

General Adult Education Grant Application Rubric

Applicant Information

Applicant Name: _____

Applicant Scoring Summary

Grant/Funding Stream	Applicant Points Received	Total Points Available	Applicant Score <i>(Pts Received/Pts Available)</i>
General Adult Education (231)		32	

General Adult Education Rubric

PROGRAM OVERVIEW (Considerations 1 and 4)			
Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant will serve a population of individuals eligible to receive AEFLA services. • The applicant’s proposed activities directly align with the student population’s needs and are highly likely to lead to improved education, career, and other outcomes. • The applicant’s program will address an identified, but unfilled need, in their region and their approach strongly aligns with their LWDB’s local plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant will serve a population of individuals eligible to receive AEFLA services. • The applicant’s proposed activities align with the student population’s needs and are likely to lead to improved education, career, and other outcomes. • The applicant’s program will address an identified need in their region and their approach aligns with their LWDB’s local plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant will serve a population of individuals eligible to receive AEFLA services. • The applicant’s proposed activities somewhat align with the student population’s needs and are somewhat likely to lead to improved education, career, and other outcomes. • The applicant’s program will somewhat address a need in their region and their approach somewhat aligns with their LWDB’s local plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant indicates it will serve individuals that are not eligible to receive AEFLA services. • The applicant’s proposed activities do not align with the student population’s needs and are unlikely to lead to improved education, career, and other outcomes. • The applicant’s program will not address a need in their region and their approach does not or barely aligns with their LWDB’s local plan.

STAFFING
(Consideration 9)

Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates it will staff its program with well-trained, highly-qualified staff and volunteers that meet or exceed the state’s minimum qualifications and will fulfill all of the essential duties outlined in the grant guidelines. The applicant supports its staffing structure with a strong, logical rationale. The applicant has a well-articulated, strategic plan to hire highly-qualified staff and volunteers, maximize each staff member and volunteer’s skills and strengths, and retain highly-effective staff and volunteers. The applicant has a well-articulated, strategic plan to provide staff and volunteers with high-quality, relevant, and meaningful professional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates it will staff its program with well-trained, qualified staff and volunteers that meet the state’s minimum qualifications and will fulfill all of the essential duties outlined in the grant guidelines. The applicant supports its staffing structure with a logical rationale. The applicant has a plan to hire highly-qualified staff and volunteers, maximize each staff member and volunteer’s skills and strengths, and retain highly-effective staff and volunteers. The program has a plan to provide staff and volunteers with mostly high-quality, relevant, and meaningful professional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates it will staff its program with staff and volunteers that meet the state’s minimum qualifications and will fulfill most of the essential duties outlined in the grant guidelines. The applicant supports its staffing structure with a somewhat logical rationale. The applicant has a plan to hire and retain the staff and volunteers needed to run the program, but does not demonstrate it has a plan to maximize each staff member or volunteer’s skills or strengths and/or retain highly-effective staff and volunteers. The program has a plan to provide staff and volunteers with professional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates it will staff its program with unqualified staff and volunteers that do not meet the state’s minimum qualifications and will not or will barely fulfill the essential duties outlined in the grant guidelines. The applicant supports its staffing structure with a weak rationale. The program does not have a plan or has a weak plan to hire staff and volunteers, maximize each staff member or volunteer’s skills or strengths and/or retain highly-effective staff and volunteers. The program has a weak plan or does not have a plan to provide staff and volunteers with professional development.

THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE
(Consideration 11, GEPA Section 427)

Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s student recruitment plan demonstrates the program will effectively recruit individuals from the program’s entire target population and was developed using feedback or data from current and/or potential students. • The applicant describes an intake and orientation process that is efficient, welcoming, positive, appropriately customized to meet student needs, and meets all federal and state requirements, including collecting accurate intake data and administering the appropriate NRS-approved assessment(s). • The applicant will coordinate with appropriate federal, state, and local organizations and provide flexible schedules to meet all of its students’ needs. • The applicant identifies barriers its students may face in accessing the program and has a plan that will address all of those barriers. All of the listed barriers are specific and applicable to its student population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s student recruitment plan demonstrates the program will effectively recruit individuals from most of the program’s target population and was developed using feedback or data from current and/or potential students. • The applicant describes an intake and orientation process that is efficient and welcoming and meets all federal and state requirements, including collecting accurate intake data and administering the appropriate NRS-approved assessment(s). • The applicant will coordinate with appropriate federal, state, and local organizations and provide flexible schedules to meet most of its students’ needs. • The applicant identifies barriers its students may face in accessing its program and has a plan to ensure it addresses most of those barriers. Almost all of the listed barriers are specific and applicable to the its student population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s student recruitment plan demonstrates that it will effectively recruit individuals from most or some of the program’s target population, but was developed based on assumptions about how to reach those potential students. • The applicant describes an intake and orientation process that meets all federal and state requirements, including collecting accurate intake data and administering the appropriate NRS-approved assessment(s), but the process is not customized to meet student needs. • The applicant will coordinate with federal, state, and local organizations and provide flexible schedules to meet some of its students’ needs. • The applicant identifies barriers its students may face in accessing the program and has a plan to address some of those barriers. Only some of the listed barriers are specific and applicable to its student population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s student recruitment plan does not demonstrate that it will effectively recruit individuals from the program’s target population and was developed based on assumptions about how to reach those potential students. • The applicant describes an intake and orientation process that does not meet all federal and state requirements, including collecting accurate intake data and administering the appropriate NRS-approved assessment(s) and does not appear to be efficient, welcoming, and positive. • The applicant will not coordinate with federal, state, or local organizations or offer flexible schedules to meet its students’ needs; OR the organizations the applicant will coordinate with do not appear that they will meet students’ needs. • The applicant identifies barriers its students may face in accessing the program, but not does not have a plan to address those barriers; OR the applicant does not identify any barriers; OR none of the listed barriers are specific and applicable to its student population.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
(Considerations 5, 6, 7, 8 & 10)

Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant’s course plan indicates: (a) students will have a minimum of six instructional hours per week; and (b) all students will have easy access (both geographically and based on when classes are offered) to the classes they need. All of the applicant’s instructional methods are supported with a strong research base. The applicant indicates it will strategically incorporate the essential components of reading instruction, and strongly align its lessons to the College & Career Readiness Standards (CCR and/or the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELP). The applicant demonstrates it will strategically leverage technology to improve the quality of instruction and will strategically utilize distance learning, if applicable, to provide quality learning experiences for students. The applicant indicates it will offer an IET, in coordination with strategic partners, that successfully prepares students for a regionally in-demand industry that its students are interested in. The applicant’s IET strategically integrates workforce training, workforce preparation activities, and adult education and will offer those components concurrently. The program has a highly-qualified instructional lead with clear roles and responsibilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant’s course plan indicates: (a) students will have a minimum of six instructional hours per week; and (b) most students will have easy access (both geographically and based on when classes are offered) to the classes they need. Almost all of the program’s instructional methods are supported with a research base. The applicant indicates it will incorporate the essential components of reading instruction, and align its lessons to the CCR and/or ELP. The applicant demonstrates it will leverage technology to improve the quality of instruction and will utilize distance learning, if applicable, to provide learning experiences for students. The applicant indicates it will offer an IET, in coordination with partners, that prepares students for a regionally in-demand industry. The applicant’s IET integrates workforce training, workforce preparation activities, and adult education and will offer those components concurrently. The program has a qualified instructional lead with mostly clear roles and responsibilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant’s course plan indicates: (a) students will have a minimum of six instructional hours per week; and (b) some students will have easy access (both geographically and based on when classes are offered) to the classes they need, but others may have difficulty accessing classes. Only some of the program’s instructional methods are supported with a strong research base. The applicant indicates it will incorporate the essential components of reading and that it will use the CCR and/or ELP as a reference. The applicant will integrate technology, but mostly as a replacement for traditional learning methods, and will utilize distance learning, if applicable. The applicant indicates it will offer an IET, in coordination with partners, that prepares students for an in-demand industry. The applicant’s IET offers workforce training, workforce preparation activities, and adult education, but they are not well integrated. The program has an instructional lead with somewhat clear roles and responsibilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant’s course plan indicates: (a) students will not have a minimum of six instructional hours per week; and (b) no or only a few students will have easy access (both geographically and based on when classes are offered) to the classes they need. None of the program’s instructional methods are supported with a research base. The applicant does not indicate it will incorporate the essential components of reading or that it will align its lessons to the CCR and/or ELP. The applicant will not or will barely integrate technology and will not utilize distance learning even where it could significantly benefit students. The applicant indicates it will not offer an IET; or its IET will not prepare students for an in-demand industry or its IET will not integrate workforce training, workforce preparation activities, and adult education. The program does not have an instructional lead or the instructional lead is unqualified.

PARTNERSHIPS
(Considerations 4, 10, & 11)

Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program has strategic partnerships – where each partner has clearly-defined roles & responsibilities – that will support a wide variety of student needs. The applicant’s statements of commitment demonstrate how each partner will support students and that each partner fully understands its roles and responsibilities. The applicant indicates it will strategically partner with all LWDBs and one-stop centers within the counties where it will serve students. The applicant fully discusses that it will enter into and fulfill the terms of an MOU(s) with its respective one-stop center(s), including providing a proportionate share of infrastructure costs as well as the other items noted in 34 CFR § 463.420. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program has partnerships – where each partner has roles & responsibilities – that will support a variety of student needs. The applicant’s statements of commitment demonstrate how each partner will support students and that most partners understand their roles and responsibilities. The applicant indicates it will partner with all LWDBs and one-stop centers within the counties where it will serve students. The applicant discusses that it will enter into and fulfill the terms of the MOU(s) with its respective one-stop center(s), including providing a proportionate share of infrastructure costs as well as the other items noted in 34 CFR § 463.420. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program has partnerships that will support some student needs. The applicant’s statements of commitment demonstrate how each partner will support students. The applicant indicates it will work with all LWDBs and one-stop centers where it will serve students, but the main goal of the partnership(s) is to fulfill the grant requirement. The applicant discusses that it will enter into and fulfill the terms of the MOU(s) with its respective one-stop center(s), including providing a proportionate share of infrastructure costs as well as the other items noted in 34 CFR § 463.420. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program does not have partnerships or the program’s partnerships will not or will barely support its student needs. The applicant does not have statements of commitment OR the statements of commitment do not demonstrate how each partner will support students or that the partner understands its roles and responsibilities. The applicant indicates that it will not partner with the LWDBs and one-stop centers within the counties where it will serve students.

PAST EFFECTIVENESS
(Considerations 2 & 3)

Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data the applicant uploaded are valid, reliable, and measure student growth. The students included in the data represent the program’s target population and are eligible to receive WIOA services; AND the applicant exceeds at least one of the below thresholds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The percentage of students: ○ Demonstrating growth exceeds 60% in each of the areas (levels and/or content domain) the applicant reported data. ○ The percentage of students employed exceeds 35%. ○ The percentage of students attaining a HSE exceeds 20%. ○ The percentage of students transitioning to postsecondary education and training exceeds 5%. • The applicant provides qualitative and quantitative data, supported with specific examples, that it has the ability to serve individuals with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data the applicant uploaded are valid, reliable, and measure student growth. The students included in the data represent the program’s target population and are eligible to receive WIOA services; AND the applicant exceeds at least one of the below thresholds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The percentage of students: ○ Demonstrating growth exceeds 55% in each of the areas (levels and/or content domains) the applicant reported data. ○ The percentage of students employed exceeds 30%. ○ The percentage of students attaining a HSE exceeds 15%. ○ The percentage of students transitioning to postsecondary education and training exceeds 3%. • The applicant provides qualitative or quantitative data, supported with examples, that it has the ability to serve individuals with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data the applicant uploaded measure student growth, but are not particularly valid or reliable or the data do not measure student growth. The students included in the data represent the target population and are mostly eligible to receive WIOA services OR the applicant exceeds at least one of the below thresholds. The percentage of students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demonstrating growth exceeds 50% in each of the areas (levels and/or content domains) the applicant reported data. ○ The percentage of students employed exceeds 25%. ○ The percentage of students attaining a HSE exceeds 10%. ○ The percentage of students transitioning to postsecondary education and training exceeds 1%. • The applicant provides anecdotal evidence or examples that it has the ability to serve individuals with disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data the applicant uploaded are invalid or unreliable and/or the students included in the target population are mostly ineligible to receive WIOA services OR the applicant does not exceed at least one of the thresholds listed in the excellent, good, and average columns of the rubric. • The applicant does not provide qualitative or quantitative data or examples that it has the ability to serve individuals with disabilities.

DATA, OUTCOMES & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT			
Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has a strong plan to collect valid data for all of the WIOA performance indicators listed in Section 116. The plan includes ensuring all staff are appropriately trained and conducting monthly data audits. The applicant will regularly collect, using both formal and informal methods, meaningful feedback from students, instructors, staff, and partner organizations. The applicant has a team of people who will regularly analyze qualitative and quantitative data (from GALIS and other sources) and use those data to inform purposeful and innovative (where applicable) program improvements. The applicant demonstrates it has a realistic and nuanced plan to ensure its program works towards meeting or exceeding the state-adjusted performance targets. The plan takes into account the applicant's current performance, including areas where the program might need to improve and areas where the applicant can continue to utilize or expand its current strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has a plan to collect valid data for all of the WIOA performance indicators listed in Section 116. The program will conduct regular, at least quarterly data audits. The applicant will collect, using both formal and informal methods, feedback from students, instructors, staff, and partner organizations. The applicant will regularly analyze qualitative and quantitative data (from GALIS and other sources) and use those data to inform program improvements. The applicant demonstrates it has a realistic plan to ensure its program meets the state-adjusted performance targets. The plan takes into account the applicant's current performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has a plan to collect valid data for most of the WIOA performance indicators in Section 116. The program may conduct data audits on an as-needed basis. The applicant will collect some feedback from students, instructors, staff, and partner organizations, but will mostly rely on their own observations or assumptions. The applicant will regularly look at GALIS data to inform basic program improvements. The applicant demonstrates it has a plan to ensure its program meets the state-adjusted performance targets for some areas. The plan is not based or only loosely based on the applicant's current performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant does not have a plan to collect valid data for the WIOA performance indicators and will not conduct data audits. The applicant will not collect feedback from students, instructors, staff, and partner organizations and will rely entirely on their own assumptions. The applicant will not use data to inform program improvements. The applicant does not have a plan that will help ensure it meets the state-adjusted performance targets.

BUDGET			
Excellent (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Average (2 points)	Poor (1 point)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the items in the applicant's budget are allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary to operate the program. The program's budget is specific and strongly aligns with the activities and plans described in the applicant's grant application. • The applicant has not exceeded the administrative cost limit, or they have provided a strong and logical rationale for why they need a rate that is higher than 5%. • The applicant clearly describes any major changes that may impact their budget throughout the course of the grant. The changes described are logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the items in the applicant's budget are allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary to operate the program, but a few items may need revision. The program's budget is specific and aligns with the activities and plans described in the applicant's grant application. • The applicant has not exceeded the administrative cost limit, or they have provided a strong rationale for why they need a rate that is higher than 5%. • The applicant describes any major changes that may impact their budget throughout the course of the grant. The changes described are logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the items in the applicant's budget are allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary to operate the program, but many items are not. The program's budget is somewhat vague and only somewhat aligns with the activities described in the applicant's grant application. • The applicant has not exceeded the administrative cost limit, or they have provided a rationale for why they need a rate that is higher than 5%. • The applicant somewhat describes any major changes that may impact their budget throughout the course of the grant. Most of the changes described are logical, but some may not be. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority or none of the items in the applicant's budget are allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary to operate the program. The program's budget is extremely vague and barely or does not align with the activities described in the applicant's grant application. • The applicant has exceeded the administrative cost limit and does not provide a rationale for why they need a rate that is higher than 5%. • The applicant barely or does not describe any major changes that may impact their budget throughout the course of the grant and/or the changes described are illogical.