

**ADULT VOLUNTEER LITERACY GRANT OFFERING**  
**Grant Reviewer's Rubric, Score and Comments**

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Submitting Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

**City:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewers will use the following selection criteria from 15 ILCS 3035.230.**

**EXPERIENCE, TRAINING AND EDUCATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**      **Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**  
**Analysis of whether the persons managing the project have experience, training and education to provide adult literacy programming, including at least a BA and the administrative capacity to support the project.**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Well-described, specifically focused on adult volunteer tutoring and shows significant years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Includes a BA degree and further education in adult literacy.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — The agency's primary purpose is adult volunteer literacy and the administrative functions supporting adult volunteer literacy are well described and comprehensive.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Understandable but lacks important details, is appropriate to adult volunteer tutoring and shows some years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Includes a BA degree.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — One of the agency's purposes is adult volunteer literacy and administrative functions supporting adult volunteer literacy are limited.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on adult volunteer tutoring and very limited years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Does not include a BA degree.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity of the Agency — Adult volunteer literacy's place is unclear or poorly described and administrative functions supporting adult volunteer literacy are missing or inadequate.</li> </ul>

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSTRACT**      **Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**  
**Analysis of the application's brief and explicit description of the literacy program, purpose and goals.**

	Excellent 4–5	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is complete, concise, understandable and compelling.
	Adequate 2–3	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is understandable but lacks important details and is not compelling.
	Minimal 0–1	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on adult volunteer tutoring.

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Maximum Point Value — 20: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the application contains the number of students and evaluation methods that will produce quantifiable data on the results of educational assessment including pre and post testing to evaluate student progress.**

	<p>Excellent 16–20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners is excellent in relation to the amount requested and service proposed.</li> <li>• Proposed number of volunteer tutors is one half or more of the proposed number of adult learners.</li> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners who receive one to one tutoring is at or exceeds 75% of total number of learners.</li> <li>• Pre-service adult literacy tutor training hours meets or exceeds 15 hours.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention of adult learners is well-planned and well-described with plans including three or more strategies.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is easily understood and includes specific information such as methods tutors will use.</li> <li>• Plans to assess, evaluate and report learning gains are well thought out, include appropriate tests, testing intervals &amp; tester responsibility.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention of volunteer tutors is well planned and well described with plans including three or more strategies.</li> </ul>
	<p>Adequate 8–15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners is adequate in relation to the amount requested and service proposed.</li> <li>• Proposed number of volunteer tutors is one third but less than one half (33-49%) of the proposed number of adult learners.</li> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners who receive one to one tutoring ranges from 50% to 74% of total number of learners.</li> <li>• Pre-service adult literacy tutor training hours ranges between 12 to 15.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention of adult learners is understandable but lacks important details with less than three strategies described.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is understandable but lacks important details such as methods tutors will use.</li> <li>• Plans to assess, evaluate and report learning gains are understandable, but lack important details such as tests, testing intervals &amp; tester responsibility.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention of volunteer tutors is understandable but lacks important details and describes less than three strategies.</li> </ul>
	<p>Minimal 0–7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners is minimal in relation to the amount requested and service proposed.</li> <li>• Proposed number of volunteer tutors is less than one third of the proposed number of adult learners.</li> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners who receive one to one tutoring ranges from 10% to 49%.</li> <li>• Pre-service adult literacy tutor training hours are less than 12.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention of adult learners is poorly planned and described, lacks or includes inappropriate strategies.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on adult volunteer tutoring.</li> <li>• Plans to assess, evaluate and report learning gains are unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on adult volunteer tutoring.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention of volunteer tutors is poorly planned and described, lacks strategies or includes inappropriate strategies.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**CURRENT YEAR'S PROGRAM**

Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Analysis of the report on the previous year's grant detailing number of students served, progress toward goals, student programmatic outcomes achieved and program impact. If the application reads "N/A" the correct score will be zero for this section.**

	Excellent 4–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program includes all required details, shows significant success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program may lack some details, shows moderate success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program is unclear, incomplete or lacks success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**TARGET AUDIENCE AND NEED STATEMENT**

Maximum Point Value — 15: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Analysis of whether the need for literacy services for the target population is demonstrated.**

	Excellent 11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant clearly identifies and documents the low literate or limited English proficient adult who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>Applicant uses demographic information well to document the need for adult literacy services in the <b>local</b> area.</li> <li>Applicant uses statistics, reports and stories that are current, credible, convincing and compelling.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant adequately identifies the low literate or limited English proficient adults who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>Applicant uses limited demographic information to document the need for adult literacy services in general terms.</li> <li>Applicant uses few or limited statistics, reports and stories.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant does not identify or poorly documents the low literate or limited English proficient adults who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>Applicant does not use or does not adequately use demographic information to document the need for adult literacy services.</li> <li>Applicant uses statistics, reports and stories that are outdated, unconvincing, and incomplete or does not use statistics and reports at all.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Analysis of whether the time schedule will support the successful achievement of proposed outcomes.**

	Excellent 4–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The time schedule has more than sufficient time to accomplish the proposed activities and outcomes.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The time schedule has sufficient time to accomplish the proposed activities and outcomes.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The time schedule does not show enough time to accomplish the proposed activities and outcomes.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**OUTCOMES, EVALUATIONS AND METHODS TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES**

**Maximum Point Value — 20: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of how the proposed literacy services for the target population address the need.**

**Analysis of whether the application contains a specific statement of outcomes, methods to achieve outcomes, and manner in which outcomes will be evaluated.**

	Excellent 16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful adult literacy tutoring outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 8–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two appropriate and meaningful adult literacy tutoring outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adult literacy tutoring outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described and may not include an outcome concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided are inadequate to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**BUDGET**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the budget is reasonable in view of goals and adequate to support the project.**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amount is very reasonable and cost effective to support the number of adult learners and tutors proposed.</li> <li>• Explanation of financial support is complete, easily understood, cost-effective and well justified.</li> <li>• Personnel line item indicates that the staff time allocated to the project is excellent in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>• Cost-sharing indicates that the submitting agency is supplying administrative support.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amount is reasonable to support the number of adult learners and tutors proposed.</li> <li>• Explanation of financial support is somewhat limited or not well justified.</li> <li>• Personnel line item indicates that the time allocated to the project is limited in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>• Cost-sharing indicates that the submitting agency is supplying limited administrative support.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amount is excessive or unreasonable to support the number of adult learners and tutors proposed.</li> <li>• Explanation of financial support is incomplete, not easily understood, not cost-effective and not well justified.</li> <li>• Personnel line item indicates that the time allocated to the project is insufficient in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>• Cost-sharing indicates that the submitting agency is not supplying adequate administrative support.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**LETTERS FROM PARTICIPATING AGENCIES**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether statements from participating agencies demonstrate cooperation and coordination with the proposed literacy project.**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letters show several other agencies that support the program through cooperation on a significant variety of services ranging from tutor recruitment and learner recruitment to fiscal support. Services are well described.</li></ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letters show few other agencies that support the program through cooperation on limited services. Services are adequately described.</li></ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letters are inadequate or do not indicate cooperation and coordination with the adult volunteer literacy project. Services poor or inappropriate.</li></ul>

**Comments:**

**TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE (100 possible): \_\_\_\_\_**

**Funding Recommendation:    Yes    No    Yes but Low Priority**

**Comments:**

**FAMILY LITERACY GRANT OFFERING**  
**Grant Reviewer's Rubric, Score and Comments**

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Submitting Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

**City:** \_\_\_\_\_

The reviewers will use the following selection criteria from 15 ILCS 3035.230.

**EXPERIENCE, TRAINING AND EDUCATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**      **Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**  
**Analysis of whether the persons managing the project have experience, training and education to provide family literacy programming, including at least a BA and the administrative capacity to support the project.**

	Excellent 4–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Well-described, specifically focused on literacy and shows significant years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Includes a BA degree and further education in literacy.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — The agency's primary purpose is literacy and the administrative functions supporting family literacy are well described and comprehensive.</li> <li>• Specific services provided to this project are focused on family literacy, the target population and are comprehensive.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Understandable but lacks important details, is appropriate to family literacy and shows some years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Include a BA degree.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — One of the agency's purposes is literacy and administrative functions supporting family literacy are limited.</li> <li>• Specific services provided to this project are adequately focused on family literacy but may lack important details.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on literacy and very limited years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Does not include a BA degree.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity of the Agency — Family literacy's place is unclear or poorly described and administrative functions supporting family literacy are missing or inadequate.</li> <li>• Specific services provided to this project are inappropriate or poorly described.</li> </ul>

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSTRACT**      **Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**  
**Analysis of the application's brief and explicit description of the literacy program, purpose and goals**

	Excellent 4–5	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner and his or her child(ren) is complete, concise, understandable and compelling.
	Adequate 2–3	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner and his or her child(ren) is understandable but lacks important details and is not compelling.
	Minimal 0–1	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner and his or her child(ren) is unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on family literacy.

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Maximum Point Value — 20: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the application contains the number of students and evaluation methods that will produce quantifiable data on the results of educational assessment, including pre- and post-testing to evaluate student progress.**

	Excellent 16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of adult learners and their children are excellent in relation to the amount requested and service proposed.</li> <li>Recruitment and retention of adult learners and their children is well planned and well described with plans including 3 or more strategies.</li> <li>Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is easily understood and includes specific information such as specific methods.</li> <li>Plans to assess, evaluate and report learning gains are well thought out, include appropriate tests, testing intervals &amp; tester responsibility.</li> <li>Design and plan for the integration of the five program components is well described, complete and comprehensive.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 8–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of adult learners and their children are adequate in relation to the amount requested and service proposed.</li> <li>Recruitment and retention of adult learners and their children is understandable but lacks important details with less than 3 strategies.</li> <li>Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is understandable but lacks important details.</li> <li>Plans to assess, evaluate and report learning gains are understandable, but lack important details such as tests, testing intervals &amp; tester responsibility.</li> <li>Design and plan for the integration of the five program components is understandable but lacks important details.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of adult learners and their children are minimal in relation to the amount requested and service proposed.</li> <li>Recruitment and retention of adult learners and their children is poorly planned and described, lacks or includes inappropriate strategies.</li> <li>Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on family literacy.</li> <li>Plans to assess, evaluate and report learning gains are unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on family literacy.</li> <li>Design and plan for the integration of the five program components is unclear, incomplete, or poorly described.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**CURRENT YEAR'S PROGRAM**

**Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of the report on the previous year's grant detailing number of students served, progress toward goals, student programmatic outcomes achieved and program impact. If the application reads "N/A" the correct score will be zero for this section.**

	Excellent 4–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program includes all required details, shows significant success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program may lack some details, shows moderate success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program is unclear, incomplete or lacks success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**TARGET AUDIENCE AND NEED STATEMENT**

**Maximum Point Value — 15: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the need for family literacy services for the target population is demonstrated.**

	Excellent 11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant clearly identifies and documents the low literate or limited English proficient adult who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>• Applicant clearly identifies and documents the low literate or limited English proficient child who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>• Applicant uses demographic information well to document the need for family literacy services in the <b>local</b> area.</li> <li>• Applicant uses statistics, reports and stories that are current, credible, convincing and compelling.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant adequately identifies the low literate or limited English proficient adults who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>• Applicant adequately identifies the low literate or limited English proficient children who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>• Applicant uses limited demographic information to document the need for family literacy services in general terms.</li> <li>• Applicant uses few or limited statistics, reports and stories.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant does not identify or poorly documents the low literate or limited English proficient adults who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>• Applicant does not identify or poorly documents the low literate or limited English proficient children who will directly benefit from this project.</li> <li>• Applicant does not use or does not adequately use demographic information to document the need for family literacy services.</li> <li>• Applicant uses statistics, reports and stories that are outdated, unconvincing, and incomplete or does not use statistics and reports at all.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the time schedule will support the successful achievement of proposed outcomes.**

***Library Services***

	Excellent 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent amount of time in library services is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited amount of time in library services is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient amount of time in library services is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>

***Adult Education***

	Excellent 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent amount of time in adult education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited amount of time in adult education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient amount of time in adult education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>

**Children's Education**

	Excellent 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent amount of time in children's education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited amount of time in children's education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient amount of time in children's education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>

**Parenting Education**

	Excellent 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent amount of time in parenting education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited amount of time in parenting education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient amount of time in parenting education is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>

**Parent and Child Together Activities (PACT)**

	Excellent 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent amount of time in PACT is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited amount of time in PACT is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient amount of time in PACT is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**OUTCOMES, EVALUATIONS AND METHODS TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES**

Maximum Point Value — 20: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Analysis of how the proposed literacy services for the target population address the need.

Analysis of whether the application contains a specific statement of outcomes, methods to achieve outcomes, and manner in which outcomes will be evaluated.

**Library Services**

	Excellent 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful library outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two appropriate and meaningful library outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Library outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided are inadequate to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

Comments:

**Adult Literacy Services**

	Excellent 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful adult literacy outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two appropriate and meaningful adult literacy outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adult literacy outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described and may not include an outcome concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided are inadequate to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

Comments:

**Children' s Education Services**

	Excellent 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful children's education outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two appropriate and meaningful children's education outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The children's education outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided are inadequate to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**Parenting Education Services**

	Excellent 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful parenting outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two appropriate and meaningful parenting outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parenting outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided are inadequate to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**Parent and Child Together Activities (PACT)**

Excellent 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful PACT outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
Adequate 2-3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two appropriate and meaningful PACT outcomes are listed.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
Minimal 0-1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PACT outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Services to be provided are inadequate to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

Comments:

**BUDGET**

Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Analysis of whether the budget is reasonable in view of goals and adequate to support the project**

Excellent 8-10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amount is very reasonable and cost effective to support the number of adult learners and their children proposed.</li> <li>• Explanation of financial support is complete, easily understood, cost-effective and well justified.</li> <li>• Personnel line item indicates that the staff time allocated to the project is excellent in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>• Cost-sharing indicates that the submitting agency is supplying administrative support.</li> </ul>
Adequate 4-7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amount is reasonable to support the number of adult learners and their children proposed.</li> <li>• Explanation of financial support is somewhat limited or not well justified.</li> <li>• Personnel line item indicates that the time allocated to the project is limited in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>• Cost-sharing indicates that the submitting agency is supplying limited administrative support.</li> </ul>
Minimal 0-3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amount is excessive or unreasonable to support the number of adult learners and their children proposed.</li> <li>• Explanation of financial support is incomplete, not easily understood, not cost-effective and not well justified.</li> <li>• Personnel line item indicates that the time allocated to the project is insufficient in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>• Cost-sharing indicates that the submitting agency is not supplying adequate administrative support.</li> </ul>

Comments:

**LETTERS FROM PARTICIPATING AGENCIES**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether statements from participating agencies demonstrate cooperation and coordination with the proposed literacy project.**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letters are present from two of the three required agencies shown as Agencies Involved as well as additional participating agencies.</li><li>• Letters show these agencies support the program through comprehensive cooperation and coordination on the required five components.</li><li>• Strong services are well described.</li></ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letters are present from two of the three required agencies shown as Agencies Involved.</li><li>• Letters show these agencies support the program but cooperation and coordination on the required five components is limited.</li><li>• Services are adequately described or may be less than strong.</li></ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letters are inadequate or do not indicate cooperation and coordination with the family literacy project.</li><li>• Services are poor or inappropriate.</li></ul>

**Comments:**

**Total Application Score (100 possible): \_\_\_\_\_**

**Funding Recommendation:    Yes    No    Yes but Low Priority**

**Comments:**

**WORKPLACE SKILLS ENHANCEMENT GRANT OFFERING**  
**Grant Reviewer's Rubric, Score and Comments**

**Reviewer's Name:**

**Submitting Agency:**

**City:**

The reviewers will use the following selection criteria from 15 ILCS 3035.230.

**EXPERIENCE, TRAINING AND EDUCATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**      **Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**  
**Analysis of whether the persons managing the project have experience, training and education to provide workplace literacy programming, including at least a BA and the administrative capacity to support the project.**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Well described, specifically focused on workplace education and shows significant years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Includes a BA degree and further education.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — The agency is focused on workplace literacy and the administrative functions supporting workplace literacy are well described and comprehensive.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Understandable but lacks important details, is appropriate to workplace education and shows some years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Includes a BA degree.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — The administrative functions supporting workplace literacy are limited.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience — Unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on workplace education and very limited years of experience.</li> <li>• Education — Includes a BA degree.</li> <li>• Administrative Capacity — The administrative functions supporting workplace literacy are missing or inadequate.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**ABSTRACT**      **Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**  
**Analysis of the application's brief and explicit description of the literacy program, purpose and goals.**

	Excellent 4–5	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is complete, concise, understandable and compelling.
	Adequate 2–3	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is understandable but lacks important details and is not compelling.
	Minimal 0–1	• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is unclear, incomplete, poorly described, or not focused on workplace literacy.

**Comments:**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Maximum Point Value — 15: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the application contains the number of students and evaluation methods that will produce quantifiable data on the results of educational assessment including pre and post testing to evaluate student progress**

	Excellent 11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of adult learners in relation to the dollar amount requested is excellent.</li> <li>Assessment of adult learners is well planned and well described.</li> <li>Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is easily understood and includes specific information.</li> <li>Plans to evaluate and report learning gains are well thought out, include appropriate tests, testing intervals &amp; tester responsibility.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of adult learners in relation to the dollar amount requested is adequate.</li> <li>Assessment of adult learners is understandable but lacks important details.</li> <li>Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is understandable but lacks important details.</li> <li>Plans to evaluate and report learning gains are understandable, but lack important details.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of adult learners in relation to the dollar amount requested is minimal.</li> <li>Assessment of adult learners is poorly planned and described, lacks appropriate strategies.</li> <li>Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction is unclear, incomplete, poorly described.</li> <li>Plans to evaluate and report learning gains are unclear, incomplete, poorly described.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**CURRENT YEAR'S PROGRAM**

**Maximum Point Value — 5: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of the report on the previous year's grant detailing the number of students served, progress toward goals, student programmatic outcomes achieved and program impact. If the application reads "N/A" the correct score will be zero for this section.**

	Excellent 4-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program includes all required details, shows significant success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program may lack some details, shows moderate success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program is unclear, incomplete or lacks success in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**TARGET AUDIENCE AND NEED STATEMENT**

**Maximum Point Value — 15: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the need for literacy services for the target population is demonstrated.**

Excellent 11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant clearly identifies and documents needs of the low literate or limited English proficient employees who will directly benefit from this project.</li> </ul>
Adequate 6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant adequately identifies the needs of the low literate or limited English proficient employees who will directly benefit from this project.</li> </ul>
Minimal 0–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant does not identify or poorly documents the needs of the low literate or limited English proficient employees who will directly benefit from this project.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the time schedule will support the successful achievement of proposed outcomes.**

Excellent 8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of courses in relation to the dollar amount requested is excellent.</li> <li>Proposed number of instructional hours in relation to the dollar amount requested is excellent.</li> <li>Excellent amount of instructional hours and planning is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
Adequate 4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of courses in relation to the dollar amount requested is adequate.</li> <li>Proposed number of instructional hours in relation to the dollar amount requested is adequate.</li> <li>Limited amount of instructional hours and planning is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>
Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed number of courses in relation to the dollar amount requested is minimal.</li> <li>Proposed number of instructional hours in relation to the dollar amount requested is minimal.</li> <li>Insufficient amount of instructional hours and planning is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**OUTCOMES, EVALUATIONS AND METHODS TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES**

**Maximum Point Value — 20: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of how the proposed literacy services for the target population address the need.**

**Analysis of whether the application contains a specific statement of outcomes, methods to achieve outcomes, and manner in which outcomes will be evaluated.**

Excellent 16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three or four well described, appropriate and meaningful adult instructional outcomes are listed, including at least one concerning the employee’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>Evaluation tools are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>Services to be provided directly impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
Adequate 8–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or two appropriate and meaningful adult instructional outcomes are listed, including at least one concerning the employee’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>Evaluation tools may lack specifics, may not be understandable, timely or relevant.</li> <li>Services to be provided adequately impact the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>
Minimal 0–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adult instructional outcomes listed are inappropriate, poorly described and may not include an outcome concerning the employee’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>Services to be provided are inadequate or unrelated to the need described in the Target Audience and Need section.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**  
**Page 4 — WSE**  
**BUDGET**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether the budget is reasonable in view of goals and adequate to support the project.**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget amount is very reasonable and cost effective to support the number of adult learners proposed.</li> <li>Explanation of financial support is complete, easily understood, cost-effective and well justified.</li> <li>Personnel line item indicates that the staff time allocated to the project is excellent in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>Business match indicates that the business shows a strong commitment to the project and is supplying administrative support.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget amount is reasonable to support the number of adult learners proposed.</li> <li>Explanation of financial support is somewhat limited or not well justified.</li> <li>Personnel line item indicates that the time allocated to the project is limited in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>Business match indicates that the business shows an adequate commitment to the project and is supplying limited administrative support.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget amount is excessive or unreasonable to support the number of adult learners proposed.</li> <li>Explanation of financial support is incomplete, not easily understood, not cost-effective and not well justified.</li> <li>Personnel line item indicates that the time allocated to the project is insufficient in relation to the funding requested.</li> <li>Business match indicates that the business shows a limited commitment to the project and is supplying minimal administrative support.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**LETTERS FROM PARTICIPATING AGENCIES**

**Maximum Point Value — 10: Section Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Analysis of whether statements from participating agencies demonstrate cooperation and coordination with the proposed literacy project**

	Excellent 8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A letter from either the educational partner agency or the business partner and who is <b>not</b> the submitting agency indicates significant commitment to the project by detailing specific services, cooperation and coordination ranging from employee recruitment to fiscal support. Services are well described.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A letter from either the educational partner agency or the business partner and who is <b>not</b> the submitting agency indicates limited commitment to the project by detailing adequate cooperation and coordination. Services are adequately described.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter is inadequate or does not indicate cooperation and coordination with the workplace skills enhancement project. Services poor or inappropriate.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE (100 possible): \_\_\_\_\_**

**Funding Recommendation:    Yes    No    Yes but Low Priority**

**Comments:**