

**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	Program	0
B	Status of Review		out of 70
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
Q1 - RA	<p>Rationale and Approach (10 points of 70 in Program Design) The applicant's approach as either a geographically- or issue-based Social Innovation Fund (as described in Section A.1: Purpose of Social Innovation Fund Funding), including the target community or geographies that the applicant will serve and the Social Innovation Fund issue area(s) on which the applicant's programming will focus. - Whether the applicant made a persuasive case, using statistical information, that it has identified a critical social problem in the target geographical area(s). - Whether the applicant demonstrated that solutions currently being implemented to address the selected social problem in the target geographical area(s) have not been proven to be effective, are not achieving outcomes at scale, or are too slow to respond. - Whether the applicant presented a clear, logical theory of change that outlines the applicant's investment approach and the specific measurable outcomes that will be achieved through the applicant's proposed program. The applicant should clearly explain:</p> <p>1) the types of organizations the applicant will invest in and why; and 2) the value-added activities, including technical assistance or other services, the applicant will provide to the applicant subrecipients in order to align them with the theory of change and achieve the desired outcomes.</p> <p>- the applicant description of the programming strategy (A or B) the applicant plan to utilize and why it's the most appropriate for the applicant to achieve the applicant goals - Strategy A: The case the applicant makes that appropriate, evidence-based solutions exist to address the identified social problem in the target geography(ies). - Strategy B: The case the applicant makes that the solution(s) the applicant proposes to implement is: innovative (as defined in Section A.1: Purpose of Social Innovation Fund Funding), appropriate for the social problem identified, aligned with the applicant theory of change, and is likely to produce the desired outcomes. - If the applicant is applying for renewed funding of a currently funded SIF project: whether the proposed activities will further increase knowledge about intervention. - If the applicant is a current recipient of, or are under consideration for, other federal funding: how the proposed SIF project is distinct from, or will supplement rather than duplicate, other federally funded projects. Is the applicant using other federal funding sources, and if so, what are they?</p>		0
STR RA	Include strengths, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Rationale and Approach		
WEAK RA	Include weaknesses, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Rationale and Approach		
	<p>Proposal for subrecipient strategy (15 points of 70 in Program Design) - the applicant profile of the type of subrecipient organization the applicant hopes to fund and how it aligns with the rationale and approach described above. - Whether the applicant provides a clear and comprehensive plan for carrying out a competitive subrecipient selection process, that includes: o The estimated number of subawards that will be made; o The estimated range of subaward amounts; o The criteria that will be used to determine prospective subrecipients' fit with the applicant theory of change or successfully contribute to its outcome measures; and</p>		

Q2 - SUB	<p>o A general timeline or timeframe outlining when stages of the selection process would be completed. Does the applicant identify subrecipient selection and award process must be completed within six to eight months of the grant award?</p> <p>- Whether the applicant presents a selection process that has a high likelihood of identifying high-performing subrecipients (as defined in Section A.1: Purpose of Social Innovation Fund Funding), meet all of the eligibility criteria of a Social Innovation Fund grant as outlined in Appendix I.</p> <p>- The applicant's capacity to successfully implement their applicant proposed subaward selection process, including demonstrated experience selecting and awarding competitive grants to nonprofits.</p> <p>- Strategy A: How the applicant will attract and select solutions that are innovative (as defined in Section A.1: Purpose of Social Innovation Fund Funding).</p> <p>- Strategy B: How the applicant will select subrecipients who are well-suited to implement the pre-defined intervention.</p> <p>- How the applicant will assess subrecipient applicants for readiness (i.e., necessary skills and knowledge) and capacity (i.e., necessary resources) to implement program growth as a part of their participation in the Social Innovation Fund</p>		0
STR SUB	Include strengths, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Subrecipient Selection		
WEAK SUB	Include weaknesses, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Subrecipient Selection		
Q4 - GROW	<p>Proposal for Growing Subrecipient Impact (15 points of 70) In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria:</p> <p>The applicant's capacity to support subrecipient growth including relevant examples of successful past efforts to support growth through replication or expansion and a description of adequate resources to support successful subrecipient growth as proposed.</p> <p>- The applicant's theory or approach to growing effective subrecipient program models.</p> <p>- The characteristics the applicant will use to assess subrecipient capacity for growth and the applicant's description of how evidence of effectiveness will be used to determine when or how a program is well-situated for growth.</p> <p>- How the applicant will support strategic and effective subrecipient growth through technical assistance, data systems, planning assistance or other resources that results in long-term sustainability for the expanded program beyond the three to four year period.</p>		0
STR GROW	Include strengths, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Growing Subrecipients		
WEAK GROW	Include weaknesses, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for the Proposal for Growing Subrecipients		
OC Section total	Organizational Capability (15 points) Examine the degree to which the applicant clearly and convincingly conveys	Organizational Capability Section Points	0.00
Q5 - OB, SC	<p>Organizational Background and Staff Capacity (7 points of 15) In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria:</p> <p>- Whether the applicant made a compelling case for the applicant's ability to successfully support the approach and outcomes that the applicant propose, including a description of the applicant track record and resources, including as applicable:</p> <p>o The applicant's experience, accomplishments and outcomes operating and overseeing programs in the selected issue area(s) of activity.</p> <p>o The applicant's experience and current capacity to collect and analyze data required for evaluation, continuous improvement, compliance and other purposes.</p> <p>o The applicant's current organizational budget, the percentage of the budget this grant would represent, and the implications for the applicant organization.</p> <p>o The experience, qualifications and current capacity of staff and contractors to effectively implement the proposed program. Discuss the involvement of management, and board members.</p> <p>- The applicant's ability to develop the necessary systems to maintain a grant program compliant with federal grant requirements, including a description of how the applicant will ensure compliance with CNCS National Service Criminal History Check requirements. For reference, please see Section F.3. National Service Criminal History Check Requirements.</p> <p>- The applicant's capacity to maintain long-term relationships with subrecipients, including how short- and long-term goals will be established.</p>		0

Q6 - SS, M&O	<p>Subrecipient Support, Monitory and Oversight (5 points of 15) In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the applicant prior experience setting and implementing goals with recipients. - the applicant experience evaluating the performance of recipients for outcome-focused initiatives. - The technical assistance and other services that the applicant will provide to subrecipients to support their success in achieving the applicant proposed outcomes. - the applicant plan for building subrecipient capacity to develop compliant federal grants management systems. - the applicant plan for building subrecipient capacity to achieve scaling, evaluation and other key program goals. - the applicant plan for developing subrecipient performance measurement systems and the applicant description of how the applicant will use these to monitor and improve subrecipient performance. - How the applicant will monitor subrecipients for compliance and for progress towards goals. 		0
Q6 - SUSTAIN	<p>Strategy for Sustainability after the SIF Grant Period (3 points of 15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The applicant's demonstrated commitment to continue the investment priorities articulated in this application beyond the life of the grant. - The applicant's strategy for ensuring that subrecipients are positioned to continue evaluation and sustain program growth beyond the grant lifecycle. 		0
STR OC	Include strengths, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for organizational capability		
WEAK OC	Include weaknesses, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for organizational capability		
CEBA section total	<p>Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (15 points)</p> <p>In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria:</p>	Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy Section Points	0.00
Q8 - JUST	<p>Budget Justification (5 points of 15) In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria:</p> <p>Whether the budget the applicant proposed is reasonable and sufficient to successfully support program activities, including subrecipient selection, evaluation, program growth, and subrecipient support and oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the budget is aligned with the application's narrative and provided an adequate explanation for expenses. - (If applicable) Whether the applicant made a compelling case for higher program costs due to an intention to make subawards in areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved. 		0
Q9 - MATCH	<p>Match (10 points of 15) In determining the quality of the applications, please assess the following criteria:</p> <p>The applicant's prior experience achieving significant non-federal fundraising goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant's description of match already raised or committed. - the applicant's plan for securing the total one-to-one non-federal cash match requirement. - The applicant's capacity and plan for assisting subrecipients to secure their required match. 		0
CEBA STR	Include strengths, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for cost effectiveness and budget adequacy		
CEBA WEAK	Include weaknesses, as needed, to justify the ratings selected for cost effectiveness and budget adequacy		