recommended file naming is: IPM_Coordinator_Handbook_YYYY or IPM_Coordinator_Handbook_MonthYYYY. The review team should maintain a brief revision history that lists the date of the update, the group responsible for the revision, and a concise summary of major changes.

Prior versions may be retained for institutional memory, but they should be clearly labeled as superseded or archived. The most current version should be the only version promoted for active use.

Posting and distribution

Once approved, the updated handbook should be posted in two locations:

- The NIPMCC Basecamp workspace, where members of the IPM Enterprise can access and discuss it internally.
- The NIPMCC website, so that the current version is publicly available and easy to find.

When a new version is posted, NIPMCC should announce the update through Basecamp and other appropriate communication channels. The announcement should include a short summary of major changes, the effective date of the new version, and a reminder that the updated version supersedes previous copies.

Interim updates between three-year review cycles

Although the full handbook should be updated every three years, minor interim updates may be needed when information becomes outdated before the next scheduled review. Examples include broken links, changes in contact information, changes to communication platforms, major changes in federal funding guidance, or updates to NIPMCC or Regional IPM Center structure.

Minor corrections may be made by the designated handbook lead or NIPMCC Executive Committee without reopening the full review process. Substantive changes that alter guidance, roles, responsibilities, or policy interpretation should be reviewed by NIPMCC before posting.