

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 10/17/22, 4:49 PM
<b>Received:</b> October 14, 2022
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 198-wml4-rmrw
<b>Comments Due:</b> October 17, 2022
<b>Submission Type:</b> API

**Docket:** CNCS-2022-0018

Application Package for AmeriCorps Program Life Cycle Evaluation—Climate Change Bundled Evaluation

**Comment On:** CNCS-2022-0018-0001

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals: Application Package for AmeriCorps Program Life Cycle Evaluation-Climate Change Bundled Evaluation

**Document:** CNCS-2022-0018-DRAFT-0002

Comment from Anonymous

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Anonymous Anonymous

**Email:** nick.dico@gmail.com

---

## General Comment

In conducting researching into how to evaluate a potential climate change or resilience metric, the evaluators should fully jettison the ideas of "how does lead to individuals wanting to complete public service in the future" and "if this grant would be continued into the future". These are longstanding awful outcomes of the AmeriCorps agency as the agency does not provide sufficient funding to allow most smaller environmental or capacity building programs to invest in these professional development opportunities that would a) allow members to see more value in public service (paid or unpaid) and b) fundraise for encumbered money to the host organization to continue after the grant ends.

The evaluation should look at the capacity building metric as as a model to allow programs to prove their effectiveness in the climate crisis, as much of the work on the ground is so vast (food reclamation, trees planted, energy efficiency, economic resilience planning) that an environmental measurement approach would be short-sighted.

Bundling should occur with an equal amount of national, state, regional organizations, spanning the scope of budgets and member placements, and over different current performance measure standards.