

FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC

---

### LSTA REVIEW PROCESS

This is a competitive grant application and review process. Each LSTA grant application must stand on its own merit.

The staff of the Illinois State Library and teams of reviewers will evaluate all applications using the Review Rubric. Final recommendations for funding are made by the Illinois State Library with the grant awards subject to approval by the Secretary of State and State Librarian.

Only the awarded grant applications shall be considered public information. Working papers, individual reviewer's comments, notes, and scores are not public information. Lists of awarded grants are announced in a Press Release on the Secretary of State's web site at: <http://www.cyberdriveillinois.com/press/home.html>

### FINAL SELECTION PROCESS

Applications will be funded that best meet the purpose of the grant offering and address one or more of the goals in the *Illinois State Library's Long Range Plan for the Use of LSTA Funds FY2008 – 2012*.

Selection factors that will be taken into account include:

- A minimum of 40% of the total funding available for competitive Library Services & Technology Act grants will be allocated for projects that address the *Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY09* and lead to models that can be replicated in other locales.
- Availability of LSTA funds.
- Submission of a complete application meeting the deadline.
- Extent to which the proposed grant activities represent an appropriate use of the funds.
- Reviewers' working papers.
- Geographic distribution of the proposed grant awards.
- Applicant's past grant performance.
- Possible duplication with other state funded initiatives.
- Earliest date and time of receipt of the complete application.
- Pre-contract negotiations between the Illinois State Library and the grant applicant will clarify any issues raised during the review process. Not all applicants contacted during the pre-contract negotiations will receive an award. ISL reserves the right to partially award an application's request.

### ACCOUNTABILITY

Grant recipients are expected to adhere to the activities in the approved application.

Grant recipients **must** file reports in a timely manner as outlined in the reporting manual provided by the Illinois State Library.

Failure to comply may result in:

- The library agency will be required to return the grant monies.
- The library agency will be ineligible for competitive grants for one year.

**JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY**

**FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC**

**LSTA Grant Review Rubric  
Applications will be evaluated based on the following guidelines.**

**COVER SHEET**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
The application will move forward for review.	Identifiable <b>original</b> signatures of the project director and authorized person are on at least one copy of the application. Photocopied signatures are acceptable on all of the other copies.
The application will be returned as incomplete.	No signatures. The signatures verify that the application is an authorized submission from the agency. Lack of signatures indicates the application is not authorized.

**NARRATIVE – 90 points total for the narrative**

**APPLYING AGENCY – 10 Points**

Briefly profile the applying library/library agency, location and general population served on a daily basis. Explain the agency's capacity to manage this project. Express the library agency's ability to subsidize a reimbursable grant or finance grant activities until grant funds are received.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
10	Excellent	Applicant clearly profiles the applying library and parent agency including demographics that give context to the proposal. Even if the reviewer is not familiar with this library or community, there is a clear portrayal of the people who live, work or go to school here and the library that serves them. The stage is set for the proposal with, for example, the community's location, urban vs. rural, background history, economic climate or lack thereof, key businesses and industry focus, educational levels and/or curriculum strengths. The applicant's capacity to manage this project is clearly evident. The financial capacity of the library will support fronting the grant activities.
7	Very Good	The applicant demonstrates their capacity to manage the project before the check arrives. Demographics and details are provided giving reviewers solid background information. Sufficient details are provided to describe the community, the library and the people served in whole.
4	Adequate	Descriptions including location and a few statistics give a general impression of the community, library and service area.
1	Poor	The community and library not clearly identified. The total service area of the library is vague.
0		No Applying Agency section is included.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION/LSTA PURPOSE – 10 Points**

Keep the overall project manageable and focused. Thoroughly describe all details of the proposed services/programs/activities and the locations where they will be located. If purchasing computers and/or connecting to the Internet, confirm that the applicant will comply with the Children's Internet Protection Act. Tie the project to at least one purpose of LSTA.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
10	Excellent	The application enthusiastically describes the intent of the project with an overview of activities and the results expected. The project is exciting and has great potential. High expectations are evident and there is obvious value in this project idea. Conclusions are compelling. Meets one clearly identified LSTA goal. Addresses CIPA if applicable. Activities justify the Items budgeted.
7	Very Good	An overview of the project is provided, and the project sound promising. Conclusions are well grounded. Meets one identified LSTA goal. Addresses CIPA if applicable. Budgeted items are described.
4	Adequate	Some details are provided but the project concept is uninteresting. Not all budgeted items are fully explained. Links to one LSTA purpose.
1	Poor	Minimal information is provided. The project is not clearly defined.

**JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY**

**FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC**

0		No project description is included.
---	--	-------------------------------------

**ACTION PLAN – 10 Points**

Does this project address the *Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY09*? If yes, please indicate which action plan is addressed and how this project furthers this Action Plan. What percentage of the LSTA funding specifically addresses the Action Plan? If the application does not address the *Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY09*, please indicate not applicable.

Score	Rating	Review Rubric
10	Excellent	Clearly links the project purpose and activities to the <i>Strategic Plan for Technology &amp; Telecommunications Action Plan for FY09</i> with 100% of the LSTA funds supporting this Action Plan.
7	Very Good	Addresses the <i>Strategic Plan for Technology &amp; Telecommunications Action Plan for FY09</i> with at least 50% of the funding clearly linked to the Action Plan.
4	Adequate	Some connection to the <i>Strategic Plan for Technology &amp; Telecommunications Action Plan for FY09</i> with minimal funding linked to the Action Plan.
1	NA	Indicates that the project does not address the <i>Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY09</i> .
0		This section is missing.

**Target Audience and Needs Assessment - 10 points**

Clearly identify the target audience that will directly benefit from this project. Cite relevant statistics and appropriate demographics. Identify the target audience's needs and explain how the needs were determined. Explain how and why this project is the best solution to address those needs.

Score	Rating	Review Rubric
10	Excellent	The application thoughtfully defines the target audience. The applicant includes facts, statistics and demographics specific to this target audience, with sources cited, to corroborate statements. The reviewers have a clear impression of the people this project will target, an awareness of their needs and how the needs were determined. Explanations are compelling as to why this project is the best method to address these needs. There is compelling evidence presented that this project will indeed make a difference in the lives of the target audience.
7	Very Good	Applicant describes the target audience, and the needs of the audience, how the need was determined, ways the project is designed to meet that need and how the library will address that need. Statistics and data are included that support need and define the target audience. Conclusions are solid and appropriate to show that this project will address the needs of the target audience.
4	Adequate	The target audience is described and there is some supporting information about the needs and how the needs were determined. There is a link between the project and the target audience needs.
1	Poor	The target audience is not clearly identified and the needs are weak. No statistics are provided. There is little connection between the target audience needs and the project.
0		No information is provided about the target audience or needs.

**JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY**

**FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC**

**OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION – 10 points**

Set three achievable, measurable outcomes based on changes in knowledge, behavior, skills or attitudes of the target audience. Propose a reasonable method to collect evaluative data to determine meeting the objectives as well as the effectiveness or success of the project, activities or services proposed.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
10	Excellent.	Three outcomes are listed. They are well defined, appropriate and demonstrate changes in knowledge, skills, behavior and/or condition. There is an unmistakable correlation between the activities proposed and the outcomes expected. The outcomes indicate this project could truly make a difference for the target audience. The evaluation methods are suitable to the project with practical strategies proposed. Statistics and data will be collected to validate the evaluation.
7	Very Good	Three outcomes are listed. They are appropriate and demonstrate changes in knowledge, skills, behavior or condition. Based on the activities proposed, the outcomes are realistic. A credible sequence of evaluation strategies is proposed. Data collection is solid.
4	Adequate	Outcomes are anticipated with some base in the activities. Evaluation is described. Data collection is appropriate.
1	Poor	The outcomes are poorly defined and/or vague. It is unclear how these outcomes will occur based on the activities proposed. A component may be missing.
0		No information is provided.

**TIMETABLE - 10 points**

Present a schedule for project activities within the grant cycle (list of actions with a date by which they will be accomplished). Confirm that grant funds will be obligated October 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009 with grant funds expended no later than August 15, 2009. Verify that equipment and programs will be delivered within the timeframe for the grant cycle. Address potential problems or challenges and how they will be resolved.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
10	Excellent	The timeline is specific with actions listed per a combination of days and months. It is evident that the action and dates have been thoughtfully considered with attention to the details. It is clear what activities must occur from start to finish. Clearly indicates all funds will be encumbered by June 30. The project is reasonable and can obviously be accomplished within the grant timeline. Candid consideration has been given to identify potential problems with feasible solutions suggested.
7	Very Good	A timetable with actions steps and dates of completion is competently presented. May include action per month. The project will be accomplished within the grant timeline. Potential problems are identified with solutions suggested.
4	Adequate	Some details are provided with a very broad timeline, but it lacks specifics and may overlook key details. Some dates may be included but the overall timeline is too vague. On the other hand the project might be unrealistically attempting to accomplish too much in too little time. At least one possible obstacle is identified.
1	Poor	There is insufficient information describing the process. The timeline is missing or inappropriate and action steps don't make sense.
0		No timetable is included.

**JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY**

**FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC**

**PERSONNEL: 10 points**

Identify which library positions or staff will be involved with this project and their responsibilities to ensure the success of this project. For staff, indicate the percentage of time they will be assigned to the project. Confirm that salary and LSTA grant funds will not be earned at the same time. Identify who will administer the grant funds and his or her qualifications or job title. If contracting with an individual or agency, identify them and their role in the project. Validate their expertise with an explanation of why they are the most appropriate for their role. Include the names of other agencies including libraries or other groups that will be involved as contributors to or partners in the project. Explain their role and contributions to the project. A letter from the director of the partnering agencies to confirm their roles and financial commitment to the project must be attached.

- *In Sync with Technology* - Give higher points to ISWT applications that show they have leveraged community support for this project. Leveraging will correlate with the Local Contribution/Match.

Score	Rating	Review Rubric
10	Excellent	Key personnel are identified and their roles described. If personnel are paid with grant funds, statements clearly indicate there will be no overlapping payments of LSTA and local funds. The person administering the grant funds is clearly qualified. The qualifications and expertise for all contractual arrangements and staff paid with grant funds clearly demonstrate that these are the best qualified agencies or staff for this project. If appropriate, other agencies contributing to the project are identified with roles and what they will be contributing to the project.
7	Very Good	Staff and personnel are identified. If personnel are paid with grant funds, statements clearly indicate there will be no overlapping payments of LSTA and local funds. The qualifications and expertise for all contractual arrangements and staff paid with grant funds are provided to justify the hiring of these agencies or individuals for this project. If appropriate, other agencies contributing to the project are identified. Letters from every agency listed are attached.
4	Adequate	Some details are provided about plans for persons involved with the project but it is either incomplete or lacks important components. Some qualifications for the contractual arrangements and staff paid with grant funds are provided. If personnel are paid with grant funds, statements indicate there will be no overlapping payments of LSTA and local funds. If appropriate, outside agencies contributing to the project are listed but letters may or may not be attached.
1	Poor	Personnel are mentioned, but there is insufficient information to grasp their responsibilities.
0		The personnel section is missing.

**PROJECT PROMOTION – 10 points**

Explain strategies to involve the target audience. Elaborate on methods that will be used to communicate successful outcomes of the project.

Score	Rating	Review Rubric
10	Excellent	It is apparent that the target audience will want to be involved. Appropriate media outlets and methods are outlined for communicating the purpose and intended outcomes of the project. A plan or schedule of when the communications and promotion will occur, and the message(s) that will be given to the targeted audience is clearly included.
7	Very Good	Sufficient details are provided to justify that promotion to the target audience and others will be accomplished. Indicators showing when the communications and promotion will occur are evident. The message is obvious.
4	Adequate	Some details are provided about plans for promotion but it is either incomplete or lacks important components.
1	Poor	Promotion is mentioned, but there is insufficient information describing the process.
0		No project plan for promotion is included.

**JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY**

**FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC**

**PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY - 10 points**

Explain how the activities implemented, products produced or items purchased during this project will be supported and maintained after the project ends/August 16, 2009 and beyond. Note that equipment purchased with LSTA funds must be maintained for five years.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
10	Excellent	There is a convincing plan showing the project's activities will be supported after the grant ends, with documentation of how this will occur. If equipment is purchased, maintenance for five years is addressed.
7	Very Good	Details demonstrate that efforts will be made to support grant activities after the grant ends.
4	Adequate	Some details are provided about plans for supporting grant activities but it is either incomplete or lacks important components.
1	Poor	Statements of sustainability are mentioned, but there is insufficient information describing the process.
0		No project plan for sustainability is included.

**BUDGETS AND EXPLANATIONS**

The budget and explanations can determine the outcome of the application.

1. LSTA Budget Chart
2. LSTA Explanation
3. Local Contribution/Match Budget Chart
4. Local Contribution/Match Explanation

All grants are expected to have local contributions.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Review Rubric</b>
Fund 8 - 10 points	<p>The <u>four</u> budget components are included. The budget addresses all aspects of costs involved and provides supporting documentation to verify costs. Budgeted items clearly relate to the proposed activities and are appropriate. The explanation shows how the budget figures were determined. The Local Contribution has a strong match that is appropriate and significant. Everything is calculated correctly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Value of Resource Sharing</i> applications local contribution/match must equal 50% or more of the total cost for the project. (50% is based on the total.)</li> <li>• <i>In Sync with Technology</i> reflects leveraging community support (cash and/or in-kind) on the Local Contribution/Match Budget and Explanation.</li> </ul>
Fund 4 - 7 points	<p>The <u>four</u> budget components are included. The budget demonstrates the validity of costs involved and the explanation provides supporting information. Budgeted items are reasonable and appropriate. The Local Contribution match is good. Budget is understandable. The explanation includes descriptions of items for purchase. Adding is accurate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Value of Resource Sharing</i> applications local contribution/match must equal 50% or more of the total cost for the project.</li> <li>• <i>In Sync with Technology</i> reflects leveraging some community support (cash and/or in-kind) on the Local Contribution/Match Budget and Explanation.</li> </ul>
Do not fund 0 - 3 points	<p>Not all four of the budget components are included. Significant information is missing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Value of Resource Sharing</i> does not have local contribution/match equaling 50% or more of the total cost for the project.</li> <li>• <i>In Sync with Technology</i> reflects no community support was leveraged.</li> </ul>

**JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY**

**FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC**

**REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION – 10 points**

Not Applicable for this project	Meets Requirement	Partially Meets this Requirement	Does not meet	
<b>Digital Imaging:</b>				
				Copyright Ownership statement
				Non-binding quote from a vendor for outsourcing the digitization (if appropriate) and/or for the equipment prices posted by an online vendor.
				CIPA certification from public libraries, public schools, and consortia that include public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification
				Letter from any agency providing funds or in-kind contributions.
				Every agency listed as a partner in this project must have a letter of commitment attached.
<b>In Sync with Technology:</b>				
				Specifications and non-binding quotes for capital outlay/equipment costing \$500 or more.
				Letter from any agency providing funds or in-kind contributions.
				Public libraries, public schools, and consortia including public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification
				Every agency listed as a partner in this project must have a letter of commitment attached.
<b>The Value of Resource Sharing:</b>				
				Specifications and non-binding quotes for capital outlay/equipment costing \$500 or more
				Letter from the Regional Library System LLSAP confirming that a preplanning discussion has taken place.
				Public libraries, public schools, and consortia including public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification
				Letter from any agency providing funds or in-kind contributions to confirm their financial commitment.
				Every agency listed as a partner in this project must have a letter of commitment attached.
				(Only if system staff member will serve as Project Director) Letter from the director of the regional library system agreeing to this arrangement.
<b>Research &amp; Development:</b>				
				Public libraries, public schools, and consortia including public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification
				Letter from any agency providing funds or in-kind contributions
				Statewide collaboration is expected. Every agency listed as a partner in this project must have a letter of commitment attached.

JESSE WHITE, SECRETARY OF STATE \* ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY  
 FY09 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT  
 REVIEW CRITERIA AND RUBRIC

**FY2009 LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT GRANT  
 Review Sheet**

Grant Number 09-\_\_\_\_\_ Agency: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grant Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

	Excellent 9-10	Very Good 6-8	Adequate 3-5	Poor 1-2	Missing 0	SCORE
Applying Agency						
Project Description/ LSTA Purpose						
Action Plan						
Target Audience & Needs Assessment						
Outcomes and Evaluation						
Timetable						
Personnel						
Project Promotion						
Project Sustainability						
Required Supporting Documentation						
Budget	Fund <input type="checkbox"/>		Do Not Fund <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>(A perfect application would score 100 points)</b>						<b>TOTAL</b>

**Recommendation:**

- Fund - 1<sup>st</sup> priority
- Fund only if grant dollars are available - 2<sup>nd</sup> priority
- Fund with these modifications:
- Do not fund