

APPLICANT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

2013 AmeriCorps State and National Grant Competition

Legal Applicant: Sokaogon Chippewa Community

Application ID: 13TN147688

Program Name: TAP AmeriCorps Project

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 proposal succinctly describes the American Indian (AI) community. It states that only 0.9% of the state population is AI while AIs suffer higher than average health disparities.

(+) The applicant consistently and abundantly provides documentation that illustrates the extent and severity of the need in the AI community. Initially, the applicant provides information about seven general issues impacting the AI community; substance abuse is the cornerstone problem. Subsequently, the applicant provides information about four additional issues that are specifically related to substance abuse. In every instance, the applicant provides data and cites its source. These issues range from high suicide rates to far too many prescription drug deaths.

(+) In accurately describing the ways in which the AI community is economically disadvantaged, the applicant provides a series of sobering statistics. In part, the applicant states that 59% of the tribal workforce is unemployed and that 96% of employed AIs live below poverty guidelines. All economic information was derived from the most recent American Indian Population and Labor Force Report (2005).

(+) The applicant provides extraordinary specific examples of proposed Member activities. Initially, new Members will be provided a Member Service Plan. However, the Member Service Plan will be revisited to ensure an authentic connection between the Plan and the Member. The Member Service Plan has two sections- -the first section is constructed of four evidence-based programs that will be implemented in the community and the second section consists of an elective, evidence-informed program that serves youth.

(+) In successfully describing how the applicant will measure and report the program's impact, the proposal outlines the use of the Tribal AmeriCorps Program (TAP) Coalition Progress Tool which is an on-site focus group-interview process. Additionally, the applicant plans to utilize pre- and post-interviews with coalition members, two Excel-based spreadsheets that will collect data, and a TAP Member-to-Success survey.

(+) The applicant organization further supports its reasoning for targeting natives within its target area. For example, a discussion supports that AI students were the only minority group whose graduation rates decreased

during the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years; incarceration rates are six times higher among minority residents in the target area compared to the white men according to the data provided.

(+) The applicant organization thoroughly describes its plans to leverage AmeriCorps members to support their mission and oversee functionality of its proposed program. The applicant proposes that with the assistance of outside agencies and Members, the “coalition” will assist in the implementation phases. For example, the applicant suggests that Members will actively participate in trainings and programs, improving their skillsets, and coalition outcomes, in the process. The plan supports an evidence-based framework that would be tailored to fit the needs of target communities.

(-) The applicant does not provide any evidence (data or percentages) when presenting evidence-based strategies or outcome goals. Therefore, it is not entirely clear if the applicant is engaged in either evidence-based or evidence-informed interventions.

(-) The applicant has not adequately described how proposed interventions will have a measurable impact in the community.