

APPLICANT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

2013 AmeriCorps State and National Grant Competition

Legal Applicant: University of Oregon

Application ID: 13ES145618

Program Name: RARE 2013-2016

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:

- (+) The applicant already has partnerships in place with various local city and county governments to outreach to the economically disadvantaged population.
- (+) The applicant provides persuasive evidence from sources such as the Oregon State University Rural Studies, the 2010 Census, and the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities substantiating that the identified need exists.
- (+) The severity of the problems is easily seen as the applicant has given such factors as low population density and further declining populations making downtown areas unable to support themselves in the current state.
- (+) The applicant demonstrates that the proposed activities will increase nonprofit capacities in the area of volunteers. Service Members' roles as described are focused on building up the volunteer base of the nonprofits through service projects which responds to the needs identified in the communities.
- (+) The applicant demonstrates that the proposed intervention is based on the evidence-informed approach "Building Communities from the Inside Out". The applicant describes the intervention in detail and explains what it is a good fit for the proposed communities.
- (+) The applicant's narrative reflects how they will implement quarterly program reports and track the impact of the services. The applicant will collect data from Members and supervisors and interview former Members.
- (+) The applicant describes a longitudinal evaluation process and tool that will be utilized to measure impact, was designed by an external evaluator, and has been utilized over the past two years to measure community impact due to Member placement.
- (-) The applicant fails to provide specifics on the locations for the programs or adequate justification for the lack of the specific locations.

(-) The applicant did not clearly define the target communities. For example, the applicant did not provide the names of the towns or specific counties in which the targeted rural communities are located.