

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2016 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A. Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	
B. Status of Review	Awaiting POL	H. Panel Number	
C. Date of Status Change		I. Funding Amount	
D. 2015 Application ID			
E. Legal Applicant			
F. Opportunity Number			

Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
---------------	--------------	------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------

PROGRAM DESIGN (50%) Strengthening Communities – Questions 1-5 Recruitment and Development Volunteers – Questions 6-8

Strengthening Communities (35%)

Reviewers will assess the extent of the work plan proposed in the application through the following criteria:

<p>Q1. (7%) Work plans and demonstrate the community need</p>	<p>Excellent</p>	<p>7.00</p>	<p>Makes clear statement of the problem or issue the program will focus on and demonstrates a community need that is a high priority for the geographic service area. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides statistics to document the problem <input type="checkbox"/> Supporting Information is from a reputable source <input type="checkbox"/> Provides current information from within past few years <input type="checkbox"/> Provides local documentation of the community need (Relevant to the proposed service locations) <input type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested; shows that meeting this need is a high priority for the geographic service area. <input type="checkbox"/> Supports assertion of a high priority community need with statements of support from key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Makes clear statement of the problem or issue the program will focus on. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides statistics to document the problem <input type="checkbox"/> Supporting Information is from a reputable source <input type="checkbox"/> Provides current information from within past few years <input type="checkbox"/> Local (Relevant to the proposed service locations) <input type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested; shows that meeting this need is a high priority for the geographic service area. <input type="checkbox"/> Supports assertion of a high priority community need with statements of support from key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Makes clear statement of the problem or issue the program will focus on. <input type="checkbox"/> Supporting Information is from a reputable source <input type="checkbox"/> Information is not current, but provides explanation</p>	<p>There is no clear statement about the problem or issue the program will focus on. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear if the supporting information is from a reputable source. <input type="checkbox"/> Information is not current and provides no explanation.</p>
<p>Q2. (7%) Work plans articulate a theory of change – meaning, how service activities will address the community needs, and how the service activity described provides a significant contribution to the outcomes listed in the work plan. This question will focus on work plans that lead to national performance measure outcomes. (see Appendix B)</p>	<p>Excellent</p>	<p>7.00</p>	<p>Defines a cause-and-effect relationship between a specific intervention, or service activity, and an intended outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear description of the activities volunteers will provide <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention directly addresses the identified community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity relates to community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity is achievable within remaining time in grant (three-years) <input type="checkbox"/> Change highly likely to occur based on proposed intervention substantiated by reputable research and/or evidence of intervention working elsewhere under similar conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Fully describes the service dosage, frequency, intensity, and duration <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly shows cause and effect relationship</p>	<p>Defines a cause-and-effect relationship between a specific intervention, or service activity, and an intended outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear description of the activities volunteers will provide <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention directly addresses the identified community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity relates to community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity is achievable within remaining time in grant (three-years) <input type="checkbox"/> Change highly likely to occur based on proposed intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly describes the service dosage: frequency, intensity and duration</p>	<p>Describes a cause-and-effect relationship between service activity and an intended outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear description of the volunteer activity <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention addresses the identified community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity relates to community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity is achievable within remaining time in grant (three-years) <input type="checkbox"/> Change may occur based on proposed service activity <input type="checkbox"/> Does not fully describe the service dosage, frequency, intensity or duration</p>	<p>Does not describe a cause-and-effect relationship between service activity and an intended outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not provide a clear description of the volunteer activity <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention does not addresses the identified community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity is not related to community need <input type="checkbox"/> Activity is not achievable within remaining time in grant (three-years) <input type="checkbox"/> Change not likely to occur based on proposed service activity <input type="checkbox"/> Does not mention the service dosage: frequency, intensity or duration</p>

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2016 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A. Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	
B. Status of Review	Awaiting POL	H. Panel Number	
C. Date of Status Change		I. Funding Amount	
D. 2015 Application ID			
E. Legal Applicant			
F. Opportunity Number			

	Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
Q3. (7%) Work plans logically connect four major elements to each other: 1. The community need(s) identified 2. The service activities that will be carried out by RSVP volunteers 3. The instrument description and data collection plans 4. The work plans that include target numbers leading to outcomes or outputs, and that are appropriate for the total number of volunteers assigned	Excellent	7.00	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure output and OUTCOME pair appropriate to the number of duplicated volunteers. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested, and commits to National Performance Measure outcomes that address the community need. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to a National Performance Measure output and outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Links four major element ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output and outcome pairs that are appropriate to the number of volunteers.	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure OUTPUT appropriate to the number of duplicated volunteers. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a response to all of the information requested. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Links four major element ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output and outcome pairs that are appropriate to the number of volunteers. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes a Data Collection Plan.	Connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure OUTPUT. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Covers a community need, service activities, instrument descriptions and a National Performance Measure output that are related. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities connect the community need to a National Performance Measure output and align with the National Performance Measure instructions. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes unrealistic target numbers or volunteer numbers. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained in describing and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instruments, and a National Performance Measure output. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outputs and Outcomes may not be appropriate for the number of volunteers.	Does not connect the four major elements. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The community need, service activities, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output are not related. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes at least one work plan with zero target numbers. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Did not connect a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not address one of the four major elements.
Q4. (7%) Work plan outputs and outcomes are aligned with National Performance Measure instructions. (see Appendix B)	Yes	7.00				
Q5. (7%) Work plans have outputs and outcomes that are achievable based on resources, program design and the number of volunteers engaged.	Excellent	7.00				
Strengthening Communities - Strengths						
Strengthening Communities - Weaknesses						
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers (15%)						

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2016 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A. Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	
B. Status of Review	Awaiting POL	H. Panel Number	
C. Date of Status Change		I. Funding Amount	
D. 2015 Application ID			
E. Legal Applicant			
F. Opportunity Number			

	Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
Q6. (5%) Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to ensure RSVP volunteers receive training needed to succeed in the service activities described in the work plan	Excellent	5.00	Does not connect the four major elements. <input type="checkbox"/> The community need, service activities, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output are not related. <input type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. <input type="checkbox"/> Includes at least one work plan with zero target numbers. <input type="checkbox"/> Did not connect a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not address one of the four major elements.	Does not connect the four major elements. <input type="checkbox"/> The community need, service activities, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output are not related. <input type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. <input type="checkbox"/> Includes at least one work plan with zero target numbers. <input type="checkbox"/> Did not connect a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not address one of the four major elements.	Realistic plan to train RSVP volunteers. <input type="checkbox"/> Is sometimes unclear how the training activity is related to service activities. <input type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to support RSVP volunteer training.	Unrealistic or no plan to provide training to RSVP volunteers. <input type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear description of how the proposed training is related to service activities. <input type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not address RSVP volunteer training.
Q7. (5%) Describes the demographics of the community served and plans to recruit a volunteer pool reflective of the community served. This could possibly include: 1. Individuals from diverse races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, or degrees of	Excellent	5.00	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. <input type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has partnered with volunteer stations that will assist in recruitment and development. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and highly compelling plan to recruit and	Realistic plan and infrastructure for significant activity in the recruitment and development of RSVP volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic plan to recruit and develop one of the above volunteer pools. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains most assumptions about infrastructure required for recruitment. <input type="checkbox"/> Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines. <input type="checkbox"/> Includes a comprehensive description of the community	Realistic plan for the recruitment and development of volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above. <input type="checkbox"/> Plan is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will serve recruitment and development from one of the above volunteer pools. <input type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions about infrastructure required for recruitment. <input type="checkbox"/> Includes a comprehensive description of the community demographics including demographic information about one	Unrealistic or no plan for the recruitment and development of volunteers who are from one of the specific volunteer pools above. <input type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear plan of how the proposed activities will serve recruitment. <input type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not address the recruitment of RSVP volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above.
Q8. (5%) Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to retain and recognize RSVP volunteers	Excellent	5.00	Plan and infrastructure for significant retention and recognition activity that includes measuring the satisfaction of current volunteers. <input type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested, and is actively managing retention activities including volunteer satisfaction measurement. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and highly compelling plan of how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention.	Plan and infrastructure for significant retention and recognition activity. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic plan of how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure that supports volunteer retention	Plan for some retention and recognition activity. <input type="checkbox"/> Plan is sometimes unclear how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention. <input type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions regarding volunteer retention.	Unrealistic or no retention and recognition activity. <input type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear plan of how the proposed recognition activities will support volunteer retention. <input type="checkbox"/> Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding volunteer retention. <input type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers - Strengths						
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers - Weaknesses						
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)	Program Management - Questions 9-11		Organizational Capability – Questions 12-14			
Program Management (15%)						

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2016 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A. Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	
B. Status of Review	Awaiting POL	H. Panel Number	
C. Date of Status Change		I. Funding Amount	
D. 2015 Application ID			
E. Legal Applicant			
F. Opportunity Number			

	Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
Q9. (5%) Plans and infrastructure to ensure management of volunteer stations in compliance with RSVP program regulations	Excellent	5.00	Realistic and dynamic plan and infrastructure to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations and have a plan to prevent and identify prohibited activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating and assessing current volunteer station management. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage volunteer stations, and the infrastructure to sustain them. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses how to prevent or identify prohibited activities	Realistic plan and infrastructure to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic plan to engage and manage volunteer stations. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond most assumptions. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explains most assumptions about prevention of or identifying prohibited activities.	__Fair (10 pts.) Realistic plan to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to prevent or identify prohibited activities.	Unrealistic or no plan to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding prevention of or identification of prohibited activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
Q10. (5%) Plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing their assigned service activities	Excellent	5.00	Realistic and dynamic plan and infrastructure for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested; is actively evaluating and assessing current volunteer assignments. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clearly describes plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will be managed by the project.	Realistic plan and infrastructure for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic description of plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations in order to ensure volunteers are performing assigned activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explains most assumptions and reasons.	Realistic plan for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is sometimes unclear how the volunteer stations will be developed or overseen. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.	Unrealistic or no plan for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives an unclear description of how the volunteer stations will be developed or overseen. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection between overseeing stations and ensuring volunteers are performing assigned activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tends to “parrot” back the question, rather than answer and explain it. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not address or mention volunteer stations or assigned service activities.
Q11. (5%) Demonstrated an organizational track record in work plans that lead to national performance measure outcomes (see Appendix B)	Excellent	5.00	The applicant organization demonstrates a track record in the work plans and in measuring performance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous or current evidence of effective management of volunteers and in measuring performance in outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examples of current and past performance measure outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested	The applicant organization has a track record of effective management of volunteers in the Primary Focus Area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a sound track record in managing volunteers in the Primary Focus Area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examples of current or past activity in the Primary Focus Area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides most of the information requested in 1) managing volunteers, 2) Primary Focus Area, and 3) measuring performance.	The applicant organization has some experience in managing volunteers or some experience in the Primary Focus Area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates some experience in managing volunteers OR demonstrates some experience in the Primary Focus Area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes minimal examples of current or past activity. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	The applicant organization has no experience in either managing volunteers or the Primary Focus Area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No examples of current or past activity in managing volunteers or in the Primary Focus Area.
Program Management - Strengths						
Program Management - Weaknesses						
Organizational Capability (20%)						

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2016 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A. Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	
B. Status of Review	Awaiting POL	H. Panel Number	
C. Date of Status Change		I. Funding Amount	
D. 2015 Application ID			
E. Legal Applicant			
F. Opportunity Number			

	Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
Q12. (5%) Plans and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight (both financial and in-kind) and day-to-day operational support to ensure the following: 1) compliance with RSVP program requirements (statutes, regulations, and applicable OMB circulars); 2) accountability, and 3) efficient and effective use of available resources	Excellent	5.00	Highest confidence in the plan and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support, to ensure compliance with RSVP program requirements and to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating how programmatic and fiscal oversight and day-to-day operational support may affect internal policies. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage and regularly assess and provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight and day-to-day operational support, to include clearly defined internal policies.	High confidence in the plan and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support, to ensure compliance with RSVP program requirements and to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic plan to manage and assess sound programmatic and fiscal oversight and day-to-day operational support, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight.	Fair to acceptable confidence in the plan and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support, to ensure compliance with RSVP program requirements and to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic plan to manage sound programmatic and fiscal oversight and day-to-day operational support, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight.	Low confidence in the plan or absence of infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight, day-to-day operational support, to ensure compliance with RSVP program requirements and to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not provide a clear description of sound programmatic and fiscal oversight and day-to-day operational support, to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding operational infrastructure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
Q13. (5%) Demonstrated clearly defined paid staff positions, including identification of current staff assigned to the project, (name, title and brief position description) and how these positions will ensure the accomplishment of program objectives	Excellent	5.00	Provides clearly defined paid staff positions, including how these positions will ensure the accomplishment of program objectives and (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested and is actively assessing staff position compatibility with project management. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and realistic plan that connects paid staff with the accomplishment of program objectives.	Provides clearly defined staff positions, including how these positions will ensure the accomplishment of program objectives and (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic staff planning infrastructure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff assignments are coordinated with project management. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explains most assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for paid staff.	Provides some description of paid staff positions, including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic staff planning infrastructure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff assignments are coordinated with project management. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for paid staff.	No clear description of paid staff positions, including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not provide a clear description of how staff assignments are coordinated with project management. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for paid staff. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
Q14. (5%) Demonstrated organizational capacity to develop and implement internal policies and operating procedures to provide governance and manage risk, such as accounting, personnel management, and purchasing	Excellent	5.00	Highest probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise and provides details on solutions to potential organizational issues. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear and highly compelling description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds.	High probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a response to all of the information requested above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.	Fair to acceptable probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Covers most of the information requested above, with a few exceptions. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.	Low probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as required above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not describe sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not provide one or more key pieces of information requested above.

Organizational Capability - Strengths	
Organizational Capability - Weaknesses	

Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%):

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2016 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A. Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	
B. Status of Review	Awaiting POL	H. Panel Number	
C. Date of Status Change		I. Funding Amount	
D. 2015 Application ID			
E. Legal Applicant			
F. Opportunity Number			

	Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
Q. 15 (10%) Have a reasonable cost per volunteer in proposed work plans that lead to national performance measure requirements (see Appendix B)	Excellent	10.00	Budget Cost per Volunteer exceeds the national performance measure requirements with a low cost per volunteer (less than \$500 per unduplicated volunteer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget includes what is required to support volunteers engaged in national performance measure requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget is logically connected to the narrative and supports the national performance service activity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget primarily supports service activities in the National Performance Measures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget provides required information	Cost per Volunteer meets the national performance measure requirements and <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget includes what is required to support volunteers engaged in national performance measure requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget is logically connected to the narrative and supports the national performance service activity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget primarily supports service activities in the National Performance Measures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget provides required information	Cost per Volunteer meets the national performance measure requirements and <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget includes what is required to support volunteers engaged in national performance measure requirements, with a few exceptions. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget is logically connected to the narrative and supports the national performance service activity, with a few exceptions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget primarily supports allowable service activities outside of the National Performance Measures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget provides required information	Cost per Volunteer meets the national performance measure requirements but <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget does not include what is required to support volunteers engaged in national performance measure requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget is not logically connected to the narrative and does not substantively support the national performance measure service activity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget supports activities unrelated to national service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget does not provide key pieces of information required. Or Cost per volunteer does NOT meet the national performance measure requirements
Q16. (10%) Have plans and infrastructure to secure the non-federal share including dedicated staff, grant proposal processes and other plans	Excellent	10.00				
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy - Strengths						
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy - Weaknesses						
Total Score		#REF!				