



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 on ______, and prepare recommendations for the Commissioners.

1. Competitive Application:

the identified community problem.

- 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 ServeWyoming at any time:

 307-234-3428/ ACProgram@servewyoming.org

Program Design: (Theory of Change, Logic Model, Evidence Base/Quality, and Member Experience)
50 POINTS

To what degree does the applicant demonstrate how AmeriCorps members are particularly well-suited to solving | Score

THEORY OF CHANGE: 0-24 POINTS	0-24
 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. 	
COMMENTS ON THEORY OF CHANGE:	

	ServeWyoming	Application	Review	Worksheet
--	--------------	--------------------	--------	-----------

Logic Model

The Logic Model depicts	Score 1-5
 A summary of the community problem The inputs or resources that are necessary to deliver the intervention, including, but not limited to: Locations or sites where members will provide services. Number of AmeriCorps members who will deliver the intervention. The core activities that define the intervention or program model that members will implement or deliver, including: Duration of intervention (e.g., total # of weeks, sessions) Dosage of intervention (e.g., number of hours per session, or sessions per week) Target population for the intervention (e.g., disconnected youth, third graders at a certain reading proficiency level) The measure able outputs that result from delivering the intervention (i.e. number of beneficiaries served, types and number of activities conducted); if applicable, identified National Performance Measures to be used as output indicators. Outcomes that demonstrate changes in knowledge/skill, attitude/behavior, or condition as a result of invention; if applicable, identified National Performance Measures to be used as outcome indicators 	
Comments on The Logic Model including both strengths and weaknesses:	

ServeWyoming Application Review Worksheet Total Score for Organizational Capacity (Maximum = 5)

EVIDENCE TIER: 0-12 POINTS	0-12
 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.	
COMMENTS on EVIDENCE TIER:	

EVIDENCE QUALITY: o-8 POINTS	o-8
Reviewers will score the narrative provided in the Evidence Tier section of the application using the following	
standards:	
 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.	
COMMENTS ON EVIDENCE QUALITY:	
MEMBER EXPERIENCE: 6 POINTS	0-6
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.	

COMMENTS ON MEMBER EXPERIENCE	
TOTAL SCORE for PROGRAM DESIGN	
(MAXIMUM= 50)	
OPCANIZATIONAL CAPACITY: 25 POINTS	Score
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY: 25 POINTS Assess the extent to which the applicant demonstrates organizational background, staffing, sustainability,	2016
compliance and accountability.	

ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND AND STAFFING: 9 POINTS	0-9
 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. 	
COMPLIANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY: 8 POINTS	0-8
 The organization has a monitoring and oversight plan to prevent and detect non-compliance and enforce compliance with AmeriCorps rules and regulations including those related to prohibited and unallowable activities and criminal history checks at the grantee, subgrantee (if applicable), and service site locations. The CNCS-required evaluation report meets CNCS requirements (if applicable), The CNCS-required evaluation report is of satisfactory quality (if applicable). 	
CULTURE THAT VALUES LEARNING: 4 POINTS	0-4
 The applicant's board, management, and staff collect and use information, including performance data, for learning and decision making. 	
MEMBER SUPERVISION: 4 POINTS	0-4
 AmeriCorps members will receive sufficient guidance and support from their supervisor to provide effective service. AmeriCorps supervisors will be adequately trained/prepared to follow AmeriCorps and program regulations, priorities, and expectations. 	
COMMENTS ON ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (ALL SECTIONS):	
TOTAL SCORE for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY	
(MAXIMUM= 25)	

SUMMARY WORKSHEETS

After completing analysis, please complete this summary section and email this and the typed comment sectior	ıs
above to ACProgram@servewyoming.org.	

1.	Having reviewed all elements of the proposal provided to you, do you think that this applicant would be an effective AmeriCorps program? Why or why not? Please be specific and cite evidence from the proposal, (i.e. What are the program's strength and weaknesses?).
2.	What elements of the proposal are unclear?
3.	What elements of the proposal are "exciting" or creative?
4.	If you recommend this proposal for consideration, what further questions would you like to ask the applicant?
Арр	lication Reviewed:
Revi	iewer Name:

Reviewer Signature and Date	: :		
SUMMARIZE YOUR FINAL S	CORES HERE:		
PROGRAM DESIGN (50):			
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (25	5)		
TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROPO	OSAL (1-75):		
	mmendation (check the box below) for the next steps for this proposal. Please ensure that ment with your analysis and comments in the worksheet sections. 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.		
Strongly Recommend for Further Review (total score between 68 and 75) Recommend for Further Review (total score between 60 and 67) Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation (total score between 53 and 59) Do Not Recommend for Further Review (total score 52 or below)			