



**Jesse White • Secretary of State & State Librarian**  
 Illinois State Library, Gwendolyn Brooks Building  
 300 S. Second St., Springfield, IL 62701-1796  
**WWW.CYBERDRIVEILLINOIS.COM**

**Adult Volunteer Literacy Grant Offering  
 Grant Reviewer's Rubric, Score and Comments**

**Reviewer's Name:**  
**Submitting Agency:**

**City:**

**Amount Requested:**

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

**Experience, 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 should be well described, specifically focused on adult volunteer tutoring and show significant years of experience.</li> <li>• Education should include a B.A. degree and further education in adult literacy.</li> <li>• Administrative capacity should state that the agency's primary purpose is adult volunteer literacy. The administrative functions supporting the adult volunteer literacy project are well described, comprehensive and include significant, detailed financial support.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience is 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 should state that one of the agency's purposes is adult volunteer literacy. The administrative functions supporting the adult volunteer literacy project are adequate and provide limited financial support or financial support outlined in general terms.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience is unclear, incomplete, poorly described or not focused on adult volunteer tutoring and very limited years of experience.</li> <li>• Education does not include a B.A. degree.</li> <li>• Adult volunteer literacy's place is unclear or poorly described. The administrative functions supporting the adult volunteer literacy project are missing, inadequate or lack financial support.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is complete, concise, understandable and compelling.</li> </ul>
	Adequate 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the overview, goals and impact on the low literate adult learner is understandable but lacks important details and is not compelling.</li> </ul>
	Minimal 0-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

**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 percent of total number of learners.</li> <li>• Pre-service adult literacy tutor training hours meet or exceed 15 hours.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention strategies of adult learners are well planned and well described with plans including three or more strategies.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction are 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 and tester responsibility.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention strategies of volunteer tutors are 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 to 49 percent) 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 percent) of total number of learners.</li> <li>• Pre-service adult literacy tutor training hours ranges between 12 to 14.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention strategies of adult learners are understandable but lack important details with less than three strategies described.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction are understandable but lack 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 and tester responsibility.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention strategies of volunteer tutors are understandable but lack 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 percent).</li> <li>• Pre-service adult literacy tutor training hours are less than 12.</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention strategies of adult learners are poorly planned and described.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction are 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 strategies of volunteer tutors are poorly planned and described.</li> </ul>

**Comments:**

**Target Audience and Need**

**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 <u>local</u> 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: \_\_\_\_\_

Outcomes of the proposed literacy services will address the needs of the target population.

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>• Four or five 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>• Outcomes are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and will take place within the time period of the grant.</li> <li>• Appropriate methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are appropriate to measure the outcome.</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>• Two or three appropriate and meaningful adult literacy tutoring outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Outcomes may lack specific details, may not be easily measured, achieved or relevant and may need more time to accomplish than is possible in the time frame of the grant.</li> <li>• Limited methods, strategies and activities are described that will lead to the achievement of the outcome.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are adequate, but may not measure the outcome well.</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 are listed are inappropriate, poorly described and may not include an outcome concerning the adult learner’s proposed educational gain.</li> <li>• Outcomes are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable or not relevant.</li> <li>• Inappropriate methods, strategies and activities are described.</li> <li>• Evaluation tools are inappropriate, poorly described or not measurable.</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 — 15: Section Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_**Analysis of whether the budget is reasonable in view of goals and adequate to support the project.**

Excellent 11-15	<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> </ul>
Adequate 6-10	<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> </ul>
Minimal 0-5	<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> </ul>

**Comments:****Page 5 — AVL****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 are poor or inappropriate.</li> </ul>

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