



Request for Workshop Proposals FY2025

June 1, 2025-May 31, 2026

Chesapeake Bay Program's Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee

The Chesapeake Bay Program's (CBP) Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) is accepting proposals for STAC-sponsored workshops for the STAC fiscal year 2025 budget cycle. Workshops are organized to gather critically needed scientific and/or technical information related to protection and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed. Workshops funded through this RFP must be convened by May 31, 2026. The total amount allocated by STAC will not exceed \$15,000 for each workshop activity.

*Proposals should indicate whether the workshop is planned to convene in-person, virtually, or using a hybrid format. Hybrid events require additional A/V equipment and technical assistance, which may be provided through STAC funds or as applicable, by the applicant(s). Please contact STAC Coordinator (contact in Section IV) with any questions concerning a hybrid arrangement and/or general inquires related to this RFP.

I. Funding Eligibility

As an independent advisory committee to the entire Chesapeake Bay Partnership, STAC reserves funds for two types of workshops. Applicants should clearly indicate the category the submitted proposal falls under.

1. Programmatic Workshop: Workshop outcomes will provide the CBP and the Partnership with actionable recommendations. Workshop participants will assess where, when, who, and how science can be implemented within the Partnership and prioritize these recommendations. Recommendations should follow the 'SPURR' format. This will provide the CBP Partnership with a clear next-step to take action on the recommendations.
 - S- Specific and granular
 - P- Programmatic partner
 - U- Urgency
 - R- Risk of not taking action
 - R- Resources and timing

2. State of the Science Workshop: A STAC Workshop with the focus on gathering various stakeholders to examine a topic from an interdisciplinary perspective with an aim to assess the state of the science, gaps in knowledge, and science needs. Recommendations should include research recommendations and strategies to address gaps in the science.

Additional information on these workshop types and expectations of each can be found in the [FY25 STAC Workshop Overview Document](#).

Workshops may be proposed by any current STAC member, or by a CBP partner or committee in collaboration with a current STAC member. Potential partners include: New York; Pennsylvania; Maryland; Delaware; West Virginia; Virginia; District of Columbia; any CBP- GIT (Goal Implementation Team) or Workgroup; Local Government Advisory Committee; Citizens' Advisory Committee; Chesapeake Bay Commission; Management Board; and Executive Council. Proposals must be made in collaboration with a current STAC member.

II. Requirements for Funding

Proposal Format

Refer to the STAC Workshop Protocol for all guidelines and specific proposal requirements listed for either Proactive or Responsive Workshops. A successful proposal should adhere to all guidelines outlined in the Workshop Protocols and be no more than three (3) pages in length.

- All workshop proposals will also require an individualized letter (not included in the three-page limit) in support of the proposed workshop activity, degree of urgency, anticipated products and estimated delivery dates. The letter should be endorsed with signature(s) of lead representatives of the group or agency that will benefit directly from the activity. Potential partners include those listed [here](#).
- Workshop Proposals require at least one current STAC member on the Steering Committee. Proposals should include a letter from the STAC member, confirming their participation (not included in the three-page limit).

Steering Committee

A steering committee, not to exceed ten individuals, must be identified by the applicant(s) with at least one current STAC member confirmed as part of the steering committee. The STAC representative may serve as chair of the steering committee, but it is not required.

Note: STAC encourages the development of steering committees that represents the various and diverse stakeholders within the Chesapeake Bay community. Please see the diversity statement in the STAC Workshop Overview Document.

Workshop Planning

Successful applicants will be required to work with STAC Staff to plan the workshop. STAC Staff will provide assistance with workshop logistics (planning calls, venue contracts, etc.). STAC Staff **must** be included in all workshop planning meetings, teleconferences, email correspondences, and other communication related to the workshop. For planning purposes, STAC workshops typically require at least three months to organize and convene.

Workshop Products

If funded, it is the responsibility of the workshop steering committee to complete the workshop and any product(s) listed in the proposal adhering to the guidelines in the [STAC Publications Protocol](#). It is incumbent upon the workshop steering committee to identify the time sensitivity for convening the workshop and the delivery of its products, and the steering committee is solely responsible for meeting these deadlines. STAC requires that each steering committee complete a final report (or other product) **within 90 days** following completion of the workshop. Final review, distribution, and online posting will be completed by STAC within six weeks of receipt of a workshop product. The STAC Executive Secretary will have final editorial discretion prior to publication or distribution.

STAC Programmatic Workshops have additional responsibilities to present SPURR recommendations to the relevant CBP Partners, GITs, or other groups. STAC State of the Science Workshops should present identified research recommendations to GITs to incorporate into the Strategic Science and Research Framework (SSRF) science needs list. Applicants can refer to the [Chesapeake Bay Program Science Needs Database](#) for both short- and long-term science needs of the partnership. Details on these requirements can be found in the STAC Workshop Overview.

III. Evaluation and Scoring

STAC seeks creative proposals that address critical elements of effective Bay protection and restoration, including workshops that will stimulate new lines of thought or serve to enhance the science and tools used to advance Bay research and management. For examples, see previous STAC workshop reports on the STAC [website](#). Applicants should make a strong case as to the importance/relevance of their topic for the current funding cycle and why the workshop should be viewed as a priority for STAC. Failure to adequately justify the workshop and its product(s) as an appropriate activity for STAC support, and as a reasonable next step in the development of management in the region could lead to return of the proposal without further action.

Scoring System

Each proposal will be scored on a 1-5 scale for each criterion. Scorers will evaluate the alignment of proposals with the outlined objectives, providing a transparent and consistent scoring process.

- 1 (Poor): The proposal does not address the criteria or provides minimal or unclear explanations.
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criteria but may lack some specifics or depth in certain areas.
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal fully addresses the criteria with clear, specific actions, and provides strong evidence or examples to support claims.

STAC's membership will evaluate the proposals based on the criteria listed below and determine funding at its spring quarterly meeting (March 4-5th, 2025). Successful applicants will be informed shortly thereafter, and funding will be available on June 1st, 2025.

Proposal Evaluation Criteria

1. Scientific and technical merit (25%)

Does the workshop's proposed topic and objectives build on the current state of knowledge related to the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem? Does it offer new insights or solutions that could enhance the understanding of the ecosystem and its management?

- Proposals should demonstrate how the workshop will advance current scientific knowledge, address existing gaps, or enhance management strategies for Chesapeake Bay.
- The scientific objectives should be clear, measurable, and based on a robust foundation of existing research and data.
- Proposals should identify how the outcomes of the workshop could positively impact the Bay ecosystem's health and long-term sustainability.

2. Impact (20%)

Will the workshop's outcomes lead to tangible changes or improvements in policies, practices, or management strategies related to Chesapeake Bay ecosystem health?

- Proposals should describe the potential for the workshop outcomes to influence decision-making and policy shifts within the Bay Program or broader management frameworks.
- Proposals should provide evidence of how the workshop will engage stakeholders, decision-makers, and other key actors to implement the recommendations generated.
- Innovative solutions or approaches that may lead to measurable, positive outcomes in the short- or long-term will be given higher consideration.

3. Relevance (15%)

Are the workshop's objectives and products clearly linked to science and management needs related to CBP goals and outcomes?

- The proposal should align the workshop's goals with the objectives and outcomes of the Chesapeake Bay Program, focusing on current challenges or gaps.
- The workshop should either aim to fill critical gaps in the scientific knowledge or gather expert input that can guide future research directions.
- Proposals should show how the workshop will benefit the broader CBP and inform ongoing efforts for ecosystem restoration.

4. Organization and planning (10%)

Does the proposal include a well-thought-out plan and timeline to ensure the workshop achieves its objectives and outcomes?

- The proposal should include a clear plan and timeline that demonstrate how the workshop will meet its objectives, with realistic milestones and deliverables.
- Proposals should identify whether the workshop will be held in-person, virtually, or in a hybrid format. If hybrid, the proposal should address the technical and budgetary considerations, including A/V equipment for virtual participants.
- Proposals should outline strategies for ensuring all participants have an equal opportunity to engage during the workshop, throughout the planning process, and in follow-up activities such as report drafting and incorporating scientific recommendations.

5. Steering Committee composition and Suitability (10%)

Does the proposed steering committee have the appropriate mix of qualified individuals to conduct the workshop and achieve the stated objectives?

- The proposal should describe the qualifications and experience of steering committee members, ensuring they possess the expertise needed to conduct the workshop and complete the proposed products.
- Proposals should also clarify why a STAC workshop is the most appropriate vehicle for this project, as opposed to other activities (e.g., peer reviews, technical reports, or white papers).
- The composition of the steering committee should reflect diversity in expertise, background, and perspectives to ensure the workshop outcomes are effective and relevant to a broad range of stakeholders.

6. Engaging Diverse Perspectives (20%)

STAC is committed to ensuring workshops integrate diversity and accessibility principles to promote inclusive and equitable outcomes: does the proposed workshop plan to integrate these principles throughout its planning, execution, and outcomes¹?

- Does the proposal include a wide range of relevant perspectives from individuals with diverse backgrounds, experiences, and areas of expertise? Is there an emphasis on ensuring diverse voices are represented throughout the workshop process, including during discussions, decision-making, and the identification of key topics?
- Does the proposal demonstrate a commitment to equitable participation and outcomes? Are efforts made to address barriers faced by historically underserved and marginalized communities, particularly those that have been excluded from decision-making processes? Does the proposal show an understanding of the root causes of disparities and propose ways to reduce them within the workshop's scope?
- Does the workshop design ensure that all participants have the opportunity to engage fully and contribute meaningfully to discussions and decision-making? Is there a

¹ Please refer to the [Chesapeake Bay Program's DEIJ Strategy Implementation Plan](#) for related definitions, including those of 'underrepresented groups/communities' and 'under resourced or overburdened' populations.

clear plan for fostering an inclusive environment that values every participant's input, regardless of background or position?

- Does the proposal outline specific strategies to make the workshop accessible to underrepresented groups, both in terms of the steering committee and participants? Are measures in place to remove physical, logistical, or technological barriers to participation? Is there consideration for providing accommodations and ensuring all attendees can contribute meaningfully?

IV. Timeline for Proposal Submission

To submit a proposal, visit the STAC website and [Apply for Assistance](#). For all inquiries related to this RFP, contact:

Primary Contact: Meg Cole, STAC Coordinator

Telephone: 718-683-2023

E-Mail: colem@chesapeake.org

Dec 20, 2024	RFP is distributed to Partnership
Jan 28, 2025	Preliminary proposals due
Jan 29-31, 2025	STAC Staff pre-screen proposals
Feb 3, 2025	Comments on draft proposals returned to proposers
Feb 10, 2025	Final proposals due; STAC Staff distributes proposals to STAC Members for scoring
Feb 18, 2025	STAC Members submit proposal scores to STAC staff
Feb 25, 2025	Proposal scores distributed to STAC members prior to September meeting
Mar 4-5, 2025	STAC membership reviews proposals at quarterly meeting and select proposals to be funded and determine funding level
Jun 1, 2025	Funds available for approved workshops
May 31, 2026	Workshops must be completed by this date to receive funding

Proposals received after the deadline may be considered, if funding is available.