Corporation for National and Community Service
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM
2014 RSVP COMPETITION

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex

Score: Type the score selected into this column.	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.	
	I. Program Design (50%) ▪ **Strengthening Communities – Questions 1-7** ▪ **Recruitment and Development Volunteers – Questions 8-11**	
	Strengthening Communities (35%)	
	Q1. Describes the community and demonstrates through both the narrative and work plans that the community need(s) identified in the **Primary Focus Area** exist in the geographic service area.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Demonstrates a community need that is a <u>high priority</u> for the geographic service area, using objective data and evidence, or statements of support from key stakeholders. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested; shows that meeting this need is a high priority for the geographic service area. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested. ▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of the community as well as the need in both the narrative and the work plan. ▪ Supports assertion of a high priority community need with statements of support from key stakeholders.
	__Good (34 pts.)	Describes both the community and the need in the geographic service area using objective data included in both the work plan and the narrative. ▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested. ▪ Explains most assumptions that the community need exists. ▪ Supports assertion of the community need with examples or other objective data.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Demonstrates a community need in the geographic service area. ▪ Describes a community need but is sometimes unclear how the objective data demonstrates that the community need exists in the geographic service area. ▪ Describes the community but makes some assumptions about the connection between the community and the community need. ▪ The community needs in the narrative and work plans are not aligned.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Does not describe a community need in the geographic service area. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons that the issue described is a community need. ▪ Makes many assumptions that the community need exists in the geographic service area. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. ▪ Does not include a response describing the community need in either the narrative or the work plans.
	Q2. Describes in the narrative how the service activities in the **Primary Focus Area** lead to National Performance Measure outputs or outcomes.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Presents an evidence basis demonstrating that this service activity will lead to the National Performance Measure(s). Highest probability and confidence that the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, using an evidence basis (using performance data, research, a well-developed theory of change). ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested. ▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed RSVP volunteer activities leads to a National Performance Measure.
	__Good (34 pts.)	Clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the proposed service activity is related to successfully achieving the National Performance Measure(s). High probability and confidence that the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes. ▪ Provides a realistic description of how proposed service activity is related to achieving

Legal Applicant:			Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #			Panel #		
Reviewer Name			PC	Int	Ex

		the National Performance Measure(s). ▪ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Demonstrates how the proposed service activity is related to successfully achieving the National Performance Measure. Fair to acceptable probability that the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes. ▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results. ▪ Makes some assumptions.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Does not demonstrate how the proposed service activity is related or is only tangentially related to addressing the National Performance Measure. Low probability the service activity will lead to outputs or outcomes. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed service activity is related to successfully achieving the National Performance Measures. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. ▪ Does not address National Performance Measures. ▪ Narrative does not address any performance measures from the work plan.
	Q3. Describes in the narrative a plan and infrastructure to support data collection and ensure National Performance Measure outcomes and outputs are measured, collected, and managed.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Highest probability and confidence that the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured, collected, and managed. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has experience in collecting and reporting similar performance measures with consideration to proper data collection processes ensuring accuracy and consistency. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed explanation of their data collection processes including how the outputs and outcomes will be collected accurately and consistently. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed explanation of the infrastructure available to collect and manage the National Performance Measure data, including systems and tools for facilitating data collection.
	__Good (34 pts.)	High probability and confidence that the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured, collected, and managed. ▪ Provides a realistic description of how the outputs and outcomes will be accurately and consistently measured. ▪ Includes plans to collect National Performance Measure data that explains most assumptions. ▪ Covers information on infrastructure and data management that explains most assumptions.
	__Fair (18 pt.)	Acceptable probability that the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured, collected, and managed. ▪ Is sometimes unclear how the outputs and outcomes will be accurately and consistently measured. ▪ Includes plans to collect National Performance Measure data that makes some assumptions. ▪ Covers information on infrastructure and data management that makes some assumptions.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pt.)	Low probability the National Performance Measure outputs and outcomes will be measured, collected, and managed. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the outputs and outcomes will be accurately and consistently measured. ▪ Includes plans to collect National Performance Measure data that includes many unsupported assumptions.

Corporation for National and Community Service
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM
2014 RSVP COMPETITION

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex

		- Covers information on infrastructure that makes many unsupported assumptions. - Did not connect the plan or infrastructure to National Performance Measure measurement. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. - Does not provide information on either the plan or the infrastructure to collect and manage data for National Performance Measures.
Q4. Program Design as described in the narrative includes activity in service to veterans and/or military families as part of service in the Primary Focus Area, Other Focus Areas or Capacity Building.		
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Significant activity in service to veterans and/or military families that includes the unique value of service by RSVP volunteers who are veterans and/or military family members. Highest probability and confidence that the plans for this activity will benefit veterans and/or military family members. - Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise in serving veterans and/or military families. - Provides a clear and realistic plan to serve veterans and/or military families with the infrastructure to sustain this service. - Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting service activity to veterans and/or military families.
	__Good (34 pts.)	Significant activity in service to veterans and/or military families. High probability and confidence that the plans for this activity will benefit veterans and/or military family members. - Provides a realistic plan to serve veterans and/or military families. - Explains most assumptions and reasons. - Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Some activity in service to veterans and/or military families. Acceptable confidence that the plans for this activity will be met. - Is sometimes unclear how the proposed service activities will serve veterans and/or military families. - Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no activity(ies) in service to veterans and/or military families or little confidence that proposed plans will lead to activity. - Gives an unclear description of how the proposed service activities will serve veterans and/or military families. - Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons in serving veterans and/or military families. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. - Does not address veterans and/or military families.

Q5. Work plans logically connect four major elements in the __Primary Focus Area__ to each other and are aligned with National Performance Measure instructions:
    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. Work plans include target numbers that lead to outcomes or outputs, and are appropriate for the level of duplicated volunteers assigned to the work plan.		

	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure output and OUTCOME appropriate to the number of duplicated volunteers. - Goes beyond what was requested, and commits to National Performance Measure outcomes that address the community need. - Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.

		- Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to a National Performance Measure output and outcome. - 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 outputs and outcomes that are appropriate to the number of duplicated volunteers. - Includes a Data Collection Plan.
	__Good (34 pts.)	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure <u>OUTPUT</u> appropriate to the number of duplicated volunteers. - Provides a response to all of the information requested. - Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. - Links four major elements explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure outputs that are appropriate to the number of unduplicated volunteers. - Includes a Data Collection Plan.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure <u>OUTPUT</u>. - Covers a community need, service activities, instrument descriptions and a National Performance Measure output that are related. - 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. - Includes unrealistic target numbers or volunteer numbers. - 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. - Outputs and Outcomes may not be appropriate for the number of duplicated volunteers.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Does not connect the four major elements. - The community need, service activities, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output are not related. - Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. - Includes at least one work plan with zero target numbers. - Did not connect a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure outcome. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. - Does not address one of the four major elements.

	Q6*. Work plans logically connect four major elements in the **Other Focus Areas** and Capacity Building to each other and are aligned with National Performance Measure instructions:
	    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. Work plans include target numbers that lead to outcomes or outputs, and are appropriate for the level of duplicated volunteers assigned to the work plan.
	*This selection criteria will only be applicable to applications with service activities in Other Focus Areas and Capacity Building.	

	__ N/A (Double Q5 pts)	This application does not include service activities in Other Focus Areas and Capacity Building.
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National

Corporation for National and Community Service **INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM** **2014 RSVP COMPETITION**		
Legal Applicant:	**Applicant ID #**	
Opportunity #	**Panel #**	
Reviewer Name	**PC**	**Int**	**Ex**

		Performance Measure output and <u>OUTCOMES</u> appropriate to the number of duplicated volunteers. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, and commits to National Performance Measure outcomes that address the community need. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested. ▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to a National Performance Measure output and outcome. ▪ Links four major element ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure output and outcome. ▪ Includes a Data Collection Plan.
	__Good (34 pts.)	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure <u>OUTPUT</u>. ▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested. ▪ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. ▪ Links four major elements explaining and connecting a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure output. ▪ Includes a Data Collection Plan.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure <u>OUTPUT</u>. ▪ Covers a community need, service activities, instrument descriptions and a National Performance Measure output that are related. ▪ 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. ▪ Includes unrealistic target numbers or volunteer numbers. ▪ 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. ▪ Outputs and Outcomes may not be appropriate for the number of duplicated volunteers.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Does not connect the four major elements. ▪ The community need, service activities, data collection instrument, and National Performance Measure output are not related. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities connect the community need to National Performance Measure outputs. ▪ Includes at least one work plan with zero target numbers. ▪ Did not connect a community need to RSVP volunteer activity, data collection instrument, and a National Performance Measure outcome. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. ▪ Does not address one of the four major elements.
	Q7. In assessing the work plans, applications will receive credit for percentage of unduplicated * volunteers in National Performance Measure outcome work plans above the minimum 10%.	
	__>80% **(50 pts.)**	(**Note:** This percentage is generated by the eGrants performance module. Potential applicants may use the recommended worksheet associated with the Senior Corps: RSVP Grant Application to develop their work plans.)
	__60% - 80% **(40**	

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex

	pts.)	*Number of Unduplicated Volunteers: This is the proposed number of volunteers who will be performing each service activity. Each volunteer can only be counted once when assigned to a service activity. The volunteer should be counted in the area where he/she will make the most impact – in terms of the type of service or in terms of the scope of service, such as the most number of hours served.
	__40% - <60% (30 pts.)	
	__20% - <40% (20 pts.)	
	_> 10% - <20% (10 pts.)	
	__<10% (0 pts.)	

	STRENGTHS: (Provide significant strengths identified in your assessment)	
	WEAKNESSES: (Provide significant weaknesses identified in your assessment)	

Recruitment and Development of Volunteers (15%)

Q8. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to create well-developed high quality RSVP volunteer assignments with opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities.

	__Excellent (38 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. ▪ Volunteer assignments include all of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested and is actively measuring the impact of volunteer activity on the RSVP volunteer. ▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments, and the infrastructure to sustain this volunteer coordination.
	__Good (26 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. ▪ Volunteer assignments include at least <u>three</u> of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities. ▪ Provides a realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. ▪ Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure to sustain this volunteer coordination.
	__Fair (14 pts.)	Realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. ▪ Volunteer assignments include at least <u>two</u> of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities. ▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan and infrastructure will create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. ▪ Makes some assumptions regarding the infrastructure required to coordinate volunteers.
	__Does Not Meet (0	Unrealistic or no plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments.

Corporation for National and Community Service		
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM		
2014 RSVP COMPETITION		
Legal Applicant:	Applicant ID #	
Opportunity #	Panel #	
Reviewer Name	PC	Int	Ex

pts.)	- Volunteer assignments include only <u>one</u> of the following: opportunities to share their experiences, abilities, and skills to improve their communities and themselves through service in their communities. - Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. - Does not address volunteer coordination or gives many unsupported assumptions. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.	
Q9. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to ensure RSVP volunteers receive training needed to be highly effective means to addressing identified community need(s) in both the Primary Focus Area and in Other Focus Areas or Capacity Building.		
	__Excellent (38 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer training that includes evaluations of the training by the RSVP volunteers or the stations. - Goes beyond what was requested and is actively evaluating the training. - Provides a clear and realistic plan to train volunteers, with infrastructure that includes a training curriculum and training material.
	__Good (26 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to train RSVP volunteers. - Provides a realistic plan to train volunteer. - Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure required to support RSVP volunteer training.
	__Fair (14 pts.)	Realistic plan to train RSVP volunteers. - Is sometimes unclear how the training activity is related to service activities. - Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to support RSVP volunteer training.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no plan to provide training to RSVP volunteers. - Gives an unclear description of how the proposed training is related to service activities. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. - Does not address RSVP volunteer training.

Q10. 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 English language proficiency.
   2.   Veterans and military family members as RSVP volunteers.
   3. RSVP volunteers with disabilities.		

	__Excellent (38 pts.)	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. - Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has partnered with volunteer stations that will assist in recruitment and development. - Provides a clear and highly compelling plan to recruit and develop RSVP volunteers from one of the above volunteer pools. - Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting service activity to recruitment and development. - Includes a comprehensive description of the community demographics including demographic information about all three volunteer pools above.
	__Good (26 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure for significant activity in the recruitment and development of RSVP volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above. - Provides a realistic plan to recruit and develop one of the above volunteer pools. - Explains most assumptions about infrastructure required for recruitment. - Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines. - Includes a comprehensive description of the community demographics including

Legal Applicant:	Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #	Panel #		
Reviewer Name	PC	Int	Ex

		demographic information about two of the three volunteer pools above.
	__Fair (14 pts.)	Realistic plan for the recruitment and development of volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above. - Plan is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will serve recruitment and development from one of the above volunteer pools. - Makes some assumptions about infrastructure required for recruitment. - Includes a comprehensive description of the community demographics including demographic information about one of the three volunteer pools above.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no plan for the recruitment and development of volunteers who are from one of the specific volunteer pools above. - Gives an unclear plan of how the proposed activities will serve recruitment. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. - Does not address the recruitment of RSVP volunteers from one of the specific volunteer pools above. - Does not include a description of the community demographics.
	Q11. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to retain and recognize RSVP volunteers.	
	__Excellent (36 pts.)	Plan and infrastructure for significant retention and recognition activity that includes measuring the satisfaction of current volunteers. - Goes beyond what was requested, and is actively managing retention activities including volunteer satisfaction measurement. - Provides a clear and highly compelling plan of how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention.
	__Good (24 pts.)	Plan and infrastructure for significant retention and recognition activity. - Provides a realistic plan of how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention. - Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure that supports volunteer retention.
	__Fair (12 pts.)	Plan for some retention and recognition activity. - Plan is sometimes unclear how the proposed recognition activities will serve volunteer retention. - Makes some assumptions regarding volunteer retention.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no retention and recognition activity. - Gives an unclear plan of how the proposed recognition activities will support volunteer retention. - Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding volunteer retention. - Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
	STRENGTHS: (Provide significant strengths identified in your assessment)	
	WEAKNESSES: (Provide significant weaknesses identified in your assessment)	

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex

	II. Organizational Capacity (35%)
	▪ **Program Management – Questions 12-16**
	▪ **Organizational Capability – Questions 17-20**
	Program Management (15%)
	Q12. Plans and infrastructure to ensure management of volunteer stations in compliance with RSVP program regulations (such as preventing or identifying prohibited activities).
	__Excellent (30 pts.) — 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. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating and assessing current volunteer station management. ▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage volunteer stations, and the infrastructure to sustain them. ▪ Addresses how to prevent or identify prohibited activities.
	__Good (20 pts.) — Realistic plan and infrastructure to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. ▪ Provides a realistic plan to engage and manage volunteer stations. ▪ Explains most assumptions. ▪ 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. ▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations. ▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to prevent or identify prohibited activities.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.) — Unrealistic or no plan to ensure volunteer stations and assignments comply with RSVP program regulations. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding prevention of or identification of prohibited activities. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
	Q13. Plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing their assigned service activities.
	__Excellent (30 pts.) — Realistic and dynamic plan and infrastructure for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested; is actively evaluating and assessing current volunteer assignments. ▪ Clearly describes plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. ▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will be managed by the project.
	__Good (20 pts.) — Realistic plan and infrastructure for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. ▪ Provides a realistic description of plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations in order to ensure volunteers are performing assigned activities. ▪ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
	__Fair (10 pts.) — Realistic plan for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities.

Corporation for National and Community Service			
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM			
2014 RSVP COMPETITION			

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		**Panel #**		
Reviewer Name		**PC**	**Int**	**Ex**

		▪ Is sometimes unclear how the volunteer stations will be developed or overseen. ▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no plan for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the volunteer stations will be developed or overseen. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection between overseeing stations and ensuring volunteers are performing assigned activities. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. ▪ Does not address or mention volunteer stations or assigned service activities.
	Q14. Plans and infrastructure to meet changing community needs to include minimizing disruption to current volunteers as applicable and/or graduating* stations as necessary. *(*Please see Appendix C for more information on graduating volunteer stations.)*	
	__Excellent (30 pts.)	Describes significant plans and infrastructure to responsibly graduate volunteer stations to meet changing community needs and plans to minimize disruptions to current volunteers where possible. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has significant plans to responsibly graduate volunteer stations that do not address specific community needs. ▪ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will minimize disruption to current volunteers. ▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.
	__Good (20 pts.)	Describes plans and infrastructure to responsibly graduate volunteer stations to meet changing community needs and plans and infrastructure to minimize disruptions to current volunteers. ▪ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will minimize disruption to current volunteers. ▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.
	__Fair (10 pts.)	No plans to graduate volunteer stations and/or adjust programming to meet changing community needs now or in the future. ▪ For example, there is no current RSVP grant in this geographic service area.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Plan to graduate volunteer stations without plans or infrastructure to minimize disruptions to current volunteers where possible. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed graduation of stations will not lead to any disruption of volunteers. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons why volunteers will not be disrupted. ▪ Did not connect the plans to minimizing disruptions. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. ▪ Does not address the requirement to minimize disruptions to current RSVP volunteers where possible.
	Q15. Demonstrates an organizational track record in managing volunteers in the Primary Focus Area, to include if applicable, measuring performance in the Primary Focus Area.	
	__Excellent (30 pts.)	The applicant organization demonstrates a track record of effective management of volunteers in the Primary Focus Area and in measuring performance in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Previous or current evidence of effective management of volunteers in the Primary Focus Area and in measuring performance in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Examples of current and past performance measure outcomes. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested, in 1) managing volunteers, 2) Primary Focus Area, and 3) measuring performance.

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex

	__Good (20 pts.)	The applicant organization has a track record of effective management of volunteers in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Demonstrates a sound track record in managing volunteers in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Examples of current or past activity in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Provides most of the information requested in 1) managing volunteers, 2) Primary Focus Area, and 3) measuring performance.
	__Fair (10 pts.)	The applicant organization has some experience in managing volunteers or some experience in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Demonstrates some experience in managing volunteers OR demonstrates some experience in the Primary Focus Area. ▪ Includes minimal examples of current or past activity. ▪ 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.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	The applicant organization has no experience in either managing volunteers or the Primary Focus Area. ▪ No examples of current or past activity in managing volunteers or in the Primary Focus Area.
	Q16. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to ensure the project is in compliance with the RSVP federal regulations to include establishing an RSVP Advisory Council, ensuring RSVP volunteers are placed in stations that have signed the required MOU, and ensuring all volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP.	
	__Excellent (30 pts.)	Realistic and dynamic plan and infrastructure to ensure the project is in compliance with the RSVP federal regulations to include establishing an RSVP Advisory Council, ensuring RSVP volunteers are placed in stations that have signed the required MOU, and ensuring all volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating and assessing current RSVP Advisory Council, station requirements, and volunteer eligibility. ▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan to manage volunteer and station requirements, and the infrastructure to sustain this management.
	__Good (20 pts.)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to ensure the project is in compliance with the RSVP federal regulations to include establishing an RSVP Advisory Council, ensuring RSVP volunteers are placed in stations that have signed the required MOU, and ensuring all volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP. ▪ Provides a realistic plan to engage and manage volunteer stations. ▪ Explains most assumptions. ▪ Provides a realistic plan for an RSVP Advisory Council.
	__Fair (10 pts.)	Realistic plan to ensure the project is in compliance with the RSVP federal regulations to include establishing an RSVP Advisory Council, ensuring RSVP volunteers are placed in stations that have signed the required MOU, and ensuring all volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP. ▪ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed plan will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations for volunteer stations and volunteers. ▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure required to support the RSVP Advisory Council.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Unrealistic or no plan to ensure the project is in compliance with the RSVP federal regulations to include establishing an RSVP Advisory Council, ensuring RSVP volunteers are placed in stations that have signed the required MOU, and ensuring all volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP. ▪ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed plan or infrastructure will ensure compliance with RSVP program regulations for Advisory Council establishment and station and volunteer eligibility requirements. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions.

Corporation for National and Community Service			
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM			
2014 RSVP COMPETITION			

Legal Applicant:		**Applicant ID #**		
Opportunity #		**Panel #**		
Reviewer Name		**PC**	**Int**	**Ex**

		▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
	STRENGTHS: (Provide significant strengths identified in your assessment)	
	WEAKNESSES: (Provide significant weaknesses identified in your assessment)	
	Organizational Capability (20%)	
	Q17. Plans and infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight (both financial and in-kind) and day-to-day operational support to ensure compliance with RSVP program requirements (statutes, regulations, and applicable OMB circulars) and to ensure accountability and efficient and effective use of available resources.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	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. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, is actively evaluating how programmatic and fiscal oversight and day-to-day operational support may affect internal policies. ▪ 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.
	__Good (34 pts.)	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. ▪ 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. ▪ Explains most assumptions regarding infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	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. ▪ 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. ▪ Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	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. ▪ 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. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding operational infrastructure.

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex

		▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
	Q18. Demonstrates clearly defined paid staff positions, including identification of current staff assigned to the project and how these positions will ensure the accomplishment of program objectives.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	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. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested and is actively assessing staff position compatibility with project management. ▪ Provides a clear and realistic plan that connects paid staff with the accomplishment of program objectives.
	__Good (34 pts.)	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. ▪ Provides a realistic staff planning infrastructure. ▪ Staff assignments are coordinated with project management. ▪ Explains most assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for paid staff.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Provides some description of paid staff positions, including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. ▪ Provides a realistic staff planning infrastructure. ▪ Staff assignments are coordinated with project management. ▪ Makes some assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for paid staff.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	No clear description of paid staff positions, including (as applicable) identification of current staff assigned to the project. ▪ Does not provide a clear description of how staff assignments are coordinated with project management. ▪ Gives many unsupported assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for paid staff. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it.
	Q19. Demonstrates organizational capacity to: 　1. Develop and implement internal policies and operating procedures to provide governance and manage risk, such as accounting, personnel management, and purchasing. 　2. Manage capital assets such as facilities, equipment, and supplies.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Highest probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise and provides details on solutions to potential organizational issues. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested above. ▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds.
	__Good (34 pts.)	High probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above. ▪ Provides a response to all of the information requested above. ▪ Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. ▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Fair to acceptable probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as described above. ▪ Covers most of the information requested above, with a few exceptions.

Legal Applicant:		**Applicant ID #**
Opportunity #		**Panel #**
Reviewer Name		**PC**	**Int**	**Ex**

		▪ Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. ▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Low probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure as required above. ▪ Does not describe sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. ▪ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it ▪ Does not provide one or more key pieces of information requested above.
	Q20. Demonstrates organizational infrastructure in the areas of robust financial management capacity and systems and past experience managing federal grant funds.	
	__Excellent (50 pts.)	Highest probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure in financial management systems and experience managing federal grant funds. ▪ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise in financial management systems and managing federal grant funds and provides details on solutions to potential organizational issues. ▪ Provides a thorough, detailed response that addresses both robust financial management systems and past experience managing federal grant funds to include examples and outlines. ▪ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the grant funds.
	__Good (34 pts.)	High probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure in financial management systems and experience managing federal grant funds. ▪ Provides a response to both robust financial management systems and past experience managing federal grant funds. ▪ Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the grant funds. ▪ Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.
	__Fair (18 pts.)	Fair to acceptable probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure in financial management systems and experience managing federal grant funds. ▪ Covers most of the information for both robust financial management systems and past experience managing federal grant funds, with a few exceptions. ▪ Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the grant funds. ▪ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
	__Does Not Meet (0 pts.)	Low probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure in financial management systems and experience managing federal grant funds. ▪ Does not describe sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the grant funds. ▪ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined. ▪ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it ▪ Does not provide one or more key pieces of information requested.
	STRENGTHS: (Provide significant strengths identified in your assessment)	

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="4">Corporation for National and Community Service
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM
2014 RSVP COMPETITION</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="4"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Applicant:</td>
<td colspan="3">Applicant ID #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity #</td>
<td colspan="3">Panel #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Name</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
</table>

	WEAKNESSES: (Provide significant weaknesses identified in your assessment)
0	**TOTAL SCORE: _____ OF 850**

APPLICANT FEEDBACK AND CLARIFICATION

A. Significant Strengths and Weaknesses for Applicant Feedback

List 5-8 comments about how the application addresses the Selection Criteria. Using complete sentences, address the significant strengths and weaknesses identified in your assessment that attributed to the selected Ratings, per the reviewer rubric. The comments must be selected from strengths and weaknesses already noted above. **Ensure the comments respond directly to the Selection Criteria from all categories** (program design, program management, and organizational capability).

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

B. CLARIFICATION

LIST CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS BELOW. GUIDELINES FOR CLARIFICATION CAN BE FOUND IN THE REVIEWER TRAINING. PHRASE ALL CLARIFICATION ITEMS AS QUESTIONS OR REQUESTS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

Corporation for National and Community Service
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM
2014 RSVP COMPETITION

Legal Applicant:		Applicant ID #		
Opportunity #		Panel #		
Reviewer Name		PC	Int	Ex