U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points): 93

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Friends of N C Museum of Nat'l History
Applicant ID: EE 4131018
Reviewer: 9 [redacted]

Name Redacted

Information Redacted pursuant to 5 U.S.C Section 552 (b)(6), Personal Privacy

PURPOSE - This form is used to evaluate proposals based on criteria and associated points delineated in the EE Model and Sub-Award Grant Solicitation Notice for 2013. In addition, reviewers must provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals for each criterion, and overall comments about the proposal at the end of the form. Clear, substantive and constructive comments document for the record scores given to proposals, and also help in the debriefing of applicants who request a follow-up conversation after receiving their scores.

PRIORITIES: For informational purposes, identify which priorities the proposal addresses.

Educational Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box (es) for the educational priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer	Applicant	
☒	☒	**Community Projects:** Addressing environmental stewardship in a local formal or informal educational context using outdoor, place-based, experiential, service learning and /or community-focused stewardship activities as the primary teaching tool(s).
☐	☐	**Human Health and the Environment:** Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, in the outdoors and in classrooms, about human health threats from environmental pollution and how to minimize human exposure to preserve good health.
☐	☐	**Career Development:** Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, about environmental issues, solutions and stewardship for the purpose of encouraging interest in careers in environmental fields.
☐	☐	**EE Capacity Building:** Building the capacity of agencies and organizations to develop, deliver, and sustain comprehensive environmental education programs statewide. Capacity building applications may focus on one, state, multiple states or a region of the country.
☐	☐	**Educational Advancement:** Utilizing environmental education as a catalyst to advance state or local educational goals and to improve environmental literacy among students in formal education programs.
☐	☐	**EE Teaching Skills:** Providing pre-service and in-service professional development for teachers, faculty, or non-formal educators to improve their environmental education teaching skills and/or knowledge about environmental issues and content, such as sustainability, water and air quality, chemical risks, hazardous wastes, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Environmental Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box(es) for the environmental priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer	Applicant	
☐	☐	**Addressing Climate Change and Improving Air Quality**
☐	☐	**Taking Action on Toxics and Chemical Safety**
☐	☐	**Making a Visible Difference in Communities Across the Country**
☒	☒	**Protecting Water: A Precious, Limited Resource**
☐	☐	**Launching a New Era of State, Tribal and Local Partnerships**

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - See Section V of the Solicitation Notice for a full explanation of the criteria and scoring.

(1) **Project Summary:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the project summary clearly and completely addresses the content and format described in Section IV(C)(3)(a). Summary should include:

- Description of applicant organization and partnerships.
- Summary of project that indicates that the current project has not been previously funded; how it is a **model, replicable program**; and includes project goals and objectives.
- Description of how project is to be implemented.
- Description of the target audience.
- Lists the expenses and costs associated with the project that EPA will finance.

0 pts 0-5

5 0 **Subtotal (0 to 5 points)**

Comments (Required):

Overall, well done. Audience is weak here No # for adults and sustained cit. sci. is generally driven by the adult volunteers vs transient youth in schools (youth outside school are more stable volunteers) This is duplicated in #2.

(2) **Project Description:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and the extent to which the applicant addresses the format and content described in Section IV(C)(3)(b):

10 0 pts 0-10 (i) What: Substantively, clearly and completely explains what the project will entail, including the educational and environmental priorities addressed, the goals the project hopes to achieve, how it will serve as a **replicable model** for advancing and strengthening the field of environmental education and how the project encourages behavior change associated with stewardship.

10 0 pts 0-10 (ii) Why: Substantively, clearly and completely explain the **need for the project as a model**, including why the particular goals, priorities and audience(s) have been chosen.

8 0 pts 0-10 (iii) How: Substantively, clearly and completely explain how the project will accomplish the stated goals and objectives, including how well the project will encourage behavioral change and increased environmental stewardship, how its methods or programs will **serve as a model capable of being replicated in a variety of settings**, and how it will advance and strengthen the field of environmental education.

9 0 pts 0-10 (iv) Who: Proposals will be evaluated based on how well the project:

- Identifies the target audience, numbers reached, why they were chosen, and clearly explains the recruitment plan, including incentives to be used such as teacher stipends or continuing education credits and if/how the applicant's partner(s) will help with recruitment. (5 points)
- Reaches a diverse audience, including but not limited to minority, low income and tribal communities, and demonstrates how the project will help address environmental issues that are more likely to adversely affect the audience (s) targeted. (5 points)

5 0 pts 0-5 (v) Sub-Award/Sub-Grant Program: Under this factor, applications will be evaluated on their approach for ensuring that **exactly** 25% of the grant funds awarded are distributed through sub-awards/sub-grants of $5000 or less to eligible sub-recipients. (5 points)

42 0 **Subtotal (0 to 45 points)**

Comments (Required):

Does not clearly reveal how educational messages toward intentions are integrated with the volunteer efforts. Many invasive species efforts exist (see Citizen Science Central on the Cornell Lab of Ornithology web-site) This is not a new model - and it is already replicated. The only hook is the partner coalition of NCAEEC - which not all States have.

(3) **Project Evaluation:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant explains how the project's success will be tracked and measured and the quality of the evaluation plan (see Section IV(C)(3)(c)):

8 0 pts 0-10 Substantively, clearly, and completely explains how success in meeting project goals and objectives will be achieved, tracked and measured. The evaluation plan should include indications of how progress in achieving the proposed project outputs and outcomes will be tracked and measured, including how well the project supports EPA's Strategic Plan and the improvement of the environment over time.

8 0 **Subtotal (0 to 10 points)**

Comments (Required):

LM → Some activities are listed as outcomes, No causal links, and Inconsistent framing of outcomes on logic model. Success Measure 1 is an output level measure. Return volunteers would be stronger. Sample is very low (n=100) for baseline.

(4) **Budget:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(4)):

0 pts 0-5 (i) Does the budget information clearly and accurately show how all funds, both EPA and non-federal funds, will be used.

0 pts 0-5 (ii) Is the funding request reasonable given the activities proposed and does the project provide a good return on the investment.

10 0 **Subtotal (0 to 10 points)**

Comments (Required):

Reasonable and clear

(5) **Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how clearly and completely and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(5)):

5 0 pts 0-5 (i) Timeline: Does the timeline link the activities to a clear project schedule, and clearly indicate a realistic timeline of when each action, event, milestone, and evaluation will occur.

3 0 pts 0-5 (ii) Logic Model: Does the applicant, through a Logic Model, clarify in a graphic display the outputs and outcomes developed through the project in accordance with the instructions and information in Appendix C.

5 0 pts 0-5 (iii) Partnership Letters of Commitment: Do the letters of commitment from partners demonstrate how the applicant will engage with their partner(s) to **effectively develop and implement the project as a model that could be replicated**, and could advance and strengthen the field of EE.

No points should be awarded if no letters of commitment are included, or if letters only indicate endorsement or recommendation of the project. The number of points awarded should reflect the extent of the partnership(s) as described in the letters, and the ability of said partnership(s) to fulfill the project goals.

13 0 **Subtotal (0 to 15 points)**

Comments (Required):

See earlier comments on ~~Logic Model~~. Timeline is reasonable given prior work of the museum. Letters are fine

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

(6) **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Sections IV(C)(5)(c) and V(A)(5)):

3 0 pts 0-3 (i) Does the applicant provide evidence of past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in the response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*

2 0 pts 0-2 (ii) Does the applicant demonstrate a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement, including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*

5 0 pts 0-5 (iii) Does the applicant provide evidence of organizational experience and a plan for the timely and successful achievement of the objectives of the project.

5 0 pts 0-5 (iv) Does the applicant provide evidence of staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources (and/or the ability to obtain them) to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

NOTE: EPA may consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant.

15 0 **Subtotal (0 to 15 points)**

Comments (Required):

Very strong!

Worksheet:

Possible points	*Score*	
5 0-5	5 0	(1) **Project Summary**
42 0-45	42 0	(2) **Project Description**
0-10	8 0	(3) **Project Evaluation**
0-10	10 0	(4) **Budget**
0-15	13 0	(5) **Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment**
0-15	15 0	(6) **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance**
	93 0	**TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)**

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Friends of NC Museum of Nat'l History
Applicant ID: EE 4131018
Reviewer: 9

Overall strengths of the proposal (Required):

Good partnership w/ the EE centers. Data cleaning + validation process not well explained. The "doing" is very clear + the experience of the Museum in leading PPSR projects ensures success. Proposal well written + clear.

Overall weaknesses of the proposal (Required):

What is the "model" being proposed? Citizen Science has many models in existence - how is this one different? Why default to youth in schools as target audience? Cit. Sci. tries to build ongoing commitment as volunteers (schooling is not voluntary) so that the data are consistent and clean.
The education beyond the doing is not clearly presented - and often is not what volunteers want (though it sometimes!)
The causal links in the logic model are assumptions, not theoretically based.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points): 95

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Friends of the North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences
Applicant ID: EE4131018, Name Removed
Reviewer [redacted] Information Redacted pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Section 552 (b)(6), Personal Privacy

PURPOSE - This form is used to evaluate proposals based on criteria and associated points delineated in the EE Model and Sub-Award Grant Solicitation Notice for 2013. In addition, reviewers must provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals for each criterion, and overall comments about the proposal at the end of the form. Clear, substantive and constructive comments document for the record scores given to proposals, and also help in the debriefing of applicants who request a follow-up conversation after receiving their scores.

PRIORITIES: For informational purposes, identify which priorities the proposal addresses.

Educational Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box (es) for the educational priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer	Applicant	
☐	☐	**Community Projects:** Addressing environmental stewardship in a local formal or informal educational context using outdoor, place-based, experiential, service learning and /or community-focused stewardship activities as the primary teaching tool(s).
☒	☐	**Human Health and the Environment:** Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, in the outdoors and in classrooms, about human health threats from environmental pollution and how to minimize human exposure to preserve good health.
☒	☐	**Career Development:** Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, about environmental issues, solutions and stewardship for the purpose of encouraging interest in careers in environmental fields.
☒	☐	**EE Capacity Building:** Building the capacity of agencies and organizations to develop, deliver, and sustain comprehensive environmental education programs statewide. Capacity building applications may focus on one, state, multiple states or a region of the country.
☒	☐	**Educational Advancement:** Utilizing environmental education as a catalyst to advance state or local educational goals and to improve environmental literacy among students in formal education programs.
☒	☐	**EE Teaching Skills:** Providing pre-service and in-service professional development for teachers, faculty, or non-formal educators to improve their environmental education teaching skills and/or knowledge about environmental issues and content, such as sustainability, water and air quality, chemical risks, hazardous wastes, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Environmental Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box(es) for the environmental priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer	Applicant	
☐	☐	**Addressing Climate Change and Improving Air Quality**
☐	☐	**Taking Action on Toxics and Chemical Safety**
☒	☐	**Making a Visible Difference in Communities Across the Country**
☒	☐	**Protecting Water: A Precious, Limited Resource**
☐	☐	**Launching a New Era of State, Tribal and Local Partnerships**

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - See Section V of the Solicitation Notice for a full explanation of the criteria and scoring.

(1) **Project Summary:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the project summary clearly and completely addresses the content and format described in Section IV(C)(3)(a). Summary should include:

- Description of applicant organization and partnerships.
- Summary of project that indicates that the current project has not been previously funded; how it is a **model, replicable program**; and includes project goals and objectives.
- Description of how project is to be implemented.
- Description of the target audience.
- Lists the expenses and costs associated with the project that EPA will finance.

5 0 pts 0-5

5 **Subtotal (0 to 5 points)**

Comments (Required):

Not a critical need project

(2) **Project Description:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and the extent to which the applicant addresses the format and content described in Section IV(C)(3)(b):

10 0 pts 0-10 (i) What: Substantively, clearly and completely explains what the project will entail, including the educational and environmental priorities addressed, the goals the project hopes to achieve, how it will serve as a **replicable model** for advancing and strengthening the field of environmental education and how the project encourages behavior change associated with stewardship.

10 0 pts 0-10 (ii) Why: Substantively, clearly and completely explain the **need for the project as a model**, including why the particular goals, priorities and audience(s) have been chosen.

10 0 pts 0-10 (iii) How: Substantively, clearly and completely explain how the project will accomplish the stated goals and objectives, including how well the project will encourage behavioral change and increased environmental stewardship, how its methods or programs will **serve as a model capable of being replicated in a variety of settings**, and how it will advance and strengthen the field of environmental education.

10 0 pts 0-10 (iv) Who: Proposals will be evaluated based on how well the project:

- Identifies the target audience, numbers reached, why they were chosen, and clearly explains the recruitment plan, including incentives to be used such as teacher stipends or continuing education credits and if/how the applicant's partner(s) will help with recruitment. (5 points)
- Reaches a diverse audience, including but not limited to minority, low income and tribal communities, and demonstrates how the project will help address environmental issues that are more likely to adversely affect the audience (s) targeted. (5 points)

5 0 pts 0-5 (v) Sub-Award/Sub-Grant Program: Under this factor, applications will be evaluated on their approach for ensuring that **exactly** 25% of the grant funds awarded are distributed through sub-awards/sub-grants of $5000 or less to eligible sub-recipients. (5 points)

45 **Subtotal (0 to 45 points)**

Comments (Required):

well written but is not a priority type concern compared to other environmental issues.

(3) Project Evaluation: Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant explains how the project's success will be tracked and measured and the quality of the evaluation plan (see Section IV(C)(3)(c)):

10 0 pts 0-10 Substantively, clearly, and completely explains how success in meeting project goals and objectives will be achieved, tracked and measured. The evaluation plan should include indications of how progress in achieving the proposed project outputs and outcomes will be tracked and measured, including how well the project supports EPA's Strategic Plan and the improvement of the environment over time.

0 **Subtotal (0 to 10 points)**

Comments (Required):

the grant clearly outlines the projected goals

(4) Budget: Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(4)):

5 0 pts 0-5 (i) Does the budget information clearly and accurately show how all funds, both EPA and non-federal funds, will be used.

5 0 pts 0-5 (ii) Is the funding request reasonable given the activities proposed and does the project provide a good return on the investment.

10 0 **Subtotal (0 to 10 points)**

Comments (Required):

not a critical need for this proposal.

(5) Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment: Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how clearly and completely and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(5)):

5 0 pts 0-5 (i) Timeline: Does the timeline link the activities to a clear project schedule, and clearly indicate a realistic timeline of when each action, event, milestone, and evaluation will occur.

0 0 pts 0-5 (ii) Logic Model: Does the applicant, through a Logic Model, clarify in a graphic display the outputs and outcomes developed through the project in accordance with the instructions and information in Appendix C.

5 0 pts 0-5 (iii) Partnership Letters of Commitment: Do the letters of commitment from partners demonstrate how the applicant will engage with their partner(s) to **effectively develop and implement the project as a model that could be replicated**, and could advance and strengthen the field of EE.

10 *No points should be awarded if no letters of commitment are included, or if letters only indicate endorsement or recommendation of the project. The number of points awarded should reflect the extent of the partnership(s) as described in the letters, and the ability of said partnership(s) to fulfill the project goals.*

0 **Subtotal (0 to 15 points)**

Comments (Required):

section C - Non federal Resources (this form is not completed but
en Clude a Budget Table (Summary) of the proposal
farther into the proposal.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

(6) **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Sections IV(C)(5)(c) and V(A)(5)):

3 0 pts 0-3 (i) Does the applicant provide evidence of past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in the response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*

2 0 pts 0-2 (ii) Does the applicant demonstrate a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement, including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*

5 0 pts 0-5 (iii) Does the applicant provide evidence of organizational experience and a plan for the timely and successful achievement of the objectives of the project.

5 0 pts 0-5 (iv) Does the applicant provide evidence of staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources (and/or the ability to obtain them) to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

NOTE: EPA may consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant.

15 **Subtotal (0 to 15 points)**

Comments (Required):

The grant outlines past perf. and reporting requirements with documentation etc.

Worksheet:

Possible points	*Score*	
0-5	0	(1) **Project Summary**
0-45	0	(2) **Project Description**
0-10	0	(3) **Project Evaluation**
0-10	0	(4) **Budget**
0-15	0	(5) **Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment**
0-15	0	(6) **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance**
	0	**TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)**

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2013 EE MODEL AND SUB-AWARD GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION FORM

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization:
Applicant ID:
Reviewer:

Overall strengths of the proposal (Required):

Well written proposal but I would ~~rank~~ not rank as a top priority/critical need.

Overall weaknesses of the proposal (Required):

Section C not completed but ~~the~~ a Budget table/Summary is enclosed towards the end of the proposal.