Texas State Library and Archives Commission

TexTreasures Grant Program Guidelines

State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2015

Application Due Date:

Friday, March 7, 2014

TexShare

Library Development & Networking Division
January 2014

Table of Contents

Program Description ***3***

Criteria for Award ***5***

Instructions for Applying ***8***

Appendix A: Grant Review and Award Process ***10***

Appendix B: Scoring Rubric ***13***

Appendix C: Protest Procedure ***16***

This grant program is administered by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) and funded by the federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) through the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS).

Comments regarding the programs and services of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission can be addressed to:
Director and Librarian
P. O. Box 12927 ◆ Austin, Texas 78711-2927
512-463-5460 ◆ 512-463-5436 fax

Cover: The State Capitol. Postcard, ca. 1888. *Prints & Photographs #1/103-164, Texas State Library and Archives Commission.*

Program Description

Goals and Purposes

The TexTreasures Grant program is administered by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) as a component of the TexShare program. The TexTreasures grant program provides assistance and encouragement to libraries to provide access to their special or unique holdings and to make information about these holdings available to library users across the state. Applicants may propose projects designed to increase accessibility through a wide range of activities such as organizing, cataloging, indexing, or digitizing local materials.

These programs must meet the following LSTA goal as identified in the Texas LSTA 5 Year Plan (https://www.tsl.texas.gov/sites/default/files/public/tslac/ld/pubs/lstaplan/LSTA2013_Final.pdf):

Need

Texans of all ages need access to services and resources to further their formal and informal learning goals.

Goal

Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs.

Eligible Applicants

Libraries that are members of the TexShare Library Consortium, or non-profit organizations that are applying on behalf of TexShare members, are eligible to apply for funds through their governing authority. These funds are awarded to eligible applicants, but may be used with all types of libraries or with non-profit organizations that participate as partners in the grant project.

Successful applicants are eligible to apply for grant funds to support additional work on the project for the two years following the initial grant year. The second and third year applications will be evaluated on the same criteria as new applications. No applicant will be eligible for a fourth year of funding for the same project.

Funds Available

Approximately $200,000 is expected to be available for TexTreasures Grants, subject to approval by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission and the availability of funds.

Maximum Award

The maximum award for SFY 2015 is $20,000 for a single institution and $25,000 for collaborative grant projects. While applicants are encouraged to provide support for the project with matching funds or in-kind resources, matching funds are not required for TexTreasures grants.

Length of Funding

Funding will be for one state fiscal year (September 1, 2014–August 31, 2015). Successful applicants are eligible to apply for grant funds to support additional work on the project for up to two additional years following the initial grant year.

Eligible Activities

The focus of TexTreasures Grants is to support activities that make unique collections accessible. These activities include cataloging, indexing, and digitizing significant materials. TexTreasures grants may fund costs for staff, equipment**, capital expenditures, supplies, professional services, and other typical operating expenses, as permitted by 13 TAC 2.116 (relating to Uniform Grants Management Standards). TexTreasures Grant funds may not be used for collection development or activities primarily focused on the acquisition or conservation of library materials or resources.

***Equipment costing $5,000 or more per unit will require approval from IMLS before purchase.*

Ineligible Activities

Except as provided in grant guidelines, competitive grants may NOT fund the following costs:

a. Building construction or renovation
b. Food, beverages, or food delivery equipment or services
c. Awards, honoraria, prizes, or gifts
d. Equipment or technology not specifically needed to carry out the goals of the grant
e. Transportation/travel for project participants or non-grant funded personnel
f. Databases currently offered or similar to ones offered by the agency (i.e., a magazine index database may not be purchased if a comparable one is provided by the agency)
g. Collection development purchases not targeted directly to the grant goals nor integral to the service program
h. Advertising or public relations costs not directly related to promoting awareness of grant-funded activities
i. Performers or presenters whose purpose is to entertain rather than to educate.
j. Indirect costs, overhead or Finance & Administration (F&A) costs

Criteria for Award

This grant program is competitive. The Texas Collections Working Group will score proposals on the five criteria listed below. The maximum number of points for each criterion is listed. **See Appendix B for the detailed scoring rubric that will be used by the Working Group.**

All collaborative projects must clearly state what organizations are involved and what role each plays in carrying out the project responsibilities. Collaborative projects may include cooperation among libraries, agencies, or other non-profit organizations. While a proposal of any size may involve partnerships, grants of over $20,000 *require* partnerships. It is expected that all parties in a collaborative partnership contribute resources (time, staff, resources, etc.) that go above and beyond their usual operating activities. **Provision of financial support only does not constitute formal cooperation but can be used as evidence of local support for the project.** See Project Design criteria for further information concerning collaborative projects.

1. Significance of the Collection (35 points)

The overall purpose of the TexTreasures grants is to make unique and special collections of materials available for use by as many citizens of Texas as possible, no matter where they are located. Proposals should address the following questions:

- Will the materials be useful to persons throughout the state? Demonstrate demand for the materials by providing information on audience demographics, results of user surveys, and/or usage patterns as reflected by library usage statistics. More points will be assigned to collections in fields or topics with a large number of students or researchers.
- Does this project focus on materials about Texas? Justify the significance of the collection in terms of how it relates to historical or cultural trends, geography, natural features, or events in Texas. More points will be awarded for projects that focus on materials about Texas.
- Will the project provide an "advancement of knowledge" rather than cleaning up general cataloging and/or processing backlogs? Projects should be focused on making particularly significant collections available, not aimed at exhaustively cataloging or digitizing a library's collections.
- More points will be assigned for projects that show evidence of thoughtful selection of materials to be made available. Institutions considering digitization may wish to review the NEDCC leaflet "Preservation and Selection for Digitization" at http://www.nedcc.org/free-resources/preservation-leaflets/6.-reformatting/6.6-preservation-and-selection-for-digitization.
- Identify the objects to be made available, and include the criteria used to select the items. When possible, include the number and type of objects to be made available. For example:
    - Digitize 220 hours of audio cassette and VHS tapes
    - Digitize 26,000 newspaper pages
    - Describe and digitize 60 interviews
    - MARC records for 400 musical scores
    - 10 finding aids for manuscript collections, including box and folder level descriptions

2. Project Design (25 points)

Applicants should demonstrate that they have done the necessary planning to carry out the project effectively. Proposals should outline a realistic timeline for the work (preferably broken down by month). Proposals should also include a list of the measurable targets to be achieved at various points in the grant period (for example, number of items digitized, number of metadata records created) and a plan to sustain the access to the collection following the end of the grant period. Projects that make a whole collection, or a logical subset of a collection, available are preferred over those that perform only part of the necessary work.

- Is the project well defined? The applicant should identify all the resources that will be needed to carry out the project (i.e., staff, workspace, hardware, software, processing supplies) and should demonstrate a clear sense of the workflow within the project.

- Will access to the collection be sustainable beyond the grant period? Although institutions are not required to commit matching funds to the project, costs contributed by the institution or by other partners, such as salary for full-time permanent staff who will be involved with the project, can be used as evidence of institutional support and project sustainability. A written plan for maintaining online access to the materials in the future (e.g., through ongoing funding, transfer to strategic partners, and/or deposit in a managed digital archive) is desirable but not required.
- If the project is collaborative, please identify the eligible applicants and provide details of the collaboration between entities. Explain the roles and responsibilities of each partner, along with the contribution of each partner. The partners must submit a letter of support with the application indicating their commitment to the project and outlining their roles and responsibilities. More points will be assigned to projects in which partners substantively share in the work and the results of the project.
- Does the project design reference commonly accepted standards and practices? For all projects, identify the type(s) of descriptive metadata to be created. For digitization projects, also identify the imaging standards to be used.

3. Availability (20 points)

TexTreasures grants are intended to make collections of unique or special collections materials, which generally are available for use only at the holding institution, more widely available in digital or physical form. Proposals should address the following questions:

- How will access to the collection be improved?
  - In terms of funding priorities, projects that make widely available digital surrogates of unique or rare materials that were previously only available to researchers on-site will be scored highest.
  - Projects that make digital surrogates of materials that are available to users through interlibrary loan or other channels or that already exist as copies at multiple locations in the state will receive fewer points than those that digitize unique or rare holdings.
  - Proposals that involve only organizing and arranging, cataloging, or indexing local holdings will receive fewer points than projects that make digital surrogates widely available.
- What specific methods will be used to provide statewide access? Projects that leverage one or more established cooperative or collaborative access systems are preferred, including:
  - OCLC WorldCat http://www.worldcat.org/ (see membership guidelines at http://www.oclc.org/membership.en.html)
  - Discovery Texas (formerly Library of Texas) http://www.libraryoftexas.org (For membership info, contact Judith Hiott, judith.hiott@houstontx.gov.)
  - Portal to Texas History http://texashistory.unt.edu (For membership info, contact Tara Carlisle, tara.carlisle@unt.edu.)
  - Texas Archival Resources Online (TARO) http://www.lib.utexas.edu/taro/index.html (see membership guidelines at http://www.lib.utexas.edu/taro/admin/howdoi/participate.html)
  - Texas Digital Library http://repositories.tdl.org/ (see membership guidelines at http://www.tdl.org/membership)

  At the conclusion of projects that develop digital resources, information on the digital collection must be submitted to the IMLS Digital Collections and Content project. See http://imlsdcc.grainger.illinois.edu/.

  Libraries making information about the collection available through more than one access point will receive more points. If methods other than those listed above will be used to provide access, please specify what interoperability standards or protocols will be adopted (e.g., Z39.50, SRU, or OAI-PMH).
- How will you build awareness of the project in your community and statewide? Identify any methods that will be used to share information about the project or about the collections that you will make available, including special events, press releases, blogs, websites, and so on.

- Are there any legal barriers to making the materials available? All applicants must certify that all applicable activities related to TexTreasures grants will be in compliance with the Copyright Law of the United States (Title 17, U.S. Code). In Section 8 of the application, please describe the process undertaken to ensure copyright compliance and the documentation to support the claim.

  Applicants may wish to refer to Peter Hirtle's chart of "Copyright Term and the Public Domain in the United States" at http://copyright.cornell.edu/resources/publicdomain.cfm to determine the copyright status of material in the collection. For copyrighted materials, applicants should specify for what portion of the collection copyright clearance has already been obtained and the nature of that clearance (copyright held by library, permission granted in writing by copyright holder, materials out-of-copyright due to age, etc.). For those portions for which copyright clearance has not yet been granted, specify what actions are required to obtain clearance or describe the efforts that have or will be made to identify and locate rights holders in the case of "orphan" works. See the SAA "Orphan Works: Statement of Best Practices" (http://www.archivists.org/standards/OWBP-V4.pdf) for more information about best practices for these works.

4. Cost Effectiveness (15 points)

Provide a complete budget for the proposed project and fully justify the budget by describing how budgeted items will contribute to the project. Identify sources for all stated costs and show that costs are reasonable to achieve project objectives. Describe the methodology for the equipment chosen. Include any vendor information and/or vendor websites.

- How appropriate are the chosen hardware, software, staffing, and service providers for the project, given the cost of the project?
- Is the budget realistic?
- Does the project proposal make effective use of the grant funds?
- Does the project proposal leverage local resources? As stated above, even though match is not required, those projects budgeting actual and/or in-kind contributions will have more points assigned. Please include all local funds and in-kind effort (including staff time) on the budget form in the application.

5. Evaluation (5 points)

This section should include a well-defined plan to demonstrate the success of the project. More simply put, what evidence will show that this project resulted in increased or more cost-effective services to Texans? How will this information be gathered? Describe this plan in full.

- How well has the applicant designed and described the methodology to evaluate the project and estimate the level of usage, including measurable results of items organized, cataloged, indexed, or digitized during the course of the grant? Is the evaluation methodology appropriate and effective?
- Has applicant shown that the institution(s) will be able to document the increased use of the materials or more cost-effective delivery that results from increasing their accessibility?
- Applicants may also wish to document which kinds of local materials are most useful to users and, if possible, the importance of the research facilitated by access to the materials, including the results of citation analysis and user surveys.

Because of the nature of digitization projects, TSLAC recognizes that it may not be possible to evaluate a project fully during the period of the grant. Applicants may wish to include a commitment to share evaluation results with TSLAC after the close of the grant period if it will not be possible to document increased use of materials during the contract year.

Instructions for Applying

Project Development and Draft Review

The Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) recommends that applicants discuss their projects with TSLAC staff before developing a proposal. TSLAC consultants are available to help throughout application development and in determining the best grant program for your project. For more information, **contact Erica McCormick at 512-463-5527 or via e-mail at emccormick@tsl.texas.gov**.

TSLAC also strongly encourages applicants to send a draft of the proposal to TSLAC for staff for review. To allow adequate time to review the draft proposal, submit the draft **by Friday, February 14, 2014.**

Grant Management System (GMS) Access

TSLAC uses a Grant Management System or GMS that enables applicants to apply for grants electronically through a web portal. Applications must be submitted in GMS by the due date in order to be eligible for consideration. To submit your application online, you must register in GMS (https://gms.tsl.texas.gov) and obtain a user name and password. Once approved, you will then be able to access and complete the application online. Step-by-step instructions for accessing GMS and applying for TSLAC grants online can be found at: https://gms.tsl.texas.gov/docs/GMSManual.pdf.

Application Components

The grant application consists of the following components:

1. Applicant Information* — To be completed in GMS, but submitted by e-mail, mail, or fax. Once you have completed the form, click the "Printer Friendly" button to print the form. The form must be signed by an individual authorized to enter into contracts with the State of Texas (e.g., president/vice president, executive director, county judge, city manager, etc.).
2. Budget — To be completed in GMS.
3. Narrative — To be completed in GMS.
4. Children's Internet Act Protection Form (CIPA)*— Available for download in GMS, but cannot be submitted in GMS; must be submitted by e-mail, mail, or fax. The form may be signed by the library director.
5. Letters of cooperation or memoranda of understanding/agreement indicating commitment of time, funds, volunteers, or other resources must be submitted from all participating agencies if project is collaborative.

Who can submit the online application?

The online Grant Management System (GMS) requires that the **Grantee Official** or **Legal Entity Official** submit the online application. Please verify that the correct roles have been assigned to the individuals submitting the application. Definitions of these roles are detailed in the GMS Manual.

Deadline and Submission

Completed applications (budget and narrative) must be submitted in GMS **by 11:59 p.m. Central Time, Friday, March 7, 2014.** *Note: Technical support will not be available after 5 p.m.*

The signed Applicant Information and CIPA forms must also be received **by 11:59 p.m. Central Time, Friday, March 7, 2014.** Please send to the attention of **Erica McCormick** via email to emccormick@tsl.texas.gov, fax at 512-936-2306, or mail to Library Development & Networking Division, TSLAC, P. O. Box 12927, Austin, TX 78711, (Street address: 1201 Brazos, Austin, TX 78701).

Is your application complete? (checklist)

	All 3 sections (Applicant Information form, Budget, Project Narrative) have been completed in the Grant Management System (GMS).
	The online application has been formally submitted by pressing the “Submit Application” button in GMS.
	A copy of the Applicant Information form (from GMS) has been printed and signed by a person legally authorized to enter into contracts with the State of Texas.
	The Children’s Internet Act Protection form (CIPA) has been printed and signed.
	The signed Applicant Information form, CIPA form, and any additional materials (i.e., memoranda of understanding/agreement, letters, etc.) have been submitted to the Grants Administrator via email/mail/fax on or before the due date.

Timetable

January 2014	Guidelines released
February 14, 2014	Draft proposals due to TSLAC for review (recommended but not required)
March 7, 2014	Applications due in GMS; signed forms due to TSLAC
April/May 2014	Application packets evaluated by Grant Review Panel
June 2014	Applicants notified of Grant Review Panel recommendations
July/August 2014	Commission meets and approves projects
August 2014	Contracts issued
September 1, 2014	Projects begin
August 31, 2015	Projects end

Appendix A: Grant Review and Award Process

Peer Review (13 TAC §2.113)

(a) The commission may use peer review panels to evaluate applications in competitive grant programs.

(b) The director and librarian may select professionals, citizens, community leaders, and agency and library staff to evaluate grant applications. Peer reviewers must have appropriate training or service on citizen boards in an oversight capacity and may not evaluate grant applications in which there is, or is a possible appearance of, a conflict of interest.

(c) The agency staff will distribute selected applications to reviewers and will provide written instructions or training for peer reviewers. Reviewers must complete any training prior to reviewing applications.

(d) The reviewers score each application according to the review criteria and requirements stated in the grant guidelines.

(e) Each peer review evaluation of an application for competitive grants shall be appropriately documented by the peer reviewer conducting the evaluation. The documentation shall include the scores assigned by the peer reviewer. The peer reviewer may also include comments that may be shared with the applicant.

(f) To be eligible for review, each application must be submitted by the specified deadline with all required components and all necessary authorization signatures.

Funding Decisions (13 TAC §2.114)

(a) The agency staff will submit a recommended priority-ranked list of applicants for possible funding. Final approval of a grant award is solely at the determination of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission.

(b) Applications for grant funding will be evaluated only upon the information provided in the written application.

(c) The agency staff may negotiate with selected applicants to determine the terms of the award. To receive an award, the applicant must accept any additional or special terms and conditions listed in the grant contract and any changes in the grant application.

(d) The agency staff will notify unsuccessful applicants in writing.

Awarding of Grants (13 TAC §2.115)

The commission has the right to reject applications or cancel or modify a grant solicitation at any point before a contract is signed. The award of any grant is subject to the availability of funds.

TSLAC Staff Responsibility (13 TAC §2.117)

The Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) staff will review each application packet for the following:

- Legal eligibility of the institution to participate in this grant program and appropriate authorizing signature
- Conformance to the federal and state regulations pertaining to grants
- Inclusion of unallowable costs
- Errors in arithmetic or cost calculations
- Submission of all required forms
- Compliance with submission procedures and deadlines
- Relevance and appropriateness of the project design and activities to the purpose of the grant program

Agency staff will raise issues and questions regarding the needs, methods, staffing, and costs of the applications. Staff will also raise concerns regarding the relevance and appropriateness of the project design and activities to the purpose of the grant program. Staff comments will be sent to the grant review panel with the applications for consideration by the panel.

Applicants will be sent a copy of the staff comments to give applicants an opportunity to respond in writing. Applicants may not modify the grant proposal in any way; however, applicants' responses to staff will be distributed to the panel.

Applications with significant errors, omissions, or eligibility issues will not be rated. Applications in which the project design and activities are not relevant and appropriate to the purpose of the grant program will be ineligible.

Agency staff will be available to offer technical assistance to reviewers.

Grant Review Panel Responsibility (13 TAC §2.117)

Applications will be scored using the following process:

(1) The peer reviewers will review all complete and eligible grant applications forwarded to them by agency staff and complete a rating form for each. Each reviewer will evaluate the proposal in relation to the specific requirements of the criteria and will assign a value, depending on the points assigned to each criterion.

(2) No reviewer who is associated with an applicant or with an application, or who stands to benefit directly from an application, will evaluate that application. Any reviewer who feels unable to evaluate a particular application fairly may choose not to review that application.

(3) Reviewers will consider and assess the strengths and weaknesses of any proposed project only on the basis of the documents submitted. Considerations of geographical distribution, demographics, type of library, or personality will not influence the assessment of a proposal by the review panel. The panel members must make their own, individual, decisions regarding the applications. The panel may discuss applications. The panel's recommendations will be compiled from the individual assessments, not as the result of a collective decision or vote.

(4) Reviewers may not discuss proposals with any applicant before the proposals are reviewed. Agency staff is available to provide technical assistance to reviewers. Agency staff will conduct all negotiations and communications with the applicants.

(5) Reviewers may recommend setting conditions for funding a given application or group of applications (e.g., adjusting the project budget, revising project objectives, modifying the timetable, amending the evaluation methodology, etc.). The recommendation must include a statement of the reasons for setting such conditions. Reviewers who are ineligible to evaluate a given proposal will not participate in the discussion of funding conditions.

(6) Reviewers will submit their evaluation forms to the agency. In order to be counted, the forms must arrive before the specified due date.

Decision Making Process (13 TAC §2.118)

To be considered eligible for funding by the commission, any application must receive a minimum adjusted mean score of more than 50 percent of the maximum points available. To reduce the impact of scores that are exceedingly high or low, or otherwise outside the range of scores from other reviewers, agency staff will tabulate the panel's work using calculations such as an adjusted mean score.

(1) Applications will be ranked in priority order by score for consideration by the commission.

(2) If insufficient funds remain to fully fund the next application, the staff will negotiate a reduced grant with the next ranked applicant.

(3) If the panel recommends funding an application that, for legal, fiscal, or other reasons, is unacceptable to the staff, a contrary recommendation will be made. The applicant will be informed of this situation prior to presentation to the commission and may negotiate a revision to the application. A positive recommendation to the commission will be contingent upon successfully completing these negotiations prior to the commission meeting.

(4) If the panel is unable to produce a set of recommendations for funding, the agency staff will use the same evaluation procedures to develop recommendations to the commission.

Multiple Applications (13 TAC §2.119)

Applicants for competitive grants may submit more than one grant application for different projects, in different grant programs. Applicants may not submit the same, or nearly the same, application in more than one grant category. Applicants may submit more than one grant application for a grant program if the grant program has specified categories for application and the proposals submitted are not the same, or nearly the same, project.

Appendix B: Scoring Rubric

Project Scoring Total in Five Areas: 100 points		
Relevance and appropriateness of the project design and activities to the goals and purpose of the TexTreasures grant program will be considered in the scoring of all criteria. Members of the Texas Collections Working Group may score each criteria as follows: **0 points:** Project does not meet the goals and purposes of the TexTreasures grant program. **1-3 points:** Project partially meets the goals and purposes of the TexTreasures grant program. **4-5 points:** Project is a clear fit for the goals and purposes of the TexTreasures grant program.		
1. Significance of the Collection (Points: Raw score = 5 max, weight = 7; Final score = 35 max)		
The overall purpose of the grant is to make needed materials available for use by as many citizens of Texas as possible. Applicants describe how the materials will be useful to users throughout the state. They will describe audience demographics and the fields or topics covered. Applicants will justify the significance of the collection for Texas. They must identify the objects to be made available, and include the criteria used to select the items.		
0-1 points	2-3 points	4-5 points
• Applicant provides little or no evidence of statewide significance of the collection. • Audience is not defined. • Collection is not Texas-related. • Applicant does not identify objects to be made available.	• Applicant provides partial/some evidence of statewide significance of the collection. • Audience is defined but demand is limited or not specified. • Collection has some relationship to Texas. • Applicant identifies objects to be made available but does not include criteria used to select the items.	• Applicant provides clear and convincing evidence of statewide significance of the collection. • Audience is defined and wide-spread demand is established. • Collection is clearly Texas-related. • Applicant identifies the objects to be made available and includes the criteria used to select the items. • Provides convincing evidence of thoughtful selection of materials to be made available.
2. Project Design: (Points: Raw score = 5 max, weight = 5; Final score = 25 max)		
Applicants demonstrate that they have done the necessary planning to carry out the project effectively. They identify all the resources needed and demonstrate a clear sense of workflow within the project. The proposal outlines a realistic timeline and measurable results during the grant period and beyond. This may include a written plan for maintaining online access to the materials in the future. Applicant indicates local contributions as evidence of institutional support and project sustainability. If project is collaborative, partners are identified and details of the collaboration are documented. They reference commonly accepted standards and practices in the design of their project.		
0-1 points	2-3 points	4-5 points
• Resources needed for the project are not identified.	• Resources needed for the project are identified.	• Resources needed for the project are identified and a clear sense of workflow is demonstrated.

• Timeline is missing or incomplete (i.e., does not include a list of actions with specific target dates for completion). • There is no evidence of future support and/or sustainability of the project. • No local contributions are mentioned. • If project is collaborative, no partners are identified. • Project design does not reference commonly accepted standards and practices.	• Timeline exists, but is not clearly relevant to achieving the project goals. • Some evidence of future support and/or sustainability described. • Some local contributions are described. • If project is collaborative, partners are identified but details of the collaboration are not clearly documented. • Project design is vague or unclear regarding commonly accepted standards and practices.	• Timeline includes a list of actions with specific target dates and is clearly relevant to achieving the established objectives. • Clear evidence of support and/or sustainability is described, and/or there is a written plan for maintaining online access in the future. • If project is collaborative, partners are identified and details of the collaboration are clearly documented. • Project design references commonly accepted standards/practices and clearly states how they will be implemented.
3. Availability (Points: Raw score = 5 max, weight = 4; Final score = 20 max)		
Applicants describe how the materials will be accessed by the users (in digital and/or physical format) and will list methods for providing statewide access. Applicants will include information on how they will build awareness of the project in their community and statewide. They must certify all applicable activities related to the grant will be in compliance with the Copyright Law. Applicants must specify what portion of the collection copyright clearance has already been obtained and the nature of that clearance.		
0-1 points	2-3 points	4-5 points
• Statewide access to the collection is unclear or vague. • Project will not provide access to digital surrogates of unique or rare collections. • Applicant does not mention how the community will become aware of the project. • Copyright compliance and clearance is unclear or vague.	• Statewide access to the collection is described but access is restricted in some way. • Project is for digitization of non-unique materials or materials which are already available by other means. • Mentions how the local community will become aware of the project, but doesn't address statewide awareness. • Copyright clearance is obtained for all or a portion of the collection.	• Multiple methods of statewide access and discoverability are described. • Project is for digitization and providing statewide access to materials previously only available locally. • Applicant provides information about awareness of the project both in the local community and statewide. • Copyright clearance is clearly described for all or a portion of the collection, and a plan is in place to obtain clearance for portions not yet granted.

4. Cost Effectiveness (Points: Raw score = 5 max, weight = 3; Final score = 15 max)		
Applicants provide a complete budget for the project and justify it by describing how budgeted items will contribute to the project. They will identify sources for all costs and show that costs are reasonable within the scope of the project. Applicants will describe the methodology for any equipment chosen and include any vendor information and/or vendor websites. They will explain how the project makes effective use of grant funds and leverages local resources.		
0-1 points	2-3 points	4-5 points
• Budget is incomplete. • Applicant provides no description (justification) beyond the budget column of how funds will be spent. • Costs are not reasonable. • Basis for any equipment or service selection is not described and vendor information is not included. • No explanation of use of local resources is included.	• Budget is complete. • Budget description exists, but does not clearly relate to the project. • Costs seem reasonable, but the sources for stated costs are not identified. • Basis for any equipment or service selection is described, but vendor information is not included. • An explanation of use of local resources is included.	• Budget is complete and clearly describes how the funds will be used for the project. • Items listed in the budget description match those in the budget form. • Applicant clearly justifies the reasonableness of costs and identifies sources of stated costs. • Basis for any equipment or service selection is described and vendor information is included. • An explanation of use of local resources is included and local contributions are included in the budget.
5. Evaluation (Points: Raw score = 5 max, weight = 1; Final score = 5 max)		
Applicants design and describe the methodology to evaluate the project and the estimated level of usage. They will demonstrate increased or more cost-effective services to Texans, and will determine which kinds of local materials are most useful to users. Applicants document the increased usage of the materials and, if possible, the importance of the research facilitated.		
0-1 points	2-3 points	4-5 points
• Methodology to evaluate the project is not defined. • Methodology to estimate the level of usage is not described.	• Methodology to evaluate the project is stated but unclear and/or limited. • Methodology to estimate the level of usage is stated but unclear and/or limited.	• Methodology to evaluate the project is well defined, appropriate and effective. • Methodology to estimate the level of usage is well defined. • Applicant includes a plan to document the importance of the research facilitated.

Appendix C: Protest Procedure

Texas State Library and Archives Commission, 13 TAC §2.55

(a) An aggrieved person who is not satisfied with a decision, procedure, or service received from the staff of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission or who is an actual or prospective bidder, grantee, or contractor aggrieved in connection with a solicitation, evaluation, or award may file a protest with the Director and Librarian in accordance with this rule.

(b) A protest must be submitted to the Director and Librarian within 21 days after the person knows or should have known of the matter which is protested. The Director and Librarian has the discretion to allow a protest filed after 21 days if the protestant shows good cause for the late filing or if the protest raises an issue significant to the general policies and procedures of the commission.

(c) The protestant shall mail or deliver a copy of the protest to all interested persons. The Director and Librarian will furnish a list of interested persons to a protestant. For protests of a competitive selection (bid, contract, or grant), interested persons shall include all persons who have submitted a bid, proposal, or application.

(d) A protest must be in writing and identified as a protest under this section, and contain the following:

(1) A description of the protestant's interest in the matter
(2) The issue(s) to be resolved and remedy(s) requested
(3) The protestant's argument supporting the protest, including a statement of relevant facts and applicable law, specifying the statutes, rules, or other legal authority alleged to have been violated
(4) The protestant's affirmation that facts set forth in the protest are true
(5) A certification that a copy of the protest has been mailed or delivered to all interested persons

(e) Upon receipt of a protest conforming to the requirements of this section, the commission shall not proceed with the solicitation, award, or contract until the protest is resolved, unless the Director and Librarian makes a written determination that delay would harm the substantial interests of the state.

(f) The Director and Librarian has the authority to decide, settle, or resolve the protest and will make a written determination. The Director and Librarian may solicit written responses to the protest from other parties. The Director and Librarian shall inform the protesting party and other interested parties by letter of his determination, and how to appeal the determination to the commission.

(g) An interested party may appeal the determination of the Director and Librarian. An appeal must be in writing and conform to paragraphs (1) - (3) of this subsection:

(1) The appeal must be received in the office of the Director and Librarian no later than 15 days after the date the determination is mailed to interested parties;
(2) A copy of the appeal must be mailed or delivered by the appealing party to all interested parties and contain a certification of mailing or delivery;
(3) The appealing party must state whether or not an opportunity is requested to make an oral presentation to the commission in open meeting.

(h) The Director and Librarian shall refer the matter to the commission for their consideration at an open meeting.

(i) The chair of the commission has the discretion to allow an appeal filed more than 15 days after the Director and Librarian's determination if the appealing party shows good cause for the late filing or if the appeal raises an issue significant to the general policies or procedures of the commission.

(j) An interested party may file a response to an appeal of the determination of the Director and Librarian no later than seven days after the appeal is mailed or delivered.

(k) Copies of the appeal and responses of interested parties, if any, shall be mailed to the commission by the Director and Librarian.

(l) The chair of the commission has the discretion to decide whether or not a request for oral presentations will be granted and will set the order and amount of time for oral presentations that are allowed. The chair also has the discretion to decide whether presentations and written documents presented by Commission staff and interested parties will be allowed.

(m) The commission will determine properly filed appeals and make its decision in open meeting. The commission shall vote to uphold or reverse the decision of the Director and Librarian. Failing a majority vote of a quorum of the commission, the Director and Librarian's decision is upheld. The commission's decision is final and not subject to judicial review under the statutes governing the commission.

(n) A decision issued either by the commission in open meeting or in writing by the Director and Librarian shall be the final administrative action of the commission.

(o) Documentation concerning a protest of a competitive selection is part of the commission's records series for that selection and is retained in accordance with the commission's approved records retention schedule.