2016 New/Recompete Consensus Staff Review Worksheet AmeriCorps State & National	
A Type of Review	Consensus
B. Status of Review	
C. Date of Submission	
D. Reviewer	
E. Panel Number	
F. 2016 Application ID	
G. Legal Applicant	
H. Program Name	
I. Program History	
J. Single or Multi-State	

Review Summary	
Phase 1	
Recommendation	0
Justification of Recommendation	
0	
Significant Opportunity and/or Risk	0
Comments on Significant Opportunity and/or Risk	
N/A	
Phase 2	
Recommendation	0
Recommended Funds ($)	$0
Recommended MSYs	0.00
Recommended Slots	0
Recommended Cost/MSY ($)	0.00
Justification of Clarification Recommendation	
0	
Significant Opportunity and/or Risk	N/A
Comments on Significant Opportunity and/or Risk	
N/A	
Final	
Recommendation	0
Recommended Funds ($)	$0
Recommended MSYs	0.00
Recommended Slots	0
Recommended Cost/MSY ($)	0.00
Justification of Funding Recommendation	
0	

PHASE 1 CONSENSUS REVIEW: PROGRAM DESIGN

A. Program Design

1. Problem/Need

1a. The community problem/need is clearly defined and aligns with the proposed intervention.	
1b. The community problem/need is prevalent and severe in communities where members will serve and has been well documented with relevant data.	

2. Theory of Change and Logic Model

2a. The applicant's proposed intervention is clearly articulated including the design, target population, and roles of AmeriCorps members and (if applicable) leveraged volunteers.	
2b. The applicant's intervention is likely to lead to the outcomes identified in the applicant's theory of change. The theory of change should be either evidence-informed or evidence-based, meaning that the proposed intervention is guided by the best available research evidence that supports its effectiveness in the evidence section.	
2c. The proposed outcomes represent meaningful progress in addressing the community problem/need identified by the applicant.	
2d. The applicant's AmeriCorps members will produce significant and unique contributions to existing efforts to address the stated problem.	

3. The evidence base appears to have the potential to be Moderate or Strong.	
Comments on Evidence Base	

4. Comments on Commission Recommendation (for Commission subapplicants only)
N/A

Phase 1 Opportunity/Risk

The applicant represents a significant opportunity or a significant risk.	
Comments on Opportunity/Risk	
N/A	

Phase 1 Recommendation

Recommendation	
Recommendation Justification	

Phase 1 Review Feedback: Strengths

No significant strengths noted.

PHASE 1 CONSENSUS REVIEW: PROGRAM DESIGN

Phase 1 Review Feedback: Weaknesses

No significant weaknesses noted.

Phase 1 Program Design Clarification

Bonus!

Bonus 1

Bonus 2

PHASE 2 CONSENSUS REVIEW: PROGRAM DESIGN

A. Executive Summary

Executive Summary	

B. Program Design

4. Notice Priority	
4a. The applicant's proposed program fits within one or more of the 2016 AmeriCorps funding priorities as outlined on page 3 of the *Notice* and more fully described in the Glossary, AND the proposed program meets all of the requirements listed on page 3 and in the Glossary.	

5. Member Training	
5a. AmeriCorps members will receive high quality training to provide effective service.	
5b. AmeriCorps members and volunteers will be aware of, and will adhere to, AmeriCorps requirements including the rules regarding prohibited activities.	

6. Member Supervision	
6a. AmeriCorps members will receive high quality guidance and support from their supervisor to provide effective service.	
6b. AmeriCorps supervisors will be adequately trained/prepared to follow AmeriCorps and program regulations, priorities, and expectations.	

7. Member Experience	
7a. AmeriCorps members will gain skills and experience as a result of their training and service that can be utilized and will be valued by future employers after their service term is completed.	
7b. AmeriCorps members will have access to meaningful service experiences, including opportunities for reflection and connection to the broader national service network.	
7c. The program will recruit AmeriCorps members from the geographic or demographic communities in which the program will operate.	

8. Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification	
8a. Members will know they are AmeriCorps members.	
8b. Staff and community members where the members are serving will know they are AmeriCorps members.	
8c. AmeriCorps members will be provided and wear service gear that prominently displays the AmeriCorps logo daily.	

Phase 2 Program Design Feedback: Strengths
No significant strengths noted.

Phase 2 Program Design Feedback: Weaknesses

PHASE 2 CONSENSUS REVIEW: PROGRAM DESIGN

No significant weaknesses noted.

Phase 2 Program Design Clarification

Performance Measure Clarification

Bonus!

Bonus 3

Bonus 4

C. Organizational Capability	
1. Organizational Background and Staffing	
1a. The organization has the experience, staffing, and management structure to plan and implement the proposed program.	
1b. The organization has adequate experience administering AmeriCorps grants or other federal funds.	
1c. The organization has sufficiently engaged community members and partner organizations in planning and implementing its intervention.	

2. Compliance and Accountability	
2a. The applicant's organization, in implementation and management of its AmeriCorps program, will prevent and detect compliance issues.	
2b. The applicant will hold itself, subgrantees, and service site locations (if applicable) accountable if instances of risk or noncompliance are identified.	
2c. The organization will comply with AmeriCorps rules and regulations including those related to prohibited and unallowable activities at the grantee, subgrantee, and service site locations (if applicable).	
2d. The AmeriCorps members' service will not duplicate, displace, or supplant volunteers, staff and/or interns.	

Phase 2 Organizational Capability Feedback: Strengths
No significant strengths noted.

Phase 2 Organizational Capability Feedback: Weaknesses
No significant weaknesses noted.

Phase 2 Organizational Capability Clarification

Bonus!
Bonus 5
Bonus 6

D. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy

1. Cost Effectiveness	
1a. The budget is sufficient to carry out the program effectively. Program costs not included in the formal budget, including for Fixed Price and Partnership Challenge grantees, must be described in this section in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to assess their sufficiency and alignment.	
1b. The budget aligns with the applicant's narrative. Program costs not included in the formal budget, including for Fixed Price and Partnership Challenge grantees, must be described in this section in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to assess their sufficiency and alignment.	
1c. The program design is cost effective and the benefits justify the cost**.**	
1d. The applicant has raised or describes an adequate plan to raise non-CNCS resources to fully support the program.	
1e. The applicant, if recompeting, has a lower cost per Member Service Year (MSY – see Glossary) than approved in previous grants, or provides a compelling rationale for the same or increased cost including why this increase could not be covered by the grantee share.	

Budget Adequacy - Grant Officer Rating	
Budget is submitted without mathematical errors and proposed costs are allowable, reasonable, and allocable to the award	GO rating
Budget is submitted with adequate information to assess how each line item is calculated.	GO rating
Budget is in compliance with the budget instructions.	GO rating
Match is submitted with adequate information to support the amount written in the budget.	GO rating

Cost Effectiveness Feedback: Strengths
No significant strengths noted.

Cost Effectiveness Feedback: Weaknesses
No significant weaknesses noted.

Cost Effectiveness Clarification

E. Applicant Priority Area	
Disaster Services	No
Economic Opportunity- especially Opportunity Youth	No
Education - improving student academic performance in Science, Technology, Engineering, and/or Mathematics (STEM) or addressing student and school need through School Turnaround AmeriCorps programming (see Glossary and Appendix)	No
Environment- 21st CSC	No
Veterans and Military Families	No
Governor and Mayor Initiative	No
Programming that Supports My Brother's Keeper	No
Multi-Focus Intermediary	No
Safer Communities	No
Next Generation AmeriCorps	No
School Turnaround	No
Elder justice	No
No NOFO Priority Area	No
Panel Comments: Applicant Priority Area	
N/A	

F. Applicant Characteristics	
Encore Program	No
Faith Based Organization	No
Community Based Organization	Yes
SIG/Priority School	No
Professional Corps	No
STEM Program	No
Geographic Focus - Urban	No
Geographic Focus - Rural	No
Geographic Focus - Rural and Urban	No
21st CSC	No
None of the Above	No
Panel Comments: Applicant Characteristics	
N/A	

G. AmeriCorps Member Population	
Communities of Color	No
Low income Individuals	No
Native Americans	No

Rural Residents	No
Veterans, Active Military, or their Families	No
Economically disadvantaged young adults/Opportunity Youth	No
None of the Above	No
Panel Comments: AmeriCorps Member Population	
N/A	

H. Threshold Requirements and Multi-State Consultation	
Full Time Fixed Amount Grants	N/A
Governor and Mayor Initiative	N/A
Tutoring Program	N/A
School Turnaround	N/A
Multi-Focus Intermediary	N/A
Next Gen AmeriCorps	N/A
If a Multi-State applicant, did the applicant adequately describe its consultation with applicable state commissions?	N/A
Panel Comments: Threshold Requirements and Multi-State Consultation	
N/A	

I. Professional Corps Threshold and Detail (for applicants proposing Professional Corps programs)	
Professional Corps Detail 1	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 2	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 3	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 4	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 5	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 6	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 7	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 8	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 9	N/A
Professional Corps Detail 10	N/A
Comments on Professional Corps Detail	
N/A	
Justification of Professional Corps funding recommendation.	
N/A	

J. Letters of Support (When applicable)	
Governor/Mayor initiative	N/A
Multi Focus Intermediary	N/A
School Turnaround	N/A
Elder justice	N/A

Phase 2 Opportunity/Risk	
The applicant represents a significant opportunity or a significant risk.	N/A
Comments on Opportunity/Risk	
N/A	

Bonus!	
Bonus 9	
Bonus 10	

Phase 2 Consensus Recommendation	
Recommendation	
Recommended Funds ($)	
Recommended MSYs	
Recommended Slots	
Recommended Cost/MSY ($)	$0.00
Recommended Cost/Slot	$0.00
Justification of Clarification Recommendation	

Content for additional rounds of clarification
N/A

No Cost Slot Request	
MSY	
Slots	
Notes	

Strategic Engagement Slot Request	
MSY	
Slots	
Notes	

Bonus!	
Bonus 9	
Bonus 10	

Final Recommendation (Consensus)	
Recommendation	
Recommended Funds ($)	
Recommended MSY	
Recommended Slots Total	
FT	
HT	
RHT	
QT	
MT	
Recommended Cost/MSY ($)	$0.00
Recommended Cost/Slot	0.00
Justification of Funding Recommendation	

No Cost Slot Recommendation Note the number of No Cost MSY and Slots included in the above recommendation	
MSY	
Slots	
Notes	

Strategic Engagement Slot Recommendation Note the number of Strategic Engagement MSY and Slots included in the above recommendation	
MSY	
Slots	
Notes	