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Overview

- Part 1: Basic grant components and processes
- Part 2: Planning and preparation for proposals
- Part 3: Telling a good story
- Part 4: Pre-review and post-review
Part 1: Basic parts of a grant proposal

- Letter of Intent
- Cover letter, title page, and abstract
- Statement of the Problem / Needs Statement
- Program Description (goals and objectives and methods / activities)
- Evaluation Plan
- Budget Request and Budget Justification
- Applicant Qualifications
- Future Funding Plans / Plans for Sustainability
- Attachments and Appendices
Reasons Why You Should Not Submit a Grant Proposal

- “Because my boss/the Board told me to”
- “Because it’s there”
- “Because the funder has lots of money to give out”
Common mistakes

- **Letter of intent**
  - Not sending one if it’s required
  - Sending one that does not include the required information from the funding announcement
Common mistakes

- Cover letter, title page, and abstract
  - Not including a cover page
  - Not including the Request for Proposals (RFP) or Request for Applications (RFA) number
  - Not including information required according to the RFP/RFA (e.g., fiscal or program contact)
Common mistakes

Statement of the Problem / Needs Statement

- Not being responsive to the priorities identified in the RFP/RFA
- Using outdated epidemiological data or literature (e.g., surveillance data or program data)
- Not including data relevant to program description
- Focus on program needs over problem needs
Common mistakes

- Program Description (goals and objectives and methods / activities)
  - Providing only a chronological description of activities
  - Providing a laundry list of activities without regard to relevance
  - Providing little rationale for program
  - Not including SMART objectives
  - Using an outdated program description
S M A R T Objectives

(from www.ctb.ku.edu)

- **Specific.** How much (e.g., 40%) of what is to be achieved (e.g., what behavior of whom or what outcome) by when (e.g., by 2010)?
- **Measurable.** Information concerning the objective can be collected, detected, or obtained from records (at least potentially).
- **Achievable.** Not only are the objectives themselves possible, it is likely that your organization will be able to pull them off.
- **Relevant to the mission.** Your organization has a clear understanding of how these objectives fit in with the overall vision and mission of the group.
- **Timed.** Your organization has developed a timeline (a portion of which is made clear in the objectives) by which they will be achieved.
Common mistakes

- Evaluation Plan
  - Does not match the Program Description or SMART objectives
  - Is not included with application
  - Is focused exclusively on client satisfaction or knowledge
  - Is not linked to the timeline for the program
Common mistakes

- **Budget Request**
  - Staff on budget pages do not match staff listed in
    - Program Description
    - Budget Justification
  - Staff efforts are insufficient to carry out program/SMART objectives
  - Budget includes ineligible costs
Common mistakes

- Applicant Qualifications
  - Staff qualifications do not match program needs/SMART goals
  - Staff listed do not have skills required by the RFA/RFP
    - Licenses or certifications
  - Staff listed are unlikely to have sufficient time to conduct program
    - Executive staff, Board members
Common mistakes

Future Funding Plans / Plans for Sustainability

- No plans beyond current term of funding or source of funding
- No identified or demonstrated efforts to seek new funding
- Major funders are not acknowledged in program materials
Common mistakes

- **Attachments and Appendices**
  - Not including all required forms and attachments
  - Including too many attachments or appendices, especially ones that are irrelevant
  - Referring to an attachment in the narrative and not including it in the submitted materials
Avoiding common mistakes

- Follow instructions
- Use readable fonts
- Use subheadings to organize and to break up narrative
- Use negative (blank space) judiciously
- Use tables, charts and figures
- Do spell check and grammar check
- Re-read the grant for flow and clarity
- Include all necessary attachments
- Have someone else read the grant
Grant Review Process

- Applications eligibility screening
  - For completeness and for compliance
  - Ineligible applications notification
- Convening of grant review panels
  - Expertise or experience
  - Confidentiality
- Scoring
  - Predetermined points and categories
- Award decisions
  - May be by the grant panel or some other body
Grant Review Process

- If you are invited to be a reviewer
  - May need to excuse oneself because of conflict of interest or potential for conflict of interest
  - Sign confidentiality form
- Receive application packets
  - Receive a number of proposals as determined by the review coordinators
  - May have a limited amount of time to review the packets (e.g., one week)
  - Usually have been screened for basic eligibility by review coordinators
Grant Review Process

- Review applications and process
  - Primary, secondary and tertiary reviewers
  - Each reviewed application may get only a few minutes of discussion
  - Summarize strengths and weaknesses
  - Individual and group scoring and rescoring
  - Summary statements
Grant Review Process

- **Review coordinator**
  - Compiles all scores on all applications
  - Compiles all reviewers’ comments
  - Summarizes main strengths and weaknesses
  - Forwards scores and comments to selection body/group
  - Responds to appeals to decisions
Grant Review Process

- **Reviewers**
  - May be people with expertise or experience in research/service area
  - May be local stakeholders
  - May be from faith community
  - May be clients
  - May be researchers
  - May be funders for other types of programs
  - Are people, too!
Being a Grant Reviewer

- Volunteer to serve on a panel for grants in your area of expertise and experience
- Join a community advisory panel for a research project
- Offer to read a colleague’s proposal for clarity, cohesion and completeness
Activity 1 Instructions

- **Time for activity: 10 minutes**
- **Develop a scoring system for a grant**
  - Assume 100 total possible points
  - What are possible points for each grant section?
  - What are funding cutoffs, minimum fundable score?
- **Provide rationale for why you assigned the number of points to each grant section**
- **Provide rationale for your funding cutoff**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Points possible</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover letter &amp; abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Justification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Funding/Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment/Appendices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Funding Cutoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points received</th>
<th>Recommendation for funding</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Recommend for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
<td>Do not recommend for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 1 Discussion

- What were similarities among the scoring cutoffs chosen by each group?
- What were differences among the scoring cutoffs chosen by each group?
- What process did you use to come to agreement/decisions?
Part 2: Planning and Preparation

- HIV research proposals
- HIV programs/services proposals
- Foundation proposals
- Electronic grant submissions
Basic parts of a research grant proposal

- Letter of Intent (prior to submission)
- Face page
- Table of contents
- Introduction and Specific Research Aims
- Background and Significance
- Preliminary Data
- Methods and Design
- Data Analysis
- Animal/Human Subjects Protection
- Budget and Budget Justification
- Investigators’ Publications and Funding History (e.g., Biosketch and Other Support)
- Attachments and Appendices
Types of Funding Announcements

- Requests for Applications/Proposals (RFAs/RFPs): Announcements for more narrowly defined areas for which funds are set aside for awarding grants; usually, accepted on a single receipt date specified in the announcement.

- Program Announcements: Standing announcements with application due dates throughout the year to allow the funding of new organizations on an ongoing basis.
HIV research proposals are judged according to:

- Significance
- Approach
- Innovation
- Investigator
- Environment
HIV Research Proposal

- Significance: Does this study address an important problem? If the specific aims are achieved how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effects of the study on the concepts or methods that drive this field?
Approach: Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?
HIV Research Proposal

Innovation: Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches, or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?
HIV Research Proposal

Investigator: Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers (if any)?
HIV Research Proposal

- Environment: Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed experiments take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?
If you are a CBO and want to partner with researchers

- Planning and preparation
  - What is the appropriate role of research in relation to the mission of the CBO?
  - What have been some past experiences in working with researchers?
  - What are the values for collaboration?
  - What are the needs for covering staff time dedicated to the research?
  - What CBO capacity exists to engage in research?
  - What research products and by-products are of value to the CBO?
If you are a researcher and want to partner with CBOs

- **Planning and preparation**
  - Which community champions and gatekeepers need to be involved?
  - What are the IRB requirements for collaboration?
  - How will resources be equitably allocated?
  - What research products and by-products can be provided that are of value to the CBO?
  - How will the research directly benefit the CBO?
  - How will the research findings be communicated and disseminated?
HIV Programs/Services Proposal

- CDC grants are rated on
  - Availability of funds
  - Relevance
  - Experience
  - Capacity
  - Coordination/Linkages with other HIV CBOs
  - Collaboration with local planning group/health department
  - Evaluation and monitoring
HIV Programs/Services Proposal

- SAMHSA grants are rated
  - Statement of need
  - Proposed Evidence-Based Service/Practice
  - Proposed Implementation Approach
  - Staff and Organizational Experience
  - Performance Assessment and Data
  - Cultural competence
  - Confidentiality
HIV Programs/Services Proposal

Other criteria
- Access to communities or populations
- Site visits
- Responsiveness to funding priorities
- Geographic considerations for services delivery
- Identified staff/experts on team
- Sustainability
- Fiscal capacity
HIV Programs/Services Proposal

- Planning and preparation
  - Have annual audits been completed and audit reports received?
  - Do you have program process and outcome data summarized and available?
  - Do you know the cycles or timelines for funding?
  - Do you have examples of successful applications?
HIV Programs/Services Proposal

- Planning and preparation
  - What are the current funding priorities for programs and services in my region?
  - What other agencies are serving the same or similar clients?
  - What MOUs will be needed to strengthen the application?
  - How can we improve on our score from the previous funding cycle?
  - Whom can we ask to read the narrative?
Applications may be by invitation only rather than through RFPs/RFAs or public announcements.

Greater variability in basic grant components and application process.

Less paperwork than some other grants.
Foundation Proposal

- Planning and preparation
  - Have you read the foundation’s “information for applicants” materials?
  - Have you read through the foundation’s informational tax return or annual report?
  - Does your program address one or more of their funding priorities?
  - What is the usual process for applying?
  - Have you spoken with the Program Officer or foundation representative about your program?
  - What other programs like yours have received funding?
Electronic Grant Submissions

- Increasingly grant applications are being submitted electronically
  - CDC
  - SAMHSA
  - California HIV/AIDS Research Program
- www.grants.gov
- ERA Commons
ERA Commons
https://commons.era.nih.gov/commons/

COMMONS USER ALERT 12/18/2007: The eRA Helpdesk will be closed Monday December 24 through Tuesday December 25 for the federal observance of Christmas.

Support Tip: We encourage you to take advantage of our new web support at http://helpdesk.nih.gov/eRA. When requesting support please supply as much of the requested data as possible for faster service.

Electronic Submission Tip: Learn about the most frequent application errors at Avoiding Common Errors.

What's New on the Commons

More Recent Features of Commons include:

- **NEW** xTrain has been released in a pilot mode for a limited pool of institutions. If you are not a participant in the xTrain pilot please do not enter the xTrain system. This functionality will be released to full production mid-2008. For more information please contact the eRA Helpdesk.
- eSHAP - Allows an institution to review non-competing grant data and submit a progress report online.
- **NEW** For Directors: Pioneer Applications only. To submit a reference letter when requested by an applicant, please follow this link: Submit Reference Letter.
- Internet Assisted Review (IAR) - Allows reviewers to submit critiques and preliminary scores for applications they are reviewing. Allows Reviewers, SRA’s, and OTAs to view all critiques in preparation for a meeting. IAR creates a preliminary summary statement body containing submitted critiques for the SRA or OTA.
- Demo Facility - Demo Facility allows you to try most of the capabilities of the NIH eRA Commons in a sample environment.

When contacting the eRA Helpdesk make sure you are using the correct contact information. Our preferred contact information is as follows: Web: http://helpdesk.nih.gov/eRA; Phone: 301-402-7459 (FAX) 301-402-5522 (toll free) 301-402-6259 (TTY); Business hours M-F 7am-5pm EST. This will help us to help you better, thanks.

Contact Us/Help Desk | Privacy Notice | Disclaimer | Accessibility

National Institutes of Health (NIH) | Department of Health and Human Services

Electronic Grant Submissions – DOs

- Do start any on-line registration processes ASAP
- Do review attachments and previews of uploaded documents
- Do sign up for e-mail notifications about grant details or changes
- Do try to submit the application early
- Do check your e-mail for confirmation or notification messages after you submit
Electronic Grant Submissions – DON’Ts

- Don’t wait until the hour before the deadline
- Don’t forget to print a copy for your records
- Don’t submit without previewing the .pdf attachments
- Don’t ignore errors and warnings
- Don’t assume that once you hit submit you are done
Activity 2 Instructions

- **Time for activity:** 15 minutes
- **Develop a 3-month plan to prepare for a grant proposal for programs/services**
  - List possible activities at each timepoint
  - Three months before the grant is due
  - One month before the grant is due
  - One week before the grant is due
- **If your group has time**
  - Who is responsible for each activity? (Can be more than one person)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 2 Discussion

- What resources (materials, facilities, personnel) are available to accomplish the activities listed?
- What are some activities that you would like to try to accomplish earlier? Why?
- What are some activities that you can delete? Add? Why?
- Who has the most responsibility for activities in your timeline?
Is it time for a break?

10 minutes
Part 3: Telling a Good Story

- Good proposals versus funded proposals
- Poor proposals
- Logic model
# A Good Proposal versus A Funded Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FUNDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Narrative may not be of interest to funder</td>
<td>- Narrative important to funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- States problem</td>
<td>- Provides context for problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coherence of past experience not clear to current project</td>
<td>- Narrative connects past experience to present proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rushed</td>
<td>- Considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**A Good Proposal versus A Funded Proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FUNDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single agency or collaborative, some experience and fit for program</td>
<td>Collaborative, multiple agencies with good record of doing the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains a lot of information but is not well-organized</td>
<td>Contains a lot of information that is easy on reviewers’ eyes/easy to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omits some review criteria</td>
<td>Written to all of the review criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Good Proposal versus A Funded Proposal

GOOD
- Completed just in time
- Submitted without consultation with program staff
- Read by writer only

FUNDED
- Completed with time to check for consistency
- Reflects program staff and stakeholder contributions
- Reviewed by multiple people before submission
Preparing a Poor Proposal

- Not responsive to funding announcement/priorities
- Unclear or unattainable objectives
- Lack of necessary collaboration
- Lack of identified staff/experts
- Completed at the last hour
Telling A Story About Your Program With A Logic Model

- Recommended for planning, implementation and evaluation of your program

- Basic components
  - Problem statement
  - Sources of information
  - Process objectives (inputs, activities, outputs)
  - Outcome objectives
  - Behavior change objectives
  - Goal statement
Figure 13: SHAPE Year 1 Logic Module for Many Men, Many Voices

Process Objectives
By 12/31 project director (PD) will secure human resources including internal and external provider networks.

By 12/31 staff will develop, implement protocols, materials for recruitment, retention, referral, service utilization, and intervention.

By 12/31 staff will secure and test equipment, software, information management and QA systems.

By 12/31 PD will train, evaluate staff on intervention delivery, evaluation, and QA.

By 2/1 staff will begin recruitment for pilot test, and implementation of 1st intervention cycle (n=36).

By 3/31 staff will pilot test intervention (n=48), evaluate, modify intervention, networks, systems and evaluation methods.

Between 4/1 and 5/31 staff will implement and evaluate 1st intervention cycle (n=100).

Between 5/10 and 6/10 staff will conduct 2-month follow-up of intervention participants (n=36).

Between 11/25 and 12/31 staff will collect and complete data analyses.

By 12/31 staff will prepare and disseminate Year 1 evaluation report.

Outcome or Immediate Objective
By the end of last intervention session, 90% of participants will list two sources of support they can use to maintain positive self-identity.

By the end of last intervention session, 30% of participants will accurately identify risk factors for HIV and STIs.

By the end of last intervention session, 50% of participants will report high confidence in ability to negotiate safer sex roles and situations with partners.

By the end of last intervention session, 100% of participants who do not know their HIV status on intake will be referred to counseling and testing.

By the end of last intervention session, 75% of participants will report they intend to use condoms with every sexual encounter.

Behavioral or Intermediate Objective
Two months post intervention, 60% of participants will report practicing safer sex for the last month as measured by reductions in unprotected and intercourse and increased condom use with every sexual encounter.

Goal
To decrease by 5% the number of new HIV cases in black MSM ages 18 to 49 years living in the SHAPE service area over the next three years.

Planning Process

Process monitoring and evaluation

Outcome monitoring and evaluation

Impact evaluation

Implementation and Evaluation
Telling A Story About Your Program With A Logic Model

- **Basic components**
  - **Problem statement:** Defines the issue of interest and identifies risk factors and behaviors.
  - **Sources of information:** Data, people, reports which can be used to document problem statement, objectives, outcomes.
  - **Process objectives (inputs, activities, outputs):**
    - **Inputs** are resources needed to operate a program.
    - **Activities** are things that the program is doing and can include strategies, interventions, services.
    - **Outputs** are the amount of the product or service that the program will provide including specific strategies, interventions, services.
Basic components

- **Outcome objectives**: Intended changes in risk factors that are directly related to the program
- **Behavior change objectives**: Intended changes in risk behaviors that are directly related to the program
  - Immediate: post-intervention
  - Intermediate: at follow-up
- **Goal statement**: Intended impact of the program
Action 2:
Begin to develop a logic model for a new intervention.

1. What information goes into each empty box of the model shown below?
What services will be provided via the intervention?

What sources of information will be used?

What are the risk factors?

What are the immediate outcomes?

What are the intermediate outcomes?

What impact?
Sample Logic Model for an HIV Prevention Program

**Process Objectives (Inputs, Activities, Outputs)**
- Secure resources
- Develop procedures
- Train
- Document

**Outcome Objectives**
- Risk factor objective: At the end of the intervention,
- Immediate behavior change:

**Behavior Change Objectives**
- Risk factor objective: At the end of the intervention,
- Intermediate behavior change:

**Goal Statement**
- Goal: To decrease the incidence of HIV among __________ in Los Angeles by ____ over the next 3 years.

**Planning Process**

**Sources of information:**
- A
- B
- C
- D

**Implementation and evaluation**

**Process monitoring and evaluation**

**Outcome monitoring and evaluation**

**Impact evaluation**
Logic model narrative

Logic Model – Narrative Form

**Organization:** The Best HIV Prevention Project
**Targeted population:** MSM Youth
**Intervention:** Preventing HIV and AIDS Today

**Problem statement:** MSM youth do not perceive themselves to be at risk for HIV, lack condom use skills, and have low self-efficacy for condom use.

**Intervention/activities:** There are two components. The first is a series of 3 two-hour small group sessions emphasizing activities to increase perception of risk, skills building on condom use and negotiation, and role plays to increase condom use skills and build confidence in negotiation and efficacy for condom use. The second part is a condom distribution effort focusing on places where young MSM meet socially and sexually.

**Immediate outcomes:** Increased perception of risk, increased condom use skills, and increased condom self-efficacy.

**Behavior changes:** Increased condom use.

From http://www8.utsouthwestern.edu/vgn/images/portal/cit_56417/19/44/205365OM_module1_partman.pdf
Activity 3 Instructions

- Time for activity: 30 minutes
- Develop a logic model for a program
- Select a population from the list of priority populations
- Select one risk factor from the list
- Select one risk behavior from the list
## Priority populations, risk factors and risk behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Population</th>
<th>HIV+ individuals</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>People who share needles or works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical target populations</td>
<td>• Gay men • Transgender • Women • NGI* men who have sex with men</td>
<td>• Gay men • Transgender • Sex workers</td>
<td>• Gay men • NGI men who have sex with men</td>
<td>• Women who have sex with serostatus unknown partners • Women in highly impacted geographical areas</td>
<td>All transgenders</td>
<td>All who share needles or works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk factors
mental health issues, language, incarceration, STIs, poverty, stigma, homophobia, transphobia, sexism, racism, homelessness, immigration status, discrimination, education level, violence, sexual assault, legal issues, employment status

### Risk behaviors
Substance use, inconsistent condom use, sex exchange

*NGI = non-gay identified*
Activity 3 Instructions

- Define sources of information
  - A = sources for process objectives
  - B = sources for outcome objectives
  - C = sources for behavior change objectives
  - D = sources for goal statement
Activity 3 Instructions

- Define process objectives
  - E = A securing resources objective
  - F = A developing procedures objective
  - G = A training objective
  - H = A documenting objective
Activity 3 Instructions

- Define outcome objectives
  - I = A risk factor objective
  - J = Another risk factor objective

- Define behavioral change objectives
  - K = An immediate-term behavior change objective (post-intervention)
  - L = An intermediate-term behavior change objective (at 3 month follow up)

- Define a goal statement
  - M = A measurable impact
Activity 3 Discussion

- What priority population did you select and why?
- Whom will you involve in the development of your logic model?
- Which of your objectives were SMART? Need more work?
- How might a logic model be used to describe a locally developed intervention?
Activity 4 Instructions

- AFTER you have developed a logic model for your program
- **Develop a Program Abstract based on your logic model**
- Your abstract should include
  - The name and mission of your organization
  - The title of the program
  - The goal(s) of the program
  - The priority population for the program
  - The expected number of clients to be served by the program
  - The intended outcomes of the program
  - 150-200 words.
Part 4: Pre-Review and Post-Review

- Seeking Technical Assistance
- Responding to Reviews
Seeking Technical Assistance

- What is technical assistance?
- Degree and duration of effort
- Short-term, limited degree of involvement
  - Grant review
  - Grant consultation
  - Program recommendations
- Longer-term, moderate to extensive degree of involvement
  - Grant writing
  - Grant collaboration
  - Program evaluation
Responding to Reviews

- Be polite and professional
- Request detailed information on what you can improve for future applications
- Provide evidence or justification based on
  - Fit with funding announcement/priorities
  - RFP/RFA instructions
  - Bidders’ conference instructions
- Appeals process
  - Address all reviewer comments
- Resubmission
Current HIV Prevention Funding Opportunities

- [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov)
- California HIV/AIDS Research Program [http://chrp.ucop.edu](http://chrp.ucop.edu)
- HIV/AIDS Prevention Research Centers and Institutes
- Foundation Center [www.fdncenter.org](http://www.fdncenter.org)
- Cities
- Counties
Thank you

- HIV Prevention Planning Committee
Handouts/Worksheets

- Activity 1: Scoring Sheet and Funding Cutoffs
- Activity 2: Proposal Preparation plan
- Activity 3: Sample Logic Model
- Activity 4: Sample Abstract