



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

Penny Severns Family 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 family literacy programming including at least a B.A. degree and the administrative capacity to support the project.

Excellent 8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience is well described, specifically focused on family literacy and shows significant years of experience. • Education includes a B.A. degree and further education in family literacy. • The agency’s primary purpose is literacy. The administrative functions supporting the family literacy project are well described, comprehensive and include significant, detailed financial support. • Specific services provided to this project are focused on family literacy, the target population and are comprehensive.
Adequate 4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience is understandable but lacks important details, is appropriate to family literacy and shows some years of experience. • Education includes a B.A. degree. • One of the agency’s purposes is literacy. The administrative functions supporting the family literacy project are adequate; provide limited financial support or financial support outlined in general terms. • Specific services provided to this project are adequately focused on family literacy but may lack important details.
Minimal 0-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience is unclear, incomplete, poorly described or not focused on literacy and very limited years of experience. • Education does not include a B.A. degree. • Family literacy’s place is unclear or poorly described. The administrative functions supporting the family literacy project are missing, inadequate or lack financial support. • Specific services provided to this project are inappropriate or poorly described.

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

Comments:

Target Audience and Need

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

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," then the correct score is zero for this section.

	Excellent 4-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of current grant program includes all required details, statistically shows significant progress in number of adults and children served, hours of service provided in each of the five instructional components, student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.
	Adequate 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of current grant program may lack some details, yet statistically shows moderate progress in number of adults and children served, hours of service provided in each of the five instructional components student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.
	Minimal 0-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of current grant program is unclear, incomplete or does not demonstrate progress in number of adults and children served, hours of service provided in each of the five instructional components student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.

Comments:

Project Schedule

Maximum Point Value – 5: Section Total Score: _____

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

Library Services

	Excellent 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 or more hours of library services are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.
	Adequate 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29 or less hours of library services are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.

Adult Education

	Excellent 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 or more hours of adult education are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.
	Adequate 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 99 or less hours of adult education are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.

Children’s Education

	Excellent 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 or more hours of children’s education are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.
	Adequate 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49 or less hours of children’s education are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.

Parenting Education

	Excellent 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 or more hours of parenting education are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.
	Adequate 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29 or less hours of parenting education are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.

Parent and Child Together Activities (PACT)

	Excellent 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36 or more hours of PACT are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.
	Adequate 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 35 or less hours of PACT are scheduled to achieve the outcomes proposed.

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.

Library Services

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

Comments:

Adult Literacy Services

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

Comments:

Children’s Education Services

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

Comments:

Parenting Education Services

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

Comments:

Parent and Child Together Activities (PACT)

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

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

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

Comments:

Total Application Score (100 possible): _____

Comments: