
Applicant Feedback Summary: External Evidence Review 2017 AmeriCorps State and National Grant Competition

Legal Applicant: ArtistYear

Application ID: 17ND191427

Program Name: ArtistYear

The purpose of this summary feedback is to enhance our programs by improving the quality and quantity of applications to the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS). These comments originate from the External Review and are not meant to represent a comprehensive assessment. Rather, the analysis pertains to the evidence base portion of the application and the elements that had the greatest impact on Reviewer determinations for the Evidence Tier and Quality Rating. This feedback consists of summary comments from more than one Reviewer. For this reason, some of the comments may seem inconsistent or reflect multiple views. External Review comments do not represent all of the information used in the final funding decision.

External Review Summary Comments

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

Evaluation Required: No

Evaluation Submitted: N/A

Type of Grantee: N/A

EVIDENCE REVIEW

Evidence Tier Claimed: Preliminary

Number of Studies Submitted: 2

Number of Studies Assessed: 0

Evidence Tier Assessed: Pre-preliminary

Quality Rating: High

Evidence Tier Justification:

The applicant's level of evidence is "Pre-preliminary" based on their description of survey data collected from school partners. ArtistYear seeks to provide issue-based arts education using "Citizen-Artist" curriculum to vulnerable students in 13 Title I schools in three locations (Philadelphia, PA; Queens, NY; and the Roaring Fork School District, CO) to increase school engagement and promote artistic self-expression. The applicant collected mid-year survey data measuring partner schools' satisfaction, attitudes, and actions with regard to ArtistYear programming and AmeriCorps members. Results from the survey indicated that 100% of their 2014 school partners reported satisfaction with ArtistYear programming and Members as well as an increased commitment to hosting a Member in subsequent years of the program. Although the applicant assessed its level of evidence as Preliminary, they did not describe conducting an outcome evaluation using a pre-/post- or post-only with a comparison group design, which is required for achieving that tier. Additionally, the applicant cites a number of research studies that informed their program model; however, the studies are not of the applicant's own program and therefore do not contribute to their evidence base. Because the applicant collected systematic and accurate data through the survey of school partners to test or examine one or more components of its logic model, the Evidence Tier was assessed as Pre-preliminary. Note that because the applicant was assessed at a "Pre-preliminary" tier, the attached studies were not considered as part of the evidence review.

Quality Rating Justification:

The Quality Rating is "High." Data collected in 2014 clearly align with the program's logic model, and the data collection methods and data sources are reliable and appropriate for assessing program implementation. The performance measure data also provide useful and reliable information on one or more components of the program's logic model.