

Serve Wisconsin – Program Evaluation and Development Committee Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 2, 2016

Committee Chairman Tony Hallman called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m., March 2, 2016, at Fresh Madison Market-Event Room, 703 University Avenue, Madison, WI.

Committee Members Present

Tony Hallman, Committee Chair; Lisa Delmore; Scott Fromader; Michael Hinman; Paula Horning; Amy McDowell; Jane Moore

Committee Members Not Present – Excused Absence

Kathy Groat

Staff Present

Tom Devine, Jessica Kessler, Amy Porter, Casey Sweeney, Steven Yule

Approval of December 3, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Paula Horning made a motion to approve the December 3, 2015 meeting minutes. Seconded by Jane Moore. Motion passed unanimously.

Competitive & Formula Funding/RFP Policies

Revision of 80% Performance Threshold for Competitive Continuation Applications

Michael Hinman made a motion to recommend to the full Board revision of RFP policy regarding the 80% performance threshold for Competitive Continuation applications as follows:

Any Competitive Continuation application that has a performance scoring percentage less than 80% (inclusive of rounding to two places after the decimal point) will be eliminated from further consideration for Competitive funding, unless the Board decides to waive the 80% requirement based on evidence of a corrective action plan to include benchmarks and associated milestones. The Board could choose to recommend to CNCS that the application be funded based on this plan.

Motion seconded by Jane Moore. Motion passed unanimously.

80% Performance Threshold for Competitive Recompete and Formula Applications

Jane Moore made a motion to recommend to the full Board revision of the RFP policy regarding the 80% performance threshold for New/Recompete Competitive and Formula applications as follows:

Recompete applications that have a performance scoring percentage less than 80% (inclusive of rounding to two places after the decimal point) will be eliminated from further consideration for Competitive funding, unless the Board decides to waive the 80% requirement based on evidence of a corrective action plan to include benchmarks and associated milestones. The Board could choose to recommend to CNCS that the application be funded based on the corrective action plan. An exception to the 80% minimum shall apply to applicants proposing a new and not previously funded AmeriCorps project, and shall apply for the first three years the new/not previously funded project is funded. The exception for such new projects shall not preclude use of other criteria to determine appropriateness of funding such new projects.

Formula Funding Process: Minimum performance score of 80% of total points possible is required. Reaching the 80% minimum shall be inclusive of rounding to two places after the decimal point; therefore, a performance scoring percentage of 79.50% or above shall be considered to have met the 80% or above requirement. An application for a program that has a performance score of less than 80% of total points possible shall not be eligible for Formula funding, unless the Board decides to waive the 80% requirement based on evidence of a corrective action plan to include

benchmarks and associated milestones. An exception to the 80% minimum shall apply to applicants proposing a new and not previously funded AmeriCorps project, and shall apply for the first three years the new/not previously funded project is funded. The exception for such new projects shall not preclude use of other criteria to determine appropriateness of funding such new projects.

Motion seconded by Amy McDowell. Motion passed unanimously.

Post Review Quality Control

Scott Fromader made a motion to recommend to the full Board revision of the RFP policy related to Post Review Quality Control as follows:

After the peer review is complete, Board staff will review the results for fairness and consistency. Some applications may be selected for a Quality Control review. This additional level of review may be used for applications with peer review scores that would impact an application's ability to meet the established threshold.

Motion seconded by Lisa Delmore. Motion passed unanimously.

Consider Allowing Additional Application Documents to be Submitted Electronically

Jane Moore made a motion to recommend to the full Board revision of the RFP policy related to submission of additional application documents as follows:

Allow for electronic submission of additional application documents; allow staff to review electronically submitted and paper additional application documents for completeness upon receipt and allow staff to notify any applicants about missing documents prior to the deadline, so that applicants have the opportunity to submit missing documents by the deadline.

Motion seconded by Amy McDowell. Motion passed unanimously.

Scoring of Evidence Base Section of Application Narrative

Scott Fromader made a motion to allow staff flexibility in establishing scoring for application narrative related to evidence base when drafting the annual RFP. Motion seconded by Michael Hinman. Motion passed unanimously.

Expanding Use of "Fit in Portfolio" in Competitive Funding Process

"Fit in Portfolio" criteria from the Formula funding policy are also currently used in the numerical ranking process for Competitive applications.

Jane Moore made a motion to recommend to the full Board that the "Fit in Portfolio" criteria also be allowed to be considered in the overall Competitive funding process, such that the criteria could be used to determine whether or not to recommend to CNCS that an application be funded. Motion seconded by Scott Fromader. Motion passed unanimously.

Revise Formula Funding Policy to Include Criteria Required by Regulation

Lisa Delmore made a motion to recommend to the full Board that the following criteria be added to the Formula funding policy for the Board to consider when making Formula funding decisions, in accordance with 45 CFR §2522.475(a)-(h):

- The innovative aspects of the national service program, and the feasibility of replicating the program.
- The sustainability of the national service program.
- The quality of the leadership of the national service program, the past performance of the program, and the extent to which the program builds on existing programs.

- The extent to which participants of the national service program are recruited from among residents of the communities in which projects are to be conducted, and the extent to which participants and community residents are involved in the design, leadership, and operation of the program.
- The extent to which projects would be conducted in one of the areas listed in §2522.450(c)(1) through (5).

Motion seconded by Michael Hinman. Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn

Amy McDowell made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Michael Hinman. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.