

**NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE/WFD
AMERICORPS APPLICATION SUMMARY SCORE FORM**

SFN - 59540

2015 – 2016 North Dakota *AmeriCorps*

Reviewer Name: *Name*

Page 1 of 12

Narratives	Maximum Point Values		Points Awarded	
Executive Summary:	0		0	
1. Rationale and Approach/Project Design (50pts)				
a) Problem/Need	9			
b) Theory of Change & Logic Model	17			
c) Evidence Base	8			
d) Notice Priority	3			
e) Member Training	4			
f) Member Supervision	3			
g) Member Experience	3			
h) Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification	3			
2. Organizational Capability (25pts)	Existing Program	New Program	Existing Program	New Program
a) Organizational Background and Staffing	7	10		
b) Compliance and Accountability	11	15		
c) Past Performance for Current and Former Grantees	7	NA		
3. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (25pts)				
a) Cost Effectiveness	18			
b) Budget Adequacy	7			
Total Points	100			
Applicant's Legal Name:				
Project Title:				
Reviewed By:	Date:			

1. RATIONALE AND APPROACH/PROJECT DESIGN (Continued)

c) Evidence Base Scoring Rubric

No evidence (0 points) means that the applicant has not provided evidence that they have collected any qualitative or quantitative data to date.

Pre-preliminary evidence (1 point) means the applicant presents evidence that it has collected quantitative or qualitative data from program staff, program participants, or beneficiaries that have been used for program improvement, performance measurement reporting, and/or tracking. An example could be gathering feedback from program participants following their receipt of the intervention.

Preliminary evidence (2 points) means the applicant presents an initial evidence base that can support conclusions about the program's contribution to observed outcomes. The evidence base consists of at least one non-experimental study conducted on the proposed program (or another similar program that uses a comparable intervention). A study that demonstrates improvement in program beneficiaries over time on one or more intended outcomes OR an implementation (process evaluation) study used to learn and improve program operations would constitute preliminary evidence. Examples of research that meet the standards include: 1) outcome studies that track program beneficiaries through a service pipeline and measure beneficiaries' responses at the end of the program; and 2) pre- and post-test research that determines whether beneficiaries have improved on an intended outcome.

Moderate evidence (4 points) means the applicant presents a reasonably developed evidence base that can support causal conclusions for the specific program proposed by the applicant with moderate confidence. The evidence base consists of one or more quasi-experimental studies conducted on the proposed program (or another similar program that uses a comparable intervention) with positive findings on one or more intended outcomes OR two or more non-experimental studies conducted on the proposed program with positive findings on one or more intended outcomes OR one or more experimental studies of another relevant program that uses a similar intervention. Examples of research that meet the standards include: well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies that compare outcomes between the group receiving the intervention and a matched comparison group (i.e. a similar population that does not receive the intervention).

Strong evidence (8 points) means the applicant presents an evidence base that can support causal conclusions for the specific program proposed by the applicant with the highest level of confidence. This consists of one or more well-designed and well-implemented experimental studies conducted on the proposed program with positive findings on one or more intended outcomes.

The description of evidence in this section should include as much detailed information as possible. Applicants are advised to focus on presenting high-quality evidence from their strongest studies rather than only cursory descriptions of many studies. Reviewers will examine criteria that may include: a) how closely the program model evaluated in the studies matches the one proposed by the applicant; b) the methodological quality of the studies presented (e.g., statistical power, internal and/or external validity, sample size, etc.); c) the recency of the studies, with a preference towards studies that have been conducted within the last six years; and d) strength of the findings, with preference given to findings that show a large and persistent positive effect on participants demonstrated with confidence levels.

1. RATIONALE AND APPROACH/PROJECT DESIGN (Continued)

d) Notice Priority	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
<p>1) The applicant clearly describes how its proposed program is within one or more of the 2015 AmeriCorps funding priorities listed in the Notice of Funding Opportunity. http://www.nationalservice.gov/documents/main-menu/2014/2015-notice-funding-opportunity ; and</p> <p>2) The applicant clearly describes how the proposed program meets all of the requirements listed in the Notice of Funding Opportunity and in the Glossary. http://www.nationalservice.gov/documents/main-menu/2014/2015-nofo-glossary</p>	3	
Sub-Total Points		
e) Member Training	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
<p>1) The applicant clearly describes how members will receive high quality training to provide effective service.</p>	2	
<p>2) The applicant clearly describes how members and volunteers will be aware of, and will adhere to, the rules including prohibited activities listed in the 2014 AmeriCorps State and National Grant Provisions. https://egrants.cns.gov/provisions/RevisedFinal2014AmeriCorpsGrantProvisions_20141001.pdf</p>	2	
Sub-Total Points	4	
f) Member Supervision	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
<p>1) The applicant clearly describes how members will receive high quality guidance and support from their supervisor to provide effective service.</p>	1	
<p>2) The applicant clearly describes how supervisors will be adequately trained/prepared to follow AmeriCorps and program regulations, priorities, and expectations.</p>	1	
<p>3) The applicant clearly describes how supervisors will provide members with excellent guidance and support throughout their service.</p>	1	
Sub-Total Points	3	

1. RATIONALE AND APPROACH/PROJECT DESIGN (Continued)

g) Member Experience	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
<p>1) AmeriCorps members will gain skills and experience as a result of their training and service that can be utilized and will be valued by future employers after their service term is completed; and 2) The applicant clearly describes how AmeriCorps members will have access to meaningful service experiences and opportunities for reflection.</p>	1	
<p>3) The applicant clearly describes how AmeriCorps members will have opportunities to establish connections with each other and the broader National Service network to build esprit de corps; and 4) The applicant clearly describes how AmeriCorps members will develop an ethic of and skills for active and productive citizenship and will be encouraged to continue to engage in public and community service after their AmeriCorps term.</p>	1	
<p>5) The applicant clearly describes how the program will recruit AmeriCorps members from the communities in which the programs operate.</p>	1	
Sub-Total Points	3	
h) Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification		
<p>1) The applicant clearly describes how members will know they are AmeriCorps members.</p>	1	
<p>2) The applicant clearly describes how the staff and community members where the members are serving will know they are AmeriCorps members.</p>	1	
<p>3) The applicant clearly describes how AmeriCorps members will be provided with and will wear service gear that prominently displays the AmeriCorps logo daily.</p>	1	
Sub-Total Points	3	

1. RATIONALE AND APPROACH/PROJECT DESIGN (Continued)

Reviewer Comment Section: 1. Rationale and Approach/Project Design

- d) Notice Priority**
- e) Member Training**
- f) Member Supervision**
- g) Member Experience**
- h) Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification**

Strengths: (Note exceptional areas where the applicant presented innovative strategies & design)

Weaknesses: (Specifically address any areas where points were not awarded)

2. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY

Follow the Maximum Assigned Point Values for Existing and New Programs	Maximum Point Values		Points Awarded	
	Existing	New	Existing	New
a) Organizational Background and Staffing				
1) The applicant clearly describes how the organization has the experience, staffing, and management structure to plan and implement the proposed program.	2	3		
2) The applicant clearly describes how the organization has adequate experience administering AmeriCorps grants or other federal grants.	2	3		
3) The applicant clearly describes how the organization has sufficiently engaged community members and partner organizations in planning and implementing its intervention.	3	4		
Sub-Total Points	7	10		
b) Compliance and Accountability				
1) The applicant clearly describes how the applicant’s organization, in implementation and management of its AmeriCorps program, will prevent and detect compliance issues.	5	7		
2) The applicant clearly describes how the applicant will hold itself and service site locations (if applicable) accountable if instances of risk or noncompliance are identified.	3	4		
3) The applicant clearly describes how the organization will comply with AmeriCorps rules and regulations including those related to prohibited and unallowable activities at the grantee, subgrantee, and service site locations (if applicable).	3	4		
Sub-Total Points	11	15		

2. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY (Continued)

c) Past Performance for Current Grantees and Former Grantees Only. (<u>Applicants that have received competitive or formula funding for the same project in any of the past three years must address this criteria</u>)	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
1) The applicant clearly describes how it has met performance measurement targets during the last three years of program operations, or, if not, has an adequate corrective action plan in place.	2	
2) The applicant clearly describes how it achieved 100% member enrollment, in the most recent full year of program operations, or if not, has an adequate corrective action plan in place.	2	
3) The applicant clearly describes how it achieved 100% member retention, in the most recent full year of program operations, or, if not, has an adequate corrective action plan in place.	2	
4) The applicant clearly describes any compliance issues or areas of weakness/risk identified during the last three years of program operations (if applicable) and describes an effective corrective action plan that was implemented.	1	
Sub-Total Points	7	

<p>Reviewer Comment Section: 2. Organizational Capability</p> <p>a) Organizational Background and Staffing</p> <p>b) Compliance and Accountability</p> <p>c) Past Performance for Current Grantees and Former Grantees Only</p>
<p>Strengths: (Note exceptional areas where the applicant presented innovative strategies & design)</p>
<p>Weaknesses: (Specifically address any areas where points were not awarded)</p>

3. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy

a) Cost Effectiveness	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
1) The budget is sufficient to carry out the program effectively.	4	
2) The budget aligns with the applicant’s narrative.	4	
3) The program design is cost effective and the benefits justify the cost.	4	
4) The applicant has raised or describes an adequate plan to raise non-CNCS resources to fully support the program.	4	
5) The applicant, if re-competing, has a lower cost per Member Service Year (MSY – see Glossary) than approved in previous grants, or provides a compelling rationale for the same or increased cost including why this increase could not be covered by the grantee share.	2	
Sub-Total Points	18	
b) Budget Adequacy	Maximum Point Values	Points Awarded
1) Budget is submitted without mathematical errors.	1	
2) Budget is submitted with <u>adequate information to assess how each line item is calculated.</u>	3	
3) Budget is in compliance with the budget instructions.	3	
Sub-Total Points	7	
Reviewer Comment Section: 3. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy		
Strengths: (Note exceptional areas where the applicant presented innovative strategies & design)		
Weaknesses: (Specifically address any areas where points were not awarded)		

Strengths: (Specifically address each one of the three major sections and highlight notable areas that were clearly written and included strong program design in relation to proposed program performance measures)

Weaknesses: (Specifically address each one of the three major section(s) beginning with the section where