

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

Serves Veterans and/or Military Families

Existing Grantee

If an existing Grantee, select the program:  RSVP  FGP  SCP  AmeriCorps  Other

**Assess the extent to which the applicant addresses each of the Selection Criteria. Using the reviewer rubric as a guide to understanding the ratings, select a rating to show how well the application addresses each selection criterion element.**

**I. Program Design (50%)**

- Strengthening Communities – Questions 1-5
- Recruitment and Development Volunteers – Questions 6-9
- National Performance Measures – Question 10

***Strengthening Communities through focus area activities (20%)***

Q1. Demonstrates that the community need(s) identified in the **Primary Focus Area** exist in the geographic service area and is currently unmet.

<b>__Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	Demonstrates an <u>unmet</u> community need that is a <u>high priority</u> for the geographic service area, using objective data and evidence, or statements of support from key stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested; shows that meeting this unmet need is a high priority for the geographic service area.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of the unmet community need.</li> <li>▪ Supports assertion of a high priority unmet community need with statements of support from key stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<b>__Good (3 pts.)</b>	Demonstrates an unmet community need in the geographic service area using objective data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions that the community need exists and reasons why it is unmet.</li> <li>▪ Supports assertion of unmet community need with examples or other objective data.</li> </ul>
<b>__Fair (2 pts.)</b>	Demonstrates a community need in the geographic service area using objective data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Describes a community need but is sometimes unclear how the objective data demonstrates that the community need is unmet.</li> <li>▪ Describes a community need but makes some assumptions that the community need is unmet.</li> </ul>
<b>__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	Does not provide any objective sources in describing a community need in the geographic service area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons that the issue described is a community need.</li> <li>▪ Makes many assumptions that the community need exists in the geographic service area.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not respond with any objective data.</li> </ul>

Q2. Demonstrates plans and infrastructure to manage RSVP volunteers and their stations as a highly effective means to addressing the identified community need(s) in the **Primary Focus Area**.

<b>__Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	Provides an evidence basis demonstrating that RSVP volunteer services will be highly effective in addressing this community need. Highest probability and confidence that the identified community need(s) will be met. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, using an evidence basis (using performance data, research, a well-developed theory of change).</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed RSVP volunteers will address this community need.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans connecting the RSVP volunteer at the volunteer stations to the community needs.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

<b>__ Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>Clearly and convincingly demonstrates how RSVP volunteers will address this community need. High probability and confidence that the community need(s) will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of how RSVP volunteers will address this community need.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions and reasons how the RSVP volunteer will address this community need.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines connecting the RSVP volunteer at the volunteer stations to objectives.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Demonstrates how RSVP volunteers will address this community need. Fair to acceptable probability that the community need will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the RSVP volunteers will address this community need.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions about RSVP volunteers' activity at the volunteer stations.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Does not demonstrate how RSVP volunteers will address this community need. Low probability the community need will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the RSVP volunteers will address the community need.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection between the volunteer stations and the unmet community need.</li> <li>▪ It is unclear if the RSVP volunteers can perform the proposed service activity at the proposed volunteer stations.</li> <li>▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>

Q3. Describes how the service activities in the **Primary Focus Area** lead to National Performance Measure outputs or outcomes

<b>__ Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	<p>Presents an evidence basis demonstrating that this service activity will lead to the National Performance Measure(s). Highest probability and confidence that the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, using an evidence basis (using performance data, research, a well-developed theory of change).</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed RSVP volunteer activities leads to a National Performance Measure.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>Clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the proposed service activity is related to successfully achieving the National Performance Measure(s). High probability and confidence that the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of how proposed service activity is related to achieving the National Performance Measure(s).</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions and reasons.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Demonstrates how the proposed service activity is related to successfully achieving the National Performance Measure. Fair to acceptable probability that the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions and reasons.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Does not demonstrate how the proposed service activity is related or is only tangentially related to addressing the National Performance Measure. Low probability the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed service activity is related to successfully achieving the National Performance Measures.</li> <li>▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address National Performance Measures.</li> </ul>

Q4. Connects three major elements in the **Primary Focus Area** to each other:

1. the community need(s) identified
2. the service activities that will be carried out by RSVP volunteers
3. the anticipated National Performance Measure output(s) or, if possible, National Performance Measure

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

outcome(s)	
<b>__Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	<p>Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure output and <u>OUTCOME</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, and commits to National Performance Measure outcomes that address the community need.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to a National Performance Measure output and outcome.</li> <li>▪ Links three major elements ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity and a National Performance Measure output and outcome.</li> </ul>
<b>__Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure <u>OUTPUT</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs.</li> <li>▪ Links three major elements with plans, examples, or outlines explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity and a National Performance Measure output.</li> </ul>
<b>__Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure <u>OUTPUT</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Covers a community need, a service activities and a National Performance Measure output that are related.</li> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities connect the community need to a National Performance Measure output.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained in describing and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity and a National Performance Measure output.</li> </ul>
<b>__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Does not connect the three major elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The community need, service activities and a National Performance Measure output are not related.</li> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs.</li> <li>▪ Did not connect a community need to RSVP volunteer activity and a National Performance Measure outcome.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address one of the three major elements.</li> </ul>

**Q5. Program Design includes significant activity in service to veterans and/or military families as part of service in the Primary Focus Area, Other Focus Areas or Capacity Building.**

<b>__Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	<p>Significant activity in service to veterans and/or military families that includes the unique value of service by RSVP volunteers who are veterans and/or military family members. Highest probability and confidence that the plans for this activity will benefit veterans and/or military family members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise in serving veterans and/or military families.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to serve veterans and/or military families with the infrastructure to sustain this service.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting service activity to veterans and/or military families.</li> </ul>
<b>__Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>Significant activity in service to veterans and/or military families. High probability and confidence that the plans for this activity will benefit veterans and/or military family members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to serve veterans and/or military families.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions and reasons.</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service  
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM  
2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

<b>__Fair</b> (2 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul> <p>Some activity in service to veterans and/or military families. Acceptable confidence that the plans for this activity will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed service activities will serve veterans and/or military families.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.</li> </ul>
<b>__Does Not Meet</b> (0 pts.)	<p>Unrealistic or no activity(ies) in service to veterans and/or military families or little confidence that proposed plans will lead to activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed service activities will serve veterans and/or military families.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons in serving veterans and/or military families.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address veterans and/or military families.</li> </ul>

**COMMENTS: (Provide significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment)**

**CLARIFICATION: (Include issues requiring further clarification that will help CNCS to make informed decisions).**

***Recruitment and Development of Volunteers (15%)***

Q6. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to create well-developed high quality RSVP volunteer assignments with opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities.

<b>__Excellent</b> (3.75 pts.)	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Volunteer assignments include all of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities.</li> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested and is actively measuring the impact of volunteer activity on the RSVP volunteer.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments, and the infrastructure to sustain this volunteer coordination.</li> </ul>
<b>__Good</b> (2.5 pts.)	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Volunteer assignments include at least <u>three</u> of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure to sustain this volunteer coordination.</li> </ul>
<b>__Fair</b> (1.5 pts.)	<p>Realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Volunteer assignments include at least <u>two</u> of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities</li> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan and infrastructure will create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding the infrastructure required to coordinate volunteers.</li> </ul>
<b>__Does Not Meet</b> (0 pts.)	<p>Unrealistic or no plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Volunteer assignments include only <u>one</u> of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service**  
**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**  
**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.</li> <li>▪ Does not address volunteer coordination or gives many unsupported assumptions.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Q7. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to ensure RSVP volunteers receive training needed to be effective in their assignments.**

<b>—Excellent (3.75 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer training that includes evaluations of the training by the RSVP volunteers or the stations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested and is actively evaluating the training.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to train volunteer, with infrastructure that includes a training curriculum and training material.</li> </ul>
<b>—Good (2.5 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to train RSVP volunteers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to train volunteer.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure required to support RSVP volunteer training.</li> </ul>
<b>—Fair (1.5 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan to train RSVP volunteers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the training activity is related to service activities.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to support RSVP volunteer training.</li> </ul>
<b>—Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Unrealistic or no plan to provide training to RSVP volunteers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed training is related to service activities.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address RSVP volunteer training.</li> </ul>

**Q8. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to recruit a RSVP volunteer pool from one of following populations:**

1. Individuals of all races, ethnicities, sexual orientation, and degrees of English language proficiency.
2. Veterans and military family members as RSVP volunteers.
3. RSVP volunteers with disabilities including individuals with age-related disabilities

<b>—Excellent (3.75 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure for significant activity in the recruitment and development of RSVP volunteers who are from one of the specific volunteer pools above, and that includes developing service activities that might be particularly attractive to the volunteer pool.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has partnered with volunteer stations that will assist in recruitment and development.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling plan to recruit and develop RSVP volunteers from one of the above volunteer pools.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting service activity to recruitment and development.</li> </ul>
<b>—Good (2.5 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure for significant activity in the recruitment and development of RSVP volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to recruit and develop one of the above volunteer pools.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions about infrastructure required for recruitment.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<b>—Fair (1.5 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan for the recruitment and development of volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plan is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will serve recruitment and development from one of the above volunteer pools.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions about infrastructure required for recruitment.</li> </ul>
<b>—Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Unrealistic or no plan for the recruitment and development of volunteers who are from one of the specific volunteer pools above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear plan of how the proposed activities will serve recruitment.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address the recruitment of RSVP volunteers from one of the specific volunteer</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service**  
**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**  
**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	pools above.
<b>Q9. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to retain and recognize RSVP volunteers.</b>	
<b>__Excellent (3.75 pts.)</b>	Plan and infrastructure for significant retention and recognition activity that includes measuring the satisfaction of current volunteers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, and is actively managing retention activities including volunteer satisfaction measurement.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling plan of how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention.</li> </ul>
<b>__Good (2.5 pts.)</b>	Plan and infrastructure for significant retention and recognition activity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan of how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure that supports volunteer retention.</li> </ul>
<b>__Fair (1.5 pts.)</b>	Plan for some retention and recognition activity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plan is sometimes unclear how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding volunteer retention.</li> </ul>
<b>__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	Unrealistic or no retention and recognition activity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear plan of how the proposed recognition activities will support volunteer retention.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding volunteer retention.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>

**COMMENTS: (Provide significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment)**

**CLARIFICATION: (Include issues requiring further clarification that will help CNCS to make informed decisions).**

***National Performance Measure outcome plans above the 10% minimum (15%)***

**Q10. In assessing the work plans, applications will receive credit for percentage of unduplicated \* volunteers in National Performance Measure outcome work plans above the minimum 10%.**

<b>__80% &lt; (15 pts.)</b>	<p>(Note: This percentage is generated by the eGrants performance module. Potential applicants may use the recommended worksheet associated with the Senior Corps: RSVP Grant Application to develop their work plans.)</p> <p>*Number of Unduplicated Volunteers: This is the proposed number of volunteers who will be performing each service activity. Each volunteer can only be counted once when assigned to a service activity. The volunteer should be counted in the area where he/she will make the most impact – in terms of the type of service or in terms of the scope of service, such as the most number of hours served.</p>
<b>__60% - &lt;= 80% (12 pts.)</b>	
<b>__40% - &lt;60% (9 pts.)</b>	
<b>__20% - &lt;40% (6 pts.)</b>	
<b>__10% - &lt;20% (3 pts.)</b>	
<b>__&lt;10% (0 pts.)</b>	

**COMMENTS: (Provide significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment)**

**CLARIFICATION: (Include issues requiring further clarification that will help CNCS to make informed decisions).**

**II. Organizational Capacity (35%)**

- Program Management – Questions 11-15

**Corporation for National and Community Service**  
**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**  
**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

▪ **Organizational Capability – Questions 16-20**

**Program Management (15%)**

Q11. Plans and infrastructure to ensure management of volunteer stations in compliance with RSVP program regulations, including preventing or identifying prohibited activities.

<b>—Excellent</b> (3 pts.)	Realistic and dynamic plan and infrastructure to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating and assessing current volunteer station management.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage volunteer stations, and the infrastructure to sustain them.</li> <li>▪ Addresses how to prevent or identify prohibited activities.</li> </ul>
<b>—Good</b> (2 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to engage and manage volunteer stations.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions about prevention of or identifying prohibited activities.</li> </ul>
<b>—Fair</b> (1 pt.)	Realistic plan to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to prevent or identify prohibited activities.</li> </ul>
<b>—Does Not Meet</b> (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no plan to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding prevention of or identification of prohibited activities.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>

Q12. Plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations that address specified unmet community needs **outside the Primary Focus Area**.

<b>—Excellent</b> (3 pts.)	Demonstrates how volunteer stations will address an unmet community need that is a high priority for the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested; shows that meeting at least one of the unmet needs is a high priority for the community.</li> <li>▪ Clearly describes plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations in order to address the specified unmet community need(s).</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will address community needs.</li> </ul>
<b>—Good</b> (2 pts.)	Demonstrates how volunteer stations will address an unmet community need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations in order to address the specified unmet community need(s).</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions and reasons.</li> </ul>
<b>—Fair</b> (1 pt.)	Demonstrates how volunteer stations will address community needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the volunteer stations will address community needs.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.</li> </ul>
<b>—Does Not Meet</b> (0 pts.)	Does not describe how volunteer stations will address a community need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the volunteer stations will address the community need.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection between the community and the need.</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address a community need or mention volunteer stations.</li> </ul>
<p>Q13. Plans and infrastructure to responsibly graduate volunteer stations to meet changing community needs and do so in a way that minimizes disruption to current volunteers where possible.</p>	
<p><b>—Excellent (3 pts.)</b></p>	<p>Describes significant plans and infrastructure to responsibly graduate volunteer stations to meet changing community needs and plans to minimize disruptions to current volunteers where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has significant plans to graduate volunteer stations that do not address specific community needs in a responsible manner.</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will minimize disruption to current volunteers.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<p><b>—Good (2 pts.)</b></p>	<p>Describes plans and infrastructure to responsibly graduate volunteer stations to meet changing community needs and plans and infrastructure to minimize disruptions to current volunteers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will minimize disruption to current volunteers.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<p><b>—Fair (1 pt.)</b></p>	<p>No plans to graduate volunteer stations and/or adjust programming to meet changing community needs and 2) therefore does not need to minimize disruptions to current volunteers where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Describes why there will be no need for graduating volunteer stations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>—Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b></p>	<p>Plan to graduate volunteer stations 2) without plans or infrastructure to minimize disruptions to current volunteers where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed graduation of stations will not lead to any disruption of volunteers.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons why volunteers will not be disrupted.</li> <li>▪ Did not connect the plans to minimizing disruptions.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address the requirement to minimize disruptions to current RSVP volunteers where possible.</li> </ul>

**PLEASE NOTE:** Graduating Stations and Station Alignment while minimizing disruptions to current volunteers: All applications should describe how they plan to minimize the disruption of volunteers if they propose graduating volunteer stations that are included in the incumbent grant. A graduated volunteer station would no longer be an active service station for the RSVP grant. Applicants may propose graduating stations that are volunteer sites in the incumbent grant that do not align with the application’s program design. Volunteers associated with this station, as part of the incumbent grant, can be provided other service opportunities through other service stations, or may continue to volunteer outside of the RSVP program.

Applications may also propose transforming stations that are volunteer sites in the incumbent grant into sites where RSVP volunteers perform capacity building service activities such as recruiting and/or managing community volunteers. This would allow the applicant to provide service activity that supports a national performance measure (capacity building) even if the activity of the station does not otherwise support a national service measure. Community Volunteers are residents in the community who are recruited and/or managed by the CNCS-supported organization or assigned national service participant(s) to offer time, knowledge, skills, and expertise for free to support the CNCS-supported program or organization. Community volunteers differ from national service participants in that they are not enrolled in a national service program. In this situation, RSVP volunteers associated with a volunteer site in the incumbent grant could transition from being RSVP volunteers into community volunteers that were managed by RSVP volunteers who are performing a capacity building role. Please see Appendix B of the Notice for more information on the capacity building performance measure.

<p>Q14. Plans and infrastructure to assure National Performance Measure outcomes and outputs are measured and collected.</p>	
<p><b>—Excellent (3 pts.)</b></p>	<p>Highest probability and confidence that the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured and collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has experience in collecting</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	<p>and reporting similar performance measures with consideration to proper data collection processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed explanation of their data collection processes including how the outputs and outcomes will be collected consistently and accurately.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed explanation of the infrastructure available to collect the National Performance Measure data, including systems and tools for facilitating data collection.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (2 pts.)</b>	<p>High probability and confidence that the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured and collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of how the outputs and outcomes will be measured.</li> <li>▪ Includes plans to collect National Performance Measure data that explains most assumptions.</li> <li>▪ Covers information on infrastructure that explains most assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (1 pt.)</b>	<p>Acceptable probability that the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured and collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the outputs and outcomes will be measured.</li> <li>▪ Includes plans to collect National Performance Measure data that makes some assumptions.</li> <li>▪ Covers information on infrastructure that makes some assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pt.)</b>	<p>Low probability the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured and collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the outputs and outcomes will be measured.</li> <li>▪ Includes plans to collect National Performance Measure data that includes many unsupported assumptions.</li> <li>▪ Covers information on infrastructure that makes many unsupported assumptions.</li> <li>▪ Did not connect the plan or infrastructure to National Performance Measure measurement. Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not provide information on either the plan or the infrastructure to collect National Performance Measures.</li> </ul>

**Q15. Plans and infrastructure to manage project resources, both financial and in-kind, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.**

<b>__ Excellent (3 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to manage project resources, both financial and in-kind, with the highest probability of accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating and managing project resources, both financial and in-kind, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage and sustain project resources, both financial and in-kind, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to manage project resources, both financial and in-kind, with a high probability of accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to manage project resources, both financial and in-kind, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions regarding the infrastructure required to ensure accountability.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (1 pt.)</b>	<p>Realistic plan and infrastructure to manage project resources, both financial and in-kind, with an acceptable probability of accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan and infrastructure will ensure management of project resources, both financial and in-kind, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to ensure accountability.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Unrealistic or no plan or absence of infrastructure to manage project resources, both financial and in-kind, with a low probability of accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</p>

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will ensure management of project resources, both financial and in-kind, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding infrastructure required to ensure accountability.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>
--	--

**COMMENTS: (Provide significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment)**

**CLARIFICATION: (Include issues requiring further clarification that will help CNCS to make informed decisions)**

***Organizational Capability (20%)***

Q16. Plans and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.

<b>—Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	<p>Highest confidence in the plan and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies that are informed by ongoing data collection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating how programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection may affect internal policies.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage and regularly assess and provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--

<b>—Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>High confidence in the plan and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to manage and assess sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight.</li> </ul>
-----------------------	---

<b>—Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Fair to acceptable confidence in the plan and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic plan to manage sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight.</li> </ul>
-----------------------	---

<b>—Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Low confidence in the plan or absence of infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not provide a clear description of sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support and annual data collection, to include clearly defined internal policies.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding operational infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------	--

Q17. Descriptions of clearly defined paid staff positions, including how these positions will be sustained and (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project.

<b>—Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	Provides clearly defined paid staff positions, including how these positions will be sustained and
----------------------------	--

**Corporation for National and Community Service**  
**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**  
**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	(as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested and is actively assessing staff position compatibility with project management.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to sustain paid staff.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (3 pts.)</b>	Provides clearly defined staff positions, clear descriptions of how these positions will be sustained and including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic and sustainable staff planning infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Staff assignments are coordinated with project management.</li> <li>▪ Explains most assumptions regarding the infrastructure required to sustain paid staff.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (2 pts.)</b>	Provides some description of paid staff positions, including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a realistic staff planning infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Staff assignments are coordinated with project management.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions regarding the infrastructure required to sustain paid staff.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	No clear description of paid staff positions, including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not provide a clear description of how staff assignments are coordinated with project management.</li> <li>▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding the infrastructure required to sustain paid staff.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> </ul>

Q18. Examples of the applicant organization’s track record in managing volunteers in the **Primary Focus Area**, to include if applicable, measuring performance in the Primary Focus Area.

<b>__ Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	The applicant organization demonstrates a track record of effective management of volunteers in the primary Focus Area and in measuring performance in the primary Focus Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Previous or current evidence of effective management of volunteers in the primary Focus Area and in measuring performance in the primary Focus Area.</li> <li>▪ Examples of current and past performance measure outcomes.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested, in 1) managing volunteers, 2) primary Focus Area, and 3) measuring performance.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (3 pts.)</b>	The applicant organization has a track record of effective management of volunteers in the primary Focus Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates a sound track record in managing volunteers in the primary Focus Area.</li> <li>▪ Examples of current or past activity in the primary focus area.</li> <li>▪ Provides most of the information requested in 1) managing volunteers, 2) primary focus area, and 3) measuring performance.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (2 pts.)</b>	The applicant organization has some experience in managing volunteers or some experience in the primary focus area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates some experience in managing volunteers OR demonstrates some experience in the primary focus area.</li> <li>▪ Includes minimal examples of current or past activity.</li> <li>▪ Provides responses to only two of the three parts of the information requested in 1) managing volunteers, 2) primary Focus Area, and 3) measuring performance.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	The applicant organization has no experience in either managing volunteers or the primary focus area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No examples of current or past activity in managing volunteers or in the primary focus area.</li> </ul>

Q19. Demonstration of organizational infrastructure in the following areas (I-iv):

- i. Tangible assets such as facilities, equipment, supplies.
- ii. Governance structure and operations such as internal policies, purchasing procedures, and personnel management.

**Corporation for National and Community Service**  
**INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**  
**2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

iii. Role of a community participation group, such as an RSVP Advisory Council, to ensure input from the community.  
iv. Robust financial management systems and past experience managing federal grant funds.

<b>—Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	<p>Highest probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above in I-iv.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested in areas I-iv, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise and provides details on solutions to potential organizational issues.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested above in areas I-iv.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds.</li> </ul>
<b>—Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>High probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above in areas I-iv.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested above in areas I-iv.</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<b>—Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Fair to acceptable probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above in areas I-iv.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Covers most of the information requested above in areas I-iv, with a few exceptions.</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.</li> </ul>
<b>—Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Low probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as required above in areas I-iv.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not describe sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds.</li> <li>▪ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it</li> <li>▪ Does not provide one or more key pieces of information requested above in areas i-iv.</li> </ul>

**Q20. Demonstrates the adequacy and sustainability of the applicant's proposed required non-federal financial share.**

<b>—Excellent (4 pts.)</b>	<p>Highest probability and confidence of the adequacy and sustainability of the applicant's proposed required non-federal financial share.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has a plan for exceeding non-federal funds beyond the required non-federal financial share.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling rationale for the adequacy and sustainability of the non-federal share that will support the grant.</li> </ul>
<b>—Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>High probability and confidence of the adequacy and sustainability of the applicant's proposed required non-federal financial share.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic rationale for the adequacy and sustainability of the non-federal share that will support the grant.</li> <li>▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<b>—Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Fair to acceptable probability and confidence of the adequacy and sustainability of the applicant's proposed required non-federal financial share.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.</li> <li>▪ Provides a realistic rationale for the adequacy of the non-federal share that will support the grant.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions about the sustainability of the applicant's proposed required non-federal financial share.</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service  
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM  
2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

<b>__ Does Not Meet</b> (0 pts.)	<p>Low probability and confidence of the adequacy and sustainability of the applicant's proposed required non-federal financial share.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gives an unclear description of the rationale for the adequacy of the non-federal share that will support the grant.</li> <li>▪ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.</li> </ul>
----------------------------------	---

**COMMENTS:** (Provide significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment)

**CLARIFICATION:** (Include issues requiring further clarification that will help CNCS to make informed decisions)

**III. Effectiveness & Budget Adequacy (15%)**

Q21. Plans and infrastructure to provide applicable costs and reimbursable expenses to volunteers such as transportation, meals, and insurance, as well as plans and infrastructure to provide criminal history background checks as appropriate.

<b>__ Excellent</b> (5 pts.)	<p>Highest confidence in plan and infrastructure to provide reimbursable expenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The application specifically addresses and demonstrates that the budget is adequate and reasonable to support transportation, meals, and insurance for volunteers as well as criminal history background checks as appropriate for those who receive a salary or similar payment from the grant.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested in the budget section relevant to reimbursable expenses.</li> <li>▪ The budget is adequate and reasonable to support the reimbursable expenses proposed in the application.</li> </ul>
------------------------------	---

<b>__ Good</b> (3.5 pts.)	<p>High confidence in plan and infrastructure to provide reimbursable expenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The application provides a realistic description of how the budget will support transportation or meals, insurance and criminal history background checks.</li> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested in the budget section relevant to reimbursable expenses.</li> <li>▪ The budget is adequate and reasonable to support the reimbursable expenses proposed in the application.</li> </ul>
---------------------------	---

<b>__ Fair</b> (2 pts.)	<p>Fair to acceptable confidence in plan and infrastructure to provide reimbursable expenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The application provides a description of how the budget will support insurance and criminal history background checks.</li> <li>▪ Covers most of the information requested in the budget section relevant to reimbursable expenses, with a few exceptions.</li> <li>▪ The budget is adequate and reasonable for the reimbursable expenses proposed in the application.</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

<b>__ Does Not Meet</b> (0 pts.)	<p>Low confidence in plan and infrastructure to provide reimbursable expenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed plan for providing reimbursable expenses exceeds the capacity of the proposed budget.</li> <li>▪ Does not address insurance or criminal history background checks in the budget.</li> </ul>
----------------------------------	--

Q22. The adequacy and reasonableness of the budget to support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.

<b>__ Excellent</b> (5)	<p>Comprehensive and highly compelling description of the adequacy and reasonableness of the budget to support volunteer recruitment and recognition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The budget is adequate and reasonable to support the RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition described in the application.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested in the Budget Section on RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</li> </ul>
-------------------------	--

**Corporation for National and Community Service  
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM  
2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates how the budget will support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition with thorough and detailed plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (3.5 pts.)</b>	<p>High confidence of the adequacy and reasonableness of the budget to support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested in the Budget Section on RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</li> <li>▪ Demonstrates how the budget will support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Fair to acceptable confidence of the adequacy and reasonableness of the budget to support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Covers most of the information requested in the Budget Section on RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition, with a few exceptions.</li> <li>▪ Demonstrates how the budget will support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions about the relationship between budgeted items and volunteer recruitment and recognition.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Low confidence of the adequacy and reasonableness of the budget to support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not sufficiently demonstrate how the budget will support RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</li> <li>▪ The application makes many unrealistic assumptions about the budgeted infrastructure required for RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition.</li> <li>▪ Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.</li> <li>▪ Does not address RSVP volunteer recruitment and recognition in the budget.</li> <li>▪ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.</li> </ul>

**Q23. The adequacy and reasonableness of required non-federal funds budgeted.**

<b>__ Excellent (5 pts.)</b>	<p>Highest confidence in the adequacy of the resources for non-federal funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The application budget specifically addresses and demonstrates the commitment of the applicant organization to secure resources for exceeding required non-federal funds.</li> <li>▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested in the Budget Section on applicant organization’s financial commitment to the proposal including specific identification of the sources of non-federal funds.</li> <li>▪ Application includes a compelling plan to secure resources for non-federal funds with sustainable plans to increase match in subsequent years as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Good (3 pts.)</b>	<p>High confidence in the adequacy of the resources for non-federal funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested in the Budget Section on applicant organization’s financial commitment to the proposal including specific identification of the sources for non-federal funds.</li> <li>▪ Application includes a reasonable plan to secure resources for non-federal funds and meets their non-federal fund requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Fair (2 pts.)</b>	<p>Fair to adequate confidence in the adequacy of the resources for non-federal funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Covers most of the information requested in the Budget Section on applicant organization’s financial commitment to the proposal, with a few exceptions.</li> <li>▪ Is sometimes unclear on rationale for the adequacy of the resources for non-federal funds.</li> <li>▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.</li> <li>▪ Application describes a plan to secure resources for non-federal funds and meets their non-federal fund requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>__ Does Not Meet (0 pts.)</b>	<p>Low confidence in the adequacy of the resources for non-federal funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The applicant organization does not make any commitments to meet the required non-federal funds.</li> <li>▪ Budget Section does not address the applicant organization’s financial commitment to the proposal.</li> </ul>

**Corporation for National and Community Service  
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM  
2013 RSVP COMPETITION**

<b>Legal Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant ID #</b>
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	<b>Panel #</b>
<b>Opportunity State</b>	<b>Opportunity #</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.</li> <li>▪ Application does not describe the plan to secure resources for non-federal funds.</li> </ul>
--	--

**COMMENTS:** (Provide significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment)

**CLARIFICATION:** (Include issues requiring further clarification that will help CNCS to make informed decisions)



**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_ **OF 100**

**REVIEWER OVERALL COMMENTS**

**A. Significant Strengths and Weaknesses**

**Copy and paste 5-8 comments from above** addressing how the application addresses the Selection Criteria. Using complete sentences, address the significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment that attributed to the selected Ratings, per the reviewer rubric. **Ensure the comments respond directly to the Selection Criteria from all categories** (program design, program management, organizational capability, and cost effectiveness and budget adequacy). Also note if there is significant activity serving veterans or military families.

**COMMENTS:**