

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**2010 Social Innovation Fund**

**Missouri Foundation for Health**

**Reviewer Comments – Phase 1**

## **Table of Contents**

**Reviewer Comments – Group 1**

**Section 1**

**Reviewer Comments – Group 2**

**Section 2**

**2010 Social Innovation Fund**

**Missouri Foundation for Health**

**Section 1 – Reviewer Comments: Group 1**

## SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010 PANEL CONSENSUS FORM

*Instructions throughout this form are indicated in red.*

**Before you begin, please fill out the Applicant Name and Application ID# in the above header.** This Panel Consensus Form (PCF) is where each panel records its consensus assessment of an application. The completion of this form may be led by any panelist; that individual will be designated the Lead Reviewer (LR). All Expert Reviewers are expected to serve as the LR on at least one application. The consensus assessment should be based on the panel's examination of the full application Narrative, which consists of the following 3 categories:

Category	Percentage	Subcategories
Program Design	45%	A. Goals and Objectives
		B. Use of Evidence
		C. Community Resources
		D. Description of Activities i. Subgranting ii. Technical Assistance and Support
Organizational Capacity	35%	A. Ability to Provide Program Oversight
		B. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	20%	A. Budget and Program Design
		B. Match Sources

Panels will utilize Panel Consensus Calls to discuss each application and come to agreement on the content of the Narrative Assessment for each category, the Rating for each category, the Overall Appraisal Statement and the Band in which the application will be placed. When completing this form, the LR should rely on four primary documents: 1) the application being reviewed; 2) the IRW Compilation for the application being reviewed (compiled prior to discussion by the panel Facilitator); 3) the SIF Notice of Federal Funds Availability (NOFA); 4) the Consensus Rubric at the end of this form.

**Please complete the following steps:**

1. For each of the 3 categories (Program Design; Organizational Capacity; Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy), the LR should:
  - a. **Write a 3 – 5 sentence Narrative Assessment** reflecting the panel's assessment of the quality of the response in the category being assessed; it is important that this narrative is not a summary of the application, rather the panel's evaluation of the application's quality.
  - b. **List the application's significant strengths and weaknesses and annotate each.** Each significant strength or weakness **must** be supported by **at least one** of the Eligibility or Application Review Criteria that were in the SIF NOFA. (examples are included in this form)
  - c. **Taking into consideration** both the Narrative Assessment and the listed strengths and weaknesses, **select a Rating** by checking the appropriate box.
2. **Complete the Overall Appraisal section.** In this section, you will:
  - a. Provide an Overall Appraisal Statement; and
  - b. Select a consensus Band that represents the quality of the application as a whole. The Bands are described in the Overall Appraisal section at the end of this form, and Appendix D of the Review Guide.
3. **After the panel has discussed all applications, provide a Rank for each application.**

---

## **PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)**

---

The **Social Innovation Fund Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Program Design.

### **A. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

*The Corporation asks applicants to use a thematic approach in describing their proposed investments in community organizations. As established in the Act, there are two basic operational models of SIF intermediaries. The first is a SIF that will operate in a single geographic location, and address one or more priority issues within that location. This model is referred to as a "geographically-based SIF." The second model is a SIF that will address a single priority issue area in multiple geographic locations. This model is referred to as an "issue-based SIF." The Corporation will assess whether the application properly proposes goals and objectives as either a geographically-based or an issue-based SIF.*

#### **i. Geographically-Based SIF**

*To apply as a geographically-based SIF, the applicant must propose to focus on serving low-income communities within a specific local geographic area, and propose to focus on improving measurable outcomes related to one or more of the following priority issue areas:*

- **Economic Opportunity** – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;
- **Youth Development and School Support** – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;
- **Healthy Futures** – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.

*The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area(s) within the specific local geographic area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to those issue areas that the applicant will seek to improve.*

#### **ii. Issue-Based SIF**

*To apply as an issue-based SIF, the application must propose to focus on addressing one of the following priority issue areas within multiple low-income communities:*

- **Economic Opportunity** – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;
- **Youth Development and School Support** – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;
- **Healthy Futures** – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.

*The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area within the geographic areas likely to be served, including statistics demonstrating that those geographic areas have a high need in the priority issue area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to the priority issue area that the applicant will seek to improve.*

### **B. USE OF EVIDENCE**

- i. *Applicants must include in their application information describing their track record of using rigorous evidence, data, and evaluation tools to:*
- *Select and invest in subgrantees;*
  - *Support and monitor the replication and expansion of subgrantees; and*
  - *Achieve measurable outcomes.*

### **C. COMMUNITY RESOURCES**

Not applicable. The applicant's Community Resources should be assessed in the Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy section. Applicants were instructed **not** to provide information in this section. If applicants include information in this section, it should not be considered in your overall rating for the Program Design section.

### **D. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES**

#### **i. Subgranting**

- a. *Applicants must describe the process by which they will competitively select their nonprofit community organization subgrantees, and, if applicable, the process by which they have pre-selected some subgrantees. Specifically, applicants must describe how their competitive subgrant selection process will ensure a portfolio of subgrantees that are innovative nonprofit community organizations serving low-income communities and that possess:*
- *A strong theory of change;*
  - *Strong leadership and financial and management systems, including data management;*
  - *A strong financial position, including funding diversity, the ability to meet the requirements for providing dollar-for-dollar matching funds, and the ability to sustain the initiative after the subgrant period concludes;*
  - *Strong community relationships;*
  - *A commitment to and track record of using data and evaluation for performance and program improvement;*
  - *Evidence of effectiveness, including a demonstrated track record of achieving specific measurable outcomes related to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary;*
  - *Strong potential for replication or expansion;*
  - *A well-defined plan for achieving specific measurable outcomes connected to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary, evaluation of program effectiveness, performance improvement, and replication or expansion; and*
  - *A commitment to use grant funds to replicate, expand, or support their programs.*

*Either as part of its review of the applications or in clarification reviews prior to award, the Corporation may request additional information regarding pre-selected subgrantees for compliance and appropriate outcomes.*

#### **ii. Technical Assistance and Support**

- a. *Applicants must include in their application information describing how they will provide technical assistance and support (other than financial support) that will increase the ability of subgrantees to achieve their measurable outcomes, including replication or expansion. Replication or expansion may happen in various ways (including, for example, creating new sites*

*or affiliating with another program to replicate an intervention) and in multiple contexts (including, for example, serving more people in a current geography or growing to new geographies).*

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
  - **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
  - **Select a Rating for this section.**
- 

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant documents an impressive track record of epidemiological assessment and multimodal population-level intervention approaches to reducing local and statewide prevalence rates of two significant chronic health-related risk factors – obesity and tobacco use. Their intervention and grantee selection methods are evidence-based and systematic. They demonstrate a strong commitment to subgrantee capacity building. These strengths are duly acknowledged, however, the applicant did not articulate theories of change that guide their strategic plan nor did they clearly reference targeted intervention strategies to be implemented in the current initiative.

### **Significant Strengths**

The applicant demonstrates an excellent evidence-measured track record of success in supporting 50 communities in prototypes of the proposed expanded program since 2004. The methodology of subgrantee selection, nurturance, evaluation and reporting is clearly and impressively documented, including examples of policy changes and outcomes achieved, partnerships forged and sustained, and, replication of community models at state and national levels. (pp. 5-6) (*Program Design B.i.*)

The applicant describes an exemplary history of developing measures for assessing impact of population-based interventions – policies and programs – on intended outcomes. They have conducted the largest health assessment in state history and developed short- and long-term, quantitative and spatial, internal and external indicators and evidence-based instruments in association with university partners. (pp. 8-11) (*Program Design D.i.a.*)

The applicant has determined a systematic, evidence-based subgrantee selection process. Selection criteria are detailed and previous success in using these methods is documented. (pp.13-14) (*Program Design D.ii.a.*)

The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment to building subgrantee internal capacity, including training and support in strategic planning, management systems development, data analysis and evaluation, strategic communications and short-term business and financial planning. As a result, subgrantees develop qualifications and are ready to start activities early into the contract period. (pp. 15, 18) (*Program Design D.i.a.*)

### **Significant Weaknesses**

While the applicant claims that its programs will apply a theory-based approach and that applicant staff develop program theory to guide subgrantees, no examples are given, nor is any plan articulated for how strong theories of change will be implemented in the current proposal. (p.10) (*Program Design D.ii.*)

The applicant cites excellent outcomes and outcomes measurement instruments used and policy and program interventions implemented to achieve significant positive change in obesity reduction and tobacco control in its funded communities. Given this exemplary documentation of past achievement, the current proposal lacks sufficient specificity of interventions planned to achieve similarly impressive outcomes going forward. (pp. 13-15) (*Program Design B.i.*)

**Select a Rating for PROGRAM DESIGN** (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent       Strong       Satisfactory       Weak/Non-responsive

---

## **ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)**

---

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Organizational Capacity.

### **A. ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM OVERSIGHT**

*In evaluating your organization's ability to provide program oversight, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *The extent to which your organization has a sound structure including:*
  - *The ability to provide sound programmatic oversight, including:*
    - *Experience with and capacity for evaluation; and*
    - *Experience with and capacity for supporting replication or expansion.*
  - *Well-defined roles for your Board of directors, administrators, and staff;*
  - *A well-designed plan and systems for organizational (as opposed to subgrantee) self-assessment and continuous improvement; and*
  - *The ability to provide and/or secure effective technical assistance.*
  
- ii. *Whether your organization has a sound record of accomplishment, including the extent to which you:*
  - *Have a track record of supporting organizations that demonstrate evidence of impact;*
  - *Demonstrate leadership within the organization and strong relationships within the communities served;*
  - *Have a track-record of raising substantial resources, and, if you are an existing Federal grantee, having secured the matching resources as required in your prior grant awards; and*
  - *The extent to which your community support recurs, increases in scope or amount, and is more diverse, as evidenced by:*
    - *Collaborations that include a diverse spectrum of community stakeholders;*
    - *A broad base of financial support, including local financial and in-kind contributions; and*
    - *Supporters who represent a wide range of community stakeholders.*

## **B. ABILITY TO PROVIDE FISCAL OVERSIGHT**

*Entities eligible to apply for SIF grants include:*

- Existing grantmaking institutions, or
  - Partnerships between an existing grantmaking institution and another grantmaking institution, a State Commission, or the chief executive officer of a unit of general local government
- i. Existing grantmaking institutions are organizations in existence at the time of the application where, investing in nonprofit community organizations or programs is an essential (rather than collateral) means of fulfilling their mission and vision. In keeping with this view, grantmaking institutions will generally have the following as part of their core operating functions:
- Conducting open or otherwise competitive programs to award grants to or make investments in a diverse portfolio of nonprofit community organizations;
  - Negotiating specific grant requirements with nonprofit community organizations; and
  - Overseeing and monitoring the performance of grantees.
- ii. In evaluating your organization's ability to provide fiscal oversight, the Corporation will take into account its review of your organization's capacity. The Corporation will further consider:
- The extent to which your organization, or proposed partnership, has key personnel with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to provide fiscal oversight of subgrantees; and
  - Whether your organization, or proposed partnership, has specific experience in providing fiscal oversight of subgrantees of Federal funds.

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY as follows:**

- Write a brief Narrative Assessment;
- List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and
- Select a Rating for this section.

---

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant offers strengths in their capacity to expand and replicate prior achievements in local communities. They also evidence strong program and research partnerships. The applicant demonstrates a high commitment to organizational transparency, offering full public access to its grants review process, operating procedures and Board and Committee proceedings. The applicant, however, notes no prior federal grant management experience beyond the past experience of some key program officers. The application ambiguously describes the limits of responsibility of the applicant's Board of Directors for program and financial operations. It is also unclear how to reconcile the few program staff assigned to the project in the Budget Narrative with the more generous deployment of staff as described in the Program Narrative.

### **Significant Strengths**

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

The applicant has extensive experience in building organizational capacity for subgrantees, experience that is guided by a staff with knowledge of health disparities research and programming, as well as knowledge generated by their extensive partnerships with individuals and organizations that possess regional and national expertise in the program related objectives of obesity and tobacco control. (p. 22) *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

Safeguards are in place to insure satisfactory and timely use of funds by subgrantees. (p. 23) *(Organizational Capacity A.ii.)*

The current proposal represents a significant replication and expansion of prototype programs for obesity and tobacco control currently active in over 50 communities, reaching 250,000 citizens and effecting change in 215 policies to create healthier communities. (p. 21-22) *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

### Significant Weaknesses

While several key staff have previous experience with federal grant management (two grants managers and the chief operating officer), it is unclear whether the applicant itself has current portfolio experience in the federal grants management arena. *(Organizational Capacity B.ii.)*

The application leaves unclear the extent and limits of responsibility of the applicant's Board of Directors for the fiscal and programmatic operations of the applicant organization. (p. 27) *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

It is unclear how staff effort allotted to the grant as listed in the Budget Narrative corresponds with the applicant's assignment of staff to programs as described in the Program Narrative. (p. 22) *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

Select a Rating for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent       Strong       Satisfactory       Weak/Non-responsive

### COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (20%)

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy.

#### A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN

*In evaluating the cost effectiveness and budget adequacy of your proposed program, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *Whether your program is cost-effective based on:*
  - *The extent to which your program demonstrates diverse, non-Federal resources for program implementation and sustainability;*

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

---

- *The extent to which you are proposing to provide more than the minimum required share of the costs of your program; and*
  - *Whether the reasonable and necessary costs of your program or project are higher because you are proposing to serve areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved.*
- ii. *Whether your budget is adequate to support your program design.*

## **B. MATCH SOURCES**

- i. *At the time of submission of the application, applicants must demonstrate either cash-on-hand or commitments (or a combination thereof) toward meeting 50 percent their first year matching funds, based on the amount of Federal grant funds applied for.*
- ii. *In addition to the match eligibility criteria, the Corporation will evaluate the extent to which you have a combination of cash-on-hand or commitments to meet the full match requirements, and whether your organization will be able to provide financial resources for your SIF program beyond the minimum required match.*

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

---

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant assures adequate resources to match SIF funding, has strong capital reserves and influential relationships and partnership pledges from local community financial assets to support and sustain subgrantee initiatives in future years.

### **Significant Strengths**

The budget appears adequate to support the proposed program design and includes non-federal resources of fiscal and in-kind contributions from internal and community resources. *(Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy A.ii.)*

The applicant's financial resources exceed the program implementation and sustainability requirements, as do the match fund criteria as specified in the SIF NOFA. *(Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy B.i.)*

### **Significant Weaknesses**

There are no significant weaknesses noted.

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

---

Select a Rating for COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent       Strong       Satisfactory       Weak/Non-responsive

---

## OVERALL APPRAISAL

**I. Provide a 3 - 5 sentence Overall Appraisal Statement of the application taking into consideration:**

- The Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, and Ratings from each category; and
- The weighting of each category (Program Design (45%), Organizational Capacity (35%), Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%)).

The applicant provides exemplary detail with respect to the population needs addressed as well as the applicant's history of effort and achievement in the areas of Healthy Futures. Staffing, community and national partnerships, funding, evaluation strategies, outcomes measurement and accountability and oversight all meet or exceed high standards of excellence. The applicant has demonstrated leadership in designing and conducting programs and instigating salutary changes in public health policy and practice. The SIF program will not strain the applicant's budget or personnel. A few ambiguities exist with respect to detailing programmatic theories of change, specific intervention components going forward, and time and effort allocation of program staff.

**II. Select one Band for this application (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked") Ensure that your selection is supported by your panel's Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, Ratings, and Overall Appraisal Statement. Take into consideration the weighting of each category.**

- Band I (Excellent):** A comprehensive and thorough application of excellent merit with very significant strengths and no/minimal significant weaknesses.
- Band II (Strong):** An application that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support, where the value of the significant strengths outweigh the identified weaknesses.
- Band III (Satisfactory):** An application with potential, where strengths and weaknesses are approximately equal. However, some fundamental weaknesses have been identified.
- Band IV (Weak/Non-Responsive):** An application with very significant weaknesses and no/minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include an application that is non-responsive to the published criteria.

---

**Rank**

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

**As a panel, Rank this application in relation to the other applications on your panel.** Complete this section only after all applications before your panel have been reviewed and consensus has been achieved on each one. The highest rank is "1".

Rank: 1 of 6 total applications on Panel # 1.

## CONSENSUS RUBRIC

Please use this Consensus Rubric as guidance when selecting your Ratings or Bands.

**BAND I (Excellent)** — *A BAND I rating reflects that the application is compelling, consistently excellent in quality, and addresses all requirements; thereby showing the highest potential for success.*

The **Excellent** application consistently:

- ✓ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.
- ✓ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Provides clear evidence to support all objectives of this section (no assumptions are made).
- ✓ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.

**BAND II (Strong)** — *A BAND II rating reflects that the application is solid, good-quality, and has great potential for success.*

The **Strong** application:

- ✓ Provides a response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
- ✓ Supports ideas with comprehensive plans, examples, or outlines.

**BAND III (Satisfactory)** — *A BAND III rating reflects that the application generally meets requirements for a reasonable chance of success, but is neither especially strong nor especially weak.*

The **Satisfactory** application:

- ✓ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.
- ✓ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

---

- ✓ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
- ✓ Supports individual ideas with plans, examples, or outline.

**BAND IV (Weak/Non-responsive)** — *A weak/non-responsive rating reflects that the application is below standard especially in ability, skill, or quality; indicating that this application will most likely not succeed as described or is not responsive to the application requirements.*

The **Weak/Non-responsive** application:

- ✓ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.
- ✓ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection to objectives.
- ✓ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
- ✓ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.
- ✓ Did not connect the activities to the anticipated results.
- ✓ Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFA.
- ✓ Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFA and application instructions.

**2010 Social Innovation Fund**

**Missouri Foundation for Health**

**Section 2 – Reviewer Comments: Group 2**

## SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010 PANEL CONSENSUS FORM

*Instructions throughout this form are indicated in red.*

**Before you begin, please fill out the Applicant Name and Application ID# in the above header.** This Panel Consensus Form (PCF) is where each panel records its consensus assessment of an application. The completion of this form may be led by any panelist; that individual will be designated the Lead Reviewer (LR). All Expert Reviewers are expected to serve as the LR on at least one application. The consensus assessment should be based on the panel's examination of the full application Narrative, which consists of the following 3 categories:

Category	Percentage	Subcategories
Program Design	45%	A. Goals and Objectives
		B. Use of Evidence
		C. Community Resources
		D. Description of Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Subgranting</li> <li>ii. Technical Assistance and Support</li> </ul>
Organizational Capacity	35%	A. Ability to Provide Program Oversight
		B. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	20%	A. Budget and Program Design
		B. Match Sources

Panels will utilize Panel Consensus Calls to discuss each application and come to agreement on the content of the Narrative Assessment for each category, the Rating for each category, the Overall Appraisal Statement and the Band in which the application will be placed. When completing this form, the LR should rely on four primary documents: 1) the application being reviewed; 2) the IRW Compilation for the application being reviewed (compiled prior to discussion by the panel Facilitator); 3) the SIF Notice of Federal Funds Availability (NOFA); 4) the Consensus Rubric at the end of this form.

**Please complete the following steps:**

1. For each of the 3 categories (Program Design; Organizational Capacity; Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy), the LR should:
  - a. **Write a 3 – 5 sentence Narrative Assessment** reflecting the panel's assessment of the quality of the response in the category being assessed; it is important that this narrative is not a summary of the application, rather the panel's evaluation of the application's quality.
  - b. **List the application's significant strengths and weaknesses and annotate each.** Each significant strength or weakness **must** be supported by **at least one** of the Eligibility or Application Review Criteria that were in the SIF NOFA. (examples are included in this form)
  - c. **Taking into consideration** both the Narrative Assessment and the listed strengths and weaknesses, **select a Rating** by checking the appropriate box.
  
2. **Complete the Overall Appraisal section.** In this section, you will:
  - a. Provide an Overall Appraisal Statement; and
  - b. Select a consensus Band that represents the quality of the application as a whole. The Bands are described in the Overall Appraisal section at the end of this form, and Appendix D of the Review Guide.
  
3. **After the panel has discussed all applications, provide a Rank for each application.**

---

## **PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)**

---

The **Social Innovation Fund Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Program Design.

### **A. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

*The Corporation asks applicants to use a thematic approach in describing their proposed investments in community organizations. As established in the Act, there are two basic operational models of SIF intermediaries. The first is a SIF that will operate in a single geographic location, and address one or more priority issues within that location. This model is referred to as a "geographically-based SIF." The second model is a SIF that will address a single priority issue area in multiple geographic locations. This model is referred to as an "issue-based SIF." The Corporation will assess whether the application properly proposes goals and objectives as either a geographically-based or an issue-based SIF.*

#### **i. Geographically-Based SIF**

*To apply as a geographically-based SIF, the applicant must propose to focus on serving low-income communities within a specific local geographic area, and propose to focus on improving measurable outcomes related to one or more of the following priority issue areas:*

- **Economic Opportunity** – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;
- **Youth Development and School Support** – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;
- **Healthy Futures** – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.

*The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area(s) within the specific local geographic area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to those issue areas that the applicant will seek to improve.*

#### **ii. Issue-Based SIF**

*To apply as an issue-based SIF, the application must propose to focus on addressing one of the following priority issue areas within multiple low-income communities:*

- **Economic Opportunity** – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;
- **Youth Development and School Support** – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;
- **Healthy Futures** – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.

*The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area within the geographic areas likely to be served, including statistics demonstrating that those geographic areas have a high need in the priority issue area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to the priority issue area that the applicant will seek to improve.*

### **B. USE OF EVIDENCE**

- i. *Applicants must include in their application information describing their track record of using rigorous evidence, data, and evaluation tools to:*
- *Select and invest in subgrantees;*
  - *Support and monitor the replication and expansion of subgrantees; and*
  - *Achieve measurable outcomes.*

### **C. COMMUNITY RESOURCES**

Not applicable. The applicant's Community Resources should be assessed in the Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy section. Applicants were instructed **not** to provide information in this section. If applicants include information in this section, it should not be considered in your overall rating for the Program Design section.

### **D. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES**

i. **Subgranting**

- a. *Applicants must describe the process by which they will competitively select their nonprofit community organization subgrantees, and, if applicable, the process by which they have pre-selected some subgrantees. Specifically, applicants must describe how their competitive subgrant selection process will ensure a portfolio of subgrantees that are innovative nonprofit community organizations serving low-income communities and that possess:*
- *A strong theory of change;*
  - *Strong leadership and financial and management systems, including data management;*
  - *A strong financial position, including funding diversity, the ability to meet the requirements for providing dollar-for-dollar matching funds, and the ability to sustain the initiative after the subgrant period concludes;*
  - *Strong community relationships;*
  - *A commitment to and track record of using data and evaluation for performance and program improvement;*
  - *Evidence of effectiveness, including a demonstrated track record of achieving specific measurable outcomes related to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary;*
  - *Strong potential for replication or expansion;*
  - *A well-defined plan for achieving specific measurable outcomes connected to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary, evaluation of program effectiveness, performance improvement, and replication or expansion; and*
  - *A commitment to use grant funds to replicate, expand, or support their programs.*

*Either as part of its review of the applications or in clarification reviews prior to award, the Corporation may request additional information regarding pre-selected subgrantees for compliance and appropriate outcomes.*

ii. **Technical Assistance and Support**

- a. *Applicants must include in their application information describing how they will provide technical assistance and support (other than financial support) that will increase the ability of subgrantees to achieve their measurable outcomes, including replication or expansion. Replication or expansion may happen in various ways (including, for example, creating new sites*

*or affiliating with another program to replicate an intervention) and in multiple contexts (including, for example, serving more people in a current geography or growing to new geographies).*

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
  - **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
  - **Select a Rating for this section.**
- 

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

In 1994, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Missouri (BCBSMo), a nonprofit health services corporation, created a for profit subsidiary, RightCHOICE Managed Care Inc. BCBSMo transferred the majority of its assets to the new for-profit corporation. In 1996, Missouri Attorney General Nixon filed suit against BCBSMo and its subsidiaries, charging a violation of Missouri laws governing conversion of non-profits to for-profit status. In 1999, under direction from the Missouri Supreme Court, the parties agreed to a settlement that created the Missouri Foundation for Health (MFH) in 2000, and provided that BCBSMo would transfer \$12.8 million and 15 million shares of RightCHOICE stock directly to MFH. In 2004, MFH launched its \$40 million, nine-year Tobacco Prevention and Cessation Initiative designed to prevent and decrease tobacco use in Missouri. In 2005, MFH launched its Health and Active communities Initiative to combat obesity. The organization currently has assets totaling \$979.9 million.

This proposal seeks to expand the organization's current initiative to serve low-income, high-need communities across the state of Missouri in the areas of obesity prevention and tobacco control. MFH proposes a geographic-based initiative, grounded in relevant and vital statistics about both the need for the expanded subgrantees and their successes to date in working with Missouri's nonprofit community. The proposal addresses current and highly visible areas of need within our country - obesity prevention and tobacco control. The application offers a well thought out set of goals and objectives, undergirded with appropriate evaluation tools and processes. Although the program design itself is strong, the problem rests in the apparent lack of dedicated staff to ensure the initiative's success. Because of this significant program design flaw, the reviewers ranked this section as "strong" rather than as "excellent."

### **Significant Strengths**

The Missouri Foundation for Health (MFH) proposes a geographically-based SIF initiative in the area of Healthy Futures, specifically prevention of obesity and tobacco use. Building on experience with two separate programs which have demonstrated results, the SIF will explore the impact of integrated strategies to impact multiple health outcomes. **Program Design A.i. and B.i.**

The proposal presents details statistics about the health status of the state and target urban and rural communities. For example, they note that nearly half of children in poor families in the state are overweight or obese and 1.1 million adults use tobacco. **Program Design A.i.**

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health

Application ID#: 10SI115969

---

MFH describes their track record of using rigorous evidence, data, and evaluation tools to support and plan to replication and expand their work using SIF funding to 10-20 new communities across Missouri (urban, rural, and suburban). **Program Design B.i.**

Based on the evaluation of past programs, the applicant has evidence of the effectiveness of their approach through HVAC (an obesity prevention program) and SLTPC (a tobacco prevention program). These programs have received national recognition for effectiveness. **Program Design B.i.**

MFH does a good job aligning short term, intermediate, and long term goals, activities, and measurable outcomes to meet the parameters of the funding program. The proposal follows a strong logic model approach. **Program Design D.i.a.**

The applicant has clearly defined measures of short-term, intermediate, and long-term results, as well as identified tools for data collection. Policy changes, accesses to services, and meaningful information are the short-term levers that will lead to behavior change and reduced illness. One existing data source, the CLS survey, provides population-based baseline and trend data. MFH will utilize existing technology to map baseline health status data by community and to track changes over the project period. **Program Design A.i. and D.i.a.**

The theory of change emphasizes “layers of prevention” including policy, community infrastructure, risk exposure, individual behavior, and access to services. **Program Design D.**

The applicant clearly describes the two stage selection process for subgrantees (a Request for Concept Papers phase, which will include staff analysis of needs using objective data, and a full concept proposal stage) and anticipates 10 – 20 sub-awards. **Program Design D.i.a.**

### **Significant Weaknesses**

Although MFH describes a well thought out strategy for providing technical assistance and support to potential subgrantees, there appears to be inadequate staffing plan for the depth of activities described. The equivalent of one FTE is dedicated. **D.ii.a.**

The proposal does not provide an overview of the evidence-base supporting the selected activities. **Program Design B.i.**

The applicant does not provide examples of potential subgrantees or how collaborations formed at the local level will be encouraged and supported. **Program Design D.i.a.**

**Select a Rating for PROGRAM DESIGN** (double-click in the applicable box and select “checked”)

Excellent

Strong

Satisfactory

Weak/Non-responsive

---

### **ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)**

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant’s Organizational Capacity.

## **A. ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM OVERSIGHT**

*In evaluating your organization's ability to provide program oversight, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *The extent to which your organization has a sound structure including:*
  - *The ability to provide sound programmatic oversight, including:*
    - *Experience with and capacity for evaluation; and*
    - *Experience with and capacity for supporting replication or expansion.*
  - *Well-defined roles for your Board of directors, administrators, and staff;*
  - *A well-designed plan and systems for organizational (as opposed to subgrantee) self-assessment and continuous improvement; and*
  - *The ability to provide and/or secure effective technical assistance.*
  
- ii. *Whether your organization has a sound record of accomplishment, including the extent to which you:*
  - *Have a track record of supporting organizations that demonstrate evidence of impact;*
  - *Demonstrate leadership within the organization and strong relationships within the communities served;*
  - *Have a track-record of raising substantial resources, and, if you are an existing Federal grantee, having secured the matching resources as required in your prior grant awards; and*
  - *The extent to which your community support recurs, increases in scope or amount, and is more diverse, as evidenced by:*
    - *Collaborations that include a diverse spectrum of community stakeholders;*
    - *A broad base of financial support, including local financial and in-kind contributions; and*
    - *Supporters who represent a wide range of community stakeholders.*

## **B. ABILITY TO PROVIDE FISCAL OVERSIGHT**

*Entities eligible to apply for SIF grants include:*

- *Existing grantmaking institutions, or*
  - *Partnerships between an existing grantmaking institution and another grantmaking institution, a State Commission, or the chief executive officer of a unit of general local government*
- i. *Existing grantmaking institutions are organizations in existence at the time of the application where, investing in nonprofit community organizations or programs is an essential (rather than collateral) means of fulfilling their mission and vision. In keeping with this view, grantmaking institutions will generally have the following as part of their core operating functions:*
    - *Conducting open or otherwise competitive programs to award grants to or make investments in a diverse portfolio of nonprofit community organizations;*
    - *Negotiating specific grant requirements with nonprofit community organizations; and*
    - *Overseeing and monitoring the performance of grantees.*
  
  - ii. *In evaluating your organization's ability to provide fiscal oversight, the Corporation will take into account its review of your organization's capacity. The Corporation will further consider:*

- 
- *The extent to which your organization, or proposed partnership, has key personnel with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to provide fiscal oversight of subgrantees; and*
  - *Whether your organization, or proposed partnership, has specific experience in providing fiscal oversight of subgrantees of Federal funds.*

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

---

**Panel Narrative Assessment**

MFH's Board of Directors comprises 15 members. Board members are citizens of the 84 counties and the City of St. Louis. The Board governs MFH's distribution of approximately \$50 million annually to fund nonprofit organizations that help improve the health of the state's uninsured, underinsured and underserved residents. Current board members appear to be highly skilled. The CAC members are also citizens of the 84 counties and the City of St. Louis served by MFH. With 13 members, the CAC serves as the primary link between the community and MFH. The CAC conducts evaluation activities designed to gather community input on health-related needs in MFH's service area and uses the results to determine the efficacy of current MFH programs and what programs MFH should fund in the future.

In addition, MFH has a well qualified staff with impressive credentials. The use of advisory teams helps to keep the organization current with the needs of the state and connected to potential partners and strategies for addressing these needs. The grant making and nonprofit selection process offers a "model" of transparency that other intermediaries can learn from in important ways.

The issue of staff capacity was raised again in this section of the grant review. The major concern for the reviewers was the lack of identification of partners, potential subgrantees, or evaluators. Without these key pieces of information, there was no way to determine if the organization had the capacity to deliver the program as described. Thus, the reviewers ranked this section as "satisfactory."

**Significant Strengths**

MFH has experience as a grant maker for multiple programs, reaching 75% of the State. As a result, the applicant is very familiar with the target communities and public and non-profit leaders in those communities. MFH is an active participant in multiple regional and state networks which will provide mechanisms for dissemination of the RFP for the SIF initiative, as well as sharing lessons learned. The SIF initiative will expand the MFH initiative to the full state of Missouri. **Organizational Capacity A. and B.**

MFH has extensive experience providing technical assistance to catalyze effective capacity building, including strategic and financial planning, management systems, communication, and evaluation. All grants promote attention to sustainability from the beginning of the project. **Organizational Capacity A.**

MFH has both a strong Board of Directors and Community Advisory Council to set priorities and guide programmatic investments. Key senior staff members who will manage the SIF initiative have been identified. **Organizational Capacity A.i.**

The applicant has a strong track record working with university partners on rigorous evaluation of the programs they manage. MFH currently requires two levels of evaluation for all programs – a project evaluation (per subgrantee) and an overall program evaluation. The SIF initiative will be integrated into on-going efforts to promote learning across MFH programs and to disseminate results widely. **Organizational Capacity A.i.**

MFH has a track-record of raising substantial resources with assets of over \$979.9 million. **Organizational Capacity B.i.**

MFH has a track record of fiscal stability. Since 2002, the applicant has functioned as a grant maker, as well as managing an investment portfolio. The SIF funding represents less than 3% of their current operating and funding budget. Though not required, MFH makes all records and materials open for public review. **Organizational Capacity B.i.**

#### **Significant Weaknesses**

While MFH participates in various networks at the state and regional levels, they have not engaged any partners in the planning stage for this initiative, identified any potential subgrantees, or determined an external evaluator. **Organizational Capacity, A. 1.**

In addition, the sheer size and power of this organization can make it vulnerable to assuming an ownership model role, rather than a capacity building one. To safe guard against this, developing relationships, not systems and processes, is critical. This requires people, not processes and systems. How can the current personnel build relationships without additional support somewhere within the organization? **Bi. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight-**

**Select a Rating for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")**

Excellent

Strong

Satisfactory

Weak/Non-responsive

### **COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (20%)**

---

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy.

#### **A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN**

*In evaluating the cost effectiveness and budget adequacy of your proposed program, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *Whether your program is cost-effective based on:*

- 
- *The extent to which your program demonstrates diverse, non-Federal resources for program implementation and sustainability;*
  - *The extent to which you are proposing to provide more than the minimum required share of the costs of your program; and*
  - *Whether the reasonable and necessary costs of your program or project are higher because you are proposing to serve areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved.*
- ii. *Whether your budget is adequate to support your program design.*

## **B. MATCH SOURCES**

- i. *At the time of submission of the application, applicants must demonstrate either cash-on-hand or commitments (or a combination thereof) toward meeting 50 percent their first year matching funds, based on the amount of Federal grant funds applied for.*
- ii. *In addition to the match eligibility criteria, the Corporation will evaluate the extent to which you have a combination of cash-on-hand or commitments to meet the full match requirements, and whether your organization will be able to provide financial resources for your SIF program beyond the minimum required match.*

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

---

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

MFH has \$979.9 million in assets, showing sufficient funds to meet the required match and subgrantees' allocations. The applicant has a history of operating in the proposed issue areas across Missouri and evidence of relationships with potential funders for the subgrantees' required match. Because there is insufficient information provided regarding key partners, potential subgrantees, or potential evaluators, it is impossible to determine if the budget requested is reasonable or necessary. The reviewers felt this was a key weakness in this section of the grant, thus ranking it as "strong" rather than "excellent."

### **Significant Strengths**

MFH demonstrates both cash-on-hand and commitments toward meeting 50% of their first year. Match funds represent only one-tenth of one percent of MFH's investment assets. **Budget B.i.**

Defining a range for anticipated subgrantees (15 – 20), allows for flexibility depending on the local needs and budgets proposed, while meeting the minimum \$100,000 grant for each community. **Budget A.ii.**

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

The applicant limits the direct administrative costs to 17.1% of the total budget. **Budget A.ii.**

MFH has substantial investments which can meet the required match for the full project period. **Budget B.**

Though operating in communities lacking philanthropic support, MFH has proactively engaged potential local funders, who have expressed interest in supporting subgrantees. **Budget B.**

### Significant Weaknesses

Without the identification of key partners, potential subgrantees, or potential evaluators, it is impossible to determine if the budget requested is reasonable or necessary. **Budget A.ii.**

**Select a Rating for COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY** (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent

Strong

Satisfactory

Weak/Non-responsive

## OVERALL APPRAISAL

### I. Provide a 3 - 5 sentence Overall Appraisal Statement of the application taking into consideration:

- The Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, and Ratings from each category; and
- The weighting of each category (Program Design (45%), Organizational Capacity (35%), Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%)).

Since 2005, MFH has actively worked in the State of Missouri to combat obesity and tobacco addiction. The organization currently has assets totaling \$979.9 million, a strong board, and a well qualified staff. MFH proposes a geographic-based initiative, grounded in relevant and vital statistics about both the need for the expanded subgrantees and their successes to date in working with Missouri's nonprofit community. The proposal addresses current and highly-visible areas of need within our country and offers a well thought out set of goals and objectives, undergirded with appropriate evaluation tools and processes.

The reviewers questioned the amount of staffing time committed to this initiative (the equivalent of one FTE). This staffing pattern seems inadequate given the proposed number of subgrantees and the level of capacity building described. In addition, the applicant does not identify key partners, potential subgrantees, or potential evaluators, thus making it is impossible to determine if the budget requested is reasonable or necessary. In spite of these weaknesses, the reviewers recognized the financial strength, experience, and expertise of MFH, thus ranking it as Strong overall.

### II. Select one Band for this application (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

**Ensure that your selection is supported by your panel's Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, Ratings, and Overall Appraisal Statement. Take into consideration the weighting of each category.**

- Band I (Excellent):** A comprehensive and thorough application of excellent merit with very significant strengths and no/minimal significant weaknesses.
- Band II (Strong):** An application that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support, where the value of the significant strengths outweigh the identified weaknesses.
- Band III (Satisfactory):** An application with potential, where strengths and weaknesses are approximately equal. However, some fundamental weaknesses have been identified.
- Band IV (Weak/Non-Responsive):** An application with very significant weaknesses and no/minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include an application that is non-responsive to the published criteria.
- 

## Rank

As a panel, Rank this application in relation to the other applications on your panel. Complete this section only after all applications before your panel have been reviewed and consensus has been achieved on each one. The highest rank is "1".

Rank: 2 of 6 total applications on Panel # 15.

## CONSENSUS RUBRIC

Please use this Consensus Rubric as guidance when selecting your Ratings or Bands.

**BAND I (Excellent)** — *A BAND I rating reflects that the application is compelling, consistently excellent in quality, and addresses all requirements; thereby showing the highest potential for success.*

The **Excellent** application consistently:

- ✓ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.
- ✓ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Provides clear evidence to support all objectives of this section (no assumptions are made).
- ✓ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.

**BAND II (Strong)** — *A BAND II rating reflects that the application is solid, good-quality, and has great potential for success.*

The **Strong** application:

- ✓ Provides a response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
- ✓ Supports ideas with comprehensive plans, examples, or outlines.

Applicant Name: Missouri Foundation for Health  
Application ID#: 10SI115969

---

**BAND III (Satisfactory)** — *A BAND III rating reflects that the application generally meets requirements for a reasonable chance of success, but is neither especially strong nor especially weak.*

The **Satisfactory** application:

- ✓ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.
- ✓ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
- ✓ Supports individual ideas with plans, examples, or outline.

**BAND IV (Weak/Non-responsive)** — *A weak/non-responsive rating reflects that the application is below standard especially in ability, skill, or quality; indicating that this application will most likely not succeed as described or is not responsive to the application requirements.*

The **Weak/Non-responsive** application:

- ✓ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.
- ✓ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection to objectives.
- ✓ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it
- ✓ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.
- ✓ Did not connect the activities to the anticipated results.
- ✓ Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFA.
- ✓ Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFA and application instructions.