

SUMMARY REVIEWER COMMENTS

2013 RSVP Competition

Legal Applicant: Shepherd's Center Central

Applicant ID: 13SR144333

Project Name: Coming of Age/RSVP Kansas City

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 only the external reviewer on the blended panel. Comments are not representative of all of the information used in the final funding decision.

External Reviewer's Summary Comments:

Strengths:

Community needs to be addressed are compelling and well-documented. However, knowing the date of the report, Communities for All Ages Report, would have supported the current need.

The applicant's Primary Focus Area is Healthy Futures and has an existing infrastructure in place consisting of an Advisory Council and a Volunteer Managers Focus group with workshops and community partners.

The applicant explains existing needs for anticipated activities for volunteers and cites current data to support those needs to be addressed.

A plan will be utilized to recruit volunteers by using public awareness through local media, strengthening relationships with other nonprofits and engaging civic and social organizations.

The applicant will offer opportunities for volunteers and staff to receive training to develop their skills and leadership abilities.

Through an interview process, the applicant will ensure that those needing accommodations in order to volunteer will be assigned to stations to meet any challenges noted.

Volunteers will be recognized to maximize the impact of the volunteer experience through an Annual Recognition as well as individual feedback supplied by volunteers' stations. Also, volunteers will be able to share success stories to demonstrate community impact of the volunteers.

85% of the unduplicated volunteers are included in outcome work plans. This is well above the 10% required.

The RSVP Coordinator will conduct interviews with each station and community partners to review the mission and goals of the program for community success and assess each station to determine if that station still meets community needs. The applicant plans to discreetly graduate stations but no specific plans were given in the

narrative regarding the process.

The applicant maintains a strong system to provide effective management for daily support as well as fiscal and program management. However, the applicant lists additional support staff but does not explain what their responsibilities are for the program and no money is allocated to their salaries from the budget.

The applicant states that they have been a responsible program for 40 years.

The applicant notes a proven track record of non-federal cash of 90% resulting from individual donations and bequests from the community.

The applicant lists an annual event in the narrative for volunteer recognition but does not break out the exact costs per volunteer in the budget narrative. Volunteer liability insurance is listed in the budget but not broken down by cost per volunteer.

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that monies from this grant will be used to serve Coming of Age/RSVP Kansas City but the 10% match would indicate that this is a new grant for this county. The applicant does not specifically state that in the narrative.

The applicant listed that a “Measures Module” from eGrants would be used for measuring and collecting data but no specifics of any measurement tools were explained or how it would be reported to program staff.

The applicant lists three positions for the program and identifies the Coordinator title as overseeing the RSVP program. A Director position is listed but not much time is allocated for the program management causing confusion between the two positions that are mentioned and responsibilities to the program.