



*Lorenzo de Zavala State Archives and Library Building*

# Impact Grants Program Guidelines State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2013

**Application Due Date:**

March 9, 2012

Texas State Library and Archives Commission  
Library Development & Networking Division  
January 2012



Table of Contents

*Program Description* .....3  
*Instructions for Applying* .....5  
*Appendices* .....7  
*Criteria for Award* .....7  
*Grant Review and Award Process* .....8  
*Scoring Rubrics* .....10  
*TSLAC Protest Procedure* .....14

**Comments regarding the programs and services of the  
Texas State Library and Archives Commission can be addressed to the  
Director and Librarian.**

P. O. Box 12927 ♦ Austin, Texas 78711-2927  
512-463-5460 ♦ 512-463-5436 fax  
January 2012

*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).*

## Program Description

Want to try out a new idea for serving your community? Want to implement a best practice that will improve service delivery? Have an innovative notion you want to test? The new **Impact Grants for Library Innovation and Improvement** may be just what your library needs. Focused on broad community needs for economic recovery, early childhood literacy, and electronic access to information, **Impact Grants** are designed to distribute funding as broadly as possible to impact lives all across Texas.

## Goals and Purposes – (from Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §2.910)

This grant program provides funds that will support one-time grants to libraries for seed money for new library programming or services, or to improve existing programming and services that support best practices in the field. The purpose of the grant is to encourage libraries to create or expand their programming and services in innovative ways that directly impact the lives of Texans.

The programming must be new to the library's community, or improve existing services, and must be sustainable after the first year of grant funding with other or local resources. Libraries or library systems will not be awarded more than one grant in a single grant cycle. Libraries or library systems will not be awarded a grant for the same type of program (as described in the grant guidelines) in two consecutive grant cycles.

### Grants for FY2013

The identified focus areas for FY2013 address the following two LSTA needs and goals as identified in the Texas LSTA 5 Year Plan ([www.tsl.state.tx.us/ld/pubs/lstaplan/2008/index.html](http://www.tsl.state.tx.us/ld/pubs/lstaplan/2008/index.html)):

Need

Texans need enhanced literacy and educational attainment

Goal

Provide assistance to libraries to support literacy and educational attainment in their communities

Need

Texans need technology based library services to help them achieve economic, educational, & other personal goals.

Goal

Assist libraries with technology to serve the information needs of Texans.

Successful applicants will use the uniform measures and outcomes described below to report the impact of the programming on the library's community to the Texas State Library and Archives Commission. The agency will develop the necessary collection instruments for grantees.

### Applications for FY2013 will be accepted in three areas: Technology Skills for Economic Recovery; Early Childhood Literacy for Educational Attainment; Electronic Information Technology

#### 1. Technology Skills for Economic Recovery

This focus area supports library programs designed to improve the technology skills of Texans so that they may use computers and online/electronic resources to enhance their economic and personal goals, and enhance economic recovery in Texas. Projects may fund items such as: staff or contract assistance to provide training, staff training to acquire in-house skills to deliver training to patrons, equipment and supplies to provide training. Projects that include collaboration with local Workforce offices, community organizations, other libraries, or businesses will be given preference.

Outcome 1: Library patrons in project-sponsored programs improve their technology skills.

Measure 1: The number of project participants who report, using a Likert scale survey, that they feel more confident in their basic computer skills, searching databases/online information, online workforce/job skills or other specified computer/technology skills upon program completion.

## 2. Early Childhood Literacy for Educational Attainment

This focus area supports library early childhood literacy programs for Texas children and their caregivers to improve school readiness and educational attainment. Projects may fund items such as: staff or contract assistance to provide programming, staff training to acquire in-house skills to deliver programming, equipment and supplies to provide programs. Use of best practices such as *Born to Read* (<http://www.ala.org/alsc/issuesadv/borntoread>), *Every Child Ready to Read* (<http://www.everychildreadytoread.org/>), or other model library programs are encouraged. Projects that include collaboration with local Workforce offices, community organizations, other libraries, or businesses will be given preference.

Outcome 2: Texas caregivers and children in project-sponsored programs acquire skills that enhance early childhood literacy.

Measure 2: : The number of caregivers who report, using a Likert scale survey, that they feel more confident with early childhood literacy skills and value the library as a contributor to their quality of life and that of their children.

## 3. Electronic Information Technology

This focus area supports providing library services to enhance library patrons' access to electronic information/materials. Projects may fund items such as: equipment such as ebook readers or mobile devices; ebooks/econtent; staff training to provide patron assistance with ebooks/econtent; supplies to provide programs/training for library patrons on use of electronic information/materials; work with patrons to create their own contributed econtent. If a project includes acquisition of econtent (such as ebooks), those projects that share econtent as part of a consortium or group are given preference.

Outcome 3: Texans have enhanced access to electronic information and/or materials.

Measure 3: The number of library patrons using funded materials/services that report, using a survey, enhanced access to and satisfaction with information and/or materials to meet educational, economic, or other personal goals.

### Who may apply? – (13 TAC §2.911)

Through their governing authority, accredited public libraries, local public library systems, libraries that are members of the TexShare Library Consortium, or non-profit organizations that are applying on behalf of accredited libraries and/or TexShare members, are eligible to apply for funds. Public library applicants must be accredited by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission for the fiscal year in which the grant contracts are issued.

### Funds Available

Approximately \$750,000 is available for Impact Grants, subject to approval by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission, and availability of funds.

### Maximum Award

Applications of all sizes are encouraged. While the request may be part of a larger program, awards will not exceed \$10,000.

### Length of Funding

One state fiscal year (September 1, 2012 – August 31, 2013).

### Eligible Expenses

This grant program may fund costs for staff, equipment\*\*, capital expenditures, supplies, professional services, and other typical operating expenses, as permitted by 13 TAC §2.116 (Uniform Grants Management Standards). The purpose of competitive grants is *not* for collection development, or other activities primarily focused on the acquisition of library materials or resources.

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

## Ineligible Expenses

This grant program will NOT fund the following costs:

- a. Building construction or renovation
- b. Food, beverages, awards, honoraria, prizes, or gifts
- c. Equipment or technology not specifically needed to carry out the goals of the grant
- d. Transportation/travel for participants or non-grant funded personnel
- e. 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)
- f. Collection development purchases not targeted directly to the grant goals nor integral to the service program
- g. Advertising or public relations costs not directly related to promoting awareness of grant-funded activities
- h. Performers or presenters whose purpose is to entertain rather than to educate
- i. Indirect costs, overhead or Finance & Administration (F&A) costs

## Instructions for Applying

### Project Development and Draft Review

The Texas State Library and Archives Commission requests that applicants discuss their project with TSLAC staff before they begin developing a proposal. TSLAC consultants are available to help throughout application development. For more information, contact **Deborah Littrell at 512-463-5456 or via e-mail at [deborah.littrell@tsl.state.tx.us](mailto:deborah.littrell@tsl.state.tx.us)**.

As the written application of the proposal is the only information the grant review panel will receive, the commission strongly encourages applicants to **send a draft of the proposal to TSLAC staff for review**. To ensure staff will have time to review the draft proposal, submit the draft by the due date listed in the Timetable in Appendix C.

### Grant Management System (GMS) Guidelines and Forms

TSLAC uses a Grant Management System that enables applicants to apply for grants electronically through a web portal. In order to apply for the grant, you must obtain a user name and password for GMS (please allow up to 5 business days). You will then be able to access and fill out the application. Step-by-step GMS instructions can be found at:

<https://www.tsl.state.tx.us/sites/default/files/public/tslac/ld/funding/lsta/gmsmanual.pdf>

### Application Components

1. Applicant Information – To be completed on GMS. Once you have completed the form, *click the “Printer Friendly” button to print the form. The printout must be signed by an individual authorized to enter into contracts with the Texas State Library & Archives Commission\*\**.
  - a. To determine Congressional, State Senate, and State House representation, visit [www.fyi.legis.state.tx.us/](http://www.fyi.legis.state.tx.us/)
2. Budget -- To be completed on GMS.
3. Narrative – To be completed on GMS.
4. Children’s Internet Act Protection Act Form (CIPA) – This form can be downloaded from GMS, but it cannot be submitted electronically\*\*.
5. Letters of cooperation indicating commitment of time, funds, volunteers, or other resources must be submitted from all participating agencies\*\*.

A maximum of three (3) letters of general support may be submitted via email, fax, or mail.

### \*\*Deadline

Complete applications must be submitted in GMS by 5 p.m. Central Time on **March 9, 2012**.

**The Applicant Information printout, letters of cooperation and signed CIPA form must be received by 5 p.m. Central Time on March 9, 2012. Attn: Wendy Spinks via email to [wspinks@tsl.state.tx.us](mailto:wspinks@tsl.state.tx.us), or fax at 512-936-2306, or mail to Library Development Division, TSLAC, P.O. Box 12927, Austin, TX 78711. (TSLAC street address: 1201 Brazos, Austin, TX 78701)**

### Is Your Application Complete?

	All 3 sections (Applicant Information, Budget, Project Narrative) in the online Grants Management System (GMS) are complete.
	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 (letters of intent, MOUs, etc.) have been received by the agency via email/mail/fax on or before the due date.

### Post-Award Training

Successful applicants will be required to attend a post-award online training on best practices in grants management in the fall of 2012.

### Timetable

<b>January 2012</b>	Guidelines and application link posted to TSLAC website
<b>February 3, 2012</b>	Draft proposals due to TSLAC for review (recommended but not required)
<b>March 9, 2012</b>	Applications submitted via GMS and signature page due to TSLAC
<b>May 2012</b>	Application packets evaluated by Review Panel
<b>August 2012</b>	Commission meets and approves projects
<b>August 2012</b>	Contracts issued
<b>September 1, 2012</b>	Projects begin
<b>August 31, 2013</b>	Projects end

# Appendices

## Criteria for Award

This grant program is competitive. The Grant Review Panel will score proposals on the eleven criteria listed below (13 TAC §2.912). The maximum number of points for each category is shown.

**See also the scoring rubrics that will be made available to the Grant Review Panel.**

1. **Applicant Information (10 points)**  
Applicants describe their library, their mission, strategic goals, and their capacity to complete the project successfully.
2. **Community need (10 points)**  
Applicants describe the community they serve, why the program is needed, and the targeted audience. Applicants also describe how the need was determined.
3. **Project activities (20 points)**  
Applicants describe project activities from start to finish. Projects that include collaboration or acquire econtent as part of a consortium/group are given preference.
4. **Innovation or Improvement (5 points)**  
Applicants describe how the project is innovative for their community, or how the project will enhance or improve current programs and services and/or how the program/service integrates an established best practice in the field.
5. **Timetable (5 points)**  
Applicants present a timetable for project activities within the fiscal year (i.e., a list of actions with a date by which they will be accomplished).
6. **Alignment with desired outcome (10 points)**  
Applicants explain how their project aligns with one of the outcomes set by the “Impact Grants for Library Innovation and Improvement” guidelines.
7. **Budget (10 points)**  
Applicants provide a complete budget and budget narrative describing how costs were determined and how costs are justified.
8. **Personnel (5 points)**  
Applicants describe who is responsible for project activities and their qualifications to perform these duties.
9. **Evaluation/Documentation of Impact (10 points)**  
Applicants describe how they will accurately collect, maintain and provide the uniform performance measures to the State Library. Select one of the measures listed in the program description. Note: agency will provide the survey instrument. This section describes how the grantee will administer the survey.
10. **Marketing (5 points)**  
Applicants describe how they will publicize the programs or services to their community, and how they will share best practices and lessons learned with the library community.
11. **Sustainability (10 points)**  
Applicants describe how the program or services will be supported with other funding after the grant period ends. Plans must demonstrate that the program will be continued after the close of the grant period. Projects that include collaboration or acquire econtent as part of a consortium/group are given preference.

# Grant Review and Award Process

## 13 TAC§ 2.113-2.118

### Peer Review

- (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

- (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 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

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

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**

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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**

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.

#### **Step 1**

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

#### **Step 2**

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

#### **Step 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.

#### **Step 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.

## Awarding Grants

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.

## Multiple Applications

Applicants for competitive grants may submit more than one grant application for different projects, in different grant categories. Applicants may not submit the same, or nearly the same, application in more than one grant category.

## Scoring Rubrics

<b>Project Scoring Total in Eleven Areas: 100 points</b>		
Relevance and appropriateness of the project design and activities to the goals and purpose of the Impact grant program will be considered in the scoring of all criteria. Members of the Grant Review Panel may score each criteria as follows:  0 points: Project does not meet the goals and purposes of the Impact grant program 1-3 points: Project partially meets the goals and purposes of the Impact grant program. 4-5 points: Project is a clear fit for the goals and purposes of the Impact grant program		
<b>1. Applicant Information:</b>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants describe their library, their mission, strategic goals, and their capacity to complete the project successfully.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library, mission, and strategic goals not described</li> <li>No description of library's capacity to complete the project successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library, mission and strategic goals partially or incompletely described.</li> <li>Provides some description of library's capacity to successfully complete project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library, mission and strategic goals clearly described. Project</li> <li>Thorough description of library's capacity to successfully complete project.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Applicant Information score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.</b>		
<b>2. Community need:</b>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants describe the community they serve, why the program is needed, and the target audience. Applicant also describes how the need was determined.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community to be served is not described.</li> <li>Provides no evidence of need for program; or community need does not relate to proposed project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community to be served is partially or incompletely described.</li> <li>Provides partial/some evidence of need for program; community need vaguely relates to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community is clearly defined.</li> <li>Provides clear and convincing evidence of need for program and why they are best suited to meet this need.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not describe needs assessment process and/or how need was determined (i.e., no description of community served, demographic statistics, library records or evidence or surveys).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed project.</li> <li>Needs assessment process seems vague and incompletely describes how stated need was determined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly describes needs assessment process including how stated need was determined (e.g., statistics, records, surveys).</li> </ul>
<p><b>For final score, Community Need will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.</b></p>		
<p><b>3. Project activities:</b></p>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants describe project activities from start to finish.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program activities lack definition and are unclear. Project appears to lack direction and planning, and does not relate to described needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services, programs and activities are defined. Project has direction and some relationship to described needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services, programs and activities are clearly defined, including timelines and resources required. Project shows evidence of clear direction and planning and strong relationship to described needs.</li> <li>Projects must include collaboration or acquire content as part of a consortium/group to receive top points.</li> </ul>
<p><b>For final score, Project activities score will be multiplied by a weight of 4 = 20 points max.</b></p>		
<p><b>4. Innovation or Improvement:</b></p>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants describe how the project is innovative for their community, or how the project will enhance or improve current programs and services and/or how the program/service integrates an established best practice in the field.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No description of how project is innovative, an enhancement/improvement of current programs and services, and/or integrates established best practice in the field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partial or incomplete description of how project is innovative, an enhancement/improvement of current programs or services, and/or integrates established best practice in the field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes a thorough case for how project is innovative, an enhancement/improvement of current programs or services, and/or integrates established best practice in the field.</li> </ul>

<b>For final score, Innovation or Improvement score will be multiplied by a weight of 1 = 5 points max.</b>		
<b>5. Timetable:</b>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants present a timetable for project activities within the project year (i.e., a list of actions with a date by which they will be accomplished.)	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable is missing or incomplete (i.e., does not include a list of actions with specific target dates for completion).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable exists, but is not clearly relevant to achieving the project goals.</li> <li>Timetable seems unachievable within the project period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable includes a list of actions with specific target dates and is clearly relevant to achieving the established objectives.</li> <li>Timetable seems achievable within the project period.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Timetable score will be multiplied by a weight of 1 = 5 points</b>		
<b>6. Alignment with desired outcome:</b>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants explain how their project aligns with the desired uniform outcome: Select one of the outcomes listed in the program description.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project does not align with desired uniform outcome, or description is not present.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project only partially aligns with uniform goal. Description vague.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project clearly aligns with uniform outcome.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Evaluation score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.</b>		
<b>7. Budget:</b>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants provide a complete budget and budget narrative describing how costs were determined. All costs must be justified.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget incomplete.</li> <li>Provides no narrative description (justification), beyond the budget column, of how funds will be spent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget complete.</li> <li>Budget narrative description exists but does not clearly relate to the project and sources for costs are not stated.</li> <li>Items listed in the budget description do not match those in the budget form.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget is complete and clearly describes how the dollars will be used for the project.</li> <li>Clearly identifies source of stated costs and justification for their reasonableness.</li> <li>Items listed in the budget description match those in the</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs do not seem reasonable and description is unclear.</li> <li>No time given for staff to be hired, if appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>budget form.</li> <li>Realistic timeline for hiring of new staff, if appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Budget score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.</b>		
<b>8. Personnel:</b>		
Points: 5 max	Applicants describe who is responsible for project activities and their qualifications to perform these duties.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No description of key personnel and their qualifications to perform these duties.</li> <li>No job descriptions for new hires.</li> <li>No description of time spent on project by each staff member.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some description of key personnel and their qualifications.</li> <li>Partial or seemingly incomplete job descriptions available for new hires.</li> <li>Time spent on project by each staff member only partially identified and justified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describes qualifications of key personnel in detail, including past experience with similar projects, and how each will contribute to the project's success.</li> <li>Full job descriptions provided for new hires.</li> <li>Time spent on project by each staff member identified and justified.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Sustainability score will be multiplied by a weight of 1 = 5 points max.</b>		
<b>9. Evaluation/Documentation of Impact:</b>		
Points: 5 max	Applicants describe how they will accurately collect, maintain and provide the uniform measure:  Select one of the measures listed in the program description. Note: agency will provide the survey instrument. This section describes how the grantee will administer the survey.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of how measure will be collected, maintained and provided to TSLAC is not provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of how measure will be collected, maintained and provided to TSLAC is vague or not complete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of how measure will be collected, maintained and provided to TSLAC is well described and complete.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Evaluation/Documentation of Impact score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.</b>		
<b>10. Marketing:</b>		
Points: 5 max	Applicants describe how they will publicize the programs or services to their community, and how they will share best practices and lessons learned with the library community.	

0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No description of how programs or services will be publicized or marketed to their community. No mention of sharing best practices or lessons learned with larger library community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of how programs or services will be publicized or marketed to their community is vague or not complete. Sharing best practices or lessons learned with larger library community is addressed but not clearly spelled out.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of how programs or services will be publicized or marketed to their community well described. Sharing best practices or lessons learned with larger library community is clearly described.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Marketing score will be multiplied by a weight of 1 = 5 points max.</b>		
<b>11. Sustainability:</b>		
Points: 5 max	Applicants describe how the program or service will be supported with other funding after the grant period ends. Plans must demonstrate that the program will be continued after the close of the grant period.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of resources used to support/sustain the project after grant completion is vague and unspecific.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some evidence of future support/ sustainability described.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear evidence of sustainability described.</li> <li>A written commitment of future support from governing bodies is provided, if appropriate.</li> <li>Projects must include collaboration or acquire econtent as part of a consortium or group to receive top points.</li> </ul>
<b>For final score, Sustainability score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.</b>		

## TSLAC Protest Procedure

### 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,

**Impact Grants Program Guidelines – SFY 2013• Application Due Date: March 9, 2012**

Published by the Library Development & Networking Division of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission Austin, Texas January 2012

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.