Corporation for National and Community Service

2010 Social Innovation Fund

National AIDS Fund

Reviewer Comments – Phase 1

Table of Contents

2010 Social Innovation Fund

National AIDS Fund

Section 1 – Reviewer Comments: Group 1

Applicant Name: National AIDS Fund
Application ID#: 10SI114882

SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010
PANEL CONSENSUS FORM

Instructions throughout this form are indicated in **red.**

Before you begin, please fill out the Applicant Name and Application ID# in the above header. This Panel Consensus Form (PCF) is where each panel records its consensus assessment of an application. The completion of this form may be led by any panelist; that individual will be designated the Lead Reviewer (LR). All Expert Reviewers are expected to serve as the LR on at least one application. The consensus assessment should be based on the panel's examination of the full application Narrative, which consists of the following 3 categories:

Category	Percentage	Subcategories
Program Design	45%	A. Goals and Objectives
		B. Use of Evidence
		C. Community Resources

		D. Description of Activities
		   i. Subgranting
		   ii. Technical Assistance and Support

Organizational Capacity	35%	A. Ability to Provide Program Oversight
		B. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	20%	A. Budget and Program Design
		B. Match Sources

Panels will utilize Panel Consensus Calls to discuss each application and come to agreement on the content of the Narrative Assessment for each category, the Rating for each category, the Overall Appraisal Statement and the Band in which the application will be placed. When completing this form, the LR should rely on four primary documents: 1) the application being reviewed; 2) the IRW Compilation for the application being reviewed (compiled prior to discussion by the panel Facilitator); 3) the SIF Notice of Federal Funds Availability (NOFA); 4) the Consensus Rubric at the end of this form.

Please complete the following steps:

1. For each of the 3 categories (Program Design; Organizational Capacity; Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy), the LR should:
   a. **Write a 3 – 5 sentence Narrative Assessment** reflecting the panel's assessment of the quality of the response in the category being assessed; it is important that this narrative is not a summary of the application, rather the panel's evaluation of the application's quality.
   b. **List the application's significant strengths and weaknesses and annotate each.** Each significant strength or weakness **must** be supported by **at least one** of the Eligibility or Application Review Criteria that were in the SIF NOFA. (examples are included in this form)
   c. **Taking into consideration** both the Narrative Assessment and the listed strengths and weaknesses, **select a Rating** by checking the appropriate box.

2. **Complete the Overall Appraisal section.** In this section, you will:
   a. Provide an Overall Appraisal Statement; and
   b. Select a consensus Band that represents the quality of the application as a whole. The Bands are described in the Overall Appraisal section at the end of this form, and Appendix D of the Review Guide.

3. **After the panel has discussed all applications, provide a Rank for each application.**

PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)

The **Social Innovation Fund Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) states** that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Program Design.

A. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Corporation asks applicants to use a thematic approach in describing their proposed investments in community organizations. As established in the Act, there are two basic operational models of SIF intermediaries. The first is a SIF that will operate in a single geographic location, and address one or more priority issues within that location. This model is referred to as a "geographically-based SIF." The second model is a SIF that will address a single priority issue area in multiple geographic locations. This model is referred to as an "issue-based SIF." The Corporation will assess whether the application properly proposes goals and objectives as either a geographically-based or an issue-based SIF.

i. *Geographically-Based SIF*
    To apply as a geographically-based SIF, the applicant must propose to focus on serving low-income communities within a specific local geographic area, and propose to focus on improving measurable outcomes related to one or more of the following priority issue areas:
    - *Economic Opportunity – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;*
    - *Youth Development and School Support – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;*
    - *Healthy Futures – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.*

    The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area(s) within the specific local geographic area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to those issue areas that the applicant will seek to improve.

ii. *Issue-Based SIF*
    To apply as an issue-based SIF, the application must propose to focus on addressing one of the following priority issue areas within multiple low-income communities:
    - *Economic Opportunity – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;*
    - *Youth Development and School Support – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;*
    - *Healthy Futures – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.*

    The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area within the geographic areas likely to be served, including statistics demonstrating that those geographic areas have a high need in the priority issue area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to the priority issue area that the applicant will seek to improve.

B. USE OF EVIDENCE

i.   *Applicants must include in their application information describing their track record of using rigorous evidence, data, and evaluation tools to:*
- *Select and invest in subgrantees;*
- *Support and monitor the replication and expansion of subgrantees; and*
- *Achieve measurable outcomes.*

C. COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Not applicable. The applicant's Community Resources should be assessed in the Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy section. Applicants were instructed **not** to provide information in this section. If applicants include information in this section, it should not be considered in your overall rating for the Program Design section.

D. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

i.   **Subgranting**

a.   *Applicants must describe the process by which they will competitively select their nonprofit community organization subgrantees, and, if applicable, the process by which they have pre-selected some subgrantees. Specifically, applicants must describe how their competitive subgrant selection process will ensure a portfolio of subgrantees that are innovative nonprofit community organizations serving low-income communities and that possess:*
- *A strong theory of change;*
- *Strong leadership and financial and management systems, including data management;*
- *A strong financial position, including funding diversity, the ability to meet the requirements for providing dollar-for-dollar matching funds, and the ability to sustain the initiative after the subgrant period concludes;*
- *Strong community relationships;*
- *A commitment to and track record of using data and evaluation for performance and program improvement;*
- *Evidence of effectiveness, including a demonstrated track record of achieving specific measurable outcomes related to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary;*
- *Strong potential for replication or expansion;*
- *A well-defined plan for achieving specific measurable outcomes connected to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary, evaluation of program effectiveness, performance improvement, and replication or expansion; and*
- *A commitment to use grant funds to replicate, expand, or support their programs.*

Either as part of its review of the applications or in clarification reviews prior to award, the Corporation may request additional information regarding pre-selected subgrantees for compliance and appropriate outcomes.

ii.   **Technical Assistance and Support**

a.   *Applicants must include in their application information describing how they will provide technical assistance and support (other than financial support) that will increase the ability of subgrantees to achieve their measurable outcomes, including replication or expansion. Replication or expansion may happen in various ways (including, for example, creating new sites*

or affiliating with another program to replicate an intervention) and in multiple contexts (including, for example, serving more people in a current geography or growing to new geographies).

Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant has extensive experience in crafting, implementing, and evaluating large scale projects such as the Community-Science Partnership (CSP), GENERATIONS, and Girl Smart. They have established long-term partnerships and collaborations with established institutions of higher education, and have a history of utilizing these academic experts for rigorous evaluation plans and assessing program effectiveness (e.g., R3). The applicant also reports a 21-year history of working as a national grant making intermediary, and has provided evidence of capacity building in subgrantees. However, the program design is vague for some of the specific measurable outcomes as it relates to how they will be measured (e.g., what tools will be used – what surveys will be used), and does not describe how their competitive process will select subgrantees that possess a strong theory of change.

Significant Strengths

The applicant provides extensive statistical data that clearly identifies why the specific goals and measurable objectives were selected for the program design. Examples of data provided include HIV case rates and the percentage of U.S. annually diagnosed HIV infections, and the fact that epicenters of populations that are living with HIV/AIDS are less likely or not receiving antiretroviral treatment or other needed services. These population epicenters are identified as the targets for the 7-9 proposed public-private partnerships to be funded. *(Program Design A.i.)*

The applicant presents a track record of utilizing evidence-based models to build subgrantee capacity building, replication and expansion. This is documented through details provided regarding measurable outcomes (formative and summative) from programs such as R3, Generations, Girl Smart, and The Sisterhood Project. *(Program Design B.i.)*

The applicant provides a tested process by which they will select subgrantees. For example, subgrantees must propose programs based on preliminary evidence, conduct research, involve the targeted population in program design, pilot test interventions and evaluations during a 3 month formative phase before final selection. *(Program Design B.i.)*

Significant Weaknesses

While several goals and objectives are stated for the proposal, minimal details are provided to determine how subgrantees would be selected based on a strong theory of change. This required criterion from the NOFA was not clearly outlined. *(Program Design D.i.a.)*

Specific measures for certain key outcomes are not provided. For example, the applicant states that they will measure estimated behavioral change, clients' perceived self efficacy, quality of life, cost effectiveness of clinical providers or to society at large, and effectiveness of collaboration. They do not state how they plan to measure these (e.g., what measurement design, surveys, etc). *(Program Design D.i.a.)*

Select a Rating for PROGRAM DESIGN (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

    ☐ **Excellent**   ☐ **Strong**   ☒ **Satisfactory**   ☐ **Weak/Non-responsive**

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA states** that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Organizational Capacity.

A. ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM OVERSIGHT

In evaluating your organization's ability to provide program oversight, the Corporation will consider:

i.   *The extent to which your organization has a sound structure including:*
- *The ability to provide sound programmatic oversight, including:*
  - *Experience with and capacity for evaluation; and*
  - *Experience with and capacity for supporting replication or expansion.*
- *Well-defined roles for your Board of directors, administrators, and staff;*
- *A well-designed plan and systems for organizational (as opposed to subgrantee) self-assessment and continuous improvement; and*
- *The ability to provide and/or secure effective technical assistance.*

ii.   *Whether your organization has a sound record of accomplishment, including the extent to which you:*
- *Have a track record of supporting organizations that demonstrate evidence of impact;*
- *Demonstrate leadership within the organization and strong relationships within the communities served;*
- *Have a track-record of raising substantial resources, and, if you are an existing Federal grantee, having secured the matching resources as required in your prior grant awards; and*
- *The extent to which your community support recurs, increases in scope or amount, and is more diverse, as evidenced by:*
  - *Collaborations that include a diverse spectrum of community stakeholders;*
  - *A broad base of financial support, including local financial and in-kind contributions; and*
  - *Supporters who represent a wide range of community stakeholders.*

B. ABILITY TO PROVIDE FISCAL OVERSIGHT

Entities eligible to apply for SIF grants include:
- *Existing grantmaking institutions, or*
- *Partnerships between an existing grantmaking institution and another grantmaking institution, a State Commission, or the chief executive officer of a unit of general local government*

i. *Existing grantmaking institutions are organizations in existence at the time of the application where, investing in nonprofit community organizations or programs is an essential (rather than collateral) means of fulfilling their mission and vision. In keeping with this view, grantmaking institutions will generally have the following as part of their core operating functions:*
- *Conducting open or otherwise competitive programs to award grants to or make investments in a diverse portfolio of nonprofit community organizations;*
- *Negotiating specific grant requirements with nonprofit community organizations; and*
- *Overseeing and monitoring the performance of grantees.*

ii. *In evaluating your organization's ability to provide fiscal oversight, the Corporation will take into account its review of your organization's capacity. The Corporation will further consider:*
- *The extent to which your organization, or proposed partnership, has key personnel with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to provide fiscal oversight of subgrantees; and*
- *Whether your organization, or proposed partnership, has specific experience in providing fiscal oversight of subgrantees of Federal funds.*

Panel Narrative Assessment

An impressive record of successful replication of models in 35 cities/regions since 1988 is presented. The applicant describes an extensive record of providing technical assistance for subgrantees, and has proposed the inclusion of significant dollars in the SIF proposal to support a wide network of technical advisors. Experienced staff possess the skill set needed to provide administrative fiscal oversight, which includes grants management and monitoring. An extensive network of fund development collaborative is described and an established track record of raising a diverse pool of non-Federal resources.

Significant Strengths

The applicant has experience in managing and administering Federal grant programs. This is documented through a 16+ year track record of managing AmeriCorps programs, and over 10 years of managing Cooperative Agreements with the Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

The evaluation team is highly interdisciplinary, with extensive experience in HIV community-based work, clinic-based work, program evaluation, HIV treatment, multi-site interventions and analytic methodologies. *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

The applicant has a well-defined plan and systems for organizational self-assessment and continuous improvement, as evidenced by an operational plan that covers all aspects of the organization, including

systems and organizational structure, and identifies staffing and capacity requirements linked to operational and programmatic performance. *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

The applicant employs a state-of-the-art online tool for fiscal management that secures a standard means of grantee assessment and supervision. For example, the online grants management system gives the applicant the capacity to conduct pre-grant and active grant due diligence, effectively track grant dollars, determine how funds are being utilized, and evaluate the impact funds are having on organizational and programmatic goals. *(Organizational Capacity B.i.)*

Several core operating functions are managed by skilled staff with a track record of conducting competitive grant programs, and negotiating and overseeing grant details and requirements. *(Organizational Capacity B.ii.)*

Significant Weaknesses

No significant weaknesses noted.

Select a Rating for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

     ☒ **Excellent**   ☐ **Strong**   ☐ **Satisfactory**   ☐**Weak/Non-responsive**

COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (20%)

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA states** that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy.

A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN

In evaluating the cost effectiveness and budget adequacy of your proposed program, the Corporation will consider:

i.   *Whether your program is cost-effective based on:*
- *The extent to which your program demonstrates diverse, non-Federal resources for program implementation and sustainability;*
- *The extent to which you are proposing to provide more than the minimum required share of the costs of your program; and*
- *Whether the reasonable and necessary costs of your program or project are higher because you are proposing to serve areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved.*

ii.   *Whether your budget is adequate to support your program design.*

B. MATCH SOURCES

i.   *At the time of submission of the application, applicants must demonstrate either cash-on-hand or commitments (or a combination thereof) toward meeting 50 percent their first year matching funds, based on the amount of Federal grant funds applied for.*

ii.   *In addition to the match eligibility criteria, the Corporation will evaluate the extent to which you
have a combination of cash-on-hand or commitments to meet the full match requirements, and
whether your organization will be able to provide financial resources for your SIF program
beyond the minimum required match.*

Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant demonstrates a track record of successfully raising dollars and building on national
resources to leverage local challenge or matching funds (e.g., raised over $160 million in challenge
grants program). They have already amassed the total needed matching funds and support dollars that
are required in the NOFA. The applicant also allocates staff's time and skill set across the budget to
assure sufficient resources for successfully meeting stated objectives.

Significant Strengths

The budget presented by the applicant is consistent with the program design's goals and objectives. Of
note is the fact that the applicant has established a successful fund development track record with
foundations and corporations (non-Federal resources). The proposed budget indicates that the applicant
will absorb 51% of the budget cost (more than the minimum required), and they are poised to do this at
the beginning of the grant period. *(Budget A.i and A.ii.)*

The applicant has extensive resources already secured that exceed their match amount and more than
50% of their first year matching funds ($4 million). They also have the dedicated expertise and time of
a senior development officer for assistance in securing multi-year commitments. *(Budget B.i. and B.ii.)*

Significant Weaknesses

There are no significant weaknesses identified.

☒ **Excellent**   ☐ **Strong**   ☐ **Satisfactory**   ☐**Weak/Non-responsive**

OVERALL APPRAISAL

I. Provide a 3 - 5 sentence Overall Appraisal Statement of the application taking into consideration:

The applicant has provided evidence of extensive previous experience in acting as an intermediary for
large scale projects (CSP model as they relate to HIV/AIDS). Their program design is steeped in
evidence-based evaluation, with the use of data and the expertise of nationally recognized experts in the
discipline utilized to guide program assessment and effectiveness. A track record of successful fund
raising with non-Federal entities (e.g., corporations and Foundations) was presented, and innovative
strategies to build subgrantee capacity both in the pre-selection phase and during the proposed project
timeline are outlined.

However, it should be noted that the program design does omit detailed information regarding some of the outcome measures as it relates to how they would be measured. There was also a lack of clarity as it relates to the specific process of selecting subgrantees based on a strong theory of change. Overall, the proposal is strong and has great potential for success.

II. Select one Band for this application (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")
Ensure that your selection is supported by your panel's Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, Ratings, and Overall Appraisal Statement. Take into consideration the weighting of each category.

☐ **Band I (Excellent):** A comprehensive and thorough application of excellent merit with very significant strengths and no/minimal significant weaknesses.

☒ **Band II (Strong):** An application that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support, where the value of the significant strengths outweigh the identified weaknesses.

☐ **Band III (Satisfactory):** An application with potential, where strengths and weaknesses are approximately equal. However, some fundamental weaknesses have been identified.

☐ **Band IV (Weak/Non-Responsive):** An application with very significant weaknesses and no/minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include an application that is non-responsive to the published criteria.

Rank

As a panel, Rank this application in relation to the other applications on your panel. Complete this section only after all applications before your panel have been reviewed and consensus has been achieved on each one. The highest rank is "1".

Rank: __3___ of __6___ total applications on Panel # __1___.

CONSENSUS RUBRIC

Please use this Consensus Rubric as guidance when selecting your Ratings or Bands.

BAND I (Excellent) — *A BAND I rating reflects that the application is compelling, consistently excellent in quality, and addresses all requirements; thereby showing the highest potential for success.*

The **Excellent** application consistently:
- ✓ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.
- ✓ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Provides clear evidence to support all objectives of this section (no assumptions are made).
- ✓ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.

BAND II (Strong) — *A BAND II rating reflects that the application is solid, good-quality, and has great potential for success.*

The **Strong** application:
- ✓ Provides a response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
- ✓ Supports ideas with comprehensive plans, examples, or outlines.

BAND III (Satisfactory) — *A BAND III rating reflects that the application generally meets requirements for a reasonable chance of success, but is neither especially strong nor especially weak.*

The **Satisfactory** application:
- ✓ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.
- ✓ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
- ✓ Supports individual ideas with plans, examples, or outline.

BAND IV (Weak/Non-responsive) — *A weak/non-responsive rating reflects that the application is below standard especially in ability, skill, or quality; indicating that this application will most likely not succeed as described or is not responsive to the application requirements.*

The **Weak/Non-responsive** application:
- ✓ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.
- ✓ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection to objectives.
- ✓ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it
- ✓ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.
- ✓ Did not connect the activities to the anticipated results.
- ✓ Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFA.
- ✓ Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFA and application instructions.

2010 Social Innovation Fund

National AIDS Fund

Section 2 – Reviewer Comments: Group 2

SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010
PANEL CONSENSUS FORM

Instructions throughout this form are indicated in **red.**

Before you begin, please fill out the Applicant Name and Application ID# in the above header. This Panel Consensus Form (PCF) is where each panel records its consensus assessment of an application. The completion of this form may be led by any panelist; that individual will be designated the Lead Reviewer (LR). All Expert Reviewers are expected to serve as the LR on at least one application. The consensus assessment should be based on the panel's examination of the full application Narrative, which consists of the following 3 categories:

Category	Percentage	Subcategories
Program Design	45%	A. Goals and Objectives
		B. Use of Evidence
		C. Community Resources

		D. Description of Activities
		   i. Subgranting
		   ii. Technical Assistance and Support

Organizational Capacity	35%	A. Ability to Provide Program Oversight
		B. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	20%	A. Budget and Program Design
		B. Match Sources

Panels will utilize Panel Consensus Calls to discuss each application and come to agreement on the content of the Narrative Assessment for each category, the Rating for each category, the Overall Appraisal Statement and the Band in which the application will be placed. When completing this form, the LR should rely on four primary documents: 1) the application being reviewed; 2) the IRW Compilation for the application being reviewed (compiled prior to discussion by the panel Facilitator); 3) the SIF Notice of Federal Funds Availability (NOFA); 4) the Consensus Rubric at the end of this form.

Please complete the following steps:

1. For each of the 3 categories (Program Design; Organizational Capacity; Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy), the LR should:
   a. **Write a 3 – 5 sentence Narrative Assessment** reflecting the panel's assessment of the quality of the response in the category being assessed; it is important that this narrative is not a summary of the application, rather the panel's evaluation of the application's quality.
   b. **List the application's significant strengths and weaknesses and annotate each.** Each significant strength or weakness **must** be supported by **at least one** of the Eligibility or Application Review Criteria that were in the SIF NOFA. (examples are included in this form)
   c. **Taking into consideration** both the Narrative Assessment and the listed strengths and weaknesses, **select a Rating** by checking the appropriate box.

2. **Complete the Overall Appraisal section.** In this section, you will:
   a. Provide an Overall Appraisal Statement; and
   b. Select a consensus Band that represents the quality of the application as a whole. The Bands are described in the Overall Appraisal section at the end of this form, and Appendix D of the Review Guide.

3. **After the panel has discussed all applications, provide a Rank for each application.**

PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)

The **Social Innovation Fund Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) states** that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Program Design.

A. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Corporation asks applicants to use a thematic approach in describing their proposed investments in community organizations. As established in the Act, there are two basic operational models of SIF intermediaries. The first is a SIF that will operate in a single geographic location, and address one or more priority issues within that location. This model is referred to as a "geographically-based SIF." The second model is a SIF that will address a single priority issue area in multiple geographic locations. This model is referred to as an "issue-based SIF." The Corporation will assess whether the application properly proposes goals and objectives as either a geographically-based or an issue-based SIF.

i. *Geographically-Based SIF*
    To apply as a geographically-based SIF, the applicant must propose to focus on serving low-income communities within a specific local geographic area, and propose to focus on improving measurable outcomes related to one or more of the following priority issue areas:
    - *Economic Opportunity – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;*
    - *Youth Development and School Support – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;*
    - *Healthy Futures – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.*

    The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area(s) within the specific local geographic area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to those issue areas that the applicant will seek to improve.

ii. *Issue-Based SIF*
    To apply as an issue-based SIF, the application must propose to focus on addressing one of the following priority issue areas within multiple low-income communities:
    - *Economic Opportunity – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;*
    - *Youth Development and School Support – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;*
    - *Healthy Futures – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.*

    The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area within the geographic areas likely to be served, including statistics demonstrating that those geographic areas have a high need in the priority issue area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to the priority issue area that the applicant will seek to improve.

B. USE OF EVIDENCE

i. *Applicants must include in their application information describing their track record of using rigorous evidence, data, and evaluation tools to:*
   - *Select and invest in subgrantees;*
   - *Support and monitor the replication and expansion of subgrantees; and*
   - *Achieve measurable outcomes.*

C. COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Not applicable. The applicant's Community Resources should be assessed in the Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy section. Applicants were instructed **not** to provide information in this section. If applicants include information in this section, it should not be considered in your overall rating for the Program Design section.

D. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

i. **Subgranting**
a. *Applicants must describe the process by which they will competitively select their nonprofit community organization subgrantees, and, if applicable, the process by which they have pre-selected some subgrantees. Specifically, applicants must describe how their competitive subgrant selection process will ensure a portfolio of subgrantees that are innovative nonprofit community organizations serving low-income communities and that possess:*
   - *A strong theory of change;*
   - *Strong leadership and financial and management systems, including data management;*
   - *A strong financial position, including funding diversity, the ability to meet the requirements for providing dollar-for-dollar matching funds, and the ability to sustain the initiative after the subgrant period concludes;*
   - *Strong community relationships;*
   - *A commitment to and track record of using data and evaluation for performance and program improvement;*
   - *Evidence of effectiveness, including a demonstrated track record of achieving specific measurable outcomes related to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary;*
   - *Strong potential for replication or expansion;*
   - *A well-defined plan for achieving specific measurable outcomes connected to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary, evaluation of program effectiveness, performance improvement, and replication or expansion; and*
   - *A commitment to use grant funds to replicate, expand, or support their programs.*

   Either as part of its review of the applications or in clarification reviews prior to award, the Corporation may request additional information regarding pre-selected subgrantees for compliance and appropriate outcomes.

ii. **Technical Assistance and Support**
a. *Applicants must include in their application information describing how they will provide technical assistance and support (other than financial support) that will increase the ability of subgrantees to achieve their measurable outcomes, including replication or expansion. Replication or expansion may happen in various ways (including, for example, creating new sites*

or affiliating with another program to replicate an intervention) and in multiple contexts (including, for example, serving more people in a current geography or growing to new geographies).

Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant has extensive experience in crafting, implementing, and evaluating large scale projects such as the Community-Science Partnership (CSP), GENERATIONS, and Girl Smart. They have established long-term partnerships and collaborations with established institutions of higher education, and have a history of utilizing these academic experts for rigorous evaluation plans and assessing program effectiveness (e.g., R3). The applicant also reports a 21-year history of working as a national grant making intermediary, and has provided evidence of capacity building in subgrantees. However, the program design is vague for some of the specific measurable outcomes as it relates to how they will be measured (e.g., what tools will be used – what surveys will be used), and does not describe how their competitive process will select subgrantees that possess a strong theory of change.

Significant Strengths

The applicant provides extensive statistical data that clearly identifies why the specific goals and measurable objectives were selected for the program design. Examples of data provided include HIV case rates and the percentage of U.S. annually diagnosed HIV infections, and the fact that epicenters of populations that are living with HIV/AIDS are less likely or not receiving antiretroviral treatment or other needed services. These population epicenters are identified as the targets for the 7-9 proposed public-private partnerships to be funded. *(Program Design A.i.)*

The applicant presents a track record of utilizing evidence-based models to build subgrantee capacity building, replication and expansion. This is documented through details provided regarding measurable outcomes (formative and summative) from programs such as R3, Generations, Girl Smart, and The Sisterhood Project. *(Program Design B.i.)*

The applicant provides a tested process by which they will select subgrantees. For example, subgrantees must propose programs based on preliminary evidence, conduct research, involve the targeted population in program design, pilot test interventions and evaluations during a 3 month formative phase before final selection. *(Program Design B.i.)*

Significant Weaknesses

While several goals and objectives are stated for the proposal, minimal details are provided to determine how subgrantees would be selected based on a strong theory of change. This required criterion from the NOFA was not clearly outlined. *(Program Design D.i.a.)*

Specific measures for certain key outcomes are not provided. For example, the applicant states that they will measure estimated behavioral change, clients' perceived self efficacy, quality of life, cost effectiveness of clinical providers or to society at large, and effectiveness of collaboration. They do not state how they plan to measure these (e.g., what measurement design, surveys, etc). *(Program Design D.i.a.)*

Select a Rating for PROGRAM DESIGN (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☐ **Excellent**   ☐ **Strong**   ☒ **Satisfactory**   ☐Weak/Non-responsive

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA states** that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Organizational Capacity.

A. ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM OVERSIGHT

In evaluating your organization's ability to provide program oversight, the Corporation will consider:

i.   *The extent to which your organization has a sound structure including:*
  - *The ability to provide sound programmatic oversight, including:*
    - *Experience with and capacity for evaluation; and*
    - *Experience with and capacity for supporting replication or expansion.*
  - *Well-defined roles for your Board of directors, administrators, and staff;*
  - *A well-designed plan and systems for organizational (as opposed to subgrantee) self-assessment and continuous improvement; and*
  - *The ability to provide and/or secure effective technical assistance.*

ii.   *Whether your organization has a sound record of accomplishment, including the extent to which you:*
  - *Have a track record of supporting organizations that demonstrate evidence of impact;*
  - *Demonstrate leadership within the organization and strong relationships within the communities served;*
  - *Have a track-record of raising substantial resources, and, if you are an existing Federal grantee, having secured the matching resources as required in your prior grant awards; and*
  - *The extent to which your community support recurs, increases in scope or amount, and is more diverse, as evidenced by:*
    - *Collaborations that include a diverse spectrum of community stakeholders;*
    - *A broad base of financial support, including local financial and in-kind contributions; and*
    - *Supporters who represent a wide range of community stakeholders.*

B. ABILITY TO PROVIDE FISCAL OVERSIGHT

Entities eligible to apply for SIF grants include:
- *Existing grantmaking institutions, or*
- *Partnerships between an existing grantmaking institution and another grantmaking institution, a State Commission, or the chief executive officer of a unit of general local government*

i. *Existing grantmaking institutions are organizations in existence at the time of the application where, investing in nonprofit community organizations or programs is an essential (rather than collateral) means of fulfilling their mission and vision. In keeping with this view, grantmaking institutions will generally have the following as part of their core operating functions:*
- *Conducting open or otherwise competitive programs to award grants to or make investments in a diverse portfolio of nonprofit community organizations;*
- *Negotiating specific grant requirements with nonprofit community organizations; and*
- *Overseeing and monitoring the performance of grantees.*

ii. *In evaluating your organization's ability to provide fiscal oversight, the Corporation will take into account its review of your organization's capacity. The Corporation will further consider:*
- *The extent to which your organization, or proposed partnership, has key personnel with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to provide fiscal oversight of subgrantees; and*
- *Whether your organization, or proposed partnership, has specific experience in providing fiscal oversight of subgrantees of Federal funds.*

Panel Narrative Assessment

An impressive record of successful replication of models in 35 cities/regions since 1988 is presented. The applicant describes an extensive record of providing technical assistance for subgrantees, and has proposed the inclusion of significant dollars in the SIF proposal to support a wide network of technical advisors. Experienced staff possess the skill set needed to provide administrative fiscal oversight, which includes grants management and monitoring. An extensive network of fund development collaborative is described and an established track record of raising a diverse pool of non-Federal resources.

Significant Strengths

The applicant has experience in managing and administering Federal grant programs. This is documented through a 16+ year track record of managing AmeriCorps programs, and over 10 years of managing Cooperative Agreements with the Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

The evaluation team is highly interdisciplinary, with extensive experience in HIV community-based work, clinic-based work, program evaluation, HIV treatment, multi-site interventions and analytic methodologies. *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

The applicant has a well-defined plan and systems for organizational self-assessment and continuous improvement, as evidenced by an operational plan that covers all aspects of the organization, including

systems and organizational structure, and identifies staffing and capacity requirements linked to operational and programmatic performance. *(Organizational Capacity A.i.)*

The applicant employs a state-of-the-art online tool for fiscal management that secures a standard means of grantee assessment and supervision. For example, the online grants management system gives the applicant the capacity to conduct pre-grant and active grant due diligence, effectively track grant dollars, determine how funds are being utilized, and evaluate the impact funds are having on organizational and programmatic goals. *(Organizational Capacity B.i.)*

Several core operating functions are managed by skilled staff with a track record of conducting competitive grant programs, and negotiating and overseeing grant details and requirements. *(Organizational Capacity B.ii.)*

Significant Weaknesses

No significant weaknesses noted.

Select a Rating for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☒ **Excellent**   ☐ **Strong**   ☐ **Satisfactory**   ☐**Weak/Non-responsive**

COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (20%)

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA states** that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy.

A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN

In evaluating the cost effectiveness and budget adequacy of your proposed program, the Corporation will consider:

i.   *Whether your program is cost-effective based on:*
  - *The extent to which your program demonstrates diverse, non-Federal resources for program implementation and sustainability;*
  - *The extent to which you are proposing to provide more than the minimum required share of the costs of your program; and*
  - *Whether the reasonable and necessary costs of your program or project are higher because you are proposing to serve areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved.*

ii.   *Whether your budget is adequate to support your program design.*

B. MATCH SOURCES

i.   *At the time of submission of the application, applicants must demonstrate either cash-on-hand or commitments (or a combination thereof) toward meeting 50 percent their first year matching funds, based on the amount of Federal grant funds applied for.*

ii.   *In addition to the match eligibility criteria, the Corporation will evaluate the extent to which you have a combination of cash-on-hand or commitments to meet the full match requirements, and whether your organization will be able to provide financial resources for your SIF program beyond the minimum required match.*

Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant demonstrates a track record of successfully raising dollars and building on national resources to leverage local challenge or matching funds (e.g., raised over $160 million in challenge grants program). They have already amassed the total needed matching funds and support dollars that are required in the NOFA. The applicant also allocates staff's time and skill set across the budget to assure sufficient resources for successfully meeting stated objectives.

Significant Strengths

The budget presented by the applicant is consistent with the program design's goals and objectives. Of note is the fact that the applicant has established a successful fund development track record with foundations and corporations (non-Federal resources). The proposed budget indicates that the applicant will absorb 51% of the budget cost (more than the minimum required), and they are poised to do this at the beginning of the grant period. *(Budget A.i and A.ii.)*

The applicant has extensive resources already secured that exceed their match amount and more than 50% of their first year matching funds ($4 million). They also have the dedicated expertise and time of a senior development officer for assistance in securing multi-year commitments. *(Budget B.i. and B.ii.)*

Significant Weaknesses

There are no significant weaknesses identified.

☒ **Excellent**   ☐ **Strong**   ☐ **Satisfactory**   ☐**Weak/Non-responsive**

OVERALL APPRAISAL

I. Provide a 3 - 5 sentence Overall Appraisal Statement of the application taking into consideration:

The applicant has provided evidence of extensive previous experience in acting as an intermediary for large scale projects (CSP model as they relate to HIV/AIDS). Their program design is steeped in evidence-based evaluation, with the use of data and the expertise of nationally recognized experts in the discipline utilized to guide program assessment and effectiveness. A track record of successful fund raising with non-Federal entities (e.g., corporations and Foundations) was presented, and innovative strategies to build subgrantee capacity both in the pre-selection phase and during the proposed project timeline are outlined.

However, it should be noted that the program design does omit detailed information regarding some of the outcome measures as it relates to how they would be measured. There was also a lack of clarity as it relates to the specific process of selecting subgrantees based on a strong theory of change. Overall, the proposal is strong and has great potential for success.

II. Select one Band for this application (<u>double-click in the applicable box and select "checked"</u>)
Ensure that your selection is supported by your panel's Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, Ratings, and Overall Appraisal Statement. Take into consideration the weighting of each category.

☐ **Band I (Excellent):** A comprehensive and thorough application of excellent merit with very significant strengths and no/minimal significant weaknesses.

☒ **Band II (Strong):** An application that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support, where the value of the significant strengths outweigh the identified weaknesses.

☐ **Band III (Satisfactory):** An application with potential, where strengths and weaknesses are approximately equal. However, some fundamental weaknesses have been identified.

☐ **Band IV (Weak/Non-Responsive):** An application with very significant weaknesses and no/minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include an application that is non-responsive to the published criteria.

Rank

As a panel, Rank this application in relation to the other applications on your panel. Complete this section <u>only</u> after all applications before your panel have been reviewed and consensus has been achieved on each one. The highest rank is "1".

Rank: __3___ of __6___ total applications on Panel # __1___ .

CONSENSUS RUBRIC

Please use this Consensus Rubric as guidance when selecting your Ratings or Bands.

BAND I (Excellent) — *A BAND I rating reflects that the application is compelling, consistently excellent in quality, and addresses all requirements; thereby showing the highest potential for success.*

The **Excellent** application consistently:
✓ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.

✓ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.

✓ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

✓ Provides clear evidence to support all objectives of this section (no assumptions are made).

✓ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.

BAND II (Strong) — *A BAND II rating reflects that the application is solid, good-quality, and has great potential for success.*

The **Strong** application:
✓ Provides a response to all of the information requested.

✓ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

✓ Explains most assumptions and reasons.

✓ Supports ideas with comprehensive plans, examples, or outlines.

BAND III (Satisfactory) — *A BAND III rating reflects that the application generally meets requirements for a reasonable chance of success, but is neither especially strong nor especially weak.*

The **Satisfactory** application:
✓ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.

✓ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

✓ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.

✓ Supports individual ideas with plans, examples, or outline.

BAND IV (Weak/Non-responsive) — *A weak/non-responsive rating reflects that the application is below standard especially in ability, skill, or quality; indicating that this application will most likely not succeed as described or is not responsive to the application requirements.*

The **Weak/Non-responsive** application:
✓ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.

✓ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

✓ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection to objectives.

✓ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it

✓ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.

✓ Did not connect the activities to the anticipated results.

✓ Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFA.

✓ Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFA and application instructions.