FORM INSTRUCTIONS AND TIPS

• Save the blank IRF to your computer. Do not work from the S drive or your email.

• If a security warning displays, select 'Enable Content.'

• The form is best viewed at 80% magnification in the lower right corner. Zoom out only to review the entire form to ensure cells have not been skipped.

• Do NOT paste into the form. Type directly into the cells.

• Complete all yellow cells. (Most white and gray cells are locked and so cannot be edited.) Type in the boxes or select from the drop-down menu.

• Do not use periods (".") or slashes ("/" or "\") in the Legal Applicant field. These characters will prevent the IRF from being submitted correctly. If an applicant uses one these characters in their Legal Applicant Name, please replace it with a dash ("-").

• Follow the instructions for each cell. More detailed instructions are in the Reviewer Handbook.

• For the text boxes, cells will auto-fit as you type. Use ALT+Enter to start a new line. Mac users ALT+Command+Return for a new line. Note: Excel will display/print only the first 1,024 characters in each cell. The rest of the text can be seen in the formula bar.

• Scrolling through the form may lead you to accidently skip a row. It's best to use Tab to move to the

• Use File – Save As to save each Review Form to your computer. Save as: "IRF.legal applicant name. last four digits of application ID.Reviewer last name" example "IRF.SuperApplicant.5177.Smith"

• To view all of the strengths and weakness comments together, go to the Feedback tab. The Feedback tab is also where you will write the overall strengths and weaknesses and clarifications.

• Other questions or problems? Email ----GARP Liaison

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2015 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	Jreviewer
B. Status of Review	POL Approved	H. Panel Number	25
C. Date of Status Change	9/29/2014		
D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747		
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization		
F. Opportunity Number	TN 01		

I. PROGRAM DESIGN (50%)   Strengthening Communities – Questions 1-7   Recruitment and Development Volunteers – Questions 8-11

Strengthening Communities (35%)

	Rating	Score	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Meet
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.	Good	34	Demonstrates a community need that is a high priority 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. (50 points)	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. (34 points)	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 (18 points)	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. (0 points)
Q2. Describes in the narrative how the service activities in the Primary Focus Area lead to National Performance Measure outputs or outcomes.	Good	34	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. (50 points)	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 the National Performance Measure(s). > Explains most assumptions and reasons. (34 points)	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. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
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.	Fair	18	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. (50 points)	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. (34 points)	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. (18 points)	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. > 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. (0 points)

D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747				
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization				
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.	Does Not Meet	0	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. (50 points)	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. (34 points)	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. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
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 total number of volunteers assigned to the work plan.	Fair	18	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 volunteers. > Includes a Data Collection Plan. (50 points)	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure OUTPUT 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 volunteers. > Includes a Data Collection Plan. (34 points)	Connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure OUTPUT. > 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 volunteers. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
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 total number of 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. If there are no service activities in Other Focus Areas and Capacity Building, the score for Q5 will be used for Q6 score.	Fair	18	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure output and OUTCOMES 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. (50 points)	Clearly and convincingly connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure OUTPUT. > 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. (34 points)	Connects a community need and the service activities to a National Performance Measure OUTPUT. > 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 volunteers. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
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%.	40-<60%	30	(Note: This percentage is generated by the eGrants performance module.)	*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.		

D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747	
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization	

Strengthening Communities - Strengths	The applicant provided convincing, objeective data that the community need for increased access to food exists in the community. The applicant used both state wide an dcounty specific data to make the case for the healthy futures priority area compelling. The service activities in the primary focus area are designed in such a way that there is a high probability that they will result in achieving the outputs and outcomes stated. The intervention involves having the same individual deliver meals five days per week to the same homebound and disabled individuals. It is convincing that through frequent interaction with the same volunteer, the clients will experience an increase in social ties and be able to live independantly in their homes.

Strengthening Communities - Weaknesses	The RSVP program does not target service to veterans and military families. The applicant states that they are gathering information about veterans and military families in the service area, but does not present a plan of how this population will be served. Stations will be heavily relied upon to collect output and outcome data for the RSVP program. The applicant does not provide information on how the stations will provide data on what the RSVP volunteers have done. The applicant also plans to use a survey to collect outcome data but no clear plan on administering these surveys is provided. The work plan for food delivery does not present a consistent anticipated output target. The service activity description states that volunteers will deliver food to 100 individuals, while the anticipated outcome is 150 individuals. The outcome in the work plan also focuses on individuals with disabilities who will have increased social support, while the work plan is also to support the elderly.

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.	Fair	14	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. (38 points)	Realistic plan and infrastructure to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. > Volunteer assignments include at least three 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. (26 points)	Realistic plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. > Volunteer assignments include at least two 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. (14 points)	Unrealistic or no plan to create high quality RSVP volunteer assignments. > Volunteer assignments include only one 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. (0 points)
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.	Fair	14	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. (38 points)	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. (26 points)	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. (14 points)	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. (0 points)
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.	Fair	14	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. (38 points)	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 demographic information about two of the three volunteer pools above. (26 points)	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. (14 points)	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. (0 points)
Q11. Demonstrates a plan and infrastructure to retain and recognize RSVP volunteers.	Fair	12	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. (36 points)	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. (24 points)	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. (12 points)	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. (0 points)

D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747			
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization			
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers - Strengths	None noted			
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers - Weaknesses	Volunteer assignments described to address selection criteria Q8 focus more heavily on meeting community needs over improving the lives of volunteers through service. The applicant states that they give special consdieration to make it possible for volunteers with disabilities to serve. This demonstrates that they have a plan in place, but the applicant does not specify how these volunteers are recruited. The applicant does not present a plan to ensure that the volunteers serving are representative of the community. The advisory group is composed only of females, demonstrating that the program may have a difficult time recruiting a diverse group of volunteers.			

I. 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).	Fair	10	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. (30 points)	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. (20 points)	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. (10 points)	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. (0 points)
Q13. Plans and infrastructure to develop and/or oversee volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing their assigned service activities.	Fair	10	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. (30 points)	Realistic plan and infrastructure for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. > Gives 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. (20 points)	Realistic plan for developing and overseeing volunteer stations to ensure that volunteers are performing assigned service activities. > Is sometimes unclear how the volunteer stations will be developed or overseen. > Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained. (10 points)	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. (0 points)
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.)	Good	20	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. (30 points)	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. (20 points)	Realistic plans to graduate volunteer stations and/or adjust programming to meet changing community needs. > Makes some assumptions regarding infrastructure to graduate volunteer stations and/or adjust programming to meet changing community needs. > For example, there is no current RSVP grant in the geographic service area so there is no need to graduate stations, but the applicant has not addressed anticipating responses to changing community needs. (10 points)	Plan to graduate volunteer stations without plans or infrastructure to minimize disruptions to current volunteers where possible or does not address the question. > 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. (0 points)

D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747			
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization			
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.	Fair / 10	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. (30 points)	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. (20 points)	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. (10 points)	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. (0 points)
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.	Fair / 10	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. (30 points)	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. (20 points)	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. (10 points)	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. > Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. (0 points)
Program Management - Strengths	The applicant has a plan to graduate volunteer stations through natural attrition and as volunteers' interests change. The applicant demonstrates that they will work with new volunteers to focus their involvement on the new focus areas.			
Program Management - Weaknesses	The applicant states that they provide training to volunteer stations in addition to written materials containing information on RSVP regulations. The applicant also uses quarterly site visits and other forms of communication to work with the volunteer stations; however it is not apparent how these visits result in ensuring RSVP program compliance. The applicant does not present a convincing plan for making sure that volunteers are performing assigned activities. Program staff communicates with and visits volunteer stations regularly, but it is unclear what they do to provide oversight. Minimal information is presented in the application about the organization's experience managing volunteers in the Healthy Futures focus area. The applicant has experience managing volunteers, but it does not provide details on how the station or the applicant manages volunteers who are delivering meals to homebound individuals. No plan is presented in the application for ensuring volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP. Information about the advisory group's involvement is also unclear. The advisory group assists with volunteer recruitment but their level of activity is not shared in the application.			

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.	Fair	18	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. (50 points)	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. (34 points)	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. (18 points)	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. > Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it. (0 points)

D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747				
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization				
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.	Fair	18	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. (50 points)	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. (34 points)	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. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
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.	Does Not Meet	0	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. (50 points)	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. (34 points)	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. > Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the project and grant funds. > Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
Q20. Demonstrates organizational infrastructure in the areas of robust financial management capacity and systems and past experience managing federal grant funds.	Does Not Meet	0	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. (50 points)	High 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. > Provides a realistic description of sufficient organizational infrastructure to support the grant funds. > Supports ideas with plans, examples, or outlines. (34 points)	Fair to acceptable probability and confidence that the grantee has sufficient organizational infrastructure in financial management systems and 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. (18 points)	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. (0 points)
Organizational Capability - Strengths	None noted				
Organizational Capability - Weaknesses	The applicant provides little information about the infrastructure in place to provide fiscal oversight and to ensure accountability. One accounting technician keeps track of financial resources, which may be problematic if a system with checks and balances is not in place. The applicant makes mention of various staff involved with the project throughout the application. However, very little information about their job responsibilities and who is currently in these staff positions are shared. The applicant does not show that it has the organizational capacity to manage assets and develop internal policies and operating procedures. The applicant did not provide any information in the Organizational Capability narrative and information regarding policies and managing assets was not presented in the other narratives. The applicant does not present a convincing case that it has the capacity to manage a federal grant because very little information is shared about the organization's capacity. The applicant does state that they use Orion software, but an insignificant amount of information is provided about other financial management systems.				
Total Score		302				

Corporation for National and Community Service INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM -- 2015 RSVP COMPETITION

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.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

A Type of Reviewer	Individual-Panel Coordinator	G. Reviewer	Jreviewer	
B. Status of Review	POL Approved	H. Panel Number	25	
C. Date of Status Change	9/29/2014			
D. 2015 Application ID	15SR153747			
E. Legal Applicant	Sample Organization			
F. Opportunity Number	TN 01			

The following Strengths and Weaknesses are displayed as entered on the Review Form. To edit these individually, you must edit on the Review Form page.

View these to compile your Significant Strenths and Weaknesses to be provided as Applicant Feedback below.

Strengthening Communities - Strengths	The applicant provided convincing, objective data that the community need for increased access to food exists in the community. The applicant used both state wide an dcounty specific data to make the case for the healthy futures priority area compelling. The service activities in the primary focus area are designed in such a way that there is a high probability that they will result in achieving the outputs and outcomes stated. The intervention involves having the same individual deliver meals five days per week to the same homebound and disabled individuals. It is convincing that through frequent interaction with the same volunteer, the clients will experience an increase in social ties and be able to live independently in their homes.
Strengthening Communities - Weaknesses	The RSVP program does not target service to veterans and military families. The applicant states that they are gathering information about veterans and military families in the service area, but does not present a plan of how this population will be served. Stations will be heavily relied upon to collect output and outcome data for the RSVP program. The applicant does not provide information on how the stations will provide data on what the RSVP volunteers have done. The applicant also plans to use a survey to collect outcome data but no clear plan on administering these surveys is provided. The work plan for food delivery does not present a consistent anticipated output target. The service activity description states that volunteers will deliver food to 100 individuals, while the anticipated outcome is 150 individuals. The outcome in the work plan also focuses on individuals with disabilities who will have increased social support, while the work plan is also to support the elderly.
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers - Strengths	None noted
Recruitment and Development of Volunteers - Weaknesses	Volunteer assignments described to address selection criteria Q8 focus more heavily on meeting community needs over improving the lives of volunteers through service. The applicant states that they give special consdieration to make it possible for volunteers with disabilities to serve. This demonstrates that they have a plan in place, but the applicant does not specify how these volunteers are recruited. The applicant does not present a plan to ensure that the volunteers serving are representative of the community. The advisory group is composed only of females, demonstrating that the program may have a difficult time recruiting a diverse group of volunteers.
Program Management - Strengths	The applicant has a plan to graduate volunteer stations through natural attrition and as volunteers' interests change. The applicant demonstrates that they will work with new volunteers to focus their involvement on the new focus areas.
Program Management - Weaknesses	The applicant states that they provide training to volunteer stations in addition to written materials containing information on RSVP regulations. The applicant also uses quarterly site visits and other forms of communication to work with the volunteer stations; however it is not apparent how these visits result in ensuring RSVP program compliance. The applicant does not present a convincing plan for making sure that volunteers are performing assigned activities. Program staff communicates with and visits volunteer stations regularly, but it is unclear what they do to provide oversight. Minimal information is presented in the application about the organization's experience managing volunteers in the Healthy Futures focus area. The applicant has experience managing volunteers, but it does not provide details on how the station or the applicant manages volunteers who are delivering meals to homebound individuals. No plan is presented in the application for ensuring volunteers are eligible to serve in RSVP. Information about the advisory group's involvement is also unclear. The advisory group assists with volunteer recruitment but their level of activity is not shared in the application.
Organizational Capability - Strengths	None noted
Organizational Capability - Weaknesses	The applicant provides little information about the infrastructure in place to provide fiscal oversight and to ensure accountability. One accounting technician keeps track of financial resources, which may be problematic if a system with checks and balances is not in place. The applicant makes mention of various staff involved with the project throughout the application. However, very little information about their job responsibilities and who is currently in these staff positions are shared. The applicant does not show that it has the organizational capacity to manage assets and develop internal policies and operating procedures. The applicant did not provide any information in the Organizational Capability narrative and information regarding policies and managing assets was not presented in the other narratives. The applicant does not present a convincing case that it has the capacity to manage a federal grant because very little information is shared about the organization's capacity. The applicant does state that they use Orion software, but an insignificant amount of information is provided about other financial management systems.

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	The service activities in the primary focus area are designed in such a way that there is a high probability that they will result in achieving the outputs and outcomes stated. The intervention involves having the same individual deliver meals five days per week to the same home-bound and disabled individuals. It is convincing that through frequent interaction with the same volunteer, the clients will experience an increase in social ties and be able to live independently in their homes. The applicant has a plan to graduate volunteer stations through natural attrition and as volunteers' interests change. The applicant will gradually graduate the volunteer stations so as to not abandon community partners. The applicant demonstrates that they will work with new volunteers to focus their involvement on the community priority while still supporting other partners in the community.
Weaknesses	The RSVP program does not target service to veterans and military families. The applicant states that they are gathering information about veterans and military families in the service area, but does not present a plan of how this population will be served. Volunteer assignments focus more heavily on meeting community needs over improving the volunteer's life through service. The applicant does not present a plan to ensure that the volunteers serving are representative of the community. The advisory council is composed only of females, demonstrating that the program may have a difficult time recruiting a diverse group of volunteers. Minimal information is presented in the application about the organization's experience managing volunteers in the Healthy Futures focus area. The applicant has experience managing volunteers, but it does not provide details on how the station or the applicant manages volunteers who are delivering meals to homebound individuals. The applicant does not show that it has the organizational capacity to manage assets and develop internal policies and operating procedures. The applicant did not provide any information in the Organizational Capability narrative and information regarding policies and managing assets was not presented in the other narratives.

| **B. Clarification:** List clarifications questions. Guidelines for Clarification can be found in the reviewer training. Phrase all Clarification items as questions or requests for further information. | The following items must be addressed directly in the work plans:

With the exception of work plan 2.1, all service activity descriptions are incomplete. Update service activity descriptions to explain what the RSVP volunteers are doing in a way that shows how they will achieve the outputs and outcomes. The service activity should say who the beneficiaries are, and what the volunteers will be doing with the beneficiaries. The service activity should say how often volunteers will provide the service and for how long. The service activity should say where the service will take place.

Currently all target numbers are zero. Please enter the appropriate target number for each output and outcome selected. Note that if using the Other Community Priorities work plan, the target number for that work plan should be '1.'

In work plan 3.2 the total volunteers contributing is less than the unduplicated volunteers. The total volunteers should not be a lower number. Please correct the volunteer numbers in this work plan.

Please review and correct all instrument descriptions as needed. The instrument descriptions should all give the name of the instrument and briefly describe who will collect the data, and from whom and when it will be collected.

The Other Community Priorities work plan looks like it should actually be an ED4A output. Review the work plan to ensure that it is correctly included as Other Community Priorities. If it should instead be ED41, please correct this in eGrants.

The service activity description for work plan 3.2 shows RSVP volunteers as the service activity beneficiaries. The work plan should be corrected to instead focus on the community members that will receive CNCS-supported service in disaster from the RSVP volunteers. |