

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#44: The Watershed Education Project**

Chico Unified School District

**Environmental Education Technical Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

**#1**

**#2**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

# Environmental Education Technical Review:

## CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Environmental Education Technical Review Form

**Proposal Number:** 44

**Applicant Organization:** Chico Unified School District

**Proposal Title:** The Watershed Education Project

**Review:**

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

**Above Average:** Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Adequate:** No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Not Recommended:** Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	<b>The strength of this proposal is its partnerships and encompassing community volunteers and resource agency personnel to assist in the restoration projects to be conducted by students. The K-12 curriculum to be used and its specific concepts were not clearly explained. A matrix of the K-12 concepts and potential projects or an example of an actual lesson and a detailed description of a specific project to be done would have strengthened this proposal. No correlations to state standards are provided. Support of Butte County teachers and their commitment to participate in this project not clearly identified.</b>
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

1. **Clearly stated educational goals, objectives and expected outcomes.** Are the project's educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem? Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration?

**The projects educational goals and objectives are clearly stated but the deliverables and services provided are not adequately described. The target audience is K-12 Butte County teachers and students, community volunteers, and resource agency personnel. It is unclear if this project will broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem system. Example of concepts students will learn and more details about the curriculum would have strengthened this proposal. It is unclear if the project will change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration because the curriculum is not identified and the number of teachers and students who will most likely participate in this project is not provided.**

Even though the proposal describes this to be a countywide program for K-12 Butte County Schools, the support of these schools is not apparent.

Engaging the public in the educational system as volunteers, docents, and teachers aides is a good idea. However there were no descriptions on how will these be recruited.

2. **Justification (including conceptual model, likelihood of success).** Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? Is it supported by research or past results?

The idea of using the environment as an integrating context and focusing on professional development and conducting field studies is a good one, but a specific example of this and its application to Butte Countys students would have strengthened this proposal.

3. **Approach (including appropriate curriculum for target audience).** Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants?

The proposal needs a clear example of how activities will be integrated. For example, a description of a part of the professional development and curriculum as it relates to standards, field study, restoration project, should be included in the proposal. On the other hand, there is a description of the linkages to other watershed education projects. It is assumed that Adopt-a-Watershed and Project WET curricula, among others will be used. If so, these are appropriate to its audience and can it be implemented by teachers

4. **Linkages and compatibility to existing school, community and stewardship programs (fits into existing curricula, demonstrated learning value).** Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities?

The proposal describes partnerships. The project is somewhat aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks. It is mentioned that the educational coordinator will be responsible for the development of curriculum linkages. An example of this would have been beneficial to the grant reviewers.

5. **Replicability and dissemination of the program or project.** Can the project be replicated, if successful? Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others?

The project can be replicated, if successful. But there are no satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others.

6. **Pre- and post-project evaluation component.** Are the evaluation methods effective and appropriate to the project?

Some evaluation methods are described.

7. **Capabilities (qualifications and infrastructure).** Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFED's funds are expended?

**The project staff seems qualified. The project needed more evidence that the teachers will participate. This project will develop the leadership and partnerships for sustainability, but long-term financial support is not certain.**

8. **Cost/benefit.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**The budget seems reasonable and adequate for the work proposed.**

9. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

**This proposal was rated high by the regional panel. The panel indicates the following: This is next phase funding of an ongoing project. The project will continue and expand comprehensive watershed education outreach through local school districts in Butte County. It is widely accepted and supported countywide.**

10. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

**There were no significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## Sacramento Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 44

**Applicant Organization:** Chico Unified School District

**Proposal Title:** The Watershed Education Project

Overall Ranking:    -Low    -Medium    **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**This proposal is widely supported. The applicants have a proven track record. It involves watershed and fisheries issues.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This is next phase funding of an ongoing project. The project will continue and expand comprehensive watershed education outreach through local school districts in Butte County. It is widely accepted and supported countywide.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The proposal meets PSP Sacramento Region Priority No. 7.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The project is directly or indirectly involved with 7 ongoing Butte County Projects mainly involving spring-run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Steelhead Restoration on the Butte Creek restoration process.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Involves students, parents, Butte County Office of Education, local watershed groups and the Water Education Foundation.**

Other Comments:

**Supports early age education process of the environment.**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1**

**New Proposal Number:** 44

**New Proposal Title:** The Watershed Education Project

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**01-N35, Watershed Education Project, ERP.**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:



## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2**

**New Proposal Number:** 44

**New Proposal Title:** The Watershed Education Project

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**CALFED funding for WEP, \$50,000**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**CALFED project cited above was very well managed. As Education Coordinator and project manager of the previous CALFED WEP that I managed, she produced quarterly CALFED progress reports on time and produced very valuable and polished products that are designed to provide watershed curriculum to 1-12 grades.**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 44

**Applicant Organization:** Chico Unified School District

**Proposal Title:** The Watershed Education Project

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 44

**Applicant Organization:** Chico Unified School District

**Proposal Title:** The Watershed Education Project

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: