

**Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form**  
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

**Proposal number: 2001-I206**

**Short Proposal Title: Master River  
Teacher**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Education objectives: Train Master River Teachers (MRT) who will in turn train and support other teachers in their own and other districts throughout the San Joaquin River watershed. When MRTs complete the training, their name is distributed to other teachers as a resource for watershed education. MRTs will also teach children directly.

Hypothesis: Participants will impart knowledge from their experience at Riverview Ranch House (RRH) to fellow teachers and students, who will in turn share their knowledge with their peers. Result will be an increased utilization of RRH and awareness of the SJR watershed.

*Panel Summary:*

**1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?**

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Conceptual model is that training MRT in the use of the RRH as an educational resource will result in the MRTs be seen and used as education resources by other teachers, expanding the use of RRH for educational purposes.

*Panel Summary:*

**1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?**

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

“Yes - but how will the program continue after CALFED money ends?”

“Yes, teachers get academic credit which will increase the number of participants. Ground work for lectures, field study, research projects and conference seem well laid out.

Development of curriculum materials related to research is clear. How availability of MRTs will be advertised is not made clear.”

***Panel Summary:***

Many aspects of the curriculum to be presented to MRTs is vague. No curriculum was presented. It is not clear what the educational content of the presentations and field trips will be. It is not clear what the educational purpose of the research project will be, how doing this project will improve the participants' understandings and ability to educate other teachers and students.

**1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Teachers participating in the current, basic teacher workshops have indicated a strong interest in gaining greater knowledge of the San Joaquin River.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

**1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Participants will develop group research projects that could inform future decision making.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

**2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Participants will be surveyed on program content and quality.

***Panel Summary:***

The proposed monitoring and assessment does not produce information to test the hypothesis and whether the participants have effectively trained their peers, created the "ripple effect."

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Other than the findings of the group projects, it is not clear what, if anything, will be collected regarding the impact and effectiveness of the MRT project.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

**3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

**4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Education Director is highly qualified. Executive Director has a background in natural resources.

***Panel Summary:***

The proposal does not clearly make the case that the program will be effectively implemented.

**5)Other comments**

The lack of a curriculum and lack of explanation of how the ripple effect is to occur are serious shortcomings of this proposal

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Though the proposal predicts a “ripple effect” of the information spreading beyond the 30 teachers to be trained by this program, there is no discussion of how this is expected to happen

or any support by the program for this outreach to effectively occur. There does not appear to be any interaction among the cohorts from different years to develop an elementary to high school articulated education program for the SJR watershed and the use of RRH.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: **POOR**