



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

**Workplace Skills Enhancement 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 workplace literacy programming including at least a B.A. Degree and the administrative capacity to support the project.**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Excellent<br>8-10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience is well described, specifically focused on workplace education and shows significant years of experience.</li> <li>• Education includes a B.A. degree and further education.</li> <li>• The agency is focused on workplace literacy. The administrative functions supporting the workplace literacy project are well described, comprehensive and include significant, detailed financial support.</li> </ul> |
| Adequate<br>4-7   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience is understandable but lacks important details, is appropriate to workplace education and shows some years of experience.</li> <li>• Education includes a B.A. degree.</li> <li>• The administrative functions supporting the workplace literacy project are adequate and provide limited financial support or financial support outlined in general terms.</li> </ul>   |
| Minimal<br>0-3    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience is unclear, incomplete, poorly described or not focused on workplace education and very limited years of experience.</li> <li>• Education does not include a B.A. degree.</li> <li>• The administrative functions supporting the workplace 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<br>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<br>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<br>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 workplace literacy.</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<br/>16-20</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners in relation to the dollar amount requested is excellent.</li> <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>• Assessment of adult learners is well planned and well described.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction are easily understood and includes specific information.</li> <li>• Plans to evaluate and report learning gains are well thought out, include appropriate tests, testing intervals and tester responsibility.</li> </ul> |
|  | <p>Adequate<br/>8-15</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners in relation to the dollar amount requested is adequate.</li> <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>• Assessment of adult learners is understandable but lacks important details.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction are understandable but lacks important details.</li> <li>• Plans to evaluate and report learning gains are understandable, but lack important details.</li> </ul>  |
|  | <p>Minimal<br/>0-7</p>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed number of adult learners in relation to the dollar amount requested is minimal.</li> <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>• Assessment of adult learners is poorly planned and described, lacks appropriate strategies.</li> <li>• Design and methodology of ABE/ESL instruction are unclear, incomplete or poorly described.</li> <li>• Plans to evaluate and report learning gains are unclear, incomplete or poorly 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<br>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<br>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<br>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:**

**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," then the correct score will be zero for this section.**

|  |                  |  |
|--|------------------|--|
|  | Excellent<br>4-5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program includes all required details, shows significant progress in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul> |
|  | Adequate<br>2-3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program may lack some details, shows moderate progress in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</li> </ul>            |
|  | Minimal<br>0-1   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of current grant program is unclear, incomplete or lacks progress in student achievement, programmatic outcomes and program impact.</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<br>4-5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent amount of instructional hours and planning is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>    |
|  | Adequate<br>2-3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited amount of instructional hours and planning is allocated to the project in relation to the outcomes proposed.</li> </ul>      |
|  | Minimal<br>0-1   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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: \_\_\_\_\_**

**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<br>16-20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four or five well described, appropriate and meaningful adult instructional outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the employee’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<br>8-15   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two or three appropriate and meaningful adult instructional outcomes are listed including at least one concerning the employee’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<br>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>• Outcomes are inappropriate, poorly described, not measurable, not achievable and 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 or unrelated 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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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 are poor or inappropriate.</li> </ul>  |

**Comments:**

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

**Comments:**