



*Tasmanian Association of Community Houses Inc*

## **EVERYDAY LITERACY FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

### **FUNDING ROUND 1, NOVEMBER 2009**

#### **APPLICATION ASSESSMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS**

Applications received:	10 (covering 12 Houses)
Applications approved:	7 (70%)
Total funding requested:	\$ 70,415.20 (includes value added funding)
Total funding approved:	\$ 34,931.20 (includes value added funding)

Thank you to all who applied for a grant. A full list of successful recipients will be placed on the TACH website at [www.tach.asn.au](http://www.tach.asn.au) once funding agreements are in place.

#### **Assessment and Observations**

- ✓ Applications should identify both the literacy area or areas that the project seeks to address and the specific aims of the project. The aims of the project should be focussed and stated clearly, avoiding generalised broad brush statements. For example, the key literacy area might be Document Literacy, but the aim of the project might be to assist people prepare a resume to use in job hunting.
  - *Some applications listed the definitions of literacy areas as the aims of the project rather than aims specifically related to the description of the project.*
- ✓ Make sure that the aims of the project and the description of the project are logically related and that the project as described sets out to meet the aims.
  - *In some cases, the description of the project did not correspond well with the aims listed in the funding application.*
- ✓ Applications should include background information on the particular literacy needs identified in the community and how this led to the proposed project. Alternatively a project may target identification of needs.
  - *Some applications did not provide much information on the literacy needs of the community or clearly link those needs with the proposed project.*

- ✓ Applications should include enough detail to show how the project would be rolled out and therefore that the applicant can realistically deliver on the aims of the project.
  - *Some applications did not demonstrate clearly how they would deliver or roll out the project. In other words some applications tended to be somewhat unclear on how the project would be implemented.*
  - *Some applications placed disproportionate emphasis on the background need but did not provide sufficient or clear information on what would actually be done with the funding or how it was directly applicable to literacy.*
  
- ✓ Applications should be consistent throughout. For example, if an application sets out to address technology and information literacy, then the aims and description of the project should build on and explain how this will be done. Similarly, the budget items should bear a close relationship to the description of the project.
  - *Some applications were inconsistent, in that the needs identified, the project as described, and the items requested in the budget did not appear to match.*
  
- ✓ Applications need to fall within the Funding Guidelines. Consistent with the original funding from the Tasmanian Community Fund, the Everyday Literacy for Local Communities Program targets and is confined to adult literacy and family literacy. There may be other good projects and good ideas but these will need to be funded elsewhere by a different program.
  - *Projects exclusively targeting school age children are outside the scope of the Program.*
  
- ✓ Applications will benefit from clearly defined success measures, where possible expressed in concrete terms. Success measures should link to the aims of the project. In some types of applications, there is scope for more concrete measures such as "target of 50% attendance" etc. In other types of applications, more information in the form of personal stories and the like would be of benefit.
  - *Some of the success measures were vague or not strongly linked to the aims and description of the project.*
  
- ✓ Budgets should contain sufficient detail for the proposed expenditure of application to be assessed. This detail will also be useful if a partial grant is to be considered. Budgets should include costings for all items directly attributable to the project. The items should be identifiable and not listed as a percentage (with the exception of salary on-costs).
  - *Some applications included percentage based administrative or auspicing costs.*
  
- ✓ Check costings (including the maths) and ensure that rates are realistic.
  - *Costings for similar items, for example tutors, varied considerably and in some cases seemed to underestimate the hourly rates usually involved.*
  - *In some cases, costings (for examples books) appeared not to have been researched and were unrealistically low.*
  - *In some cases, budgets contained typos or totals that were incorrect.*