



*Tasmanian Association of Community Houses Inc*

## **EVERYDAY LITERACY FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

### **FUNDING ROUND 2, MAY 2010 ASSESSMENT PANEL FEEDBACK AND OBSERVATIONS**

Applications received:	8 (covering 10 Houses)
Applications approved:	6 (75%, covering 9 Houses)
Total funding requested:	\$ 64,483.89 (includes value added funding)
Total funding approved:	\$ 55,081.00 (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**

- ✓ Applications should describe how the literacy component will be deliberately and actively included in a project, even if the project does not flag to participants that literacy support is involved.
  - *Some applications merely relied upon the project activities incidentally involving literacy, without showing how the literacy elements would be consciously dealt with and built upon. While many activities and programs inherently involve literacy in some way, an Everyday Literacy project should show how it will actively include a literacy component to work towards improving literacy.*
- ✓ Applications should identify the literacy support skills that tutors, project officers and the like should have to present the project.
  - *In some cases, the description of the project did not identify the literacy support required for the project, the skills needed to provide that support or the availability of people with those skills.*
- ✓ Applications should be as explicit as possible about the people being targeted by the project. Depending on the project, age, gender, literacy issues etc, and information on how the people targeted by the project have been identified could all be useful.
  - *Some applications did not provide much information on who the targeted people were, their literacy needs or how those needs were identified.*
- ✓ Applications should include enough detail to show how the project would be rolled out to realistically deliver on the aims of the project. While the degree of detail depends on the

scope of the project, a project timeline and/or work plan could be helpful in clarifying how the project would work.

- *Some applications did not demonstrate clearly how they would deliver the project.*
- ✓ Applications should aim for what is achievable and do it well. It is not necessary to set grand goals if the capacity to deliver on them is doubtful. Small steps, well done, are also of value.
  - *Some applications set ambitious goals for which the skills and resources to achieve them could prove difficult to provide.*
- ✓ Applications should aim to meet the literacy needs of people in ways that suit and engage the target audience.
  - *Some applications proposed methods and delivery mechanism that may not be engaging to the target group.*
- ✓ For Everyday Literacy funding, the aims and success measures or outcomes included in applications should include ones that are related to improving literacy.
  - *Some applications did not directly include project aims or success measures related to literacy, or only included limited reference to them.*
- ✓ Applications will benefit from clearly defined success measures. Success measures should link to the aims of the project. In some types of applications, there is scope for quite concrete measures such as "75% participant satisfaction with the program" or "over half the participants have increased confidence in completing the forms". In other types of applications, information such as personal stories and the like may also be appropriate.
  - *Some of the success measures were vague or not strongly linked to the aims and description of the project.*
- ✓ Where applications include equipment purchases, the use to which the equipment is put needs to be kept in mind and should be focused on improving literacy.
  - *Some applications focussed overly on the equipment without clearly showing how it would be used to improve literacy outcomes.*
- ✓ Budgets should contain sufficient detail for the proposed expenditure of the project to be assessed. A line item "Materials" with an amount against it but no explanatory information is not sufficiently useful, especially if the amount requested is quite large. More 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.*
  - *Some applications used very broad budget descriptions that did not allow for considered assessment.*
- ✓ 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, budgets contained typos or totals that were incorrect.*

In summary, your application should be clear about who you plan to assist, why they were chosen, and the literacy aims and success measures for the project. You should identify and describe the resources and people needed to run the project, especially the literacy expertise needed to provide the literacy support. The proposed program should be one that will suit and interest the participants and help them develop their literacy skills.