Peer Review Form
2024-25 AmeriCorps State Formula Program

Applicant Name:		Reviewer number:	
Program Name:			

Table of Contents

After you complete this review form, a copy will be provided to applicants to help improve their application (only your reviewer number will appear; they will not be able to identify who completed the form). In the comment sections below, please include both strengths and areas for improvement.

Program Design

1. Community Problem

This section describes the problem addressed by the proposed program. Score this section and the Logic Model section together and provide an overall score at the bottom of the Logic Model section.

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
1.a. The applicant provides a detailed summary of the community problem that the proposed addresses	YES ☐ NO ☐	
1.b. The applicant discusses the role that current or historical inequities faced by underserved communities may play in contributing to the problem	YES ☐ NO ☐	
1.c. The narrative discusses the community need as it relates to the CDC's Social Vulnerability Index.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
1.d. Other comments about Community Problem section		

2. Logic Model

Applicants should include short, medium and long-term outcomes in the Logic Model. Applicants are not required to measure all components of their Logic Model.

The logic model is found on the last pages of the "Application" document and is presented in landscape format. The Logic Model may not exceed eight pages.

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
2.a. The applicant depicts inputs or resources that are necessary to deliver the program, including all of the following four criteria, but not limited to: • Locations or sites where members will provide services • Context in which the intervention is delivered (e.g., the setting where the intervention is delivered) • Number of AmeriCorps members who will deliver the program	YES ☐ NO ☐	

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
Characteristics of AmeriCorps members, including specific knowledge, skills, and abilities required to implement the intervention		
2.b. The applicant depicts the core activities that define the program that members will implement are described, including all of the following three criteria: • duration of program (e.g., total # of weeks, sessions, months) • dosage of program (e.g., number of hours per session or sessions per week), and • target population for the program (e.g., disconnected youth, third graders at a certain reading proficiency level)	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.c. The applicant depicts measurable outputs that result from delivering the program (i.e., number of beneficiaries served, types and number of activities conducted).	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.d. The "short-term outcomes" column includes outcomes that demonstrate changes in: • knowledge • skills • attitudes and/or • opinions that occur as a result of the program.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.e. The "mid-term outcomes" column includes outcomes that demonstrate changes in: • behavior and/or • action that occur as a result of the program.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.f. The "long-term outcomes" column includes outcomes that demonstrate changes in: • condition and/or • status in life that occur as a result of the program.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.g. Rationales and justifications are informed by: • the organization's performance data (e.g., program data observed over time that suggests targets are reasonable) • relevant research (e.g., targets are documented by organizations running similar programs with similar populations) and/or • prior program evaluation findings	YES ☐ NO ☐	

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
2.h. The proposed program is responsive to the community problem identified	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.i. The program is likely to lead to the outcomes identified	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.j. If the applicant has multiple interventions, all interventions are incorporated into the Logic Model	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
2.k. The Logic Model does not exceed 8 pages	YES ☐ NO ☐	
2.l. Other comments about the Logic Model		
Overall points for Community Problem and Logic Model section (1-24 points)		

3. Evidence Tier

The goal of this section is to determine the **relevance** and **strength** of the evidence provided as it relates to the proposed program.

If the applicant submitted an evaluation report, it will appear as a separate document.

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
3.a. The applicant has summarized the study design and key findings of any evaluation report(s) submitted.	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
3.b. The applicant has described any other evidence that supports their program, including their own program's past performance measure data and/or other research studies that inform their program design.	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
3.c. If the applicant has submitted evaluation report(s) for consideration, they have also described how the program described in the Evidence Based section of the application narrative how the program described in the submitted reports is the same as the program described in the application.	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
3.d. If the applicant has submitted evaluation report(s) for consideration, they sufficiently match the program proposed to be considered the same program (see paragraph below for definition of "same intervention").	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
3.e. Other comments about Evidence Tier		
Overall points for Evidence Tier section (1-12)		

Same intervention described in the application: The intervention evaluated in submitted evaluation reports must match the intervention proposed in the application in the following areas, all of which must be clearly described in the Program Design and Logic Model sections of the application:

- Characteristics of the beneficiary population, including evidence of current or historic inequities facing the population
- Characteristics of the population delivering the intervention
- Dosage (frequency, duration) and design of the intervention, including all key components and activities
- The context in which the intervention is delivered
- Outcomes of the intervention

4. Evidence Quality

Now that the applicant's evidence tier has been assessed, complete one of the two sections below, depending on which evidence tier you determined the applicant to fit.

In this section, the quality of the applicant's evidence and the degree to which it supports the proposed program design will be assessed and scored. If the applicant submitted one or more evaluation reports, they will appear as a separate document.

- If the applicant submitted one or more evaluation reports, use criteria 4.a. through 4.d.
- If the applicant did not submit any evaluation reports, use criteria 4.e. through 4.g.

Criteria	*Satisfactory*		*Strengths and areas for improvement*
4.a. The submitted reports are of satisfactory methodological quality and rigor for the type of evaluation conducted (e.g., adequate sample size and statistical power, internal and/or external validity, appropriate use of control or comparison groups, etc.).	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐		
4.b. The submitted reports describe evaluations that were conducted relatively recently, preferably within the last six years.	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐		
4.c. The submitted reports show a meaningful and significant positive effect on program beneficiaries in at least one key outcome of interest.	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐		
4.d. Other comments about Evidence Quality			
Overall points for Evidence Quality section (1-8)			

If the applicant did not submit any evaluation reports, use criteria 4.e. through 4.g.

Criteria	*Satisfactory*		*Strengths and areas for improvement*
4.e. The applicant uses relevant evidence, including past performance measure data and/or cited research studies, to inform their proposed program design	YES ☐ NO ☐		
4.f. The described evidence is relatively recent, preferably from the last six years	YES ☐ NO ☐		

4.g. The evidence described by the applicant indicates a meaningful positive effect on program beneficiaries in at least one key outcome of interest.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
4.h. Other comments about Evidence Quality		
Overall points for Evidence Quality section (1-8)		

5. Member Experience

Criteria	*Satisfactory*	*Strengths and areas for improvement*
5.a. AmeriCorps members' service will provide them with opportunities to develop as leaders.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
5.b. AmeriCorps members will gain skills as a result of their training and service that can be utilized and will be valued by future employers after their service term is completed.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
5.c. AmeriCorps members receive additional benefits.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
5.d. AmeriCorps members will be provided a high quality orientation to the community they will serve in that is from an asset based frame and guided and informed by the community.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
5.e. Other comments about Member Experience		
Overall points for Member Experience Section (1-6)		

Organizational Capability

The "Organizational Capability" Section immediately follows the "Member Experience" section.

This section should explain how the applicant organization is qualified to operate the proposed programs

6. Organizational Background and Staffing

Criteria	Satisfactory		Strengths and areas for improvement
6.a. The applicant details the roles, responsibilities, and structure of the staff that will be: • implementing the AmeriCorps program • providing oversight and monitoring for the program.	YES ☐ NO ☐		
6.b. There is an explanation if the organization has facilitated, partnered, or participated in educational or workforce development programs (i.e., pre-apprenticeship/registered apprenticeship, work experience, and job training programs, etc.)	YES ☐ NO ☐		
6.c. The applicant describes how the organization's mission and relevant experience in areas such as volunteer recruitment and management, community outreach, overcoming project implementation challenges, etc.	YES ☐ NO ☐		
6.d. Other comments about Organizational Background and Staffing			
Overall points for Organizational Background and Staffing section (1-15)			

7. Member Supervision

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
7.a. AmeriCorps members will receive sufficient guidance and support from their supervisor to provide effective service, such as a structure for member supervision, cadence and format of supervisor and AmeriCorps member check-ins, member and supervisor opportunities to assess strengths and opportunities for growth, member training plan, etc.).	YES ☐ NO ☐	
7.b. AmeriCorps supervisors will be adequately trained/prepared to follow AmeriCorps and program regulations, priorities, and expectations, such as a structure for support of supervisors, training plan for supervisors related to supervision and AmeriCorps rules and regulations, cadence and format of AmeriCorps supervisors/their supervisors check ins, opportunities to assess strengthens and opportunities for growth of supervisors, etc.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
7.c. Other comments about Member Supervision		
Overall points for Member Supervision section (1-6)		

8. Commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
8.a. The applicant demonstrates if the leadership and staff at your organization have the same lived experience as the beneficiary population and/or community being served.	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
8.b. Explain if your organization has definitions of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility that demonstrate the organization is engaged in relation to diversity, equity, and inclusion (i.e., inclusion of diversity on the Board of Directors, agency staff and leadership, and/or volunteers).	YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	
8.d. Other comments about Commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility		
Overall points for Commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility section (1-4)		

Cost Effectiveness & Budget Adequacy

Criteria	Satisfactory	Strengths and areas for improvement
9.a. **Member Recruitment** (7 points).The applicant provides a description of budget expenses to support successful recruitment of AmeriCorps members best suited to serve the community, for example from geographic or demographic communities in which the program operates.	YES ☐ NO ☐	
9.b. **Member Retention** (8 points). The applicant provides a description of budget expenses to support retention of AmeriCorps members (e.g., additional member benefits such as increasing above the minimum living allowance, supporting workforce pathways, certifications, coaching for members, resume building, individual benefit as well as community building, network building, member recognition, alumni programming, etc.).	YES ☐ NO ☐	
9.c. **Data Collection** (7 points). The applicant provides a description of budget expenses to support data collection, continuous improvement activities, and evaluation in service to evaluating the interventions and impact on the community and the member experience).	YES ☐ NO ☐	
9.d. **Budget Alignment to Program Design** (3 points). The applicant's budget is aligned to the program design outlined in the narrative, meaning activities discussed in the narrative are incorporated in the budget in the agency or applicant share	N/A ☒	*This item will be assessed by staff. Please do not deduct any of the three points for this item.*
9.e. Other comments about Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy		
Overall points for Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy section (1-25)		

Other Comments

Provide any additional comments here.

Summary of Points Awarded

Transfer the points from each section above to this grid.

Narrative Item	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Reasons for deduction of points/suggestions for improvements
Community and Logic Model	24		
Evidence Tier	12		
Evidence Quality	8		
Member Experience	6		
Organizational Background and Staffing	15		
Member Supervision	6		
Commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility	4		
Member Recruitment	7		
Member Retention	8		
Data Collection	7		
Budget Alignment to Program Design	3	*3*	*N/A*
Total Score	**100**		

Use the standards below to select the category you feel best describes the proposal. Reconsider your overall rating, and ensure it is supported by your analysis and comments in the preceding sections. Please select only one.

☐	Exceptional Proposal – Recommend for Funding	A comprehensive and thorough program design of exceptional merit with very significant strengths and no significant weaknesses. Total score should be between 91-100 points.
☐	Satisfactory Proposal – Recommended for Funding	Program design demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support where the value of the strengths outweighs the identified weaknesses. Total score should be between 80-90 points.
☐	Weak/Non-responsive Proposal – Do Not Recommend for Funding	A program design with very significant weaknesses and minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include a program design that is non-responsive to the published criteria. Proposal total score should be below 80 points.