

**Scoring Rubrics for LSTA Competitive Grants Program**

**Project Scoring Total in Eight Areas: 100 points**

**Needs Assessment:**

Points: 5 max.	Applicants describe why the program is needed, the program goals and audience. They describe the greater community to be served. They include demographic statistics, library records, or surveys to support these statements. They attach letters of cooperation showing commitment to the project from agencies to be involved.
----------------	---

0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides no evidence of need for program</li> <li>• Program goals and audience are not defined</li> <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> <li>• If partners are part of the Project, no letters of support are provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides partial/some evidence of need for program</li> <li>• Program goals and audience are defined but show little to no connection to description of need</li> <li>• Needs assessment process seems vague and incompletely describes how stated need was determined</li> <li>• If partners are part of the Project, letters of support are provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear and convincing evidence of need for program and why they are best suited to meet this need</li> <li>• Program goals and audience are clearly connected to description of need</li> <li>• Clearly describes needs assessment process including how stated need was determined (e.g., statistics, records, surveys)</li> <li>• If partners are part of the Project, letters of support are provided that clearly define roles and responsibilities of partnering agencies</li> </ul>

For final score, Needs Assessment score will be multiplied by a weight of 3 = 15 points max.

**Program Design:**

Points: 5 max.	Applicants thoroughly describe services, programs, activities; describe the location where they will be offered; and explain how these services will attract shared library users. Collaborative projects have priority and inclusion of relevant community organizations is encouraged.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services, programs and activities lack definition and are unclear. Project appears to lack direction and planning, and does not relate to described needs.</li> <li>• Does not describe location(s) where project will be offered or is vague</li> <li>• Does not describe how project services will attract library users</li> <li>• Issue of collaboration not addressed.</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> <li>• Location where services will be offered is described but does not clearly relate to project activities and described needs</li> <li>• Describes how project services will attract library users</li> <li>• Issue of collaboration addressed, even if not a collaborative project</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>• Location where services will be offered is described and clearly relates to project activities and described needs</li> <li>• Clearly describes how project services will attract library users and ties to project activities and described needs</li> <li>• Collaborative project; collaboration clearly addressed and described in full.</li> </ul>
For final score, Program Design will be multiplied by a weight of 4 = 20 points max.		
<b>Project impact:</b>		
Points: 5 max.	Applicants describe the impact their project will have on library services and users locally, as well as regionally or statewide. This may include how the proposed project is a model program that would benefit other regions of the state.	
0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not address any of the impacts the project may have on library services and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes impact of the project but doesn't show an association with the library</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes both impact and measurable benefits the project will have on library</li> </ul>

<p>library users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not address larger issues that the project may address</li> </ul>	<p>services and library users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses larger issues but does not tie these issues to local project</li> </ul>	<p>services and library users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses larger issues clearly and ties them to local project</li> </ul>
<p>For final score, Project impact score will be multiplied by a weight of 3 = 15 points max.</p>		
<p><b>Personnel:</b></p>		
<p>Points: 5 max.</p>	<p>Applicants identify who will administer the funds and which positions will provide the services. List how much time will be spent in each position on assigned duties. List how the qualifications of each person relate to their job duties. Full job descriptions are required for new hires.</p>	
<p>0 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not identify fiscal agent and which positions will provide services</li> <li>No description of time spent in each position on assigned duties</li> <li>No description of qualifications of key personnel</li> <li>No job descriptions for new hires</li> </ul>	<p>1-3 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fiscal agent identified without explanation and positions briefly described</li> <li>Time spent on project by each staff member briefly identified</li> <li>Some description of qualifications of key personnel</li> <li>Partial or seemingly incomplete job descriptions available for new hires</li> </ul>	<p>4-5 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fiscal agent identified with full explanation and positions that will provide the services fully described</li> <li>Time spent on project by each staff member identified and justified</li> <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> </ul>
<p>For final score, Personnel score will be multiplied by a weight of 1 = 5 points max.</p>		
<p><b>Timetable:</b></p>		
<p>Points: 5 max.</p>	<p>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); provide verification that facilities will be available, equipment and materials delivered; and explain how staff will be hired and trained in time to carry out the services as planned.</p>	
<p>0 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable is missing</li> </ul>	<p>1-3 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable exists, but is</li> </ul>	<p>4-5 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable includes a</li> </ul>

<p>or incomplete (i.e., does not include a list of actions with specific target dates for completion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No verification regarding facilities, equipment and/or materials</li> <li>• No explanation of hiring or training of staff to carry out project in project period</li> </ul>	<p>not clearly relevant to achieving the project goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timetable seems unachievable within the project period</li> <li>• Some verification regarding facilities, equipment and/or materials, but not clearly related to project</li> <li>• Brief or incomplete explanation of hiring or training of staff to carry out project in project period</li> </ul>	<p>list of actions with specific target dates and is clearly relevant to achieving the established objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timetable seems achievable within the project period</li> <li>• Use of facilities, equipment and/or materials fully explained and relevant to project and project goals</li> <li>• Full explanation of hiring or training of staff that will allow project to be carried out during the project period</li> </ul>
--	--	--

For final score, Timetable score will be multiplied by a weight of 1 = 5 points

**Evaluation:**

<p>Points: 5 max.</p>	<p>Applicants set achievable, measurable outcomes, and present a reasonable method to collect data. Applicants present a method to count users of the services as well as the effectiveness of the service.</p> <p>N.B.: Some projects will not lend themselves to outcomes-based evaluation (OBE). While the State Library strongly encourages the use of OBE, we do not require it for proposals, and points should not be deducted from strong evaluation plans that use outputs instead of outcomes when it is reasonable not to employ OBE.</p>
-----------------------	--

<p>0 points</p>	<p>1-3 points</p>	<p>4-5 points</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not include either project outputs or outcomes</li> <li>• No method to collect data provided</li> <li>• No method to count users of services or effectiveness of service</li> <li>• Will not determine success of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides project outputs and/or outcomes but do not clearly relate to project</li> <li>• Method to collect data provided</li> <li>• Method to count users of service provided but not effectiveness of service</li> <li>• Provides some</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly describes appropriate project outputs and/or outcomes</li> <li>• Method to collect data is provided that clearly relates to project services and documented need</li> <li>• Method to count users of services and</li> </ul>

	<p>indication of the success of the project</p>	<p>effectiveness of service provided</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will effectively determine success of the project and its impact</li> <li>• Project evaluation can be used as model for other similar projects</li> <li>• Project evaluation incorporates “best practices” from other similar projects</li> </ul>
--	---	---

For final score, Evaluation score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.

**Budget:**

Points: 5 max.

Applicants provide a complete budget for the proposed project and fully justify the budget by describing how budgeted items will contribute to the project; identify a source for the stated costs (e.g., city pay classification for staff, catalog or city/county bid list for equipment); the costs are reasonable to achieve project objectives. If new staff are to be employed, applicants take into account the time for a realistic hiring process to occur.

0 points	1-3 points	4-5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget incomplete</li> <li>• Provides no 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 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> <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 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 budget form</li> <li>• Realistic timeline for hiring of new staff, if appropriate</li> </ul>

For final score, Budget score will be multiplied by a weight of 4 = 20 points max.

**Sustainability:**

Points: 5 max	Applicants describe the resources that will be used to support the services developed through the grant in the future. A written commitment of future support from governing bodies is desirable, but not required.	
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> </ul>
For final score, Sustainability score will be multiplied by a weight of 2 = 10 points max.		
<b>Extra Points Awarded for:</b>		
Cooperation: Project incorporates shared library automation system: up to 4 extra points		