

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

Proposal number: 2001-I209

Short Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed, Leadership Institute

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the hypotheses is more of a philosophical premise which essentially states healthy watersheds depend on teachers leading other teachers and their communities in valuing watersheds. The object is to give the teachers the necessary support to be able to be continually effective for the long term.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the both previous reviewer's comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the problem is one of training and sustaining leaders in community based watershed projects. The conceptual model explains how this will be accomplished.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with reviewer's comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Very much so. Team approach, long term connection and monitoring of watershed are clearly articulated and well thought out.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with reviewer's comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the proposal includes a team approach with technical support for 3 years to insure teachers have a supportive network. The long term connection and monitoring of the watershed also fostered this connection.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with both previous reviewers' comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, very much so. The objective of strengthening teacher's relationship with watershed values and their being able to lead others (teachers and communities) in watershed health is viewed as exponential. Building portfolios of partners is similar to other successful community based leadership programs (county leadership programs for example). Long range watershed monitoring means teachers are supporting each other and talking. This also has a multiplier effect.

Panel Summary: The panel agrees with both previous reviewers' comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The program monitors the number of teachers who continue on in AAW after a five year period. Impressive return of 75%.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with reviewer's comments.

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:

This area could use more detail for example data needs to be gathered in order to measure how many students and teachers go on with community based projects. This would help support the statement "develop an ecologically literate and involved citizenry".

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with reviewer's comments.

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

Yes, and has already been demonstrated in previous projects.

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Retreats, teams, 3 year programs translates into genuine support for teachers which are often given superficial materials and little training. The exponential effect of teachers teaching others helps off-set the initial high costs per person of the proposal.

Panel Summary:

The panel was concerned with the amount of money per person. There was a question about if scholarships were being provided for the 8 day retreat, however we also felt that the costs were justified given the success of AAW.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Very well qualified team.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with reviewer's comments.

5)Other comments

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

This is a very solid, well thought out proposal.

Summary Rating EXCELLENT

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: EXCELLENT