

**Grant Review Score Sheet**

<b>Applicant:</b>		<b>Reviewer:</b>	
-------------------	--	------------------	--

<b>Scoring</b>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Excellent</b> — Many major and minor strengths identified. Only minor weaknesses identified, if any. Highest probability and confidence that the requirements will be met and exceeded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.</li> <li>• Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>• Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.</li> <li>• Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Good</b> — Several major and minor strengths. No more than a few minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. High probability and confidence that the requirements will be met, and with some exceeded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a response to all of the information requested.</li> <li>• Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.</li> <li>• Explains most assumptions and reasons.</li> <li>• Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Acceptable</b> — Few if any major strengths. A few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. Acceptable probability that the requirements will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.</li> <li>• Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.</li> <li>• Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<p><b>Not Acceptable</b> — Few or no strengths but many major and minor weaknesses identified. Extremely low probability that any of the requirements will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.</li> <li>• Tends to —parrot back the question, rather than answer and explain it</li> <li>• Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFO.</li> <li>• Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFO and Application Instructions.</li> <li>• Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information</li> </ul>

## Funding Priorities

In alignment with the Serve America act funding for AmeriCorps programs is targeted toward six Focus Areas identified by the Corporation for National and Community Service.

### CNCS Focus Areas:

- Disaster Services
- Economic Opportunity
- Education
- Environmental Stewardship
- Healthy Futures
- Veterans and Military Families

Within each of the defined Focus Areas the Montana Commission on Community Service has identified three initiatives to be addressed through AmeriCorps service in the State. Applications demonstrating efforts toward addressing one or more of the Montana initiatives should be treated with priority when compared to an equal application not addressing any of the initiatives.

### Montana Initiatives:

- Generate volunteers
- Develop Montanans to be college and career ready
- Support the Governor's initiatives for clean energy, math & science education, and citizen emergency preparedness

All programs operating in Montana must address all of the Montana Expectations in their application and execution.

### Montana Expectations:

- ✓ Inclusion in the design and delivery making the program accessible to individuals with disabilities
- ✓ Collaborative approach to planning, design, and the delivery of the program
- ✓ Successful administration of an AmeriCorps and or other federal grants
- ✓ Address rural, underserved or areas of extreme poverty not currently served by AmeriCorps

## Section I. Program Design – 40%

In assessing the program design, reviewers will examine the degree to which the applicant demonstrates how AmeriCorps members are particularly well-suited to solving the identified community need.

Recompeting grantees must describe their efforts and impact to date, and provide persuasive evidence they should continue to be funded.

If a new applicant is already working to meet the community need identified in the application the applicant should describe how the proposed use of AmeriCorps members will add value, i.e. be more effective than what is currently being implemented, or enhance existing efforts.

2012 AmeriCorps Application	SCORE (0-3)	Comments (Strengths and Weaknesses)	
<b>Does The Applicant?</b>			
1) Provide persuasive evidence that the identified needs exist in the targeted community(ies). (Weight 10%)			If data is not available is the anecdotal evidence persuasive?
2) Describe the ways in which AmeriCorps members are a highly effective means to solve the identified community needs, including the unique value added by AmeriCorps. (Weight 30%)			Is AmeriCorps a uniquely efficient solution to the community problem? Is there a better, more efficient solution than AmeriCorps?
3) Describe how the interventions AmeriCorps members and volunteers are engaged in are both evidence-based and will have a measurable community impact. The intervention is evidence based if programs can demonstrate community impact and the solution community problems through an evidence based approach (e.g. performance data, research, theory of change). (Weight 30%)			Evidence of the effectiveness of the approach is key, if evidence is not available is a sound theory for the approach provided?
4) Describe the program components that enable AmeriCorps members to have a powerful service experience that increases community impact and leads to continued civic participation and connectivity with other AmeriCorps and/or national service participants. (Weight 20%)			Does the program strive to instill values of civic engagement in it's members?
5) Convincingly link four major elements: (1) the needs identified, (2) the intervention that will be carried out by AmeriCorps members and community volunteers, (3) the ways in which AmeriCorps members are particularly well-suited to deliver the intervention, and (4) the anticipated outcomes. (Weight 10%)			Do the four above pieces cohesively come together?
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Of Possible</b>	<b>15</b>

## Section II. Organizational Capability – 20%

2012 AmeriCorps Application	SCORE (0-3)	Comments (Strengths and Weaknesses)	
<b>Does The Applicant?</b>			
1) Have the experience, staffing, and management structure to plan, implement, and evaluate the proposed project.			Are the duties of staff, both programmatic and fiscal, clearly outlined? Who is responsible for what parts of member oversight?
2) Show that they have secured the financial and in-kind resources necessary to support program implementation and to demonstrate community stakeholder support. If no, is there an effective plan described for securing financial resources?			Are sources of match diversified and reliable? Based on the application is community support demonstrated?
3) Have the ability and structure to ensure subgrantees and/or service locations' compliance with AmeriCorps rules and regulations including prohibited activities.			Is oversight sufficient? Is adequate training provided to site supervisors?
Total	0	Of possible	9
<b>Current and Previous Grantees only</b>			
5) <b>If a current or previous AmeriCorps grantee</b> have they filled the member positions they were awarded and retained the AmeriCorps members they enrolled or have provided an explanation for less than 100% enrollment and retention?			How does enrollment and retention compare to previous years?
6) <b>If a current or previous AmeriCorps grantee</b> have performance targets been met and has the program demonstrated compliance with grant terms and conditions?			If performance targets are not met is explanation provided? Have compliance issues been resolved?
Total	0	Of possible	6
<b>Section Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Of possible</b>	<b>15</b>

### Section III. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy – 20%

2012 AmeriCorps Application	SCORE (0-3)	Comments (Strengths and Weaknesses)
-----------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------------

#### Cost-Reimbursement Grants

1) Is the budget clear, reasonable, cost effective, and in alignment with the program narrative.			Are costs justified and necessary?
2) Do the requested funds exceed the maximum cost per Member Service Year (MSY), or for the existing programs, have not increased over previous years.			The maximum cost per MSY is \$13,300.
Total	0	Of possible	6

#### EAP and Fixed Amount Grants

3) The applicants understanding of total program cost and capacity to raise additional resources beyond the fixed amount.			Does the program show that they understand the need for funds outside of AmeriCorps.
4) The amount requested per member. Fixed-amount applicants are encouraged to request less than the full maximum amount allowed per MSY. The amount requested is a competitive factor in the selection process.			Maximum cost per MSY: EAP - \$800, Fixed amount - \$13,000.
Total	0	Of possible	6

<b>Section Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Of possible</b>	<b>6</b>
----------------------	----------	--------------------	----------

## Section IV. Staff Assessment – 20%

This section will be based on the information provided in the staff risk assessment.

- This section will be scored on a 0-3 (4 point) scale

### A. Previous grantees only - 12 Possible Points

2012 Staff Application Assessment	Score (0-3)	Comments (Strengths and Weaknesses)	
<b>Based upon the staff assessment</b>			
1) Has the program met their match			
2) Has the program had any major compliance findings? If yes, were the findings resolved?			
3) Has the program completed enrollments/exits within 30 Days?			
4) Has the program met all CNCS and OCS deadlines?			
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	Of possible	<b>12</b>

### B. New grantees only - 6 Possible Points

2012 Staff Application Assessment	Score (0-3)	Comments (Strengths and Weaknesses)	
<b>Based upon the staff assessment</b>			
1) Did the applicant provide evidence of their ability to meet match?			
2) Did the applicant provide evidence of their capacity to manage an AmeriCorps Grant?			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	Of Possible	<b>0</b>

<b>Section IV Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Of Possible</b>	<b>12</b>
-------------------------	----------	--------------------	-----------

**Reviewer Score**

**I. Program Design - 40%**

Section Total  Of Possible  Section Percent

Section Percent  X  =  Section Final

**II. Organizational Capacity - 20%**

Section Total  Of Possible  Section Percent

Section Percent  X  =  Section Final

**III. Cost Effectiveness of Budget - 20%**

Section Total  Of Possible  Section Percent

Section Percent  X  =  Section Final

**IV. Staff Assessment - 20%**

Section Total  Of Possible  Section Percent

Section Percent  X  =  Section Final

**Final Score**  **Of**

# Interview Information

Interview Questions

Interview Comments