

**2007 OEEF Peer Reviewers Score Sheet  
Applications for General Public Audience**

*The following pages are used by peer reviewers in evaluating grant proposals.*

**Audience Need (20 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The target audience is well-described.	5	3	0
The need is recognized by members or appropriate representatives of the target audience.	5	3	0
The need for the project was determined in a valid way.	5	3	0
Meeting this need will yield substantial benefits to the target audience, community and environment.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Need Statement

**Organizational Qualifications (10 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The applicant organization and/or its collaborators are experienced and well-qualified to work with this audience.	5	3	0
The applicant organization and/or its collaborators have appropriate expertise to conduct this project and ensure that the project information is scientifically valid and unbiased.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Organizational Qualifications

**Project Objectives (35 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The objectives define specifically who will benefit and what will be learned.	5	3	0
The objectives address the need of the target audience as presented in the Statement of Need.	5	3	0
The objectives are consistent with the mission of the applicant organization.	5	3	0
The objectives meet one of OEEF's educational priorities.	5	3	0
The objectives are measurable.	5	3	0
The objectives are realistic for the segment of the general public being targeted as the audience.	5	3	0
The project does not appear to duplicate other available environmental education resources and programs.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Objectives

**Project Activities (35 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The project activities are specific, and the sequence of activities is appropriate.	5	3	0
The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated project objectives.	5	3	0
Reasonable steps are taken to ensure that the project information is scientifically valid and unbiased.	5	3	0
The project activities are relevant to real-world environmental issues affecting, or affected by, the general public.	5	3	0
The project activities are tailored to the interests and abilities of the particular segment of the general public being targeted.	5	3	0
The project does more than disseminate information: learners will engage in hands-on activities, problem solving, and/or skill-building.	5	3	0
The project makes good use of existing environmental education materials, or provides good justification for the decision to develop new materials.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Activities

**Timetable (10 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The timetable is realistic for completion of the activities.	5	3	0
The timetable is presented in 4 columns linking objectives, activities, timeline and % of budget.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Timetable

**Outcome Measurement (15 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The outcome measurements are scientifically valid for determining if the project objectives were achieved.	5	3	0
The measurements describe success indicators, tools being used to measure, methods of analyzing the data, and who will be conducting the evaluation.	5	3	0
The measurements address both short-term and long-term effects of the project.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Outcome Measurements

**Continuation/Replication Plan (15 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The project includes a realistic plan for sharing the results with a wider public.	5	3	0
The plan describes how the project can continue once OEEF funding ends.	5	3	0
The plan describes how the project can serve as a model for replication in other communities or with other audiences.	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Continuation/Replication Plan

**Budget (20 points)**

Criterion	Yes	Somewhat	Not at all
The budget table and narrative clearly explain all expenditures to be funded by the OEEF.	5	3	0
The budget is appropriate for this type of project	5	3	0
Salary costs are reasonable as a proportion of the overall budget. (In general, salary costs should not exceed 50% of the total OEEF budget for the project. Higher amounts should be very well justified by the applicant)	5	3	0
Equipment costs are reasonable as a proportion of the overall budget. (In general, equipment costs should not exceed 50% of the total OEEF budget for the project. Higher amounts should be very well justified by the applicant)	5	3	0

Reviewer comments on Budget

**Discretionary Points (up to 10 points)**

Criterion	Points Awarded:
Up to 10 discretionary points may be awarded by the peer reviewer in cases where the applicant has demonstrated that the project has unique characteristics and excellent overall quality, where this distinction does not appropriately fit into the categories previously listed. The reviewer must explain in the comment section why the discretionary points were awarded.	_____

Reviewer comments on Awarding of Discretionary Points

Total points awarded by peer reviewer, out of 170 possible: \_\_\_\_\_