

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

Proposal number: 2001-I210

**Short Proposal Title: Discover the Flyway
II**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

H1: Whether a comprehensive, hands-on wetland experience educational teacher training program can enable teachers to more effectively convey wetlands concepts and whether by providing these types of experiences, public awareness will increase with regard to both positive and negative impacts to these wetlands and environmental issues surrounding them.

Reviewers indicate that objectives are well stated and that needs are clearly indicated.

Panel Summary:

Objectives are clearly laid out: To educate and inspire people in a region through expanded programs for the general public, expanded training and support for teachers, and new project-based learning initiatives. DTF II will use local conservation sites as an educational resource.

Hypotheses are clearly presented. See paraphrasing above.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Covers a range of age groups, uses a range of techniques. Sensitive to opportunities to improve through evaluation. Aware of characteristics of the target populations. Curriculum contains clear concepts. Strategies to deliver concepts are well laid out.

Panel Summary:

Very aware of the different target audiences they would like to provide with educational opportunities. Customized programs for these different target audiences. Illustrates the educational activities proposed, how activities would work, and their projected effects.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Proposal indicates an understanding of regional population. Program includes a range of learning venues to serve a range of learning styles.

Panel Summary:

Strategies for expanding general public programs and expanding teacher training and support are well thought out. The new project based learning initiative is vague. To be fair, it is challenging to lay out a plan for project based learning because it should be student driven. However, the applicant could describe the approach they would take to prepare student to select a focus area for project work.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Expansion and continuation of a full-scale project.

Panel Summary:

In addition to expanding teacher training and programs for the general public the applicant proposes a new initiative: project based learning.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The project promises to transmit valuable information to the populace of the region.

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:

Currently, the organization uses written evaluation and oral feedback to assess programs and adapt. The applicant plans to consult with professionals at Yolo County Office of Education and UC Davis to improve evaluation procedures.

Panel Summary:

Panel likes the plan to get professional assistance with evaluation procedures. The current evaluation procedure is not weaker than that of other programs, but consultation will allow DTF to subject programs to examine their program more fully and analytically.

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:

Yes, see above.

Panel Summary:

Yes, see above.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. Good track record. Thoughtful, comprehensive design.

Panel Summary:

In addition, the applicant has developed strong partnerships which will facilitate program delivery.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Good credentials. Ten years of experience. Outside professionals who will assist with evaluations are also well qualified.

Panel Summary:

Agree. The program has received national and state recognition for its programs thus far.

5)Other comments

Some things to consider:

-For task 1, there are many organizations that have developed more extensive, multi-day teacher training programs. In the interest of efficiency, we'd suggest examining these programs (Adopt a Watershed, etc) to see what can be borrowed so you don't have to "reinvent the wheel."

- Sharpen the project-based learning strategy
- Your proposal did not mention measures that you are taking to work with the school districts to make it easier for teachers to attend trainings. What could you do to get the districts to provide teachers with regular work week time to come to trainings? Are there stipends for teachers that come to trainings during unpaid, non-work time?
- Budget: The 32% overhead rate seems high, regardless of what OMB says. Also, your proposal indicates that you are pursuing other sources of funding outside of CalFed but did not indicate what level of match you expect. The panel encourages the applicant to pursue local funding aggressively since the applicants programs are such a benefit to the local population

Panel and reviewers were impressed by the assessment/evaluation portion of the proposal. Hiring a very respected environmental education specialist to review the effect of the program is a bold step that few other project proponents have suggested but one that the reviewers feel is very important.

The proponent also has a strong cost share component.

Overall Evaluation PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS

The proposal was clear and convincing. The proposed activities are well thought out and, we believe, would improve environmental education service to the region. We like the range of programs planned, the range of audiences targeted, the emphasis on teacher training and support, and the emphasis on providing programs to underserved populations.

- If final reviewers wish to fund this proposal at a reduced level we would suggest either
- (a) eliminating the project-based learning component because it appears undeveloped or
 - (b) funding the program for two years since there are not components of the project that require the full three years to bring to fruition (Activities offered in year 3 are a repeat of activities offered in year 2 and the first 2 years can “stand alone”).

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- XXX Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD

