



*Tasmanian Association of Community Houses Inc*

## **EVERYDAY LITERACY FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

### **FUNDING ROUND 4, OCTOBER 2011**

### **ASSESSMENT PANEL FEEDBACK AND OBSERVATIONS**

Applications received:	7 (covering 8 Houses)
Applications approved:	7 (covering 8 Houses)
Total funding requested:	\$ 39,963 (includes value added funding)
Total funding approved:	\$ 39,963 (includes value added funding)

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

#### **Feedback and Observations**

- ✓ In future, applications should specifically show that they will employ or have available someone with adult literacy skills to be actively involved in delivering a project. Applications should state whether a new person with the necessary skills is to be employed or an existing staff member or volunteer with the necessary skills will be involved. A statement of the adult literacy skill level to be used in running the project should be included (for example, trained volunteer adult literacy tutor).
  - *While some applications did identify ways that literacy support could be provided in a project, they were not clear as to who would be involved and their level of adult literacy skills to provide that support.*
  
- ✓ Projects should give more attention to some sort of recording of both pre-project and post-project literacy levels of participants, with the assessment ranging from quite informal to formal depending on the context of the project. The range of ways developed by different projects to do this should be shared with other Houses.
  - *The success measures identified in some applications did not include a clear focus on how literacy outcomes will be measured. While embedded literacy projects present a challenge in this regard, some method of measuring should be considered.*

- ✓ Applications that focus on partnerships, such as with the LINC's, can provide additional support in preparing project applications and in providing literacy support during the course of the project.
  - *In this funding round, there has been an increase focus on linking up with other services providing literacy support and the applications have been stronger for it.*
- ✓ Application involving partnerships should be clear who will do what. This will avoid seeking funding to do work that may already be covered by the other organisation.
  - *Some applications required clarification to determine which parts of the project were the responsibilities of which partner.*
- ✓ Applications that are delivering an embedded literacy project would be improved if they identified what the next steps for participants could be as a result of participating in the project. For example, are follow up projects being considered, or have options been identified for referral to further literacy support?
  - *Generally applications have not described any consideration of next steps for participants in projects, though in some cases this could improve the way the project itself is framed up and delivered.*
- ✓ As mentioned in previous funding rounds, proof read applications to ensure that the responses in the application form read well, are consistent with each other, and that budgets and funds requested are consistent.
  - *Some applications contained spelling and typing errors, inconsistencies in project details and errors in transposing funding amounts.*

In summary, your application should be clear about the literacy aims and literacy success measures for the project and pitch them at a realistic and achievable level. You should identify and describe the resources and people needed to run the project, especially the literacy expertise needed to provide the literacy support. Embedded literacy support needs to be planned and actively included in the implementation of the project.