

ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY, ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY DIPLOMA PROGRAMS (WIOA SEC. 231) AND CORRECTIONS, PRISON/INSTITUTIONALIZED ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY (WIOA SEC. 225) GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW CRITERIA AND SCORING RUBRIC FOR THE GRANT REVIEW PANEL

Use the following rubric when evaluating each application. In order for an eligible applicant to be considered for this grant award, a minimum score of 70 percent of points available must be attained. (The foundation of the scoring rubric is based upon the competitive grant requirements as outlined in the *Iowa Adult Education and Literacy, English as a Second Language and High School Equivalency Diploma Programs (WIOA Sec. 231) and Corrections, Prison/Institutionalized Adult Education and Literacy (WIOA Sec. 225) Grant Application Review Criteria and Scoring Rubric for the Competitive Grant Application Package.*)

Is the applicant an eligible provider:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Did the applicant clearly indicate the grant applying for:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Did the applicant request appropriate funds for county(s) proposed to be served:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is a completed signature page uploaded:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

II. LEARNER PROGRESS (50 points)

Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.) 0-5	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.) 6-8	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.) 9-10	Comments
How well does the applicant detail how learner progress will be monitored and services will be provided in a manner that meets the needs of eligible individuals?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

How well does the applicant detail how instruction will be based on the results of the learners' diagnostic and formative assessment for an individual learner?				
Does the applicant describe how their program will capture feedback on eligible individual and enrolled participant satisfaction? Do they describe how the feedback will be used for continuous improvement?				
Does the applicant describe their current and future innovative approaches for serving eligible individuals with barriers to employment including those individuals with learning disabilities?				
Does the applicant detail their current and future innovative approaches for serving eligible individuals with low levels of literacy?				
Does the applicant detail their current and future innovative approaches for serving eligible individuals with limited English proficiency?				
III. CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (150 points)				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.)	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.)	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.)	Comments
	0-5	6-8	9-10	
How well does the program design offer sufficient intensity and quality, and is it based on the most rigorous research available so that participants achieve substantial learning gains?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

How well does the applicant detail the essential components of reading instruction?				
How well does the applicant describe how they plan to use curriculum aligned with College and Career Readiness Standards and the 21 st century skills and employability skills?				
Does the applicant’s program design offer flexible schedules and coordinate with other support services?				
How well did the applicant describe how lesson plans are developed, aligned and administered with the instructional standards, while accounting for the diverse needs of enrolled participants?				
How well does the applicant describe sufficient sites and schedule of services to address the targeted enrollment while accounting for sufficient intensity and duration of instruction?				
How well does the applicant describe the qualifications of the adult education staff, including instructors, counselors, and administrators, to ensure that they meet minimum qualifications established by the state?				
How well does the applicant describe access and dissemination of high-quality professional development as described in a three-year professional development plan based on the most rigorous and scientifically valid research available?				
How well does the applicant describe plans to implement the state’s professional development management system, My Learning Plan? How well does the applicant describe its plans to link individual and professional goals to professional development?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

How well does the applicant describe how professional development is being implemented in the classroom? Does the applicant include frequency of observations, peer mentoring and/or critical friends groups in its description?				
Does the applicant describe how it will monitor professional development for quality and compliance?				
How well did the program describe its policies or procedures for professional development travel, preparation/planning time, and compensation for preparation/planning time?				
Did the program upload a resume for each of their full-time positions?				
How well does the applicant's proposed staffing reflect the scale of delivering the services and support the intensity and quality of program instruction?				
<i>IV. PROGRAM DESIGN AND LEADERSHIP (100 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.)	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.)	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.)	Comments
	0-5	6-8	9-10	
How well did the applicant describe its experience with managed enrollment and expectations for students' participation and attendance? Will a majority of the classes be offered as managed enrollment?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

Does the applicant describe how their program effectively utilizes technology, services, and delivery systems including distance education in a manner sufficient to increase the effect and quality of learning?				
Does the applicant describe their future plans to increase access to, and integration of, technology to improve student performance?				
<p>How well does the application describe their activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the activities identified? • Has the applicant demonstrated a need for these activities? • Does the applicant have and describe previous experience in the adult education and literacy activity? • Has the applicant detailed how they plan to identify and recruit participants? • Are the activities aligned to regional needs of learners as identified in the local workforce development board plan in order to serve eligible individuals? • Are the curricula and instructional practices for each activity reflective of a single set of learning objectives? 				
Is the enrollment target for eligible individuals and enrolled participants based on previous experience and reflective of regional needs as identified by the Workforce Development Board or ACS data?				
Did the applicant’s vision provide sufficient details for Adult Education and Literacy services in their area?				
Did the applicant sufficiently describe its policy on evaluating the effectiveness of its program?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

V. ACCOUNTABILITY (100 points)				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.) 0-5	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.) 6-8	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.) 9-10	Comments
Does the applicant reflect capacity to manage a federal grant and facilitate the delivery of an effective adult education and literacy program?				
How well does the applicant provide information and supportive quantitative data in Table 1 or 2 that clearly demonstrates the program’s past service and effectiveness in serving ABE and ESL participants?				
How well has the applicant described its program’s past effectiveness in improving the literacy of eligible individuals, especially with respect to eligible individuals who have low levels of literacy?				
How well does the applicant describe strategies to meet state-adjusted performance benchmarks?				
How well does the applicant’s previous experiences, past successes and unique qualifications serve the eligible adults with references to the specific population being proposed for services?				
How well does the applicant’s management information system, including data collection, data entry, data management, and data privacy meet the needs of the proposed services?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

How well are the applicant's staff assigned clear responsibilities for data collection, data entry, attestation, and correcting errors and resolving issues?				
How well does the applicant describe how data will be used to improve performance as well as to increase recruitment and retention efforts?				
<i>VI. COMMUNITY INTERACTION AND OUTREACH (50 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.) 0-5	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.) 6-8	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.) 9-10	Comments
How well does the applicant describe the degree to which the organization will be responsive to the regional needs of English language learners, unemployed, on public assistance or below the poverty level, or lacking a high school diploma or equivalent?				
How well does the applicant describe recruitment and retention of eligible participants?				
How well does the applicant describe robust linkages to other services and providers within the proposed service area?				
How well does the applicant describe coordination with support services to reduce barriers for adults, including individuals with disabilities or other special needs, to access				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

educational services and to support their academic advancement and transition to postsecondary courses or career training?				
How well does the applicant describe coordination with local businesses and industry?				
How well does the applicant describe new innovations that are being planned to strengthen collaborations in the region in the next three years?				
How well does the applicant describe current and future intended strategies for providing career pathway activities?				
<i>VII. ONE-STOP INTEGRATION (50 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.)	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.)	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.)	Comments
	0-5	6-8	9-10	
How well does the applicant describe access through the one-stop delivery system to adult education and literacy activities?				
How well does the applicant describe its plans to use a portion of the funds made available to maintain the one-stop delivery system in accordance with the methods agreed upon by the local board and described in the memorandum of understanding?				
Does the applicant have a current local memorandum of understanding with the local workforce development board relating to the				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

operations of the one-stop system OR if not, has the applicant described its willingness to comply with this requirement?				
How well does the applicant describe its participation (or willing to participate) in the operation of the one-stop system consistent with the terms of the memorandum of understanding and the requirements of the WIOA?				
How well does the applicant describe its representation (or willingness to serve) on the local workforce development board?				
<i>XI. AEFLA BUDGET SUMMARY (20 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.)	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.)	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.)	Comments
	0-5	6-8	9-10	
How well does the applicant describe how the 2017-2018 AEFLA funds will be spent consistent with the requirements of Title II of AEFLA and with the goals and objectives outlined in the Program Design? (Please refer to the AEFLA Budget Summary in Section XI to score this question).				
Did the applicant provide a thorough AEFLA budget narrative, including a complete description of itemized expenses, by object code? (Please refer to the AEFLA Budget Details in Section XI to score this question).				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

<i>OVERALL FORMAT AND ABILITY TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS (10 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.) 0-5	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.) 6-8	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.) 9-10	Comments
Overall, how well did the applicant follow instructions (i.e., provide complete contact information, upload signature page, upload assurance page, etc.) and write in a clear and concise manner?				
LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD ALIGNMENT REVIEW (20 points)				
TOTAL AEFLA SCORE (550 points)				

VIII. INTEGRATED EDUCATION AND TRAINING (OPTIONAL) (400 points)				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.) 0-5	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.) 6-8	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.) 9-10	Comments
How well does the applicant describe what specific adult education and literacy activities will be included in the proposed integrated education and training? Has the applicant described how their program will provide these activities?				
How well does the applicant describe what specific workforce preparation activities will be included in the proposed integrated education and training?				
How well does the applicant explain which workforce training activities will be included in the proposed integrated education and training? How well does the applicant detail the IET Certification programs that will be offered as part of this project?				
How well does the applicant describe how occupationally relevant materials will be used in the proposed integrated education and training? (Proposals should include at least three (3) examples of providing this type of work and document the working knowledge and experience				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

in the industry that qualifies the applicant to apply for the IET incentive funds).				
How well does the applicant describe how the three required components of integrated education and training will occur simultaneously with academic instruction in literacy and English language acquisition and instruction on the rights and responsibilities of U.S. citizenship and civic participation?				
How well does the applicant describe what specific occupation or occupational sector the integrated education and training will cover?				
How well does the applicant describe the intensity and quality of the adult education and literacy activities component of the organization's proposed integrated education and training class(es)?				
Does the program plan to offer the proposed integrated education and training in partnership with another organization?				
How well does the applicant describe the staffing plan for implementing integration education and training? Did the applicant include an organizational chart for this project? Did their plan indicate the roles/titles, associated bio's/resumes of the assigned staff? Did their proposal include identified functions that may or will be subcontracted? If a subcontractor has been identified, did the proposal include role/title, associated bio/resume and how subcontractors fit into the organizational chart for this project?				
Did the applicant provide a proposed number of eligible participants to be served with the incentive IET funds?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

Did the applicant describe how the organization plans to achieve its targeted enrollment goals for IET participants as well as the outcome achievements?				
How well did the applicant detail the specific sites, regions and locations of the IET incentive funded activities?				
How well did the applicant explain this partnership? How well did the applicant describe their ability and experience with working with a full array of partners in a collaborative manner?				
<i>XI. IET BUDGET SUMMARY (20 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.)	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.)	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.)	Comments
	0-5	6-8	9-10	
How well does the applicant describe how the 2017-2018 IET funds will be spent consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the Program Design? (Please refer to the IET Budget Summary in Section XI to score this question).				
Did the applicant provide a thorough IET budget narrative, including a complete description of itemized expenses, by object code? (Please refer to the IET Budget Detail in Section XI to score this question).				
TOTAL IET SCORE (420 points)				

<i>IX. CORRECTIONS EDUCATION (OPTIONAL) (100 points)</i>				
Criteria Description	Minimal (information provided is absent or unclear and or incomplete; details are needed to clarify.)	Adequate (Information provided includes limited but clear and appropriate details; documentation is limited.)	Excellent (Description is clear and well written, easily understood and complete; includes appropriate and compelling strategies.)	Comments
	0-5	6-8	9-10	
How well does the applicant describe the degree to which the program will be responsive to the regional corrections education needs as identified in the local workforce development board plan under section 108 of Title I of WIOA in order to serve eligible individuals? Does the applicant provide a needs statement that describes the current adult population needing ABE, ASE, and ELA services in the identified area? (The data and research that is included to support the assertion of need should be no more than five years old.)				
How well does the applicant describe how the planned activities for this three-year grant align with the local workforce development board plan, including how concurrent enrollment will be promoted for incarcerated participants in programs and activities which help progress through identified educational attainment?				
How well does the applicant describe how its program will provide services for 2017-2018 in a manner that meets the needs of eligible				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

incarcerated individuals? (Priority should have been given to serving those who are likely to leave the correctional institution within five years of participation in the program).				
How well does the program describe the partnerships that currently exists that effectively meets the needs of the region? Does the applicant propose to add any new partnerships to strengthen collaborations in the region in the next three years?				
How well does the applicant describe how it program effectively uses technology in a manner sufficient to increase the effect and quality of learning?				
How well does the applicant describe the qualifications of their C&I adult education staff, including instructors, counselors, and administrators, to ensure that they meet minimum qualifications established by the state, and who have access to high-quality professional development?				
How well does the applicant describe how data will be collected and reported to reduce the rate of recidivism for students served?				
<i>XI. CORRECTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES BUDGET SUMMARY (OPTIONAL) (20 points)</i>				
How well does the applicant describe how the 2017-2018 Corrections funds will be spent consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the Program Design? (Please refer to the Corrections and Institutional Services Budget Summary in Section XI to score this question).				
Did the applicant provide a thorough Corrections budget narrative, including a complete description of itemized expenses, by object code?				

Grant Application Review Rubric for WIOA Sec. 231 & Sec. 225

(Please refer to the Corrections and Institutional Services Budget Details in Section XI to score this question).				
TOTAL CORRECTIONS SCORE <i>(120 points)</i>				