Grant Selection Process Report

Legal Applicant:	**Mid Coast Hunger Prevention Program**	**Program name:**	**MCHPP Vol. Management Prog Support**
Recommendation:	**Fund at Requested Level, after corrections**		
Reviewers:	**Laflin, Young**		

Grant Category:	☒ Other Competition - VGF	**Performance Period:**	☒ Initial ☐ 6 month review
Type:	☒ Cost Reimbursement	**Start/End Date:**	[4-1-2018] to [9-30-2019]
Focus Area:	☐ Aging In Place ☒ Food Security & Supports ☐ Transportation Services	**Fed Priority Area(s):**	Capacity Building

Request for New Resources

			CNCS	Local
New CNCS Funds:	**$37,500**	**Cost sharing proposed**	35.8%	64.2%
Match Committed:	$67,361	**Min. Match required**	*55 %*	
Total Grant Budget:	$104,861			

Total prior years with CNCS funding: [0]

Prior experience with CNCS funding: [describe type of grant and how many 3 year grants applicant has had; any special notes about prior funding such as whether it was same or different model, another category of funding.]

Program Summary (from application):

The Mid Coast Hunger Prevention Program (MCHPP) proposes to develop a Volunteer Generation Fund program providing service in Brunswick, Maine that will focus on the CNCS focus area of capacity building while increasing volunteerism. The CNCS investment of $37,000.00 will be matched with $67,526.35, $0.00 in public funding and $0.00 in private funding. [Note that the figures here do not match the submitted budget]

Statement of Need (from application narrative):

MCHPP's focus area is reducing food insecurity by providing emergency and ongoing food assistance. Our mission is to provide hungry people with access to healthy food, to work to improve the quality of their lives by partnering with others, and to serve them in a manner that recognizes their dignity. The community we serve is low-income, food insecure households living in midcoast Maine. The majority of the households we serve live in the towns of Brunswick, Topsham, Bowdoin, Bowdoinham, Lisbon, Lisbon Falls, Harpswell, and Durham, but we also provide support to additional communities throughout Cumberland, Sagadahoc, and Androscoggin counties. While they share a socioeconomic status and general location, our client base is otherwise diverse in terms of age, gender, religion, employment status, and race.

Identified partners:

- list partners identified by peer reviewers and task force reviewers

SCORING DETAIL

I. Summary of Reviewer Consensus Scores

Sections	Consensus Assessment	Consensus Score
Organization Qualifications and Experience (25%)		
Current volunteer management practices	Strong	11
Management of Planned effort	Adequate	9.38
Program Design & 18-month Work Plan (50%)		
Focus Area(s) and Need	Strong	10
Current Effort	Strong	10
Planned Effort	Strong	10
Implementation - Work Plan	Strong	20
Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (25%)		
Cost Effectiveness	Adequate	8.375
Budget Adequacy	Adequate	8.375
Reviewer Consensus TOTAL:		87.13 of 100 possible

Reviewer Recommendation: Fund at Requested level after correction

Final Recommendation of Excellence and Expertise Task Force:

Referenced Conditions/Corrections:

1. Correction of Executive Summary

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS COMPILED

Program Design

Comments: Need

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Intervention

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Theory of change (narrative text) and logic model

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Evidence

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Notice Priority

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Member Training

- Copy from summarized comment doc
-

Comments: Member Supervision

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Member Experience

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments: Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Organizational Capability Comments

Comments Organizational Background and Staffing

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments Compliance and Accountability

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Cost Effectiveness & Budget Adequacy Comments

Comments Cost Effectiveness

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Comments Budget Adequacy

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Evaluation Plan Comments

- Copy from summarized comment doc

Peer Review Summary Appraisal

1. Having reviewed all elements of the proposal provided to you, do you think that this applicant could be effective in this category of grant?