

OEEF Grant Application

Application Type: GeneralGrant

Application #: S-20G032

Revision from previous application:

Previous grant received: S-13G-052, F-16G-015

Organization Information

Name: Cincinnati Nature Center

Web Address: www.cincynature.org

Address: 4949 Tealtown Road, Milford, OH 45150

County: Clermont

Project Information

Project Title: Schoolyard Native Plant Program

Educational Priority: Education Encouraging Habitat Restoration

Requested Grant Amount: \$14,933.00

Target Audience: Pre-school to University - Primary

Project Description:

The Schoolyard Native Plant Program is a unique collaboration with local elementary schools that blends conservation with inquiry-based schoolyard learning. Building on the success of an existing elementary school partnership (Mulberry Elementary, Milford Exempted School District), we are seeking funding to expand the program to include two schools. The Schoolyard Native Plant Program will focus on the utilization of schoolyard garden spaces for learning and will emphasize the importance of native biodiversity on an ecosystem. Key activities include: intensive teacher training both before and after the planting project; project planning and goal identification with key teaching staff and principals; installation of native plant gardens; student programming for at least 2-3 grade levels at each school; creation of annual maintenance plan; and opportunities for community volunteers. Program activities will take place during the 2020-2021 academic year.

Anticipated List of Collaborators:

Seipelt Elementary (Milford Exempted Village School District)

Woodlawn Elementary (Princeton Public School District)

Cincinnati Nature Center volunteers and naturalists

Additional Information

Have you ever attended an OEEF grant-writing workshop? No

Proposed Start Date: 08/19/2020

Will this project have statewide impact? No

Proposed Completion Date: 06/01/2021

Which Ohio counties will the activities take place in? Clermont, Hamilton

Audience Category

Formal Education: Primary: 3-5

Project Issues

Land Issues: Habitat Preservation, Land Laboratories/Outdoor Classrooms

Executive Summary

Audience Need:

Large-scale national studies have demonstrated increased school performance through outdoor education. This research has documented increased standardized test scores, enhanced attitude about school, improved in-school behavior, improved attendance and overall enhanced student achievement when students learn in and about nature. A schoolyard native garden can provide an outdoor classroom with endless opportunities to meet and exceed high academic standards, and provides a wide range of other benefits to students, teachers, the administration, and the community.

Key Personnel:

Cincinnati Nature Center is committed providing outdoor educational programming appropriate for children in grades K-8 that result in positive experiences in nature, that reflect state grade-level curriculum standards, and that allows teachers to tie back lessons learned in nature back to their classrooms and schoolyards. Our staff members are the best in their fields and have extensive experience executing school programs both on- and-offsite. We serve over 6,500 students and teachers annually through a variety of programs designed to spark a passion for nature and the environment.

Overall Project Objectives:

The project timeline is Aug. 2020-June 2021, and will include:

- . 3 comprehensive teacher trainings about schoolyard gardens (open to teachers across districts)
- . Schoolyard garden installations with 2 committed partner schools, grades 3-6 (see letters of commitment)

Teachers will learn about natural history of native plants, pollinators, and local ecology, and will learn how to integrate outdoor habitats with science, math, ELA, and other curriculum. Students will participate in garden installations and be able to connect hands-on learning with classroom activities; develop a sense of awareness of their own schoolyard/backyards; and develop a lifelong passion for nature and the environment.

Teachers from 2 partner schools will be required to be "teacher leaders" in their own schools with the skills to provide guidance in outdoor classroom development. 16-24 teachers will receive 15 hours of training; over 500 students will benefit from outdoor learning.

Major Activities:

The program will include 3 teacher trainings (fall, winter, spring), installation of 2 native gardens (fall), and 2 garden maintenance visits (spring). Trainings will include instruction from BOTH our education team and land conservation team; they will empower teachers with the knowledge needed to integrate outdoor habitats with student curriculum and create greater awareness of local ecosystems. Topics will include: utilization of native plants to create schoolyard gardens, natural history, pollinator biology, garden biodiversity, seed harvesting, and seed/animal relationships.

Timeline:

August 2020

Training 1: Pollination Investigation (24 teachers/6 hours)

Sept/Oct: 2 Schoolyard Installations

Design gardens/plant 100 native plants at 2 partner schools

Nov/Dec

Training 2: All About Seeds (24 teachers/3 hours)

April/May 2021: Schoolyard Maintenance Visit

Spring Refresher and Weeding

May/June: Training 3

Schoolyard Native Garden Forum (24 teachers/6 hours)

Overall Cost:

Overall Cost: \$20,080; OEEF Request: \$14,933; Cincinnati Nature Center Match: \$5,147.50

Project Description

Audience Need:

Project Need

In today's demanding learning environments, educators must be creative in presenting content that is challenging, compelling, and yields results. A schoolyard garden supports teachers and students in their pursuit of achieving national and state educational standards. The National Wildlife Federation states that "The planning, design, implementation, and on-going monitoring and maintenance of schoolyard habitats provide endless opportunities to meet academic standards across curriculum. Because school gardens are by nature interdisciplinary, they help deepen the quality of instruction and student engagement." For example:

- . Science Standards: A schoolyard habitat serves as a living laboratory where students engage in hands-on inquiries into the natural world.
- . Geography and Social Studies Standards: Geography and social studies involve understanding connections between people, social constructs, and the environment.
- . Math Standards: A schoolyard habitat provides students with the opportunity to apply math concepts to the real world;
- . ELA Standards: A schoolyard habitat provides a quiet space for creative writing about nature or a research laboratory where students can develop research, writing and communication skills.

Nature-based education offers students the opportunity to learn reasoning skills that enable them to think critically about real-world situations, increase their awareness of environmental issues, and learn about social and cultural concerns.

Determination of Need

The Nature Center has excellent relationships with educators from districts throughout the region. We regularly receive requests from teachers from multiple districts who are seeking ways to deepen their students' connections to the natural world, want to better utilize the outdoor space around their buildings, and want to improve their knowledge of local natural history. Additionally, they are seeking guidance on how to integrate outdoor learning activities across curriculums. Our school program manager frequently consults with educators regarding these needs (in-school, community meetings, etc.), but this "method" is quickly becoming cost-prohibitive, as her time and resources are stretched; and, it does not provide enough time for intensive learning and curriculum support. As noted earlier, one goal of this program is to effectively train teachers by investing time and resources in a more appropriate manner (designated teacher workshops; training with both our education team and conservation team); teachers will also be required to share their information learned with cohorts in their own districts. In short, it will provide administrators and educators a framework for incorporating environment-based education into their school curriculum.

Mission Driven

This program will provide the Nature Center with an opportunity to achieve our mission to Inspire Conservation and lay the foundation for children to grow up to be advocates for our environment; we will continue to deepen our relationships with schools, develop successful and need-based curriculum that can be shared across districts at no cost to educators.

Unique Programming

The Nature Center's schoolyard native garden program is unique in that it will have a holistic approach to creating a viable outdoor learning space: we will provide intensive training, technical expertise, on-site installation, maintenance planning, and be available to support curriculum planning. We found one organization that supports schoolyard garden with training, installation, and maintenance (the Ohio River Foundation). However, their program focuses on rain gardens/protection of water quality. The Civic Garden Center provides training (speakers, etc.) that are topic-specific, and they provide consultation at \$50/hour. However, they do not install school gardens or provide year-long programs that support interdisciplinary curriculum development.

Qualification:

For over 50 years, the Nature Center has strived to provide a connection to nature for all ages and abilities through a variety of educational programming. Our School Program is year-round and includes on-site field trips and schoolyard programs that encourage hands-on discovery and learning. Under the direction of Executive Director Dr. Jeffrey Corney and Connie O'Conner, Director of Education for 24 years, we will continue to execute one of the core pillars of our 2018 strategic plan: To educate people about the natural world through knowledge and skills. The schoolyard native plant program will support this pillar by creating strategies to continue to provide top-quality educational programs for all ages and lead environmental education initiatives through collaboration.

Melissa Sabo, the Nature Center's School Program Manager, will oversee the schoolyard garden program as well as facilitate the teacher trainings. She earned her bachelor's degree in Early Childhood Education from Ball State University in 2004 and her master's degree in teaching biological sciences from Miami University in 2016. She has over 15 years of experience working with young children, families, and teachers in a variety of capacities ranging from classroom teacher to field trip coordinator. She specializes in teaching adults and children how to engage with their local ecosystems (particularly the arthropods that are easily observable by classrooms but also easily overlooked!). Her graduate studies on how to better engage adults in outdoor education have been published on a national level. She is a sought-after and indispensable resource for local teachers interested in developing nature-based programs, as well as those seeking to make outdoor education more accessible to children with special needs. Melissa is a 9-year veteran of Cincinnati Nature Center.

Co-leading the program will be a member of our conservation team, Jake Sberna. He is the Nature Center's Native Landscape Coordinator and is responsible for the management and design of all landscaped areas at our two campuses. Jake is a graduate of Sewanee: The University of the South where he earned his degree in Environmental Studies with emphasis on Ecology and Biodiversity. As head of the Native Plant Propagation Program, he coordinates staff and volunteers in the cultivation of more than 100 species of native plants in our Native Plant Greenhouse and Nursery. Jake will lead the design and installation of the garden habitats and will select plants that have been cultivated and grown on-site as part of native plant propagation and conservation program.

Continuation and Replication Plan:

Upon the completion of the schoolyard native plant program, we will evaluate qualitative objectives and assess effectiveness of the program through a series of teacher surveys. We will also include staff and teacher observations and anecdotes. Using this data and feedback, we will refine the program as needed, and create a standard Welcome to Your Pollinator Garden "tool kit" that can be used by educators who are seeking guidance on how to create and integrate outdoor learning across curriculums. The final contents of the toolkit will be determined by teacher need and feedback (from staff and partner evaluations, and surveys), but will include items such as: garden installation "how-to" guide; information about native plant biology/ecology, natural history, seed ecology; garden template designs; and curriculum for student engagement.

Additionally, our conservation team will evaluate what native plants are best suited to the learning needs and specific outdoor spaces available for habitat development at schools; this will allow us to build a set of plant "packages" that schools can select from.

We will share activities throughout the year via social media, website, and an article in our quarterly newsletter. Results will also be shared with other schools via our teacher newsletter (1,430 contacts) and our teacher Facebook page (75 members). Based on the assessment of the program, we will determine where it fits in to our overall annual education program priorities.

Budget Narrative:

A.3. Substitute Teachers: Stipends

- . Teachers from our committed partner schools receive larger stipends because of their extra commitment to installing a native garden.
- . Stipends for Training 1 and Training 3 are larger because they are 6 hours long. Training 2 is only 3 hours.

B.1. Supplies - Books

Curriculum books are the items that would otherwise make this project cost-prohibitive. School budgets cannot support the additional cost of permanent classroom copies of books. This grant will cover the costs of fiction and nonfiction books that pair with outdoor lessons. Half of classroom books will be distributed between our two committed partner schools, and the remainder will be distributed to teachers who participate in trainings. The Nature Center will retain

B.1. Supplies - Native Plants

Each partner school (2 total) will receive 100 plants for their schoolyard garden (\$2,400).

The Nature Center will give away native plant samples to non-partner schools at various trainings (\$720)

B.2. Equipment

Equipment priced out at average cost; multiple hoses are needed to accommodate distances from gardens to water sources at schools.

Project Objectives and Associated Activities & Outcome Measurements

Objective Title: Teacher Training

Objective Description:

Deliver 15 hours of schoolyard native garden teacher training to a minimum of 16 teachers from 7 schools.

Activity Title: Teacher Training 1: Pollination Investigation (6 hours)

Start Date: 09/02/2020

End Date: 09/09/2020

% of Budget: 20.0%

Activity Description:

Training will be designated for an introduction to schoolyard pollinators and native plants. Topics covered will be pollination biology; schoolyard garden wildlife habitats; foodchains; native plant contributions to health of the larger ecosystem.

Teachers will participate in sample activities using already established pollinator gardens and try their hand at some citizen science options that might be useful in their classrooms. All teachers will leave the session with materials to help facilitate outdoor learning, as well as curriculum.

Training will be provided by Nature Center education and land conservation staff.

Outcome Title: Teacher Training

Initial Outcome:

16-24 teachers from 7 schools will receive 6 hours of ecology and outdoor classroom instruction.

Long-Term Effects:

16-24 teachers will have expanded knowledge of local ecology and native plants, and will have the skills, desire, and necessary materials to create an outdoor classroom for students. Teachers will have expanded knowledge of local seed ecology that can be applied to classroom curriculum.

Activity Title: Teacher Training 2: All About Seeds (3 hours)

Start Date: 11/19/2020

End Date: 12/09/2020

% of Budget: 20.0%

Activity Description:

Training will be designated for seed ecology: harvesting seeds from plants; seed dispersal; seed/animal relationships; and garden extension for future years.

Training will be provided by Nature Center education and land conservation staff.

Outcome Title: Teacher Training 2

Initial Outcome:

16- 24 teachers from 7 schools will receive 3 hours of training in seed ecology.

Long-Term Effects:

16-24 teachers will have expanded knowledge of local seed ecology that can be applied to classroom curriculum.

Activity Title: Teacher Training 3: Schoolyard Pollinator Garden Forum (6 hours)

Start Date: 05/19/2021

End Date: 06/02/2021

% of Budget: 20.0%

Activity Description:

Training will be open to educators in all local districts who are interested in learning more about the fundamentals of creating a schoolyard native garden/outdoor learning space. Breakout sessions will be led by partner teachers, local naturalists, experienced schoolyard teachers, and other experts in the field. Instruction/breakout session topics are TBD.

Forum will be open to other organizations that may be interested in presenting or participating (Civic Garden Center has expressed interest). The Nature Center will provide a keynote speaker with the goal of attracting more teachers to the forum.

Teachers will have the opportunity to network and create relationships with others who have a common interest in schoolyard native gardens.

Outcome Title: Teacher Training 3

Initial Outcome:

25-30 teachers from multiple districts will participate in schoolyard native garden forum.

Long-Term Effects:

25-30 teachers will have expanded knowledge about the fundamentals of creating and utilizing a native garden as an outdoor learning space. They will understand the benefits of how an outdoor learning space can be applied across multiple classroom curriculums.

Objective Title: Schoolyard Native Plant Garden Design and Installation

Objective Description:

Design, install, and create maintenance plan for 2 schoolyard native gardens at 2 partner schools utilizing 200 plants from the Nature Center's Native Plant Greenhouse and Nursery.

Activity Title: Garden Design and Installation

Start Date: 09/23/2020

End Date: 10/14/2020

% of Budget: 20.0%

Activity Description:

Teachers and volunteers will design the schoolyard native garden at the beginning of the school year utilizing knowledge and materials gained from first teacher training.

Teachers, students (and possibly families) will assist with the installation of their schoolyard native garden alongside Nature Center staff and volunteers.

Outcome Title: Native Garden Installation

Initial Outcome:

4-8 teachers and 25-35 students at each partner school will participate in installing schoolyard native garden.

Long-Term Effects:

Schoolyard gardens will provide an outdoor learning space that will increase student awareness of local ecology; teachers will integrate native gardens learning experiences with science, math, ELA, and other curriculum. Students will connect to the outdoors, develop awareness of their own schoolyard/backyards, and develop a lifelong passion for nature and the environment.

Activity Title: Schoolyard Maintenance Visit/Spring Refresher and Weeding

Start Date: 04/21/2021

End Date: 05/04/2021

% of Budget: 20.0%

Activity Description:

Nature Center staff and volunteers will conduct a spring visit with each partner school and provide instruction about general native garden maintenance, summer maintenance, plant vs. weed identification, and troubleshoot general questions.

Teachers will be provided with the opportunity to ask questions and receive guidance about outdoor activities and classroom curriculum.

Outcome Title: Native Garden Spring Maintenance

Initial Outcome:

4-8 teachers and 25-35 students at each partner school will participate in spring native garden maintenance and refresher instruction.

Long-Term Effects:

Participants will understand the fundamentals of caring for their native garden long-term.

Budget Summary

Category	OEEF Grant % Total	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Match	Total
A.1. Salary or Wages	30.0	\$4,500.00	\$2,187.50	\$6,687.50
A.2. Benefits	0.0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
A.3. Substitute Teachers	18.0	\$2,750.00	\$700.00	\$3,450.00
B.1. Supplies	40.0	\$5,977.00	\$1,560.00	\$7,537.00
B.2. Equipment	6.0	\$930.00	\$0.00	\$930.00
B.3. Printing	3.0	\$425.00	\$0.00	\$425.00
B.4. Other Costs	2.0	\$351.00	\$700.00	\$1,051.00
C.1. Contractual	0.0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
D.1. Administrative	0.0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Budget		\$14,933.00	\$5,147.50	\$20,080.50

A.1. Salary or Wages

Employee Name	Title	Grant # of Hours	Grant Hourly Rate	Matching # of Hours	Matching Hourly Rate	Grant Annual Salary	Grant % of Salary	Matching Annual Salary	Matching % of Salary	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Matching Amount
Melissa Sabo	School Program Manager	180	\$20.00	70	\$20.00	\$0.00	0.0	\$0.00	0.0	\$3,600.00	\$1,400.00
Jake Sberna	Native Landscape Coordinator	40	\$22.50	35	\$22.50	\$0.00	0.0	\$0.00	0.0	\$900.00	\$787.50
Subtotal:										\$4,500.00	\$2,187.50

A.3. Substitute Teachers

Substitute Teachers Description	Personnel Name	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Matching Amount
Teacher Stipends Training 1	PARTNER Schools Teachers	\$600.00	\$0.00
Teacher Stipends Training 3	NON-Partner Schools Teachers	\$500.00	\$0.00
Teacher Stipends Training 1	NON-partner Schools	\$500.00	\$0.00
Teacher Stipends Training 3	PARTNER Schools Teachers	\$600.00	\$0.00
Teacher Stipends Training 2	NON-Partner Schools Teachers	\$250.00	\$0.00
Speaker Fees: Training 3 (Native Garden Forum)	Guest Speaker: TBD	\$0.00	\$700.00
Teacher Stipends Training 2	PARTNER Schools Teachers	\$300.00	\$0.00
Subtotal:		\$2,750.00	\$700.00

B.1. Supplies

Supplies Description	Quantity	Unit Price	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Matching Amount
Identification Booklets (plants and bugs)	30	\$13.00	\$390.00	\$0.00
Books for Ongoing Teacher Training (Staff Copies)	32	\$16.00	\$512.00	\$0.00
Curriculum Books: Monarchs and More (for Grades 3-6)	24	\$25.00	\$600.00	\$0.00
Bug Boxes (Wooden/Eco-friendly)	30	\$10.50	\$315.00	\$0.00
Garden Materials: Native Plants PARTNER School Installations	200	\$12.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
Garden Materials: Native Plants for NON-Partner Schools	60	\$12.00	\$360.00	\$360.00
Classroom Books: Permanent Classroom Copies	125	\$16.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00
Curriculum Books: Schoolyard Ecology Explorations	24	\$25.00	\$600.00	\$0.00
Subtotal:			\$5,977.00	\$1,560.00

B.2. Equipment

Equipment Description	Quantity	Unit Price	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Matching Amount
Rakes, Medium Duty	15	\$20.00	\$300.00	\$0.00
Hand Spades/Student Garden Materials	20	\$6.50	\$130.00	\$0.00
Hose, 100 Feet, Medium Duty	6	\$50.00	\$300.00	\$0.00
Metal Plant Labels	200	\$1.00	\$200.00	\$0.00
Subtotal:			\$930.00	\$0.00

B.3. Printing

Printing Description	Rate Description	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Matching Amount
Administrative Printing	500 sheets @ .20/sheet	\$125.00	\$0.00
Welcome to Your Pollinator Garden Packet	50 packets @ \$6 (printed materials, envelopes)	\$300.00	\$0.00
Subtotal:		\$425.00	\$0.00

B.4. Other Costs

Other Costs Description	OEEF Grant Amount	Applicant Matching Amount
Meals for Teacher Training	\$0.00	\$700.00
Staff Mileage: 650 miles @ .54	\$351.00	\$0.00
Subtotal:		\$351.00

Applicant Contact

Contact Type: Project Director	Job Title: School Program Manager
Name: Melissa Sabo	
Primary Phone: (513) 831-1711	Primary Fax:
Primary Email: msabo@cincynature.org	
Primary Address: 4949 Tealtown Road, Milford, OH 45150	
Alternate Phone:	Alternate Fax:
Alternate Email:	
Alternate Address:	
Alternate Start Date:	Alternate End Date:

Contact Type: Authorizing Agent	Job Title: Grants and Major Gifts Manager
Name: Mary Jo McClain	
Primary Phone: (513) 831-1711	Primary Fax:
Primary Email: mmccclain@cincynature.org	
Primary Address: 4949 Tealtown Road, Milford, OH 45150	
Alternate Phone:	Alternate Fax:
Alternate Email:	
Alternate Address:	
Alternate Start Date:	Alternate End Date:

Contact Type: Fiscal Agent	Job Title: Finance Director
Name: Maria Keri	
Primary Phone: (513) 831-1711	Primary Fax:
Primary Email: mkeri@cincynature.org	
Primary Address: 4949 Tealtown Road, Milford, OH 45150	
Alternate Phone:	Alternate Fax:
Alternate Email:	
Alternate Address:	
Alternate Start Date:	Alternate End Date:



12/3/19

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of Woodlawn Elementary, Princeton Schools and our students, I strongly support Cincinnati Nature Center in their new School Garden Native Planting Program for the 2020-2021 school year. We believe that getting students outside with the support of their teachers can deepen our existing curriculum and provide more authentic and rich learning experiences for our students.

Our job as educators is to create well-rounded students who will be life-long learners. To do this, it is essential we provide students with meaningful and engaging opportunities as well as more interdisciplinary experiences in order to meet this goal. Using nature experiences to connect subject areas with real life is a powerful way to reach students of all abilities and interest levels. A school pollinator garden will create a rich space for these explorations.

We also must make it a priority to provide our teachers with the necessary training and to create schoolyard experiences. To accomplish this, we intend to work with Cincinnati Nature Center and at least two other school districts to create a collaborative professional development experience for our teachers. This plan will require teacher representatives from each district to meet with Nature Center staff and invest 4-8 hours of planning time to ensure each district's needs are being met.

Our goal is to commit 3 teachers (3rd – 5th grade) who will work as a team during this experience. They will collaborate with other teachers from three districts to learn about natural history, develop a collection of schoolyard lessons using local plants and animals, and integrate science and literacy standards using themes from the natural world.

Woodlawn Elementary will commit to:

- Prepare and maintain the garden area before and after the planting with guidance from the Nature Center.
- Arranging date(s) for teaching staff and/or school families to assist with garden bed preparation and maintenance before and after the planting.
- Send 3 teachers (3rd – 5th grade) to the training series during the 2020-2021 school year.
 - The trainings will include a total of 2 six-hour sessions (August & June) and 1 three-hour session (November/December). All trainings will occur on weekends or non-school days.
- If funding and time allow, we also intend to send each of the participating classrooms on a field trip to Cincinnati Nature Center as a culminating experience in spring 2021.

We look forward to working with Cincinnati Nature Center and to further encouraging our teachers to use their classrooms, both outdoor and indoor, to provide authentic learning experiences.

Sincerely,

Sherry Thompson, Principal
Woodlawn Elementary School



January 13, 2020

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of Seipelt Elementary, Milford Schools and our students, I strongly support Cincinnati Nature Center in their new School Garden Native Planting Program for the 2020-2021 school year. We believe that getting students outside with the support of their teachers can deepen our existing curriculum and provide more authentic and rich learning experiences for our students.

Our job as educators is to create well-rounded students who will be life-long learners. To do this, it is essential we provide students with meaningful and engaging opportunities as well as more interdisciplinary experiences in order to meet this goal. Using nature experiences to connect subject areas with real life is a powerful way to reach students of all abilities and interest levels. A school pollinator garden will create a rich space for these explorations.

We also must make it a priority to provide our teachers with the necessary training and to create schoolyard experiences. To accomplish this, we intend to work with Cincinnati Nature Center and at least two other school districts to create a collaborative professional development experience for our teachers. This plan will require teacher representatives from each district to meet with Nature Center staff and invest 4-8 hours of planning time to be ensure each districts' needs are being met.

Our goal is to commit 3 teachers (3rd – 5th grade) who will work as a team during this experience. They will collaborate with other teachers from three districts to learn about natural history, develop a collection of schoolyard lessons using local plants and animals, and integrate science and literacy standards using themes from the natural world.

Seipelt Elementary will commit to:

- Purchasing/procuring soil amendments needed before the planting with guidance from the Nature Center.
- Purchasing/procuring mulch for a garden after installation.
- Arranging date(s) for teaching staff and/or school families to assist with garden bed preparation and maintenance before and after the planting.
- Committing 3 teachers (3rd – 5th grade) to the training series during the 2020-2021 school year.
 - The trainings will include a total of 2 six-hour sessions (August & June) and 1 three-hour session (November/December).

We look forward to working with Cincinnati Nature Center and to further encouraging our teachers to use their classrooms, both outdoor and indoor, to provide authentic learning experiences.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Melissa Carraher', is written above the printed name.

Melissa Carraher, Principal

OEEF Grant Staff Checklist

Application #: S-20G032
Application Type: GeneralGrant

Organization Name: Cincinnati Nature Center
Project Title: Schoolyard Native Plant Program

A. Overall

1. Yes Project eligible?
2. Yes Project meets which of OEEF's Educational Priorities: Education Encouraging Habitat Restoration
3. Yes Organization eligible?
4. N/A Initials of staff member who provided pre-review, if any

Overall Comments:

There are potential collaborators mentioned in the application that aren't on the cover sheet. Project targets teachers and mentions students as an audience. The proposal doesn't adequately explain student learning objectives and alignment with specific standards.

B. Application Cover Sheet

5. Yes Collaborators identified on cover sheet appear to be correct based on their role as described in the proposal
Comments: There are potential collaborators mentioned in the application that aren't on the cover sheet
6. Yes Time lines and start date are realistic and consistent with OEEF Guidelines
Comments: Not entered
7. Yes Grant duration 30 months or less
8. Yes Audience identified by applicant is correct for the project. If not, re-assign to audience: Not selected
9. 0 points Under-served Audience: Award 10 extra points if the proposed project targets a regulated community primary audience.
10. Yes List of counties identified by applicant appears correct based on activities in project description
Comments: 8: It seems that the project is focused on targeting elementary school teachers. Students are mentioned but the educational component for students is weak in the application. Standards are briefly mentioned but alignment with specific standards is lacking.
11. 0 points Under-served Counties: Award 5 points if the applicant organization is located in (OR all the proposed activities will take place in) a county/counties that OEEF has defined as under-served (i.e., where fewer than two grants have been awarded). Award 3 points if some of the proposed activities will take place in counties that OEEF has defined as under-served.
12. No Is this a revision of a previous application? (check last 2 cycles) If yes, OEEF ID#: Not entered
13. Yes Has applicant previously received OEEF grant(s)? If yes, OEEF ID#: 06M-018, S13G-052, F16G-015
14. No Was previous grant awarded in the past twelve months?
15. No Is any previous grant still open?
- Not selected If yes, is previous grant likely to close before the Council meeting for this current grant cycle?

C. Audience Categories and Project Issues

16. Comment if applicant appears to have made assignments in error
Comments: Not entered

D. Contact Information

17. Yes One person is not serving in all 3 roles (director, fiscal, authorizing)
Comments: Not entered

E. Project Description - Overall

18. Yes Project does not include political advocacy
19. Not selected Project includes adequate safeguards for any potentially dangerous activities
20. No If this is a K-12 formal education project, it includes specific examples or a satisfactory explanation of the process that will be used to align student learning activities with New Learning Standards
Comments: Mention of standards generally, but specific standards are lacking

F. Budget Narrative

21. No Itemized detail is provided
22. Yes Figures are accurate

G. Budget Spreadsheet

Personnel

23. Yes Salary
24. Not selected Benefits: Explanation of how calculated and % used for fringe.
25. Yes Stipends or Substitute: OEEF is not asked to pay for both for the same teacher for the same day

Comments on Personnel section of budget:

A lot of funds in budget going to stipends. Over the \$100 per day limit in the guidelines?

Non-Personnel

26. Yes Supplies: Identified, grouped, unit priced, and totaled
27. Yes Equipment: Itemized, grouped, unit priced and totaled
28. Yes Printing: Itemized, # of copies, unit price, and totaled
29. Yes Other: Categorized, method of calculation, and totaled

Comments on Non-Personnel section of budget:

Administrative printing item had a miscalculation: $500 \times 0.20 = \$100$ not \$125

Contractual

30. Not selected Name of party, organization, # of hours, hourly wage, total
31. Yes The combination of Personnel and Contractual costs does not exceed 35% of the budget. (If it does, add comment and note percentage)

Comments on Contractual section of budget:

Not entered

32. Yes There are no ineligible expenses
33. Yes There is no unacceptable pass-through of grant funds to a third party
34. No Overall, expenses are reasonable (if questionable, add comment)
- Comments: Stipend amount too much? See Personnel section.
35. 0 points Award five extra points if the applicant (with their collaborators) has provided a strong, well-documented cash or in-kind match that greatly exceeds 10% of the funds requested from OEEF. (Do not assign extra points for less than a 50% match)
- Comments: Not entered

H. Letters of Collaboration and Support

36. No Collaboration does not appear to be needed for this project to succeed
- Comments: Not entered
37. Yes If the project is collaborative, documentation letters have been received from all, partial or none of the collaborators
38. 0 points Award five extra points for projects with very strong, well-documented collaboration
- Comments: Not entered
39. 5 points Award five extra points if the applicant has provided documentation of support for the project from members or appropriate representatives of the target audience. (Letters or applications from teachers of the targeted grade level will meet this criteria for the pre-school to university audience. Letters or applications from an established trade or professional association will meet this criteria for the regulated community audience.)
- Comments: Not entered
40. Not selected Attachments, if any, are relevant to the applicant's ability to successfully complete the proposed project
41. Not selected Other
- Comments: Not entered

Checklist completed: Yes

Total Points Awarded: 5 out of 30

OEEF Grant Reviewer Score Sheet with Comments

Application #: S-20G032	Organization Name: Cincinnati Nature Center
Grant Type: GeneralGrant	Project Title: Schoolyard Native Plant Program
Primary Target Audience: Pre-school to University	Application Status: Scoring Complete

Reviewer 1

A. Audience Need (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The target audience is well described.	3	5
2. The need is a documented need of the target audience, not the applicant/provider organization.	3	5
3. The need for the project was determined in a valid way.	3	5
4. Meeting this need will yield substantial benefits to the target audience.	5	5
	14	20

Reviewer Comments on Need Statement:

The need appears to be with the teachers as target audience. The students secondarily benefit from what the teachers learn and share with them.

B. Organizational Qualifications (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The applicant organization and/or its collaborators are experienced and well-qualified to work with this audience.	5	5
2. 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	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Organizational Qualifications:

Not entered

C. Project Objectives (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The objectives define specifically who will benefit and what will be learned.	3	5
2. The objectives address the need of the target audience as presented in the Statement of Need.	3	5
3. The objectives are consistent with the mission of the applicant organization.	5	5
4. The objectives meet one of OEEF's educational priorities.	5	5
5. The objectives are measurable.	3	5
6. The objectives are realistic for the age group or audience being targeted.	5	5
7. The project does not appear to duplicate other available environmental education resources and programs.	5	5
	29	35

Reviewer Comments on Objectives:

The objectives are not very descriptive: Deliver 15 hours of teacher training & Garden design and installation

D. Project Activities (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project activities are specific, and the sequence of activities is appropriate.	3	5
2. The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated project objectives.	5	5
3. Reasonable steps are taken to ensure that the project information is scientifically valid and unbiased.	5	5
4. The project activities are (or will be) aligned with the Ohio Department of Education's Academic Content Standards for K-12 education. (for pre-school or university audience projects, award 5 points)	3	5
5. The activities are age-appropriate.	5	5
6. The project does more than disseminate information: learners will engage in hands-on activities, problem solving, and/or skill-building.	5	5
7. The project makes good use of existing environmental education materials, or provides good justification for the decision to develop new materials.	3	5

	29	35
Reviewer Comments on Activities:		
<i>Again, the activities are not very descriptive: 2 teacher workshops, one Forum, designing and installing garden and maintenance check. The grant mentions student programming for 2-3 grades at each school and the Tool kit includes "curriculum for student engagement" but there is no evidence that there is any type of curriculum being developed nor being aligned with ODE standards. It is also interesting that it is not until April/May during the Spring Maintenance that teachers can ask questions about outdoor activities and classroom curriculum.</i>		
E. Timetable (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The start and end dates are realistic for completion of the activities.	5	5
2. The start and end dates show that activities will be carried out in a logical sequence.	3	5
	8	10
Reviewer Comments on Timetable:		
<i>The timeline doesn't make sense to this reviewer. You are designing and installing the garden in the fall before the teachers have finished their training. You're also planting 100 plants in the fall. Are they all perennials?</i>		
F. Outcome Measurement (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The measurements are scientifically and educationally valid for determining if the project objectives were achieved.	3	5
2. The measurements describe success indicators, tools being used to measure, methods of analyzing the data, and who will be conducting the evaluation.	3	5
3. The measurements address both short-term and long-term effects of the project.	5	5
	11	15
Reviewer Comments on Outcome Measurements:		
<i>The measurements you use are counting the number of participants at the training sessions. Would additional feedback about the training sessions be useful to you? How can you scientifically measure this information?</i>		
G. Continuation/Replication Plan (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project includes a realistic plan for sharing the results with other educators.	5	5
2. The plan describes how the project can continue once OEEF funding ends.	5	5
3. The plan describes how the project can serve as a model for replication with similar audiences.	5	5
	15	15
Reviewer Comments on Continuation/Replication Plan:		
<i>Not entered</i>		
H. Budget (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The budget table and narrative clearly explain all expenditures to be funded by the OEEF.	3	5
2. The budget is appropriate for this type of project.	5	5
3. 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	5
4. 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	5
	18	20
Reviewer Comments on Budget:		
<i>The budget description is a not as complete as it could be. The Salary/Stipend component is 48% which is nearly the majority of the budget.</i>		
I. Discretionary Points (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
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.	5	10

Reviewer Comments on Awarding of Discretionary Points:

This reviewer thinks it is very important to get students outside to enhance their learning and awareness of their environment. Their involvement in creating the Native Garden for their school is very special and is a place that they can return to observe. Outdoor spaces can be used for so much inquiry and interdisciplinary studies. I hope that you will develop or assemble curricula that demonstrates how this garden will be used as a teaching tool.

Total points awarded by reviewer 1: 139 out of 170

Reviewer 2

A. Audience Need (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The target audience is well described.	3	5
2. The need is a documented need of the target audience, not the applicant/provider organization.	3	5
3. The need for the project was determined in a valid way.	3	5
4. Meeting this need will yield substantial benefits to the target audience.	3	5
	12	20

Reviewer Comments on Need Statement:

The target audience says Primary 3-5, but the main focus of the application is on the teachers rather than the students. While the teachers may benefit from the training, it's unclear how their learning will translate to greater student achievement.

B. Organizational Qualifications (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The applicant organization and/or its collaborators are experienced and well-qualified to work with this audience.	5	5
2. 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	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Organizational Qualifications:

Key personnel have expertise resulting from past experience.

C. Project Objectives (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The objectives define specifically who will benefit and what will be learned.	3	5
2. The objectives address the need of the target audience as presented in the Statement of Need.	3	5
3. The objectives are consistent with the mission of the applicant organization.	5	5
4. The objectives meet one of OEEF's educational priorities.	3	5
5. The objectives are measurable.	5	5
6. The objectives are realistic for the age group or audience being targeted.	5	5
7. The project does not appear to duplicate other available environmental education resources and programs.	5	5
	29	35

Reviewer Comments on Objectives:

Clarity needed on the audience - teachers or students. It's clear teachers will grow from the workshop but expected results are very output based (holding trainings, number of attendees, number of gardens) rather than outcome based (changes in instructional strategies or confidence teaching with outdoor environments, changes in student achievement and/or environmental awareness). Objectives focus on teachers, yet students identified as audience. If so, then objectives don't adequately address student learning.

D. Project Activities (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project activities are specific, and the sequence of activities is appropriate.	3	5
2. The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated project objectives.	3	5
3. Reasonable steps are taken to ensure that the project information is scientifically valid and unbiased.	5	5
4. The project activities are (or will be) aligned with the Ohio Department of Education's Academic Content Standards for K-12 education. (for pre-school or university audience projects, award 5 points)	0	5
5. The activities are age-appropriate.	5	5
6. The project does more than disseminate information: learners will engage in hands-on activities, problem solving, and/or skill-building.	5	5
7. The project makes good use of existing environmental education materials, or provides good justification for the decision to develop new materials.	5	5
	26	35

Reviewer Comments on Activities:

Mention of alignment of activities with academic standards is broad. Identifying specific standards at each grade level would improve understanding of what content could be address using outdoor gardens. Not clear from activity descriptions when trainings will be held (during school days or not). Additional details on the scope of attendees would be helpful; appears as if teachers from multiple districts have the opportunity to attend trainings but only those from two specific schools will have a chance to construct gardens (and that decision has already been made). Assuming attendees would have to commit to all three trainings (maybe 2 if they choose not to come to the forum?). Budget lists classroom books (great idea) but not articulated when/how/who receives them. Samples of titles would help with understanding their role in supporting learning.

E. Timetable (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The start and end dates are realistic for completion of the activities.	5	5
2. The start and end dates show that activities will be carried out in a logical sequence.	5	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Timetable:

Logical sequence for training and garden installation; using best practice by extending and following up with professional learning.

F. Outcome Measurement (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The measurements are scientifically and educationally valid for determining if the project objectives were achieved.	3	5
2. The measurements describe success indicators, tools being used to measure, methods of analyzing the data, and who will be conducting the evaluation.	3	5
3. The measurements address both short-term and long-term effects of the project.	0	5
	6	15

Reviewer Comments on Outcome Measurements:

As written, the initial outcomes are really just restating the activities. What's labeled as long-term effects are really initial outcomes. Long term effects could have really described the connection between the teacher learning and implementation with students. Post-evaluation of teachers is mentioned but not pre-assessment (so change in knowledge, attitude, behavior can be measured). Garden tool kit will be created, but when/by whom? Appears to be a grant deliverable but no mention of it in activities. Evaluation of best suited native plants is good for garden structure but likely won't contribute to evaluation of the actual overall project.

G. Continuation/Replication Plan (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project includes a realistic plan for sharing the results with other educators.	3	5
2. The plan describes how the project can continue once OEEF funding ends.	3	5
3. The plan describes how the project can serve as a model for replication with similar audiences.	0	5
	6	15

Reviewer Comments on Continuation/Replication Plan:

The Welcome to Your Pollinator Garden tool kit could be an effective idea, but the work to do doesn't seem realistic given the timeline (this would all have to come after the trainings and garden installations). It has the potential to become a model for others but that doesn't seem to be articulated in the scope of the work. No mention of how to continue adding schools where teachers are trained and additional gardens are installed. The third training (forum) mentions showcasing work to others, but it's hard to envision what that will look like if teacher participants are learning and showcasing simultaneously.

H. Budget (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The budget table and narrative clearly explain all expenditures to be funded by the OEEF.	3	5
2. The budget is appropriate for this type of project.	3	5
3. 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	5
4. 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	5
	16	20

Reviewer Comments on Budget:

It's unclear how stipends will be allocated. Activities describe 16-24 teachers at each training. What are the stipend amounts? 20 teachers at \$50/teacher for Training 1 = \$1000. Would stipend amount be reduced if there are 24 teachers? Training 3 suggests even more teachers; will every attendee receive a stipend or just presenting teachers? Though not expressed anywhere, providing stipends rather than sub coverage suggests trainings will be on weekends and/or summer. Examples of classroom books to be purchased could be listed in the justification to get a better understanding of the content connections.

I. Discretionary Points (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
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.		10
		10
Reviewer Comments on Awarding of Discretionary Points:		
Not entered		

Total points awarded by reviewer 2: 115 out of 170

Reviewer 3

A. Audience Need (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The target audience is well described.	3	5
2. The need is a documented need of the target audience, not the applicant/provider organization.	0	5
3. The need for the project was determined in a valid way.	0	5
4. Meeting this need will yield substantial benefits to the target audience.	0	5
	3	20

Reviewer Comments on Need Statement:

Audience need not determined. No alignment of learning standards or examples.

B. Organizational Qualifications (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The applicant organization and/or its collaborators are experienced and well-qualified to work with this audience.	5	5
2. 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	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Organizational Qualifications:

Organization is well qualified and has expertise to complete project.

C. Project Objectives (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The objectives define specifically who will benefit and what will be learned.	3	5
2. The objectives address the need of the target audience as presented in the Statement of Need.	0	5
3. The objectives are consistent with the mission of the applicant organization.	5	5
4. The objectives meet one of OEEF's educational priorities.	0	5
5. The objectives are measurable.	3	5
6. The objectives are realistic for the age group or audience being targeted.	3	5
7. The project does not appear to duplicate other available environmental education resources and programs.	5	5
	19	35

Reviewer Comments on Objectives:

Objectives lack detail to gain a real understanding of who is going to benefit, what is going to be done, and how it will be evaluated. No real connection to audience need. Be specific and describe what you will be doing, how you will be doing it, and what will be learned by the target audience. Connect to statement of need.

D. Project Activities (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project activities are specific, and the sequence of activities is appropriate.	5	5
2. The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated project objectives.	3	5
3. Reasonable steps are taken to ensure that the project information is scientifically valid and unbiased.	0	5
4. The project activities are (or will be) aligned with the Ohio Department of Education's Academic Content Standards for K-12 education. (for pre-school or university audience projects, award 5 points)	0	5
5. The activities are age-appropriate.	5	5
6. The project does more than disseminate information: learners will engage in hands-on activities, problem solving, and/or skill-building.	3	5
7. The project makes good use of existing environmental education materials, or provides good justification for the decision to develop new materials.	0	5
	16	35

Reviewer Comments on Activities:

Major emphasis is on trainings. This is necessary but suggest providing examples as to how teachers/schools can use the garden spaces in their curriculum to help them teach and help students learn and develop skills.

E. Timetable (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The start and end dates are realistic for completion of the activities.	5	5
2. The start and end dates show that activities will be carried out in a logical sequence.	5	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Timetable:

Reasonable to complete within described timetable.

F. Outcome Measurement (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The measurements are scientifically and educationally valid for determining if the project objectives were achieved.	0	5
2. The measurements describe success indicators, tools being used to measure, methods of analyzing the data, and who will be conducting the evaluation.	0	5
3. The measurements address both short-term and long-term effects of the project.	0	5
	0	15

Reviewer Comments on Outcome Measurements:

No criteria to determine success of program are provided.

G. Continuation/Replication Plan (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project includes a realistic plan for sharing the results with other educators.	5	5
2. The plan describes how the project can continue once OEEF funding ends.	3	5
3. The plan describes how the project can serve as a model for replication with similar audiences.	5	5
	13	15

Reviewer Comments on Continuation/Replication Plan:

A general idea of how the program can be continued is included: "how-to" guide, "tool kit", plant "packages". I particularly like the idea of garden template designs that can be used by other schools.

H. Budget (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The budget table and narrative clearly explain all expenditures to be funded by the OEEF.	3	5
2. The budget is appropriate for this type of project.	5	5
3. 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)	3	5
4. 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	5
	16	20

Reviewer Comments on Budget:

Budget is appropriate. Part of budget narrative (B.1. Supplies - Books) is missing the remainder of a description. Narrative for stipends needs to be clarified. What is the rate? Can trainings be done on Saturdays and pay participating teachers stipends (and avoid paying for substitutes)? This part of budget needs to have more explanation.

I. Discretionary Points (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
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.		10
		10

Reviewer Comments on Awarding of Discretionary Points:

Not entered

Total points awarded by reviewer 3: 87 out of 170

Reviewer 4

A. Audience Need (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The target audience is well described.	3	5
2. The need is a documented need of the target audience, not the applicant/provider organization.	3	5
3. The need for the project was determined in a valid way.	3	5
4. Meeting this need will yield substantial benefits to the target audience.	3	5
	12	20

Reviewer Comments on Need Statement:

the letters of support and the application point out what we have learned from "Last Child in the Woods" that the outdoors is beneficial for everyone. I don't know that a native garden is the answer for that, it can be as simple as a walk around the schoolyard, or woods if there is some on the property. There's more to caring for a garden than checking on it each season.

B. Organizational Qualifications (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The applicant organization and/or its collaborators are experienced and well-qualified to work with this audience.	5	5
2. 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	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Organizational Qualifications:

Staff involved are qualified.

C. Project Objectives (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The objectives define specifically who will benefit and what will be learned.	3	5
2. The objectives address the need of the target audience as presented in the Statement of Need.	3	5
3. The objectives are consistent with the mission of the applicant organization.	5	5
4. The objectives meet one of OEEF's educational priorities.	5	5
5. The objectives are measurable.	3	5
6. The objectives are realistic for the age group or audience being targeted.	3	5
7. The project does not appear to duplicate other available environmental education resources and programs.	0	5
	22	35

Reviewer Comments on Objectives:

I think the nature center could do most of this at their site. And from their description of some of their programs, they would be duplicating at the schools, but I think the results could be better at their site.

D. Project Activities (up to 35 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project activities are specific, and the sequence of activities is appropriate.	5	5
2. The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated project objectives.	5	5
3. Reasonable steps are taken to ensure that the project information is scientifically valid and unbiased.	3	5
4. The project activities are (or will be) aligned with the Ohio Department of Education's Academic Content Standards for K-12 education. (for pre-school or university audience projects, award 5 points)	3	5
5. The activities are age-appropriate.	5	5
6. The project does more than disseminate information: learners will engage in hands-on activities, problem solving, and/or skill-building.	5	5
7. The project makes good use of existing environmental education materials, or provides good justification for the decision to develop new materials.	3	5
	29	35

Reviewer Comments on Activities:

You have planned the next step before knowing how it will work with the first project. Parts of the application seem like this grant will benefit the center as much as the children.

E. Timetable (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The start and end dates are realistic for completion of the activities.	5	5
2. The start and end dates show that activities will be carried out in a logical sequence.	5	5
	10	10

Reviewer Comments on Timetable:

Planting in August could be tricky if there's a heat wave.

F. Outcome Measurement (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The measurements are scientifically and educationally valid for determining if the project objectives were achieved.	0	5
2. The measurements describe success indicators, tools being used to measure, methods of analyzing the data, and who will be conducting the evaluation.	0	5
3. The measurements address both short-term and long-term effects of the project.	0	5
	0	15

Reviewer Comments on Outcome Measurements:

I did not see any explanations of determining outcomes, measuring success to me initially would be the plants surviving the first year. The science standards for grades 3 and 4 do not mention plants, plantlife, however you may be able to get them with some creative thinking and planning for the project. Perennial gardens are a HUGE project, there is more to planting the plants and checking on them in the spring. The plan for all this sounds so simple, but it isn't. The classes you are sending the teachers to sound great, but I question their commitment to the gardens, when it's hot no one wants to weed, and you will get weeds. And that sounds simplified too, but I have experience with native gardens at my work and there are days I should be out there dealing with them, and I'm too busy, stuck inside with paperwork. I am all for native gardens, love native plants, and I know all the hard work that goes with them.

G. Continuation/Replication Plan (up to 15 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The project includes a realistic plan for sharing the results with other educators.	3	5
2. The plan describes how the project can continue once OEEF funding ends.	3	5
3. The plan describes how the project can serve as a model for replication with similar audiences.	5	5
	11	15

Reviewer Comments on Continuation/Replication Plan:

word of mouth seems to be the way you think this will spread. Your success here should spur replication. but the schools will need several teachers committed to the project and not everyone feels comfortable with plants.

H. Budget (up to 20 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
1. The budget table and narrative clearly explain all expenditures to be funded by the OEEF.	5	5
2. The budget is appropriate for this type of project.	3	5
3. 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)	3	5
4. 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	5
	16	20

Reviewer Comments on Budget:

The cost of plants seems high to me. If you went to a garden center and purchased a gallon potted perennial, I don't think they would all be \$12.

I. Discretionary Points (up to 10 points)	Points Awarded	Maximum Score
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.		10

Reviewer Comments on Awarding of Discretionary Points:

Not entered

Total points awarded by reviewer 4: 110 out of 170