

Corporation for National and Community Service

2010 Social Innovation Fund

Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Reviewer Comments – Phase 1

Table of Contents

Reviewer Comments – Group 1	Section 1
Reviewer Comments – Group 2	Section 2

2010 Social Innovation Fund

Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Section 1 – Reviewer Comments: Group 1

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 Local Initiatives Support Corporation, a national intermediary applicant, intends to use the SIF grant to support community based organizations who will implement a workforce development/asset building model which it pioneered called the Financial Opportunity Centers (FOC). The FOC model focuses on improving the financial bottom line for low-to-moderate income families by helping people boost earnings, reduce expenses, and make appropriate financial decisions. FOCs provide individuals and families with services across 3 critical and interconnected areas: employment placement/skill improvement; financial coaching; and accessing income supports. Through this model, LISC expects clients will improve their long term job retention, net income, net worth, credit score, and overall financial stability. The Panel originally questioned whether the SIF criteria were to select an intermediary to replicate and expand its own program, in this case, LISC's implementation of its FOC program. This point created considerable confusion and debate among the reviewers. After clarification with the SIF staff, the Panel determined that LISC was eligible under the criteria and that the program design was strong.

Significant Strengths

- The applicant has demonstrated that it would provide superior levels of technical assistance and support through proven mechanism and processes. The work it has done to refine its FOC program over the past four years using detailed monitoring and analysis and converting that into program improvements will improve service delivery by sub-grantees and increase the likelihood of expansion and replication. (*Program Design D.ii.a*)
- The applicant proposes to expand an already piloted and tested approach to increasing economic opportunity, through expansion into 9 diverse cities (although primarily concentrated in the mid-

west and California). Statistical data presented indicate the logic of focus on these cities as they fit a description of “high need” for purposes of the SIF; concrete short-term and mid-term outcomes are identified. *(Program Design A ii)*

- The applicant’s use of data and evidence in creating and adjusting the FOC program is impressive, as is the use of data throughout LISC. The applicant gives clear examples of where data have been used to drive programmatic changes, and also indicates that subgrantees have been defunded for failure to meet performance targets. This combination suggests programmatic design (and organizational capacity) to discern when the program is the problem (adjust that to get better results) and when the deliverer of the program is the problem (find a new subcontractor to get better results), a sophistication that will be very important in scaling a pilot nationally *(Program Design B)*
- The applicant has designed a program that can be measured with quantifiable outcomes that are supported by a rigorous program of measurement *(Program Design D.i.a)*

Significant Weaknesses

- The applicant provides a strong theory of change, including that success requires “bundling” smaller elements such that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts (a contention backed by preliminary data from pilot sites) *(Program Design C)* however the applicant does not adequately explain the early evidence from its pilot in Chicago and other 3 cities with providing 2 services to 4000 clients. The theory of change, as supported by their pilot data, is that individuals who participate in multiple services experience an amplifying effect. However, only 4,000 of 12,000 FOC clients served in 2009 received bundled services. One example was given of using data to retarget an FOC to those more likely to participate in bundled services, but the reviewers would have liked to see more attention given to increasing this number overall, given that it is the heart of their theory of change. (This effects cost effectiveness as well) *(Program Design D i a)*
- The applicant did not provide an adequate amount of statistics that clarify the problem that it is trying to solve. Data was very narrowly focused on poverty rate and did not support any causality findings or other statistics that could support the need for FOCs. *(Program Design, A.ii)*

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.*
-

Provide a panel assessment of the application's ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY 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 panel reviewers all agreed that the organization is extremely strong and has the capacity to carry out the program and fiscal oversight of the program. LISC is a large and well established national intermediary with many years proven track record in grantmaking, technical assistance and evaluation

Significant Strengths

- The applicant has extensive (historically, geographically and categorically) and deep experience securing, re-granting, monitoring and evaluating community-based efforts to improve economic opportunity. Their plans for evaluating a SIF project involve the use of well-regarded tools and methodologies. Their application demonstrates a grasp of some fundamental and sophisticated concepts in contract management and evaluation (e.g. using rigorous evaluation approaches particularly applicable to the dynamic conditions of community-level analysis) (*Organizational Capacity A I, ii*)
- The applicant has sophisticated infrastructure and highly skilled employees experienced in contract and budget management and in compliance with the administration of federal funding. (*Organizational Capacity B. ii*)

Significant Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

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.*

Provide a panel assessment of the application's COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY 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 application is strong and complete. LISC has a long track record and financial strength.

Significant Strengths

- The applicant has offices and long-standing relationships in the cities it is proposing to serve, thereby increasing the likelihood that it will be able to secure the remainder of its finding match.
- More than half of the match is in hand due to the financial strength of LISC and the potential to complete the match is high given track record of the organization. 83% of the award goes to subgrants B. i.

Applicant Name: LISC
Application ID#: 10ST116349

- The applicant clearly demonstrated its experience, capacity, longevity, and competency for administering the type of program it is proposing. The breadth and depth of its in-house resources, from program delivery services to training to fiscal management to research, indicate that it can deliver a sound program in an efficient and prudent manner.

Significant Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Select a Rating for COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent Strong Satisfactory Weak/Non-responsive

OVERALL APPRAISAL

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

- The Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, and Ratings from each category; and
- The weighting of each category (Program Design (45%), Organizational Capacity (35%), Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%).

The Panel rated this program as very strong overall given the organizational capacity as an effective intermediary capable of administering the program and providing strong oversight. Originally, the panelists wanted to set it aside and say that it does not meet the criteria because the NOFA seemed to suggest that SIF is to identify intermediaries that find innovative community organizations, not implement its own program. After determining that the LISC approach was indeed eligible and meeting the criteria in the NOFA, the panelists rated the application in Band II, Strong. The main reason for it falling short of excellent is the weakness highlighted under program design relating to the LISC theory of change about bundling of services.

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.

- X **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.

Applicant Name: LISC
Application ID#: 10SI116349

-
- 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 7 total applications on Panel # 3 .

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:

Applicant Name: LISC
Application ID#: 10SI116349

-
- ✓ 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

Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Section 2 – Reviewer Comments: Group 2

SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010
Local Initiatives Support Foundation
Application ID # 10SI116349

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

- 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

- Subgranting**
 - 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 proposal presents a well-organized theory of change regarding an effective initiative. The applicant's description of measurable outcomes is clear and realistic, including the importance of specific outcomes for various sub-populations. Their approach is to take the established Financial Opportunity Center (FOC) model that has proven successful in numerous locations across the country and replicate it on a wider scale geographically.

Significant Strengths

The FOC is a proven model that is ready to be replicated, and is based on a careful critique of traditional workforce development programs. (*Program Design B.i*)

As demonstrated by strong evidence, the FOC has been piloted and refined in 20 locations around the country, while the applicant has demonstrated experience in both selecting grantees and holding them accountable for program performance (*Program Design D.i.a*)

The applicant also has a proven track record of providing extensive technical assistance to grantees, whether in person, online, or in documents, while the proposal clearly outlines the applicant's support plans for its sub-grantees. (*Program Design D.ii.*)

Significant Weaknesses

The applicant does not make a detailed assessment of the measurable outcomes it seeks, while the capacity-building work is primarily focused on replicating the FOC without a companion effort to fully integrate it into the sub-grantee organizations. This may contribute to future stress when the funding cycle concludes. In addition,

Applicant Name: Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Application ID#: _____

the proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate the methods for assisting sub-grantees in developing evidence-based tools for assessing their own progress. (Program Design B)

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.*

Provide a panel assessment of the application's ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY 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 significant experience managing the FOC and other programs. It also has a long history of managing federal grants successfully. Its research and evaluation division is strong, well respected, and effective..

Significant Strengths

The applicant has 17 years of experience working with federal contracts and grants and is currently managing \$33.1 million in local and federal government contracts. The applicant has also demonstrated a deep commitment to outcomes measurement as evidenced by its own evaluations and its proposed work with the Economic Mobility Corporation for further independent evaluation. The applicant has its own Research & Assessment Division, and has its own tool for identifying sub-grantees who are qualified to administer federal funds (CapMap).(Organizational Capacity A & B)

Significant Weaknesses

The applicant's proposal does not indicate the intended level of support for each of its sub-grantees, nor does it specify the expected number of sub-grantees. In addition, the fundraising plan is based on foundation support, which may limit the ability of sub-grantees to build a diverse revenue base. (Organizational Capacity B)

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.*

Provide a panel assessment of the application's COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY 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's budget is appropriate to the task. There is no visible excess in the budget, and the applicant has made strong progress in raising the required SIF match. The budget narrative described key functions such as sub-

Applicant Name: Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Application ID#: _____

grantee selection and technical assistance, which demonstrates a comprehensive delivers-based budgeting approach.

Significant Strengths

As the proposal itself demonstrates, the applicant has a highly professionalized staff that is fully capable of executing this project. There is no evidence of excessive spending. (Cost-Effectiveness & Budget Adequacy)

Significant Weaknesses

None

Select a Rating for COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent

Strong

Satisfactory

Weak/Non-responsive

OVERALL APPRAISAL

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

- The Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, and Ratings from each category; and
- The weighting of each category (Program Design (45%), Organizational Capacity (35%), Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%)).

The applicant has prepared an effective package, met all requirements for the application, and provided detailed information on its plans. The proposed intervention has a demonstrated record of success and meets the NOFA requirements. There is ample evidence that the applicant has the capacity to do this work successfully and that it is singularly focused on capacity building and impact. It has a reasonable budget, considerable experience managing funds effectively, and the staffing to succeed in this endeavor.

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.

Applicant Name: Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Application ID#: _____

- 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: 1 of 6 total applications on Panel # 9.

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.

Applicant Name: Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Application ID#: _____

- ✓ 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.