



Grant Review Worksheet

Thank you very much for your interest and participation in our AmeriCorps funding process. Reviewers are able to utilize the expertise of their field, critical thinking skills, and an outside view. We appreciate your complete and in-depth critique of the application using the application and the review worksheet below. Reviewers must have their scores and be prepared to comment on the application and to accept or deny funding, by our conference call _____ pm, and prepare recommendations for the Commissioners.

- 1. Competitive Application:**
- 2. Grant Review Worksheet (Program Design and Organizational Capability Section)**
- 3. Conflict of Interest Form:** In order to ensure an impartial critique, reviewers are not permitted to review applications from individuals or organizations with whom you have been connected as outlined in the Conflict of Interest and Privacy Statement provided to you. Any reviewer with a conflict of interest is excused from the presentation, discussion and voting on that application.
- 4. Additional Important Materials:** In addition to the documents above, please review the documents called "Sentence Starts," "Reviewers Handbook," "Taproot In-kind Worksheet," and "In-kind Voucher."

If you are missing or misplace any of these documents, please contact us at **307-234-3428**

ACProgram@serveyoming.org.

Program Design: (Theory of Change, Evidence Base/Quality, and Member Experience) 50 POINTS	
<i>To what degree does the applicant demonstrates how AmeriCorps members are particularly well-suited to solving the identified community problem.</i>	Score
<p>THEORY OF CHANGE: 0-24 POINTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed intervention is responsive to the identified community problem. ● The applicant’s proposed intervention is clearly articulated including the design, dosage, target population, and roles of AmeriCorps members and (if applicable) leveraged volunteers. ● The applicant’s intervention is likely to lead to the outcomes identified in the applicant’s theory of change. ● The expected outcomes articulated in the application narrative represent meaningful progress in addressing the community problem identified by the applicant. ● The rationale for utilizing AmeriCorps members to deliver the intervention(s) is reasonable. ● The service role of AmeriCorps members will produce significant contributions to existing efforts to address the stated problem. 	0-24
COMMENTS ON THEORY OF CHANGE:	

ServeWyoming Application Review Worksheet

<p>EVIDENCE TIER: 0-12 POINTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Applicant clearly describes what tier of evidence they have assigned to their intervention (Strong, Moderate, Preliminary, or Pre-Preliminary)● Applicant clearly describes characteristics of the beneficiary population● Applicant clearly describes characteristics of the population delivering the intervention● Applicant clearly describes the dosage (frequency, duration) and design of the intervention● Applicant clearly describes the context in which the intervention is delivered● Outcomes of the intervention are clearly described.● In the Evidence Tier section of the application narrative, applicants must (1) summarize the study design and key findings of any evaluation report(s) submitted and (2) describe any other evidence that supports their program, including past performance measure data and/or other research studies that inform their program design. Applicants who submit evaluation reports for consideration must also describe in the Evidence Tier section of the application narrative how the intervention described in the submitted reports is the same as the intervention described in the application.	0-12
<p>COMMENTS on EVIDENCE TIER:</p>	
<p>EVIDENCE QUALITY: 0-8 POINTS</p> <p>Reviewers will score the narrative provided in the Evidence Tier section of the application using the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● The applicant uses relevant evidence, including past performance measure data and/or cited research studies, to inform their proposed program design;● The described evidence is relatively recent, preferably from the last six years;● The evidence described by the applicant indicates a meaningful positive effect on program beneficiaries in at least one key outcome of interest.	0-8
<p>COMMENTS ON EVIDENCE QUALITY:</p>	

ServeWyoming Application Review Worksheet

<p>MEMBER EXPERIENCE: 6 POINTS (NOT APPLICABLE TO PLANNING GRANTS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AmeriCorps members will gain skills 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. The program will recruit AmeriCorps members from the geographic or demographic communities in which the programs operate. The applicant will foster an inclusive service culture where different backgrounds, talents, and capabilities are welcomed and leveraged for learning and effective service delivery. 	0-6
<p>COMMENTS ON MEMBER EXPERIENCE</p>	
<p>TOTAL SCORE for PROGRAM DESIGN (MAXIMUM= 50)</p>	

<p>ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY: 25 POINTS <i>Assess the extent to which the applicant demonstrates organizational background, staffing, sustainability, compliance and accountability.</i></p>	Score
<p>ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND AND STAFFING: 9 POINTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization details the roles, responsibilities, and structure of the staff that will be implementing the AmeriCorps program as well as providing oversight and monitoring for the program. 	0-9

SUMMARIZE YOUR FINAL SCORES HERE:

PROGRAM DESIGN (50):	
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (25)	
TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROPOSAL (1-75):	

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

Please make an overall recommendation (check the box below) for the next steps for this proposal. Please ensure that your overall rating is in alignment with your analysis and comments in the worksheet sections.

Strongly Recommend for Further Review	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with numerous strengths
Recommend for Further Review	A proposal that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support; it has some weaknesses.
Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation	A proposal with strengths and weaknesses approximately equal. However, as a whole, the weaknesses are not offset by strengths.
Do Not Recommend for Further Review	A proposal with serious shortcomings. There are numerous weaknesses and fewer strengths.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Recommend for Further Review | (total score between 68 and 75) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend for Further Review | (total score between 60 and 67) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation | (total score between 53 and 59) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend for Further Review | (total score 52 or below) |