

**PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) STATEMENT OF PUBLIC BURDEN:** The purpose of this information collection is to collect feedback on ACF grant review processes. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information. This is a voluntary collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB # is 0970-0401; expiration date 05/31/2021. If you have any comments on this collection of information, please contact [info@reviewerregistry.net](mailto:info@reviewerregistry.net).

## Administration for Children and Families Family and Youth Services Bureau Grant Review Process Assessment Survey

### Reviewer

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a grant application review panelist for the Administration for Children and Families' (ACF) Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB). Our review panelist recruitment and training is designed to ensure review panelists are prepared to conduct reviews, supported during reviews, and to minimize burden on training participants. Please complete this survey to provide feedback on our review preparation and support process. The survey is expected to take no more than 10 minutes to complete. Your answers will inform our efforts to continually improve processes for preparing and supporting review panelists.

Please use this scale to respond.

- 1=strongly agree
- 2=agree
- 3=neutral
- 4=disagree
- 5=strongly disagree

#### RECRUITMENT

(Availability Survey Communication, Confirmation Survey Communication, Registration and Certification Instructions, Program Campaign Instructions, Timeframe for response, etc...)

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The recruitment documents provided thorough information regarding the period of performance and the scope of work.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The instructions on how to register for the review were clear.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. The online registration and certification system was easy to access.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. The online registration and certification system was easy to navigate.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Please let us know how we could improve the recruitment process, or check here <input type="checkbox"/> if you think the process should not change. |   |   |   |   |   |

You have **1000** characters remaining

#### WEB-BASED TRAINING AND TOOL

The following questions are about how well the web-based training and tool helped to prepare you for the review process.

##### Access and Navigation

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I spent a reasonable amount of time registering for training. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The web-based training was easy to access                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

##### Information Presented during Chair Training and/or Grant Review 101 Training or New Reviewer Training

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. The web-based training clearly explained FYSB's goals and vision for projects funded by the FOA.                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. The web-based training clearly described the performance standards for projects proposed in response to the FOA. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. The web-based training clearly explained the meaning of all scoring criteria.                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

6. The web-based training clearly explained how to assign numeric scores for all criteria. 1 2 3 4 5
7. The “helpful questions to consider” section helped prepare me to review grants. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The guidelines for addressing variance in reviewers’ scores were clear. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The guidelines for addressing variance in reviewers’ scores were thorough. 1 2 3 4 5
10. The guidelines for writing evaluative comments were clear. 1 2 3 4 5
11. The guidelines for writing evaluative comments were thorough. 1 2 3 4 5
12. The description of the grant review process and timeline was clear. 1 2 3 4 5

**Usefulness**

13. The web-based training was useful. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The web-based training took a reasonable amount of time to complete. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Please let us know how we could improve the web-based training, or check here if you think the training should not change.

You have 1000 characters remaining

**COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT**

16. The comprehension assessment was an accurate indication of whether I was prepared to conduct a grant application review. 1 2 3 4 5
17. It took me a reasonable amount of time to complete the comprehension assessment. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Please let us know how we could improve the comprehension assessment, or check here if you think the assessment should not change.

You have 1000 characters remaining

**ARM REVIEWER MANUAL***The following questions are about how well the reviewer manual helped to prepare you for the review process.***Access and Navigation**

1. The reviewer manual was easy to access. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The reviewer manual was easy to navigate. 1 2 3 4 5

**Information Presented in the Reviewer Manual**

3. The reviewer manual clearly explained the roles and responsibilities of reviewers. 1 2 3 4 5
4. The reviewer manual clearly explained the roles and responsibilities of the review chair. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The reviewer manual clearly explained the roles and responsibilities of Federal staff involved with a grant review. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The instructions for entering grant review information were clear and easy to follow. 1 2 3 4 5

7. It was easy to enter review scores. 1 2 3 4 5

8. It was easy to enter review comments. 1 2 3 4 5

9. It was easy to indicate whether a comment indicated a strength or weakness. 1 2 3 4 5

10. It was easy to submit my evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5

11. Did your chairperson return your evaluation? Yes No

If yes:  
Instructions on how to respond to an evaluation returned by the review chairperson were clear and easy to follow.

You have 1000 characters remaining

12. Did you have to update your contact or log-in information? Yes No

If yes:  
Instructions on how to update information in my account were clear and easy to follow.

You have 1000 characters remaining

**Usefulness**

13. The manual was a useful resource. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Please let us know how the reviewer manual could be improved, or check here if you think the process should not change.

You have 1000 characters remaining

**OVERALL**

15. The training adequately prepared me to conduct a grant application review. 1 2 3 4 5

16. The review chair provided clear guidance when needed. 1 2 3 4 5

17. In addition to suggestions you may have made in response to previous items, please let us know how we could improve the training process overall, or check here if you think the process should not change.

You have 1000 characters remaining

18. Please share any additional comments about the grant review training process here.

You have 1000 characters remaining