

2017 AmeriCorps Tribes Competition Review Form
HOME

A Type of Review	
B. Status of Review	
C. Date of Submission	
D. Reviewer	
E. Panel Number	
F. 2017 Application ID	
G. Legal Applicant	
H. Program Name	
I. Program History	

Review Summary: Internal to Clarification

Recommendation	0
Recommended Funds (\$)	\$0
Recommended MSYs	0.00
Recommended Cost/MSY (\$)	0.00
Recommended Slots	0
Justification of Funding Recommendation	
Significant Opportunity and/or Risk	N/A
Comments on Significant Opportunity and/or Risk	
N/A	

Review Summary: Final

Recommendation	0
Recommended Funds (\$)	\$0
Recommended MSYs	0.00
Recommended Cost/MSY (\$)	0.00
Recommended Slots	0
Justification of Funding Recommendation	
0	

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Competition REVIEW: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROGRAM DESIGN	
A. Executive Summary	
Executive Summary	
B. Program Design	
1. Need	
1a. The community problem/need is prevalent and severe in communities where members will serve and has been well documented with relevant data.	
2. Intervention	
2b. The proposed intervention aligns with the identified community need.	
3. Theory of Change and Logic Model	
3a. The applicant’s proposed intervention is clearly articulated including the design, target population, and roles of AmeriCorps members and (if applicable) leveraged volunteers.	
3b. The applicant’s intervention is likely to lead to the outcomes identified in the applicant’s theory of change.	
3c. The proposed outcomes articulated in the application narrative and Logic Model represent meaningful progress in addressing the community need identified by the applicant.	
3d. The applicant’s AmeriCorps members will produce significant contributions to existing efforts to address the stated problem.	
4. Evidence Base: Assessed externally	
5. Notice Priority	
5a. The applicant proposed program fits within one or more of the 2017 AmeriCorps funding priorities as outlined in the Funding Priorities section and more fully described in the Mandatory Supplemental Guidance and meets all of the requirements detailed in the Funding Priorities section and in the Mandatory Supplemental Guidance.	
6. Member Training	
6a: AmeriCorps members will receive high quality training to provide effective service.	
6b: AmeriCorps members and volunteers will be aware of, and will adhere to, AmeriCorps requirements including the rules regarding prohibited activities.	
7. Member Supervision	
7a. AmeriCorps members will receive sufficient guidance and support from their supervisor to provide effective service.	
7b. AmeriCorps supervisors will be adequately trained/prepared to follow AmeriCorps and program regulations, priorities, and expectations.	
8. Member Experience	
8a. 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.	
8b. AmeriCorps members will have access to meaningful service experiences.	
8c. AmeriCorps members will have access to opportunities for reflection and connection to the broader National Service network.	
8d. The program will recruit AmeriCorps members from the geographic or demographic communities in which the programs operate.	
9. Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification	
9a. Members will know they are AmeriCorps members.	

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Competition
REVIEW: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROGRAM DESIGN

9b. Staff and community members where the members are serving will know they are AmeriCorps members.

Program Design Reviewer Notes

Program Design Feedback: Strengths

No significant strengths noted.

Program Design Feedback: Weaknesses

No significant weaknesses noted.

Program Design Clarification

Performance Measure Clarification

Program Design Resolution

Performance Measure Resolution

Supplemental PM Review Complete No

Bonus!

Bonus 1

**2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Competition
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.	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

2. Compliance and Accountability

2a. The organization will comply with AmeriCorps rules and regulations including those related to prohibited and unallowable activities at the grantee, subgrantee (if applicable), and service site locations.	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

2b. The applicant’s organization, in implementation and management of its AmeriCorps program, will prevent and detect compliance issues.	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

2c. The applicant will hold subgrantees (if applicable) and service site locations accountable if instances of risk or noncompliance are identified.	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Organizational Capability Reviewer Notes

--

Organizational Capability Feedback: Strengths

No significant strengths noted.

Organizational Capability Feedback: Weaknesses

No significant weaknesses noted.

Organizational Capability Clarification

--

Organizational Capability Resolution

--

Bonus!

Keyword results for prohibited/unallowable activities were reviewed	NA
Keyword results review requires Clarification	NA

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Competition 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 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 grantees, must be described in this section in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to assess their sufficiency and alignment.	
1c. The applicant has raised or describes an adequate plan to raise non-CNCS resources to fully support the program.	
1d. The applicant, if recompeting, has a lower cost per Member Service Year 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	Grants Office rating
Budget is submitted with adequate information to assess how each line item is calculated.	Grants Office rating
Budget is in compliance with the budget instructions.	Grants Office rating
Match is submitted with adequate information to support the amount written in the budget.	Grants Office rating
Cost Effectiveness Reviewer Notes	
Cost Effectiveness Feedback: Strengths	
No significant strengths noted.	
Cost Effectiveness Feedback: Weaknesses	
No significant weaknesses noted.	
Cost Effectiveness Clarification	
Cost Effectiveness Resolution	

2017 Planning Grants Review Form AmeriCorps Indian Tribes <i>Complete form according to PO Guide and instructions for each cell. DO NOT paste into the form (use the formula box to paste).</i> <i>Note: All white fields must be completed; shaded fields are not required or not editable.</i>	
A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Executive Summary	
B. PROGRAM DESIGN	
1. Problem/Need	
1a) The community need/problem is prevalent and severe in communities where the program plans to serve and the need has been well documented with relevant data.	
1b) The applicant provides a clear explanation for why a planning grant is needed.	
2) Planning Process/Timeline	
2a) The applicant describes who is leading the planning process.	
2b) The applicant has a well-developed and realistic timeline for planning activities.	
2c) The applicant will use the planning period to develop the necessary components to effectively manage an AmeriCorps program in the future.	
2d) The applicant includes development of the following components in the planning process: Theory of change/logic model; Evidence base for the intervention; Member selection and training plan; Member supervision plan; Commitment to AmeriCorps identity; Compliance and accountability; Securing match support for the program	
Program Design Notes	
Program Design Strengths	No significant strengths noted.
Program Design Weaknesses	No significant weaknesses noted.
Program Design Clarification	
Program Design Resolution	
C. Organizational Capability	
1) Organizational Background and Staffing	
1a) The applicant describes how it has the experience, staffing, and management structure to plan the proposed program.	
1b) The applicant describes its prior experience in the proposed area of programming.	
1c) The applicant describes its plans to engage community members and partner organizations in the planning process.	
Organizational Capability Notes	
Organizational Capability Strengths	No significant strengths noted.
Organizational Capability Weaknesses	No significant weaknesses noted.
Organizational Capability Clarification	
Organizational Capability Resolution	
D. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	
1) Cost Effectiveness	
1a) The budget is sufficient to carry out the planning process effectively.	
1b) The budget aligns with the applicant's narrative.	
1c) The applicant has raised or describes an adequate plan to raise non-CNCS resources to fully support the planning process.	
Cost Effectiveness Notes	
Cost Effectiveness Strengths	No significant strengths noted.
Cost Effectiveness Weaknesses	No significant weaknesses noted.
Cost Effectiveness Clarification	

2017 Planning Grants Review Form	
Cost Effectiveness Resolution	
2. 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
Bonus!	
Keyword results for prohibited/unallowable activities were reviewed	NA
Keyword results review requires Clarification	NA

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Grants CHARACTERISTICS	
E. Applicant Priority Area	
Disaster Services	
Economic Opportunity- increasing economic opportunities for communities by engaging opportunity youth, either as the population served and/or as AmeriCorps members.	
Education - improving student academic performance in Science, Technology, Engineering, and/or Mathematics (STEM) and/or serving students who attend Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools	
Healthy Futures – Reducing and/or Preventing Prescription Drug and Opioid Abuse	
Veterans and Military Families	
No NOFO Priority Area	
Reviewer Notes: Applicant Priority Area	
N/A	
F. Grant Characteristics	
Faith Based Organization	
Community Based Organization	
SIG/Priority School	
Professional Corps	
STEM Program	
Geographic Focus - Urban Only	
Geographic Focus - Rural Only	
Geographic Focus - Rural and Urban	
None of the Above	
Reviewer Notes: Grant Characteristics	
N/A	
G. AmeriCorps Member Population	
Communities of Color	
Low income Individuals	
Native Americans	
New Americans	
Older Americans	
People with Disabilities	
Rural Residents	
Veterans, Active Military, or their Families	
Economically disadvantaged young adults/Opportunity Youth	
None of the Above	
Reviewer Notes: AmeriCorps Member Population	
N/A	

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Grants CHARACTERISTICS	
Opportunity/Risk	
The applicant represents a significant opportunity or a significant risk.	N/A
Comments on Opportunity/Risk	
N/A	
Clarification	
Resolution	
Bonus!	
Bonus 7	
Bonus 8	

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Competition Internal to Clarification Recommendation	
Recommendation	
Requested Funds	
Recommended Funds (\$)	
Requested MSY	
Recommended MSYs	
Requested Slots	
Recommended Slots	
Recommended Cost/MSY (\$)	
Recommended Cost/Slot	
Justification of Recommendation to Advance	
Outstanding issues after Clarification	
N/A	
No Cost Slot Request (to be used if we offer no-cost slots during the process)	
MSY	
Slots	
Notes	
Bonus!	
Bonus 9	
Bonus 10	

2017 AmeriCorps Indian Tribes Competition Final Recommendation	
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	
Note the number of No Cost MSY and Slots included in the above recommendation (to be used if we offer no-cost slots during clarification)	
MSY	
Slots	
Notes	

2017 Grant Application Review Performance Measure Worksheet- OPTIONAL							
	Application ID						
	Legal Applicant						
	Program						
	New or Recompete						
		PM1	PM2	PM3	PM4	PM5	Standard Clarification Item #
	Alignment with Narrative/TOC						
1	Focus areas, objectives, interventions, outputs and outcomes are consistent with the application narrative, logic model and theory of change.						3, 15
	Interventions						
2	The interventions selected contribute directly to the outputs and outcomes.						16
3	Interventions are not repeated in multiple aligned performance measures.						16
	Dosage						
4	The dosage (frequency, intensity, duration of intervention) is described and is sufficient to achieve outcomes.						8, 17
	Resource Allocation						
5	MSY and member allocation charts are consistent with the member activities/time spent on member activities described in the application narrative.						18
6	MSY allocations for performance measures are reasonable. (If it is clear that not all interventions are being measured, then 100% of MSYs should not be allocated to performance measures. CNCS expects an accurate estimate of MSYs that will lead to performance measure outcomes and does not require applicants to measure 100% of program activity or to allocate a certain percentage of activity to National Performance Measures.)						18
7	MSYs are zero for Teacher Corps (ED12, ED13, ED14, ED17, ED18, ED19) and Member Development (O12, O13, O14, O15, O16, O17) performance measures and any other performance measures that measure member outcomes rather than beneficiary outcomes (EN2, EN2.1, V2, V10).						2
	Selection Rules/Performance Measure Instructions						
8	Unless the applicant is a continuation, no retired measures (e.g., measures marked deleted or not appearing in the 2015 Performance Measures Instructions) have been selected.						19
9	The applicant has at least 1 aligned performance measure for the primary intervention.						20
10	National Performance Measures conform to selection rules, definitions and data collection requirements specified in the Performance Measure Instructions. (Compliance with definitions and data collection requirements must be clearly explained in the performance measure text boxes or must be clarified.)						Clarification items will be specific to rules/definitions/requirements in the measure
11	Individuals counted in National Performance Measures meet definition of "economically disadvantaged" in the Performance Measure Instructions. (Note: Definitions are different for different performance measures.)						1
12	It is clear that beneficiaries are not double-counted in an aligned performance measure.						21
13	National Performance Measures count beneficiaries, not AmeriCorps members, unless the measure specifies that national service participants are to be counted.						22
14	The population counted in each National Performance Measure is the population specified in the Performance Measure Instructions.						Clarification items will be specific to rules/definitions/requirements in the measure
15	Capacity Building interventions meet the CNCS definition of capacity-building in the Performance Measure Instructions.						3
16	Member development measures (O12, O13, O14, O15, O16, O17) have a 30-day timeline, not the previously acceptable 90-day timeline.						5
17	Applicant is not using applicant-determined member development or volunteer generation measures that are the same or similar to National Performance Measures or Grantee Progress Report demographic indicators (e.g., number of volunteers.)						3, 23
18	Member development measures (O12, O13, O14, O15, O16, O17) or volunteer generation measures (G3-3.1, G3-3.2, G3-3.3) are only present if these activities are the primary focus of the program or a significant component of the program's theory of change.						3
	Education Selection Rules/Performance Measure Instructions						
19	Completion is defined for education outputs measuring completion. (ED2, ED4A, ED21, ED32). Note: Dosage and completion are not necessarily the same. The applicant must specify the minimum dosage necessary to be counted as having completed the program, which may or may not be the same dosage specified in the intervention description.						8
20	ED1/ED2 and ED3A/ED4A are not used in the same aligned PM.						6

2017 Grant Application Review Performance Measure Worksheet- OPTIONAL						
	Application ID					
	Legal Applicant					
	Program					
	New or Recompete					
		PM1	PM2	PM3	PM4	PM5
						Standard Clarification Item #
21	The mentoring intervention is selected for ED3A/ED4A, and no other interventions are selected for ED3A/ED4A. Mentoring is not selected as an intervention in any education measures other than ED3A/ED4A.					7, 10
22	The mentoring dosage meets the dosage requirements described in the Performance Measure Instructions for ED3A/ED4A.					9
23	It is clear that the proposed standardized test for ED5 and/or ED30 meets the definition in the Performance Measure Instructions.					11
24	If the state standardized test is proposed to measure ED5 and/or ED30, a justification is provided as directed in the Performance Measure Instructions. (Note: Request must be approved by CNCS.)					12
25	If the applicant is measuring multiple subjects under ED5 and/or ED30, it is clear whether/how much students must improve in reading, math or both subjects in order to be counted.					13
26	For ED27A or ED27B, the applicant specifies which dimension(s) of academic engagement described in the Performance Measure Instructions will be measured.					14
Alignment & Quality						
27	Applicant-determined outputs and outcomes are aligned correctly.					24
28	Outputs and outcomes clearly identify what is counted.					24
29	Each output or outcome counts only one thing (except certain National Performance Measures).					24
30	Outcomes clearly identify a change in knowledge, attitude, behavior or condition. (Counts that do not measure a change are outputs and must be labeled as such.)					24
31	Outcomes clearly specify the level of improvement necessary to be counted as "improved" and it is clear why this level of improvement is significant for the beneficiary population served.					13
32	Outcomes count individual level gains, not average gains for the population served.					24
33	Outcomes measure meaningful/significant changes and are aligned with the applicant's theory of change. (Note: Outcomes that do not measure significant changes in knowledge, attitude, behavior or condition should be revised. If the applicant is not able to propose a meaningful outcome, the aligned performance measure should be removed. CNCS prefers that applicants measure a small number of meaningful outcomes rather than a large number of outputs paired with insignificant outcomes.)					24
34	Outcomes can be measured during a single grant year.					24
Data Collection/Instruments						
35	Data collection methods are appropriate.					25, 26
36	Instruments are likely to yield high quality data.					26
37	The instrument, and what it measures, is clearly described.					26
38	If the Performance Measure Instructions specify the instrument to be used, the applicant is using that instrument (e.g., pre/post test).					25
39	The instrument measures the change specified in the outcome. (For example, if the outcome is a change in knowledge, the proposed instrument measures a change in knowledge, not a change in attitude.)					26
40	Output instruments are sufficient to count all beneficiaries served and to ensure that individuals are not double-counted.					26
41	Outcome instruments will be administered to all beneficiaries receiving the intervention or completing the program. (Note, competitive grantees may propose a sampling plan for CNCS approval if this is not the case. Formula grantees are not permitted to sample.)					27
Pre/Post Test						
42	If using a pre/post test to measure knowledge gains from training activities, it is clear how the pre/post test is connected to the learning objectives of the training.					26
43	The timeline for administering the pre/post test is clear.					28
44	If a pre/post test is required by the Performance Measure Instructions, the instrument described is a pre/post test.					25
45	The applicant can successfully match pre-test data with post-test data at the individual level. The same instrument must be used for the pre-test and the post-test.					28
Targets						
46	Target values appear ambitious but realistic/It is clear how targets were set.					29
47	Outcome targets are smaller than output targets, with some exceptions (i.e., capacity-building National Performance Measures). Note: In some cases it may be appropriate for the outcome target to be equal to the output target.					30

2017 Grant Application Review Performance Measure Worksheet- OPTIONAL						
	Application ID					
	Legal Applicant					
	Program					
	New or Recompete					
		PM1	PM2	PM3	PM4	PM5
						Standard Clarification Item #
48	The output and outcome targets are reasonably proportional. Note: What constitutes reasonably proportional may depend on what is being counted, how and when.					29
	Unit of Measure					
49	The unit of measure is not AmeriCorps members except in National Performance Measures that count national service participants.					22
50	The unit of measure is consistent for all outputs or outcomes in the PM unless otherwise specified in the Performance Measure Instructions.					31
51	The unit of measure is not hours.					31
52	The unit of measure is a number, not a percent.					31
	Sampling					
53	If sampling is proposed, the targets represent the total for the population being served, not just the sample. (Note: Formula grantees are not permitted to sample.)					27
54	If sampling is proposed, the sampling plan is forwarded to CNCS for consideration. (Note: Formula grantees are not permitted to sample.)					27
	Misc.					
55	The applicant has not opted into National Performance Measures but has the potential to do so. (In this case, clarify why the applicant has not opted into National Performance Measures and, if applicable, direct them to select appropriate National Performance Measures.)					23
56	The applicant has not created applicant-determined measures that are identical to National Performance Measures. (Note: This is a common problem that occurs when applicants have not selected the correct objective. Applicants must review the selection rules and choose the correct objectives or the corresponding performance measures will not be available for selection. Applicant-determined measures are recognizable by the labels OUTPT or OUTCM, followed by numbers. Any applications containing these labels are NOT National Performance Measures, even if the applicant has labeled them with the number of a national measure.)					23