

Award Justification Statement RFP# 202102030

I. Summary

Volunteer Maine, the state service commission, awards federal AmeriCorps program resources (position slots and funds to support the people who serve) for 3-year operating grants. Applicants must implement the program model described in the proposal, use standardized performance measures to demonstrate accomplishments, comply with federal regulations for AmeriCorps, and conduct an overall program evaluation. Selected programs met the requirement of having sufficient service work to account for at least 13,600 hours of service by AmeriCorps members in each of three years.

Eligible applicants were public or non-profit agencies, higher education institutions, and regional organizations that intend to operate an AmeriCorps program solely within Maine.

Two qualifying applications were received by the deadline of 11:59 pm and, upon recommendation of the grant selection committee, the Commission voted to fund one applicant at its May 21, 2021 meeting. Selected for funding was the UMaine Center on Aging/University of Maine System.

II. Evaluation Process

(RFP pgs 12-13) Volunteer Maine uses selection criteria and a process that incorporates the mandatory AmeriCorps weighting and scoring of various criteria published in the [Code of Federal Regulations](#) as well as its own policies on funding and performance, and the requirements of state contract selection rules.

All AmeriCorps State proposals are assessed by the Commission's Grant Selection and Performance Task Force using a multi-step review process.

- 1) External Peer Review of application narrative components including logic model, supports of strong or moderate evidence base for program model, and (for certain re-competing applicants) program evaluations.
- 2) Task Force assessment of applicant's financial plan, fiscal capacity, alignment of proposed target need with funding priorities as well as proposed performance measures, program model, readiness to implement program, and past performance in other grant programs, including those funded by foundations or other government agencies (if applicable).

Peer Review. Reviewers are community service practitioners, educators, administrators, and specialists in the areas of environment, public safety, education, and other human needs who evaluate the quality of the proposals.

The Commission uses the mandated CFR weighting and selection criteria during this phase: 50% for Program Design, 25% for Organizational Capability, and 25% for Budget Adequacy and Cost Effectiveness for a possible total score of 100 Peer Reviewer points.

Peer Reviewers will express their consensus recommendations to the Commission's Grant Selection and Performance Task Force by assigning each proposal to one of the following categories:

- Strongly Recommend for Further Review (A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with numerous strengths; total score between 90 and 100)
- Recommend for Further Review (A proposal that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support; it has some weaknesses. Total score between 80 and 89)

- Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation (A proposal with approximately equal strengths and weaknesses. However, the weaknesses are not offset by strengths. Total score between 60 and 79.)
- Do Not Recommend for Further Review (A proposal with serious shortcomings. There are numerous weaknesses and few strengths. Total score 59 or below)

Applications not recommended for further review will not be submitted to the Task Force for consideration.

Task Force Review. Applications recommended for some level of review will undergo further assessment by the Grants Selection and Performance Task Force. The Task Force will include in its review documents submitted as part of this competition plus prior grant performance information and data from information systems including:

- ◆ Public registries such as the Excluded Parties List (debarment) and other publicly available materials.
- ◆ For re-competing applicants:
 - AmeriCorps member enrollment and retention rates, impact data and prior outcomes, as well as submitted evaluations;
 - results of grant monitoring, reporting, and compliance with regulations;
 - history of meeting performance targets, financial performance and match history.

Prior performance by new grantees will be based on interviews of the foundation or public agency program officers listed on the submitted documents.

The Task Force will use the following weighting and selection criteria during this phase: 15% Financial Plan, 25% Fiscal Systems, 20% Program Alignment and Model (5 of 20 points are partnership preference points), 20% Past Performance (in other grant programs) and Grant Readiness for a possible total of 100 points.

Upon completion of the Task Force review, the Peer Reviewer and Task Force Review scores will be combined to produce a single review score.

The Grant Selection and Performance Task Force will then make its final recommendations for competitive submissions to the full Commission. The Task Force is not obligated to recommend funding of any proposals and may recommend that no funding be awarded.

COMMISSION VOTE ON APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL COMPETITION

The Commission will authorize submitting the applications recommended as Maine entries in the federal competition at the regular May 2021 business meeting.

III. Qualifications & Experience

The applicant submitted a proposal that will benefit a set of partners engaged in the Age-Friendly Communities Initiative (AFCIs). The UMaine CoA was established in 2001 as an interdisciplinary center addressing aging-related issues. The Center has collaborated with a variety of partners to address a wide range of issues impacting older adults, including aging-in-community. The Center has a commitment to supporting AFCIs as evidenced by technical assistance and consultation provided, in partnership with AARP Maine, to AFCIs in Maine as well as deployment of the Lifelong Community Fellow program. The Center was awarded an AmeriCorps Planning Grant in 2020 and successfully completed all the tasks, met all the milestones, and engaged the potential partners in developing the policies and procedures that will be the foundation of this program.

IV. Proposed Services

The grantee will implement the AmeriCorps program as outlined in the proposal. It will have 16 AmeriCorps members who will provide direct services that will expand or enhance services, programs, or activities in lifelong, age-friendly communities throughout Maine. At the end of the first program year, the AmeriCorps program will have (1) engaged at least 18 new partners in lifelong/age-friendly community initiatives in Maine; and, (2) improved capacity for lifelong, age-friendly communities to deliver services and engage residents. In addition, the AmeriCorps members will leverage an additional 30 or more community volunteers who will be engaged in delivering services (e.g., volunteer transportation or social engagement programming) developed by a local age-friendly, lifelong community initiative. The CNCS investment of \$133,497 will leverage \$20,000 in state and local funds, \$8,500 in public funding, and \$30,500.00 in private funding.

V. Cost Proposal

The size of AmeriCorps operational grants is determined by the number of member service years (MSYs) which are defined as 1700 hours per service year – similar to an FTE in the employment world. The federal agency annually sets a maximum contribution per MSY from grant funds and the amount for this competition was \$16,300 per 1700 hours. The 30 positions requested and to be awarded represent various terms of service that, when added together, equate to 8.19 MSY. Thus, the award is \$16,300 X 8.19 MSY or \$133,497.

VI. Conclusion

These grants have the potential to bring AmeriCorps resources to rural areas of Maine.

Crofton, Maryalice

From: Crofton, Maryalice
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 12:55 PM
To: erincrotty@sailingshipsmaine.org
Subject: RFP 202102030 Grant Decision Notification
Attachments: SS Sailing Ships AC Grant Notification Letter.pdf

Please see the attached document.

Maryalice Crofton

Executive Director
Volunteer Maine, the state service commission
A Stronger Maine Through Volunteerism

19 Elkins Lane, Room 105
105 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0105
(207)624-7792
www.VolunteerMaine.gov





Volunteer Maine

The Maine Commission for Community Service
"A Stronger Maine Through Volunteerism"



May 24, 2021

Erin Croty
Sailing Ships Portland
30 Danforth St., S 307
Portland, ME 04101-4574

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Grant Award under RFP# 202102030, AmeriCorps Standard Formula

Dear Ms Croty:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine's service commission, Volunteer Maine, for AmeriCorps Formula Standard Grants. The Commission evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria and process identified in the RFP. On May 21, 2021, the Commission voted on funding decisions and is hereby announcing its conditional award to the following bidder:

University of Maine System, Center on Aging

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP and the attached proposal evaluation are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee, availability of federal funds, and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in serving the people of Maine through AmeriCorps.

Sincerely,


Maryalice Crofton, Executive Director

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

Crofton, Maryalice

From: Crofton, Maryalice
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 12:48 PM
To: Patricia Oh; christopher.coynton@maine.edu
Subject: RFP 202102030 Decision Notification
Attachments: UMS-COA AC Grant Notification Letter.pdf

Please see the attached document.

Maryalice Crofton

Executive Director
Volunteer Maine, the state service commission
A Stronger Maine Through Volunteerism

19 Elkins Lane, Room 105
105 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0105
(207)624-7792
www.VolunteerMaine.gov





Volunteer Maine

The Maine Commission for Community Service
"A Stronger Maine Through Volunteerism"



May 24, 2021

Christopher Boynton
Patricia Oh
UMaine Center on Aging
University of Maine System
5717 Corbett Hall
Orono, ME 04469-5717

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Grant Award under RFP# 202102030, AmeriCorps Standard Formula

Dear Mr. Boynton and Dr. Oh:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine's service commission, Volunteer Maine, for AmeriCorps Formula Standard Grants. The Commission evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria and process identified in the RFP. On May 21, 2021, the Commission voted on funding decisions and is hereby announcing its conditional award to the following bidder:

University of Maine, Center on Aging

The bidder listed above received the sufficient points to qualify for a three-year award to operate an AmeriCorps Program under the fixed amount grant program. The Commission vote to fund the program specifies that the issues noted in the reviewer report to the Commission (see attached document) must be resolved. Please review the items and consult with the Grant Officer, Jamie McFaul, who will oversee resolution. These issues must be addressed no later than June 2, 2021 in order for the funds to be included in the request to the federal AmeriCorps agency.

As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Commission and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract until a grant containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Commission is executed. The Commission further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee, availability of federal funds, and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in serving the people of Maine through AmeriCorps.

Sincerely,

Maryalice Crofton, Executive Director



Volunteer Maine

The Maine Commission for Community Service
"A Stronger Maine Through Volunteerism"



STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

Final Scores - RFP 202102030

Note: Per RFP page 12 notice about selection, proposals not recommended for further consideration by the Peer Reviewers do not continue through the process.

RFP # 202102030
Standard Formula

	Applicant Sheet 1	Applicant Sheet 2
Application ID	21ES236122	21AC235969
Applicant Name	University of Maine System	Sailing Ships Portland
Peer Reviewer Results		
Program Design	38.75	27.25
Organizational Capability	22.25	8.75
Cost Effectiveness/Budget Adequacy	12.5	12.5
Peer Review Final Score	73.5	48.5
Recommendation to Grants TF	60-79, Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation	<=59, Do Not Recommend for Further Review
Task Force Review Results		
Program Model	16.88	
Past Performance	15	
Financial Plan	11.25	
Fiscal Plan	25	
Grant Readiness	20	
Task Force Final Score	88.13	0
Final Application Score	161.63	48.5
Funding Requested	133,497.00	#REF!
Rank order for funding (high to low)	1	

Two proposals will be considered the same if they:

- Address the same issue areas.
- Address the same priorities.
- Propose the same outcomes.
- Serve the same target communities and population.
- Utilize the same sites.
- Use the same program staff and members.

II. Review Process for AmeriCorps Proposals

STATE REVIEW.

Volunteer Maine uses selection criteria and a process that incorporates the mandatory AmeriCorps weighting and scoring of various criteria published in the [Code of Federal Regulations](#) as well as its own policies on funding and performance, and the requirements of state contract selection rules.

All AmeriCorps State proposals are assessed by the Commission's Grant Selection and Performance Task Force using a multi-step review process.

- 1) External Peer Review of application narrative components including logic model, supports of strong or moderate evidence base for program model, and (for certain re-competing applicants) program evaluations.
- 2) Task Force assessment of applicant's financial plan, fiscal capacity, alignment of proposed target need with funding priorities as well as proposed performance measures, program model, readiness to implement program, and past performance in other grant programs, including those funded by foundations or other government agencies (if applicable).

Peer Review. Reviewers are community service practitioners, educators, administrators, and specialists in the areas of environment, public safety, education, and other human needs who evaluate the quality of the proposals.

The Commission uses the mandated CFR weighting and selection criteria during this phase: 50% for Program Design, 25% for Organizational Capability, and 25% for Budget Adequacy and Cost Effectiveness for a possible total score of 100 Peer Reviewer points.

Peer Reviewers will express their consensus recommendations to the Commission's Grant Selection and Performance Task Force by assigning each proposal to one of the following categories:

- ♦ Strongly Recommend for Further Review (A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with numerous strengths; total score between 90 and 100)
- ♦ Recommend for Further Review (A proposal that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support; it has some weaknesses. Total score between 80 and 89)
- ♦ Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation (A proposal with approximately equal strengths and weaknesses. However, the weaknesses are not offset by strengths. Total score between 60 and 79.)
- ♦ Do Not Recommend for Further Review (A proposal with serious shortcomings. There are numerous weaknesses and few strengths. Total score 59 or below)

Applications not recommended for further review will not be submitted to the Task Force for consideration.

Task Force Review. Applications recommended for some level of review will undergo further assessment by the Grants Selection and Performance Task Force. The Task Force will include in its review documents submitted as part of this competition plus prior grant performance information and data from information systems including:

- ♦ Public registries such as the Excluded Parties List (debarment) and other publicly available materials.
- ♦ For re-competing applicants:
 - AmeriCorps member enrollment and retention rates, impact data and prior outcomes, as well as submitted evaluations;

- results of grant monitoring, reporting, and compliance with regulations;
- history of meeting performance targets, financial performance and match history.

Prior performance by new grantees will be based on interviews of the foundation or public agency program officers listed on the submitted documents.

The Task Force will use the following weighting and selection criteria during this phase: 15% Financial Plan, 25% Fiscal Systems, 20% Program Alignment and Model (5 of 20 points are partnership preference points), 20% Past Performance (in other grant programs) and Grant Readiness for a possible total of 100 points.

Upon completion of the Task Force review, the Peer Reviewer and Task Force Review scores will be combined to produce a single review score.

The Grant Selection and Performance Task Force will then make its final recommendations for competitive submissions to the full Commission. The Task Force is not obligated to recommend funding of any proposals and may recommend that no funding be awarded.

COMMISSION VOTE ON APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL COMPETITION

The Commission will authorize submitting the applications recommended as Maine entries in the federal competition at the regular May 2021 business meeting.

PROPOSAL CONTENTS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

Once the Commission selection process is complete, all submissions in response to this RFP will be considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA) (1 M.R.S. §§ 401 *et seq.*).

III. Unauthorized Applicant Contact with Peer Reviewer or Grants Selection and Performance Task Force Members

During the review period, applicants may not directly contact either Peer Reviewers or Grants Selection and Performance Task Force Reviewers, regarding this AmeriCorps Grant competition. The review period begins at the submission deadline and ends when the Task Force presents its decision to the Commission.

Applicants may only contact the designated proposal coordinator at the Volunteer Maine with questions or comments regarding this competition. If an applicant initiates or attempts direct contact with reviewers, this will result in disqualification of their proposal.

IV. Appeal of Grant Decisions

Any person aggrieved by Volunteer Maine's decisions under this RFP may appeal the decision to the Director of the Bureau of General Services in the manner prescribed in 5 MRSA § 1825-E and 18-554 Code of Maine Rules, Chapter 120 (found here: <https://www.maine.gov/dafs/bbm/procurementservices/policies-procedures/chapter-120>). The appeal must be in writing and filed with the Director of the Bureau of General Services, 77 State House Station, Augusta, Maine, 04333-0009 within 15 calendar days of receipt of notification of contract award.

D. AMERICORPS PROGRAM DETAILS



AmeriCorps is a national service program with three distinct branches:

- ◆ AmeriCorps State and National (team-based programs),
- ◆ AmeriCorps VISTA, and
- ◆ the National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC).

These instructions focus on the **AmeriCorps State** program since that is the grant program administered by Volunteer Maine, the State Service Commission. AmeriCorps National programs are multi-state or national nonprofit organizations that submit proposals directly to CNCS.

Peer Reviewers -- Consensus Process Worksheet (STANDARD Formula)

Strong: This section of the application is a thorough, compelling, and convincing response to criteria; additional information is relevant and enhances or strengthens argument significantly; the argument shows this element shows high levels of success or highly likely to be successful.

Adequate This section of the application responds to all criteria– no omissions or additions. The argument shows this element has had some success or could possibly succeed as described.

Weak: This section responds to many but not all the required elements/criteria. Some text is not relevant or does not add to the argument. The argument does not demonstrate this element has

Substandard This section barely responds to the criteria, has a significant flaw, or lacks any indication this element could succeed as described.

Incomplete/Nonresponsive: This section of the application does not respond to the criteria

INITIAL
COMMENTS: LINK TO DOC

APP ID: 21ES236122 **PROGRAM NAME:** Lifelong Maine AmeriCorps Program
APPLICANT NAME: University of Maine **GRANTEE TYPE:** First Time Fixed Amount **FUNDS REQUESTED:** 133,497.00

After peer reviewers discuss the proposal contents, quality, and responsiveness to requirements, record the group's consensus rating in column G for each section in the cells below. (Select from drop-down menu.) Then tab into H to trigger calculation (lookup).

RATER -- Initial ratings						
	Jennifer Trowbridge	J. Martel	Benjamin Filippo			
Program Design					Consensus Rating	Point Value
Need	Strong	Adequate	Strong		Strong	5
Intervention	Adequate	Adequate	Strong		Adequate	3.75
Theory of Change, Evidence of Effectiveness, Logic Model	Adequate	Adequate	Strong		Adequate	22.5
Funding Priority	Adequate	Adequate	Strong		Adequate	0.75
Member Experience	Strong	Strong	Adequate		Adequate	6.75
Program Design Score						38.75

RATER -- Initial Ratings						
	Jennifer Trowbridge	J. Martel	Benjamin Filippo			
Organizational Capability					Consensus Rating	Point Value
Organizational Background & Staffing	Strong	Strong	Strong		Strong	9
Compliance/Accountability	Strong	Strong	Strong		Strong	5
Culture that Values Learning	Adequate	Incomplete/Nonresponsive	Strong		Adequate	3.75
Member Supervision	Strong	Weak	Adequate		Adequate	4.5
Org. Capability Score						22.25

Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	RATER -- Initial ratings				Consensus Rating	
	Jennifer Trowbridge	J. Martel	Benjamin Filippo		Weak	12.5
	Weak	Weak	Adequate		Cost and Budget Score 12.5	

Plan Quality (Indicate Evaluation or Data Plan)	RATER -- Initial ratings				Consensus Rating	
	Jennifer Trowbridge	J. Martel	Benjamin Filippo		Strong	
	Adequate	Incomplete/Nonresponsive	Strong			

FINAL SECTION TOTALS and RECOMMENDATION

Final Consensus Score	Program Design	Organizational Capability	Cost Effectiveness/ Budget Adequacy	Evaluation Plan	Total Score
	38.75	22.25	12.5	0	73.5

Recommendation: 60-79, Recommend for Further Review with Hesitation

End Peer Reviewer Work - Task Force Work Recorded Below

INITIAL RATINGS> Below are the initial ratings offered by GTF Members after their independent reading and assessment of the proposals. These are the starting points for your determination of a final rating of the application narrative.

LINK TO COMMENTS

Program Model	Rater -- initial ratings				Consensus rating	
	Matt L'Italien	Jessica Nixon			Point Value	
Alignment of community need targeted and funding priorities	Strong	Strong			3.75	
Extent to which proposal will serve specified communities and add to diversity of Commission's portfolio	Adequate	Adequate			2.81	
Proposal is innovative use of AmeriCorps and might be replicated	Strong	Adequate			3.75	
Evidence the program can be sustained beyond initial start up	Adequate	Strong			2.81	
STANDARD APP: Proposal is from a partnership/coalition whose members are working together on program implementation OR RURAL APP: Communities to be served fall within one of the non-metro RUCC codes	Adequate	Adequate			3.75	

Prog Model Score 16.88

Past Performance	Rater -- initial ratings				Consensus rating	
	Matt L'Italien	Jessica Nixon			Adequate	15
	Can comply with requirements, info consistent with other grant administrator's info, consistent with externally verified past performance	Adequate	Adequate			#N/A
RECOMPETE ONLY: applicant used member positions					#N/A	
RECOMPETE ONLY: used financial resources allocated					#N/A	

RECOMPETE ONLY: implemented program effectively

--	--	--	--

	#N/A
--	------

Past Performance	15
-------------------------	----

		Rater -- initial ratings			
Financial Plan		Matt L'Italien	Jessica Nixon		
Plan anticipates operational costs and provides sufficient resources to implement program		Adequate	Adequate		

Consensus rating	Point Value
Adequate	11.25

Financial Plan	11.25
-----------------------	-------

		Rater -- initial ratings			
Fiscal Systems		Matt L'Italien	Jessica Nixon		
Capacity of Financial mgt system to comply with fed requirements		Strong	Strong		
Strength of orgz financial mgt practices as evidenced by audits, etc.		Strong	Strong		
Strength of sponsor orgs financial status/stability per audit, 990, etc.		Strong	Strong		

Consensus rating	Point Value
Strong	8.33
Strong	8.33
Strong	8.34

Fiscal Systems	25
-----------------------	----

		Rater -- initial ratings			
Readiness		Matt L'Italien	Jessica Nixon		
Plan anticipates operational costs and provides sufficient resources to implement program		Strong	Strong		

Consensus rating	Point Value
Strong	20

Grant Readiness	20
------------------------	----

GTF Total Score:	88.13
Peer Reviewer Score	73.5
Combined Score	161.625
	of possible 200

*hlookup pre-programmed

Recommendation:	Forward with no corrections
------------------------	-----------------------------

Peer Reviewers -- Consensus Process Worksheet (STANDARD Formula)

Strong: This section of the application is a thorough, compelling, and convincing response to criteria; additional information is relevant and enhances or strengthens argument significantly; the argument shows this element shows high levels of success or highly likely to be successful.

Adequate This section of the application responds to all criteria– no omissions or additions. The argument shows this element has had some success or could possibly succeed as described.

Weak: This section responds to many but not all the required elements/criteria. Some text is not relevant or does not add to the argument. The argument does not demonstrate this element has

Substandard This section barely responds to the criteria, has a significant flaw, or lacks any indication this element could succeed as described.

Incomplete/Nonresponsive: This section of the application does not respond to the criteria

INITIAL COMMENTS: LINK TO DOC

APP ID: 21AC235969 **PROGRAM NAME:** AmeriCorps Experiential Ocean Educator **FUNDS REQUESTED:** 130,400.00
APPLICANT NAME: Sailing Ships Portl **GRANTEE+TYPE:** First Time Cost Reimburse

After peer reviewers discuss the proposal contents, quality, and responsiveness to requirements, record the group's consensus rating in column G for each section in the cells below. (Select from drop-down menu.) Then tab into H to trigger calculation (lookup).

		RATER -- Initial ratings					
Program Design	Jennifer Trowbridge	J Martel	Benjamin Filippo		Consensus Rating	Point Value	
Need	Weak	Substandard	Strong		Substandard	1.25	
Intervention	Adequate	Adequate	Strong		Adequate	3.75	
Theory of Change, Evidence of Effectiveness, Logic Model	Substandard	Weak	Strong		Weak	15	
Funding Priority	Adequate	Weak	Strong		Weak	0.5	
Member Experience	Adequate	Adequate	Strong		Adequate	6.75	
Program Design Score						27.25	

		RATER -- Initial Ratings					
Organizational Capability	Jennifer Trowbridge	J Martel	Benjamin Filippo		Consensus Rating	Point Value	
Organizational Background & Staffing	Weak	Adequate	Strong		Weak	4.5	
Compliance/Accountability	Weak	Substandard	Strong		Incomplete/Nonrespons	0	
Culture that Values Learning	Weak	Weak	Strong		Substandard	1.25	
Member Supervision	Weak	Weak	Adequate		Weak	3	
Org. Capability Score						8.75	

Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	RATER -- Initial ratings				Consensus Rating	
	Jennifer Trowbridge	J Martel	Benjamin Filippo		Weak	12.5
	Weak	Adequate	Strong		Cost and Budget Score 12.5	

Plan Quality (Indicate Evaluation or Data Plan)	RATER -- Initial ratings				Consensus Rating	
	Jennifer Trowbridge	J Martel	Benjamin Filippo		Weak	
	Weak	Incomplete/Nonresponsive	Strong			

FINAL SECTION TOTALS and RECOMMENDATION

Program Design	Organizational Capability	Cost Effectiveness/ Budget Adequacy	Evaluation Plan	Total Score
27.25	8.75	12.5	0	48.5

Final Consensus Score

Recommendation: <=59, Do Not Recommend for Further Review

End Peer Reviewer Work - Task Force Work Recorded Below

INITIAL RATINGS> Below are the initial ratings offered by GTF Members after their independent reading and assessment of the proposals. These are the starting points for your determination of a final rating of the application narrative.

[LINK TO COMMENTS](#)

Program Model	Rater -- initial ratings				Consensus rating	Point Value
Alignment of community need targeted and funding priorities						#N/A
Extent to which proposal will serve specified communities and add to diversity of Commission's portfolio						#N/A
Proposal is innovative use of AmeriCorps and might be replicated						#N/A
Evidence the program can be sustained beyond initial start up						#N/A
STANDARD APP: Proposal is from a partnership/coalition whose members are working together on program implementation OR RURAL APP: Communities to be served fall within one of the non-metro RUCC codes						#N/A

Prog Model Score #N/A

Past Performance	Rater -- initial ratings				Consensus rating	Point Value
Can comply with requirements, info consistent with other grant administrator's info, consistent with externally verified past performance						#N/A
RECOMPETE ONLY: applicant used member positions						#N/A
RECOMPETE ONLY: used financial resources allocated						#N/A

RECOMPETE ONLY: implemented program effectively

--	--	--	--

	#N/A
--	------

Past Performance	#N/A
-------------------------	------

		Rater -- initial ratings			
Financial Plan					
Plan anticipates operational costs and provides sufficient resources to implement program					

Consensus rating		Point Value
		#N/A

Financial Plan	#N/A
-----------------------	------

		Rater -- initial ratings			
Fiscal Systems					
Capacity of Financial mgt system to comply with fed requirements					
Strength of orgz financial mgt practices as evidenced by audits, etc.					
Strength of sponsor orgs financial status/stability per audit, 990, etc.					

Consensus rating		Point Value
		#N/A
		#N/A
		#N/A

Fiscal Systems	#N/A
-----------------------	------

		Rater -- initial ratings			
Readiness					
Plan anticipates operational costs and provides sufficient resources to implement program					

Consensus rating		Point Value
		#N/A

Grant Readiness	#N/A
------------------------	------

GTF Total Score:	#N/A
Peer Reviewer Score	48.5
Combined Score	#N/A

of possible 200

*hlookup pre-programmed

Recommendation: _____

Grant Selection Process Report to Full Commission

Legal Applicant: University of Maine System **Program name:** Lifelong Maine
AmeriCorps Program

Recommendation: _____

Reviewers: **TF:** L'Italien, Nixon **Peer:** Martel, Trowbridge, Filippo

Grant Category: Formula Competitive **Performance Period:** Year 1 Year 2 Year 3
 Other Competition

Type: Operating Planning **Start/End Date:** 09/01/2021 to 08/31/2024
 Fixed Amount Ed Award Only

ME Priority Area: Public Health **Fed Priority Area(s):** [N/A]

Request for New Resources	CNCS	Local
New CNCS Funds: \$133,497	%	%
Match Committed: \$n/a	Min. Match required 0 %	
Total Grant Budget: \$		
Cost Per Member: \$16,300 of \$16,300 allowed		

	AmeriCorps Member Service Years: 8.19				
	FT	HT	RHT	QT	MT
Slots with living allowance	5	3			8
Education Award only					

Total prior years with CNCS funding: [0 AmeriCorps; _]

Prior experience with CNCS funding:

The proposal is from the Center on Aging which is part of UMaine. All applications from this campus come in under the UMaine System ID. This is the applicant's first submission for AmeriCorps funding. The Center on Aging has operated two Senior Corps programs for over 10 years: Senior Companions and RSVP. Senior Companions has eligibility criteria and provides participants with a tiny stipend (\$2.65/hour) for 20 hours of service. It requires National Service Criminal History Checks of all volunteers and staff. RSVP is a flexible program for the volunteer. Placements are in nonprofit and public agencies to do a wide-ranging set of assignments. Volunteer hours are much more like community volunteers – hours and length negotiated with volunteer and organization. There is more similarity between Senior Companions and AmeriCorps.

Statement of Need (from application narrative): *Note- the applicant uses AFCI to mean Age-friendly Community Initiative throughout the proposal.*

Maine is the oldest and most rural state in the US. Overall, 29% of Maine's population is age 60 or older; 65% of older residents live outside urban areas (Ref. 1). Growing older in rural Maine can be challenging especially when the social, physical, service, and municipal environments are not easily accessible. Maine's age-friendly community initiatives (AFCIs) work to make their municipality conducive to older resident's health, well-being, and ability to age in their long-time homes and communities. Launched in 2012, when the first Maine municipality joined the WHO Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC). Maine's age-friendly movement has grown to encompass 82 active AFCIs, with 72% operating in rural areas. The majority (57%) are volunteer-led and all depend on older volunteers to organize, plan, and implement changes (Ref. 2). Each stage in the community change process requires different skills and capacities. An AFCI may have sufficient capacity to conduct a community assessment or develop an action plan but lack the capacity to act on major areas of concern for aging in the community, such as transportation, housing, food security, or accessible wellness activities.

The challenges of implementing changes in Maine's AFCIs have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Even after vaccines were made widely available, many older residents are reluctant to volunteer or attend indoor gatherings. As a result, Maine's AFCIs are struggling to resume the programs and activities offered pre-pandemic. As part of the planning process for this application, UMaine Center on Aging (CoA) had conversations with several AFCIs in Maine. Many emphasized the need for an AmeriCorps member to recruit volunteers, engage partners, and adapt pre-pandemic programming so that beneficiaries can feel safe participating.

In March 2021, UMaine CoA conducted a survey of Maine's AFCIs. Sixty-eight surveys were returned. The three top challenges identified were: (1) recruiting, training, and managing volunteers (84%); (2) engaging new partners (76%); and (3) re-vamping AFCI programs that faltered during the COVID-19 pandemic (57%). Our members will play a critical role in community and volunteer engagement, recruiting partners, and adapting and implementing programs so that residents can participate safely, which will bring the community together, post-pandemic, to enhance the environment for healthy aging.

Program Summary (from application):

The UMaine Center on Aging proposes to have 16 AmeriCorps members [(5) 1700-hour, (3) 900-hour, and (8) 300-hour stipended] who will provide direct services that will expand or enhance services, programs, or activities in lifelong, age-friendly communities throughout Maine. As a consequence of these efforts, multiple locations throughout Maine will realize increased and revitalized citizen engagement across the life span in the communities served by the targeted lifelong, age-friendly community initiatives. At the end of the first program year, the AmeriCorps program will have (1) engaged at least 18 new partners in lifelong/age-friendly community initiatives in Maine; and, (2) improved capacity for lifelong, age-friendly communities to deliver services and engage residents. In addition, the AmeriCorps members will leverage an additional 30 or more community volunteers who will be engaged in delivering services (e.g., volunteer transportation or social engagement programming) developed by a local age-friendly, lifelong community initiative. The CNCS investment of \$133,497 will leverage \$20,000 in state and local funds, \$8,500 in public funding, and \$30,500.00 in private funding.

Identified partners:

- Area Agencies on Aging,
- past Lifelong Community Fellows,
- AARP Maine,
- Maine Office of Aging and Disability Services
- Maine Community Foundation
- AFCI leaders from 8 Maine communities, and
- CNCS programs including RSVP and SCP

Proposed Host Sites:

Age-friendly Community Initiatives - Blue Hill Peninsula regional AFCI, Cranberry Isle, Danforth, Dexter, Dover-Foxcroft, Millinocket, and Saco

SCORING DETAIL

I. Summary of Peer Reviewer Consensus Scores

CATEGORY	Rating	Points
Rationale & Approach/Program Design Section (50%)		
Need	Strong	5
Intervention	Adequate	3.75
Theory of Change, Evidence of Effectiveness, Logic Model	Adequate	22.5
Notice Priority	Adequate	0.75
Member Experience	Adequate	6.75
Organizational Capability Overall Rating 25%		
Organizational Background and Staffing	Strong	9
Compliance and Accountability	Strong	5
Culture that Values Learning	Adequate	3.75
Member supervision	Adequate	4.5
Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy 25%		
Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	Weak	12.5
TOTAL		73.5
Evaluation Plan	Strong	
Recommend for further review with hesitation		

II. Summary of Task Force Consensus Rating and Final Score:

Category	Rating	Numeric Score
Program Alignment & Model		
Alignment of community need targeted and funding priorities	Strong	3.75
Extent to which proposal will serve specified communities and add to diversity of Commission's portfolio	Adequate	2.81
Proposal is innovative use of AmeriCorps and might be replicated	Strong	3.75
Evidence the program can be sustained beyond initial start up	Adequate	2.81
Proposal is from a partnership/coalition whose members are working together on program implementation	Adequate	3.75
Past Performance	Adequate	15
Financial Plan	Adequate	11.25
Fiscal Systems		
Capacity of Financial mgt system to comply with fed requirements	Strong	8.33
Strength of organizational financial mgt practices as evidenced by audits, etc.	Strong	8.33
Strength of sponsor orgs financial status/stability per audit, 990, etc.	Strong	8.34
Grant Readiness	Strong	20
GTF Review Total:		88.13

III. Final Combined Score

Total	161.6 of 200 possible
--------------	-----------------------

Final Assessment of Application

Fund with no Corrections
 Fund with Corrections
 Do Not Forward to National Competition

Final Recommendation of Grant Selection and Performance Task Force:

Fund the proposal from the UMaine System at the levels requested for money and positions.

Referenced Conditions/Corrections:

1. Source of Funds information must be updated.

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS COMPILED

Section: Program Design (50 %)

Need

- The applicant shows a strong statement of need through external research and a local Advisory Group. The members of the Advisory Group work within the area of proposal and represents a variety of programs and backgrounds. There was background information provided about like programs, which was backed up with data.
- One grammatical error and all the anacronyms confusing, it distracts from the argument.
- Clear and concise, direct survey of engaged community drives the needs assessment.
- Even during pandemic, had a solid community engagement strategy.
- This project is new even though the institute is long-standing. Doesn't seem to have the grassroots connections needed in this proposal or at least it is not evident.

Intervention

- All criteria were adequately addressed.
- Including key partners, weekly schedule, and alignment with community needs, and community volunteer involvement" here seems out of place. Should it be in "staffing and accountability"?
- Evidence-based, developed by experienced institution with community partnerships effectively engaged.
- How intervention aligns with community need is not well presented. Have to guess the alignment.

Theory of change, evidence of effectiveness, and logic model

- All points were addressed in this category.
- As above, the "Host community Prework and LMAP member contribution is better suited in another section.
- Again, directly driven by the community evoked needs, coupled with the demonstrated knowledge of the UMaine and AARP's Livable Communities initiative, with nationwide programs and knowledges.
- Pretty robust infrastructure on the ground with community networks and institution is going to shore up the infrastructure.
- Significant interest and structural knowledge is meeting something not quite as tangible – community impact. That is not aligned clearly with need. Logic model stayed general about impact on community.

Evidence of Effectiveness

- Data collection and usage was well planned. Questions to be used were included to show the type of data to be collected.
- Very strong, comes from years of evidence, coupled with the direct localized need in Maine from local groups responses.

Notice Priority

- The notice priority statement indicated that the program falls within the funding priorities of the CNCS and Maine Commission.
- Public/Mental health of the elderly is a major issue, and this program seems well positioned to tackle the issue head-on. With a well thought-out methodology and institutional backing and partnerships, there is limited risk involved in the funding of this project to meet its projected outcomes.

Member Experience

- Training includes AmeriCorps history and prohibited activities; mentors receive training on effective mentoring; members have regular check-ins that include additional training; mentors have monthly check-ins.
- 2 wk checkins, skills translating to future jobs, mentoring, mentor training, etc.
- Here, I think this group is well intentioned, with strong collaborators, evidence-based programmatic development, but I am still a bit unsure of the actual practical experience as it relates to rolling out this program. This could likely be overcome with adequate resources, which the institution can likely bolster with the help of AARP, but I did want to highlight this gap of experience.
- Training well described and the fact they are going to make sure the members/those doing the work know the rules is a strong point.
- Structural components of experience are well described. Not clear – recruitment strategy, ability to immerse the member in the community and connect. What is the link between leveraging the existing infrastructure and recruiting/supporting members.

Section: Organizational Capability (25 %)

Organizational Background and Staffing

- The organization has been in operation for 20 years, and received a planning grant to plan for this proposal. They used a state-wide advisory group to get input about the program. Policies and procedures were discussed with the advisory group, and the organization has confirmed interest of host sites that are well-established in the work that the proposal looks to support. The criteria for the on-site supervisor has been well thought out. Background and credentials of staff indicate experience with developing policies and procedures, staff recruitment and training, compliance monitoring, and federal evaluation criteria.
- Key personnel in central location not out to the regional or partner groups, ok , other groups history and general staffing mentioned in other locations
- The UMaine Center on Aging is primed for this work, given its' specific goals and initiatives. The staff are committed to enhancing the lives of those aging in the region and state, and this project is a community-oriented aspect of that commitment. Efforts such as these from institutions should be supported, as their staff are trained professionals who can give backbone and structure to the community-oriented efforts of this project.

Compliance and Accountability

- Personnel in charge of compliance and accountability are experienced, as stated above. A monitoring and oversight plan has been developed to ensure program compliance, and participant (member and those served) safety. Frequent check-ins will support this activity.
- Nice summary and then breakdown per position
- As a state-funded institution, the organization is well poised for a project such as this, with significant compliance and accountability measures already in place to meet the needs of regular state and federal funded programs.

Culture that values learning

- Data for decision-making is used regularly by the organization.
- There is clear evidence from the narrative that this group is committed deeply to the learning process in an iterative fashion. This helps overcome the limited experience the institution may have in the direct "grassroots" community initiative being proposed.
- Culture of organization is deeply committed to doing new and innovative work. Impressed by proposal's move to community engagement in order to get wholistic outcomes.

Member Supervision

- The program will be its own cohort with a dedicated "manager". This will allow for proper attention to be given to member supervision through check-ins with members, mentors, and host-site supervisors.
- The LMAP Coordinator may become a bit overwhelmed with such a massive undertaking, steps should be taken to ensure they are adequately supported at each stage of the program's process.

Section: Cost and Budget Adequacy (25 %)

- The program is fully funded through the AmeriCorps grant. The narrative did indicate that the program will leverage state and local funds, public funding, and private funding. The involvement of the Maine Community Foundation is promising as far as their ability to get private funding. Source of funds list is blank so cannot tell what is confirmed and what is hoped for.
- This budget is entirely discreet, in that it asks specifically for the amount available for Membership funding from AmeriCorps without any proposed match from the grantee. This is not ideal, but seemingly overcome by the strong initiative proposal.
- Source of Funds section has no information so it is not possible to determine if there are sufficient resources to operate the entire program.

Section: Data Plan Feedback

- The plan was adequate. Covered all the necessary points.
- As the CoA at University of Maine has deep experience in data collection, this is a strong aspect of the application.

SUMMARY APPRAISAL 1. Having reviewed all elements of the proposal provided to you, do you think that this applicant would be effective in this category of grant? Yes (3) No ()

Comments:

- The applicant has gone through a planning process and engaged the community-at-large in the design of the project.

- The experience of UMaine's COA with the LMAP cohort this past year has given them the community- oriented data and feedback to now leverage their depth of institutional knowledge and capacity, demonstrated clearly by their data collection procedure and theory of change narrative.

What elements of the proposal are unclear?

- Plans for local funding for the program.
- Overall the proposal is clear, I think there is some lacking in the community outreach experience side, knowing the demands of such a project. That being said, I believe this can be overcome.

TASK FORCE REVIEWER COMMENT DETAIL:

Program Alignment and Model

- This application focuses on community-driven need to build capacity and support environments for age-friendly communities—a key issue for Maine. It's alignment to priorities is strong due to its mostly rural implementation model and focus on aging issues. It's adequate in its attempts at ensuring diversity, Despite its focus on a mostly rural, aged population, the approaches should build the capacity of communities to respond to changing demographics. Being the that Age-Friendly Community movement is a designation recognized by both WHO and AARP, the project has extremely broad reproducibility across the US. By establishing partnerships with municipal governments, local and state non-profits, philanthropies, and other sources, of funding, the program should be able to sustain some of its efforts, albeit on a smaller scale than what is proposed in the application. The proposal is adequate in showing partnership and a common approach to a community problem but could be improved by shared effort with organizations whose missions focus on the 8 domains of livability mentioned in the proposal.
- The program has merit but the model does not appear innovative, like the mention of trying to recruit for diversity, would like to see this as a priority for every stage of the program and would like to know how much of this was involved in the original stakeholder input gathering of the program.

Past Performance

- Whereas the Center on Aging has just participated in a AmeriCorps Planning Grant, the University of Maine System has an extensive history of managing AmeriCorps programs with adequate results. The proposal suggests that the COA will continue in that tradition.
- They received a planning grant for this work, but they were able to illustrate that there is sufficient planning, network and capabilities.
- Could have explained experience with Senior Corps and whether it added to preparedness. Also didn't flesh out planning grant very much.

Financial Plan

- Being a fixed-cost proposal, it aligns the MSYs with the per MSY allocation. In the narrative it would have been helpful to see a breakdown of how both AmeriCorps and leveraged funds would be coordinated to create a comprehensive program.
- From my understanding of the budget requirements, this area could have had more details to specific match.

Fiscal Systems and Capacity

- The University's financial position as evidenced by its assets to liabilities, its lack of substantial audit findings, and its history with AmeriCorps suggests that it will have no problem with financial management of this program.
- Strong indication of a financial management capabilities as offered in the survey.

Grant Readiness

- While this plan is intentionally vague about the specific actions it intends Members to take in each community it serves, it has done the formative work to make sure that the needs have been identified and the efforts will be locally driven based upon those needs. The goals are in alignment with the goals of AmeriCorps and the evaluation measures are very well thought out. The connection between UMaine COA, AARP, and local communities could be a model for implementation going forward with broad applicability across the US.
- Document indicates they are ready for this.

AMERICORPS STATE FORMULA GRANT REVIEW (11/2020)

RFP Due Date:	4/20/2021	Project Name:	AmeriCorps Experiential Ocean Educators
Application Number :	21AC235969	Project Contact:	Erin Crotty
Legal Applicant:	Sailing Ships Maine	MSYs and Slots requested:	8 MSY; 8 slots
Grant Type:	Standard New Cost Reimbursement	Budget Proposed	CNCS funds \$130,400 Local Match \$342,249
		Cost per Member	\$16,300

1. Summarized rating:

CATEGORY	Rating	Points
Rationale & Approach/Program Design Section (50%)		
Need	Substandard	1.25
Intervention	Adequate	3.75
Theory of Change, Evidence of Effectiveness, Logic Model	Weak	15
Notice Priority	Weak	0.5
Member Experience	Adequate	6.75
Organizational Capability Overall Rating 25%		
Organizational Background and Staffing	Weak	4.5
Compliance and Accountability	Incomplete/Nonresponsive	0
Culture that Values Learning	Substandard	1.25
Member supervision	Weak	3
Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy 25%		
Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	Weak	12.5
TOTAL		48.5
Evaluation Plan	Weak	
Do not recommend for further review		

2. Other than the legal applicant, please list the agencies or organizations that appear to be the major collaborators or partners in this grant.

JMG (Jobs for Maine Graduates), the Maine Marine Trades Association, Falmouth High School

3. Applicant proposes to deliver services: (select what the applicant states in their application that their program will cover) Unable to tell.

- Within a single municipality
 Within a single County but not covering the entire County
 County-wide in a single County
 Multiple Counties but not Statewide
 Statewide

4. Which CNCS focus area does this applicant identify as related to its proposal? Do the applicant's activities in each focus area fall under the type of activities CNCS says are acceptable (see RFP page 82-9)? Do the performance measures chosen match the focus area?

Focus Area Identified	Activities are within list of acceptable for funding
<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Stewardship	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Healthy Futures	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Opportunity	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Veterans and Military Families	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Does the proposal fall in a CNCS funding priority for this competition?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the proposal fall in a MCCA funding priority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

If "yes," which one? Workforce development

Performance Measures	
Do the Service Activity performance measures chosen match the focus area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do the Capacity Building performance measures match one of the sets listed in the RFP?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do the Member Development performance measures exactly match the set provided in the RFP?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Executive Summary

Does Executive Summary conform to required template provided by CNCS? Yes No

REVIEWER COMMENTS

OVERALL NOTE: In nearly every section, the applicant did not make a strong case for environmental stewards but discussed at length the trail building team members. Some narrative text felt recycled because it generally addressed criteria but not the specifics listed.

Section: Program Design (50 %)

Need

- The applicant uses data from MDOE to show the need within the state. They did not show how community members were involved in designing the program. They stated how the community will be involved in the program's implementation through the use of volunteers and their partner organization (Falmouth High School).
- The need in the community to be served was not described. In fact, the community in which they will work is not described. Falmouth High School is mentioned but it's not clear if that's the community or not.
- Educators can infer the root issues but they are not described. So much information is missing.
- Problem is engagement needs to be up to stay in high school. This program is not mentioned nor the community that supports it
- The program aims to give AmeriCorps members the tools to teach an accredited curriculum to disadvantaged students, providing them with clear, tangible outcome-based work in job training and education.
- For people who are trying to understand the project from a distance, it's difficult. The applicant probably knows everything but can't describe it.

Intervention

- Core activities were included, proposed roles and activities of members and an outline of key partners were also included. They did not include a draft weekly schedule for the members.
- Solid section except for the how the proposed intervention aligns with the identified community need. What is the specific need in at least one community where they are proposing to run? Cannot determine if the intervention is appropriate without knowing where or who will benefit.
- The intervention is targeting a specific demographic with significant need in this intervention area. A leader is professionally engaged in education.
- Could not make an informed decision with the gaps in information.

Theory of change, evidence of effectiveness, and logic model

- While there were only two problems in the model, they were well stated, with several short-term and long-term outputs.
- They did not describe why this intervention would work in the community, only to state that they had proven success but did not provide specifics.
- It is not clear how the AmeriCorps members' involvement will add significantly to any existing efforts. Other community initiatives to address problem are not described. Where they fit – whether there is a gap they are filling – is not evident.
- They did not address the quantity of service units, or output and outcome targets for the first, second, and third years.
- Theory of outdoor experience education as a strength. Citations poorly done. Again, not addressing “why” in this community though
- Clear, measured data points on outcomes of experiential outdoor learning programs that are long-term with older youth as the target demographic.

Evidence of Effectiveness

- The evidence presented was from scholarly articles and SUNY. These sources are credible.
- Outdoor ed is strong and useful from sources but no relationship built between literature and this venture.
- The effectiveness is driven by the need and the outcomes.

Notice Priority

- The applicant listed the funding priorities they were using for the proposal. These priorities align with CNCS and Commission funding priorities.
- They say they are proven but give no statistics or even narrative data. Say align with EO-WP but take no time to elaborate and make the case this is true.
- This project aims to meet an enormous need, while maintaining the significant balance of funding on its' own, as it has done so successfully for 6+ years. With such a proven track record without Americorps support, this project seems well suited to developing into an Americorps site for the mutual job training benefit of the Americorps members and the students served.

Member Experience

- Members will gain several certifications that will be valuable for future employment, in particular the certification as an Educational Technician in the state of Maine. Recruitment will take place with the intention of recruiting a diverse set of members. The applicant states that they strive for diversity.
- Missed an opportunity to discuss executive function skills which outdoor experience education theory would have supported. So many gaps in narrative.
- Building leaders is such a significant aim of Americorps, and the priority of diverse attendance in the program will help expose the recent college graduates sought by Sailing Ships as Americorps Members to social experiences that are deep and lasting, giving them tools to demonstrate their leadership in whatever they choose to do afterwards.

Section: Organizational Capability (25 %)

Organizational Background and Staffing

- No discussion of internal preparation done. Stakeholders not identified. Role of the board not explained.
- Staffing was listed with the names and credentials/qualifications of the staff member, and vacant roles were listed with the qualifications required for the role. The role AmeriCorps members will play in carrying out the organization's mission was stated. They did not indicate how the organization prepared for, or will prepare for, the implementation of the program.
- Not having the AmeriCorps coordinator yet seems a bit concerning.
- Organizational background information is missing. Does the board support this or are those working on this the board.
- Not clear how this program would advance the mission/goals of the organization.
- If the education coordinator has a full-time job at a high school, how much time is available for this.
- A number of unfortunate oversights/omissions in the narrative.
- Given the executive leadership's career role in public education, the organization might be well suited to executing a program such as this.

Compliance and Accountability

- They stated who would be responsible but did not state how this would be done. There was no mention of current practices in place that could be used for compliance and accountability.
- (Is this only for the Falmouth Public Schools?) How so? Feedback loops? Meetings? When, frequency, how? If requirements are not met, how will they be dealt with? By whom?
- Given the partnerships with national and state organizations for accreditation, professional certifications, etc, there is a deep pool of accountability at play in this project framework.
- Hard to rate because so much is incomplete. Surprising because one of the staff is in a school system that has to do compliance all the time.

Culture that values learning

- They indicated that they would collect data but did not state how it would be used, or by whom.
- What statistics and practices give evidence of this glowing record and attitude?

- Continuous improvement and constant feedback loops are essential to building a skills-training program, particularly with youth.
- This section is about whether they internally value learning for their own continuous improvement. Don't seem to understand the question.

Member Supervision

- They have supervisors but no indication of how this will be carried out, nor how program regulations, priorities, and expectations will be maintained.
- Receiving the training is one thing, to make sure that it is supported and followed through on is another. I would like to have even seen mentioned (again) the testing or vetting that leads to the certifications that those AC Vol have the chance to receive.
- With any new venture, it will be left to be seen how effective the Americorps supervision ends up being. This project looks ready to meet the task, but only time will tell if they can effectively manage Members.

Section: Cost and Budget Adequacy (25 %)

- The cost per MSY is equal to or less than the maximum cost per MSY. The organization will provide 72% of the costs to run the program. There is no indication of the source of funds, type of funds, or whether they are secured or proposed.
- Clear and direct, demonstrates years of successful fundraising and sustainability, even running programming during the pandemic.
- Source of Funds section is blank. Not possible to tell how solid the grantee share is.

Section: Evaluation Plan Feedback

- They have a plan to collect data, but did not indicate how they would use it.
- Clear and concise data collection chart demonstrates the passion with which the leadership operates this program, regardless of funding.

SUMMARY APPRAISAL 1. Having reviewed all elements of the proposal provided to you, do you think that this applicant would be effective in this category of grant? Yes () No (3)



Maine Commission for Community Service

19 Elkins Lane, 105 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333
voice: (207) 624-7792 faxes: (207) 221-0874

service.commission@maine.gov www.MaineServiceCommission.gov



APPENDIX E: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

Please sign this form and return it to Commission staff, as instructed, at the address above *before* you begin to review applications.

I have read the Commission policy on Conflict of Interest as outlined in the Reviewer Information Package and understand that I must contact the appropriate Commission staff if a conflict arises during my service as a reviewer. I also will not divulge any confidential information I may become aware of during the grant review process. Upon completion of this work, I will return to MCCS the copies of applications and not share them with anyone or hold them.

I fully understand that I must sign and return this Conflict of Interest Acknowledgement to the Commission Office before I begin review of grant applications.

Name (please print): Benjamin Filippo

Signature: Ben Filippo

Date: 4/12/2021

[For Commission use only - - Date received: _____]



Maine Commission for Community Service

19 Elkins Lane, 105 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333

voice: (207) 624-7792 faxes: (207) 221-0874

service.commission@maine.gov

www.MaineServiceCommission.gov



APPENDIX E: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

Please sign this form and return it to Commission staff, as instructed, at the address above *before* you begin to review applications.

I have read the Commission policy on Conflict of Interest as outlined in the Reviewer Information Package and understand that I must contact the appropriate Commission staff if a conflict arises during my service as a reviewer. I also will not divulge any confidential information I may become aware of during the grant review process. Upon completion of this work, I will return to MCCS the copies of applications and not share them with anyone or hold them.

I fully understand that I must sign and return this Conflict of Interest Acknowledgement to the Commission Office before I begin review of grant applications.

Name (please print): Jennifer Traubridge

Signature: Jennifer M Traubridge

Date: 4/25/21

[For Commission use only - - Date received: _____]



Maine Commission for Community Service

19 Elkins Lane, 105 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333

voice: (207) 624-7792 facs: (207) 221-0874

service.commission@maine.gov

www.MaineServiceCommission.gov



APPENDIX E: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

Please sign this form and return it to Commission staff, as instructed, at the address above *before* you begin to review applications.

I have read the Commission policy on Conflict of Interest as outlined in the Reviewer Information Package and understand that I must contact the appropriate Commission staff if a conflict arises during my service as a reviewer. I also will not divulge any confidential information I may become aware of during the grant review process. Upon completion of this work, I will return to MCCS the copies of applications and not share them with anyone or hold them.

I fully understand that I must sign and return this Conflict of Interest Acknowledgement to the Commission Office before I begin review of grant applications.

Name (please print): Joanna N.T. Martel

Signature: Joanna N.T. Martel

Date: 4/22/2021

[For Commission use only - - Date received: _____]