

APPLICANT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

2013 AmeriCorps State and National Grant Competition

Legal Applicant: Child Abuse Prevention Council, Inc.

Application ID: 13AC147723

Program Name: Youth Investment Center

For the purpose of enhancing our programs by improving the quality and quantity of applications to the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), we are providing specific feedback regarding the strengths and weaknesses of this application. These comments are not meant to represent a comprehensive assessment; rather the analysis represents those elements that had the greatest bearing on the rating of the application. Please note that this feedback consists of summary comments from more than one reviewer. For this reason, some of the comments may seem to be inconsistent or contradictory. Comments are not representative of all of the information used in the final funding decision.

Reviewers' Summary Comments:

- (+) Community needs to be addressed are compelling and well-documented as evidenced by economically disadvantaged foster youth, budget cuts, current research data, financially strapped school districts, and comparisons of seven Sacramento counties faring worse than other geographic areas in California.
- (+) The applicant clearly documents the community problem of foster youth not having necessary life skills, competencies, and academic attainments necessary for adulthood through their documentation of former foster youth statistics compared to the general population in financial literacy, food security, and government aid.
- (+) The applicant provides persuasive evidence that the identified needs exist in the targeted community due to the high rates of unemployment, homelessness, and the lack of positive outcomes of self-sufficiency for foster care youth and the need for youths to be productive adults.
- (+) The application describes the target community as the economically disadvantaged vulnerable population of Sacramento County 500 foster youth ages 13-20.
- (+) This proposal paints a strong picture of the severity of the issue in the community, including statistics from 2011-2012, 2010 research studies, actual stories from foster youth, and local Sacramento school data.
- (+) The applicant identified the need for serving the selected population by stating Sacramento County emancipation services have been cut by 62%. The applicant also explains why they selected this population to serve by referencing state reports and statistics indicating lower achievement levels.
- (+) The applicant thoroughly describes why this population was selected to receive services. An example of why foster youth were selected is that there are over 4,000 young people who age out of the California foster care system each year.
- (+) The applicant specifically outlined Member activities, responsibilities, hours of training, and work products. The

application clearly describes what the Members will do by providing a typical daily schedule.

(+) There is evidence of clearly defined roles, activities and responsibilities for the Members. The applicant includes documentation of how the Members will serve the foster youth by including a proposed schedule of how the hours will be spent on a daily basis. The applicant effectively indicates the various tasks to be completed by the Members and how these tasks will align with their program design.

(+) The applicant effectively describes how they will accomplish service to foster youth. The California Department of Education only serves 45% of foster youth in the target area. The applicant thoroughly discusses how they will provide support and research-based life skills to the remaining foster youth.

(+) The applicant provides a clear description of what the organization will accomplish in the lives of foster youth through the roles of AmeriCorps members as a trusted friend who will provide guidance to the youth.

(+) The applicant clearly indicates how their Members will achieve a successful program by aligning activities with proposed outcomes. This will be achieved by multiple approaches. Examples of these consist of: one-on-one and group activities, utilizing the Casey Life Skills Assessment, creation of a life skills plan, education, financial literacy, life skills, and transition planning. This is a solid plan to achieve the intended outcomes.

(+) The application provides a clear description of an additional 625 volunteers that will impact and address the needs of foster youth. This substantiates the AmeriCorps investment, which includes 41 Members, 12 full-time and 29 half-time, serving as Youth Mentors.

(+) The Members will serve a total of 40,171 hours as Youth Mentors. The applicant thoroughly describes how their proposed slot types align with their program design. An example of this is the description of how a member's 75 hours of mentoring will be effectively and evenly split between one-on-one and small group settings of no more than three program participants.

(+) The application thoroughly describes how the interventions are evidenced-informed by describing the applicant's measurable community impact since 2007 and more than 40 years of experience.

(+) The applicant provided excellent detailed information on the evidence-based model to be used, Casey Family Programs, by describing program components and success rates and outcomes from prior program implementation.

(+) The applicant indicates what demonstrable impact their program will have by indicating numerous outputs and outcomes. One example of this is the applicant's indication that their participants will have increased school attendance, will graduate, and will improve their financial literacy knowledge.

(+) The applicant describes how the proposed interventions will have a measurable community impact by engaging youth in real life experience such as opening bank accounts, grocery shopping, cooking, establishing healthy relationships and how the AmeriCorps committed investment impacts the self-sufficiency of foster youth.

(+) The applicant clearly describes the changes they expect to see with their program. The applicant lists multiple outcomes such as: 2,250 foster youth will have youth-mentor matches, and 1,275 of matches will be sustained for 24

hours over six months. These outputs will result in many changes such that the program participants will have the life skills competencies and academic attainments they need to become productive adults.

(+) The application thoroughly describes the overall change expected for youth: to be productive individuals by gaining skills and tools needed to succeed after aging out of foster care. This change will be measured through evidence of increased financial literacy, increased graduation rates, and serving 67% of the area foster youth.

(+) The application provides through data on the number of foster youth served, the measurable outcomes of programming, and results such as the increase in financial literacy. The applicant describes how they will measure impact of the program for foster youth through the use of a Student Tracker and a Money Matters program. They will evaluate the results and make adjustments to goals, ensuring that services are impacting the community.

(+) The applicant does an excellent job of describing how they will measure impact. One way this will be accomplished is by preparing annual summaries of foster youth aggregate scores of pre- and post-service comparisons. The applicant also does an excellent job of indicating that they have a successful track record of providing measurable community impact, indicating that appropriate processes are in place to continue measurements.

(+) The applicant thoroughly documents how their prior program impact determined current performance measure targets. One example of how the applicant was successful in this aspect is when the applicant provides information regarding multiple effects of their program for the past two years. By increasing the number of participants with this program, they will be able to magnify this success.

(-) The applicant did not provide enough explanation on the impact of the AmeriCorps investment. Information addressing the investment was vague and indirect.

(-) One study referenced was completed in 1999. Data that is 14 years old does not effectively predict the effectiveness of the current program.