

APPLICANT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

2015 AmeriCorps State and National Grant Competition

Legal Applicant: American Red Cross of Greater Los Angeles

Application ID: 15ES170665

Program Name: California Safe Corps

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 summary 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

Strengths:

The applicant provides reasonable data to substantiate the need for disaster preparedness services in the program area based on the high level of threat from disasters, lack of preparedness, and presence of vulnerable populations.

The applicant presents a logical plan for building community resiliency by utilizing members to address the communities need through disaster education, emergency training, and direct response activities.

The applicant proposes to have AmeriCorps members trained and certified by subject-matter experts through the American Red Cross.

The proposed theory of change model is logically aligned.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not sufficiently describe how they will conduct member recruitment in target communities.

The applicant does not provide specific details on how the members will have access to meaningful service experiences and reflection opportunities.

The applicant presents inadequate information about the recruitment and activities of volunteers.

The applicant does not sufficiently address how members will be encouraged to engage in public service after their term.

The applicant does not present a clear explanation of how members will make unique contributions or distinguish their activities from existing services that address the need for disaster preparation and response.

The applicant provides data which is not current. The data is often reflective of national statistics surrounding percentages of vulnerable clients, mostly by age, but the need is not clearly related to the clients.

There are many references to community partnerships where activities will be provided by Members however it is not clear how outcomes surrounding those activities will be measured other than by the number of referral

applications by members distributed within the local community to attend the activities.

Client applications turned into the agency is how the applicant proposed to measure outcomes, yet there is no measure for outcomes on completed trainings.

It is not clear who will be providing the training and if the focus is on local or national disasters or both. Training is not specific surrounding who is providing the training and their level of expertise. It is not clear how Members will be certified in specific training areas.

Timelines for member supervision are not clear. Additionally multi-level supervision is present in the narrative but it is not clear when or how those supervisors will interact with the Members.

The pieces of the logic model do not appear to be directly related to the proposed outcomes in the narrative.

The applicant does not articulate a plan for Member recruitment.

The applicant does not provide compelling local statistics for the areas they have chosen to support with their proposed program.

The proposed activities for AmeriCorps members are duplicating roles and activities of Red Cross volunteers. The amount of training that the AmeriCorps members will receive seems insufficient to adequately provide the proposed activities.

The applicant does not clearly describe a plan to train members and volunteers about the rules including prohibited activities and how they will reinforce these rules throughout the grant period.

The applicant fails to describe a training plan for member supervisors that is reinforced throughout the program year.

The applicant does not articulate a plan to recruit members from the local communities where the program will operate.

The applicant fails to describe how this service experience will be meaningful for members, or encourage active citizenship and civic engagement.