

**FY 2016 Social Innovation Fund Classic Cooperative Agreements Competition
Review Form**

**Instructions: Complete all yellow fields. Cells may provide guidance in a help text box.
To copy and paste, do so into the formula bar above**

| # | APPLICATION OVERVIEW | Total Awarded Points | 0.00 |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| A | Type of Review | Evaluation | 0 |
| B | Status of Review | | out of 30 |
| C | Date of Status Change | | |
| D | Your First Initial, Last Name | | |
| E | Reviewer Number | | |
| F | Panel Number | | |
| G | Application ID | | |
| H | Legal Applicant | | |
| I | Program Name | | |
| J | State | | |
| K | Amount Requested | | |
| L | Share Amount | | |
| PD Section Total | Program Design (70 points total) In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria: | Program Design Section Total | 0.00 |
| Q3 - EVAL | <p>Proposal for Evaluation (30 points of 70) In determining the quality please assess the following criteria - the applicant's capacity to ensure successful evaluation(s) of the applicant portfolio as demonstrated by: o Experience in managing and supporting evaluations of past funded program models; o Experience influencing and supporting recipients to use evidence to improve program performance; o Ability to apply evidence/evaluation results to decision-making (e.g., investment strategies); and o Staff or contractor ability to ensure successful evaluation of their subrecipients' program models. - The quality of the applicant plan to assess subrecipient applicants for readiness and capacity to implement a rigorous evaluation plan that could achieve moderate or strong evidence over a three to four year period. - The adequacy of the applicant plan to assess needs for and provide technical assistance to subrecipients as they design, implement, and monitor evaluations of their program models, including a description of the role of staff and contractors.</p> <p>- Strategy A: Whether the applicant presented a reasonable plan for assessing the evidence level of the solutions being proposed by prospective subrecipients. - Strategy B: Whether the applicant's evaluation strategy is likely to result in funded program models achieving at least moderate evidence over a three to four year grant period. - The applicant's justification of the adequacy of the budget to support the cost of reasonable evaluation activities that will meet the Social Innovation Fund evaluation requirements. - Strategy A: Whether the applicant make the case that there are existing program models that align with the applicant rationale and approach with at least preliminary evidence and the potential to achieve at least moderate evidence during a three to four year period. - Strategy B: Whether the applicant's proposed solution(s) have at least preliminary evidence and has the potential to increase its level of evidence under the Social Innovation Fund, and achieve at least moderate evidence. (See definitions in Section A.4.d). In the case of either Strategy A or B, does the applicant cite the research that supports their assessment? - If the applicant is applying to more rigorously evaluate a previously funded Social Innovation Fund project: whether the evaluation strategy is likely to result in an increased level of evidence.</p> | | 0 |
| STR EVAL | Include strengths, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Evaluation | | |
| WEAK EVAL | Include weaknesses, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Evaluation | | |
| Evaluation - Strategy B | For Strategy B applicants ONLY Indicate the level of evidence of the intervention based on your assessment | Level of Evidence | |