

Wisconsin Environmental Education Board Grants Program 2007 Merit Review Form

Proposal # _____	General/Forestry/School Forest/ Mini _____	Your initials _____	Total points _____
------------------	--	---------------------	--------------------

Merit Review Process: You are responsible for evaluating *how well* each applicant presents its request and how worthy of funding each project is. Here are some guidelines for reviewing proposals:

- ⊗ Scan all of the proposals assigned to your group to familiarize yourself with the total field of applicants. As you skim each one, it is appropriate to note your initial reaction (yes fund, maybe fund, don't fund)
- ⊗ Reread and rate proposals one at a time.
- ⊗ Use all the questions within a section to determine the number of points to award in that section.
- ⊗ ***Make notes in each section to remind yourself of key points. You may also highlight, annotate, or otherwise mark-up the proposal as you see fit. These "notes" will help to "jog" your memory as you discuss the project with others.***
- ⊗ Total the points for each grant at the bottom.
- ⊗ Rank the proposals against each other. (The proposal with the highest point total does not have to be ranked #1.)
- ⊗ To facilitate the group review session, put the grants into three piles. Yes, No, Maybe

1. Statement of Need (reference - Application page 2) **(15 points possible)** _____ points

- Which *EE2010* goal does the project address? (Circle the letter in the list shown below.)
(Note: Writers were directed to limit themselves to one priority per proposal. Some did not do this. Please attempt to do so.)

- I. Focus content of EE on holistic outcomes
- II. Support and enhance cooperation and communication within EE community
- III. Support and enhance EE in preK-12 schools
- IV. Support and enhance the implementation of environmental literacy in institutions of higher education.
- V. Support and enhance the expansion of non formal and non-traditional EE
- VI. Develop a research and evaluation agenda for EE.

- How well does this proposal address an *EE2010* goal? (Note: You may wish to answer this question after reading the entire proposal.)

- Does the grant writer identify the EE goal(s) the project addresses? ____ Yes ____ No
How well does this proposal address the Fundamental Tenets of Environmental Education? In other words, how well does the narrative detail how the project will enhance the environmental literacy of the target audience? (Note: You may wish to answer this question after reading the entire proposal.)

- To what extent is the project justified by a well-documented need (e.g., how sufficient and convincing is the evidence of need statement)? (refer to page 8)

2. Project Goals, Objectives, Activities, and Dissemination
(40 points possible) (pages 3, 8 & 9)

_____ points

• How well does the narrative detail what the project will accomplish (e.g., does it detail the anticipated impact/benefit to members of the target audience?) Vague goals and objectives lead to vague results.

• How appropriate and realistic are the expected changes in the target audience related to this project?

• How workable is the project and its activities? In other words, how well does the narrative describe specific activities that will result in attainment of the desired impact to the target audience? Consider:

- appropriateness of project to the target audience and target audience's need(s)
- activity timelines
- partnerships
- If the project director and/or grant writer were no longer associated with the project, does the proposal provide sufficient detail that it could serve as a plan of work?

• How thorough and appropriate is the dissemination plan? Will it increase visibility of the WEEB grant program? Will it positively influence those **outside** the target audience and the administering organization in both the short and long term?

3. Project Evaluation (15 points possible) _____ points

- Are measurable objectives included? _____ Yes _____ No
- Did the applicant provide details of HOW they will KNOW if the goal/objective has been accomplished?
- How thorough and appropriate are the evaluation tools for assessing whether the target audience meets the objective(s)?

4. Staff qualifications (5 points possible) _____ points

- How appropriate are the staff's qualifications for the project? (page 9)

5. Continuation (5 points possible) _____ points

- How well does the project provide for its continuation after the grant period including identification of potential source for future funding? (page 9)

6. Budget (20 points possible) (pages 9 &10) _____ points

- To what extent do you believe the project goals can be met using the described existing and requested resources?

- To what extent are there workable partnerships?

- What is the ratio of total budget to number of people directly served? (e.g., \$2500/25 people)
Don't include "indirectly" or "potentially" served. _____

- How appropriate is the amount of funding being used on the project? Consider the ratio of dollars to people served and what it's paying for.

⚙ ⚙ ⚙ **Questions?** ⚙ ⚙ ⚙

What (if any) questions remain in your mind that you wish the proposal writer had addressed?

⚙ ⚙ ⚙ **Comments?** ⚙ ⚙ ⚙

What other comments do you have that would be helpful to the grants committee or the WEEB? If there are any specific strengths and/or weaknesses you want to highlight, describe them here. If you don't plan to fund a grant, what advice would you give to the applicant to help them write a better grant next time? If you do plan to fund a grant, is there something that would have made the grant even better?

Total Points _____

Would you recommend this project for funding? _____

Proposal Rank _____

Signature _____