

**2007 OEEF Peer Reviewers Score Sheet
Applications for Regulated Community 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 project is directed at environmental compliance needs identified by the regulated community, or by an appropriate environmental regulatory agency such as Ohio EPA or a local health department.	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 regulatory information presented is accurate.	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 project is likely to have regional, sector-wide or statewide impact in Ohio.	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 regulated community 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 regulated community.	5	3	0
The project activities are tailored to the interests and abilities of the particular segment of the regulated community 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
If appropriate, the measurement attempts to determine whether regulatory compliance improved as a result of the project. (If not appropriate, score 5 points.)	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 the wider regulated community.	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 regulated sectors or regions.	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: _____