

ADULT LITERACY SERVICES 2020 APPLICATION REVIEWS

ABQ/ALC		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
405	1	<p>Clear description of coalition and action plan. Clear description of org and how it serves lot lit population. Comprehensive explanation of partnerships/coordination. Career dev. With integrated academics. Addressed partnerships, classroom practices, collab support.describes how fuds will be used. Discusses PD and coalition plans. Extensive discussion of data practices. Discusses the coalition plan. Extensive list of cited resources.</p>
430	2	<p>This is the same as other project partners.I thought this was a very strong outline. It was clear and they made an effort to be evidence-based, citing recent literature that reflects the direction of the field. I appreciated their emphasis on the socioeconomic context of literacy and hope to hear more about that in the future, in terms of how it would be addressed in their model. These programs have demonstrated an ability to work well together in the past. I would have liked to read more about the nature of the proposed “kit” and how that would be used – it seems key to the overall model. Regarding the introduction of the CASEL framework for social and emotional learning: since it was included, I guess I would like to hear a bit about why they believe this is critical in literacy instruction or why that is a critical piece of their outcomes. I think that it’s a prudent plan to focus first on the northern and central regions as a pilot focus, and then expand as they refine their model; I liked this part of the plan. While I recognize the need for literacy services in the southern part of the state, I think it’s realistic to use this not-large amount of money to pilot a new model before expanding. As in the Taos application: this is a strong plan, though ambitious. Given the amount of funding, I wonder if it is too ambitious. Ambitious, again. They discuss work they have done before on this topic. They do demonstrate an evidence-based understanding of learning disability and appropriate accommodations. They don’t discuss serving individuals with other (non-learning) disabilities. I think it would have been useful to think through this and include it in their overview. I think the coordinator is a crucial role for the coalition but since many of the funds will go to this, I would like to see more about the duties of the coordinator (I know this role is mentioned elsewhere in the application). Would like a little more on the nature of the PD and what evidence (research, experience, etc.) leads to the choice of that type of PD. More</p>

		<p>than who delivers it – the justification for the model.</p> <p>Solid and thorough. This ambitious proposal makes me think that they may want to consider subscribing to a more unified curriculum. The strategies mentioned in this section and others and solid and evidence-based, but the realistic ability of the typical teacher to implement these (with time and money and training and experience constraints) should not be downplayed.</p> <p>Something to consider: Packaged programs and curricula are not theoretical underpinnings in and of themselves. Ideally, I would be looking for theory-based approaches and understandings that inform the choice of packages like Khan Academy or any other.</p>
451	3	<p>Consortium, CBO, Non-profit, Volunteer tutors Serves ok#s, longstanding. Well written and described, coordinated, answered questions. Integrated Curriculum /digital literacy distance, Warning Support team. Offered in community health centers - Free AE, HES, Career readiness - Tracks Community impact and ROI. Local networked WIOA partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participating in developing statewide System <p>Well-coordinated capacity building. DD to promote distance learning partnerships, referral scanning Integrating instruction. Partner with relevant services; orientation, advising, robust cross referrals. Working to get diagnostic services fee paid. licenced/specialist tutors for dyslexia - Better than many. instructors given a book, Funding literacy coordinator (consortium?) -Volunteer tutor stipends - materials/support. they have to high quality professional development, including through electronic means. 3hro week Literacy ARC trainings</p> <p>Integrated cross training -1 f2f, 3f2f ARCAL -Blended learning -In-house weekly. monthly, quarterly, Ye year - Community impact (ROI) & qualitative measures - Working evaluator -board of directors - - data technician, tech assistance. collaboration with wraparound service providers, and other efforts to support student persistence and progress. proposed project, including (but not limited to) project design, operations, and choice of instructional methods and activities. described multiple approaches and Consortium theoretical model. Appreciate the well thought out proposal that is easy to follow, but detailed - Reasonable ask - liked data tables</p>
449	4	<p>Anticipate strong collaboration with other local providers with no mention of how or with whom. Comprehensive but lacking details about how the initiative would improve or enhance the benefit organization currently provides. Note subgrantees will be sought out but without specificity of how; professional development noted but not detailed. Nothing on how they will identify individuals in need. Comprehensive services available.</p>

		Lacks specificity. Comprehensive. Lacking specificity for scheduling and collaboration. Research cited throughout.
420	5	overall good but would have been nice to have a better idea of how this program will coordinate with the others in the Northern region. A little wordy. Overall good. would like more details on this. would like to see more partnerships on this. overall good but would like a better idea of how they are all working together.

Gordon Bernell Charter School

Points	Reviewer	Comments
237	1	Seeking funds for NMPED certified ELA/reading teacher for Reading Plus program. Incarcerated community, specialized population. Some efforts to reach out, but mostly self contained. Incarcerated student population. PED licensure, IEPs, SAT Meetings, Wraparound services. Discussed the position to be funded. Vague, very little info provided. Discusses PED and APS. Does not address NMHED data requirements. Restructuring. Wraparound services. Sources are not cited, limited.
331	2	The response is clear and answers the questions posed. The applicant has been doing the work and plans to braid the funding with other funding to accomplish their goals. They are serving fewer students by far than usual, but this is understandable given COVID-19. For me, a notable drawback of the application overall is that this provider only serves those in a correctional facility. While this population is very important, I think this narrow focus should be a concern for us. The applicant has a history of service and a meaningful mission, but does not seem to be planning on enhancing or expanding their work and service. More detail on the briefly-mentioned coordination would have been helpful. Physical disabilities are not addressed. Also, I would have liked to read more about how they plan to address learning disabilities, especially for those over 22. Individuals with learning disabilities are a large part of the adult literacy learning population (as they note) and their needs often go unmet; I think more details about their ability to serve those over 22 would have been helpful here. Straightforward plan for a needed staff member. Although I'd like to read more about the nature of their PD for adult learning and instruction, I appreciated the description of their regular commitment to PD and their interest in training folks holistically to meet the needs of this population. I really like their emphasis on persistence and on an understanding of shame and trauma in how it impacts the learning experience of adults. I feel that this could have been stronger overall. The TABE is testing, not a theoretical underpinning, and the reading program they use would be selected because of a theoretical approach, which they do not describe in much detail.

285	3	<p>addresses main questions, reasonable picture of program, Correctional service. Basic services, losing funding and need to comp., conflicted on what's used. Broader curriculum Coordinated in Community. Stable source of learners. Multiple staff SPED licensure, IEPs (K12 Style), Older students don't qualify for SPED funding, more support than avg. School academic counseling, "Next step plan", Fund 1 FTE ELA Teacher. PD on reading instruction, ACE's, mental health PED licensed teachers /</p> <p>Not adult learner training/corrections. Data Management in place (SIS team), Outside hired tech support/software. Middle of the road. conflict around funding law chang�, high drop out wraparound less impressive s Conflicting findings on Reading Plus -dated, designed for kids, sit on computer -Study cited produced by company - using loophole to pad funding Needed, but → K12 and corrections? Odd model not impressed - did get \$750k from HED - Corrections ed is high demand. No guiding framework for programming or practice. Correctional ed high demand - Basic infrastructure there corrections - SPED aud cross-training (no adult specific training) - unimpressive software choice (limited effectiveness) designed for Children - low-touch, high drop out mid-ish ask</p> <p>apparent controversy - left questioning a number of things.</p>
318	4	<p>Missing demographic information; proposing to serve very specific corrections population and not region; don't appear to follow publisher's recommendations for post assessments. No specificity of how grant would improve or enhance current services. Doesn't describe how they would coordinate and states services are already available to individuals. Not serving most heavily populated region or any community, only serving select group of incarcerated individuals. No noted relationships to help and no referral system in place. No mention of training or grant compliance. No mention of electronic means or adaptability. Lacking specificity about how they will monitor program activities and determine needs. No collaboration or referral noted even upon parole. No research or promising practices specifically cited, no mention of facility specific project design or operations and successes.</p>
440	5	<p>overall good but total numbers served and coordination with other programs seems low.</p>

New Mexico Coalition for Literacy		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
145	1	Wow! Lots of veiled and not so veiled threats and accusations; very unprofessional response. Resumes, history of org. Lots of extraneous information. Discussed cancelled activities, Discussed MOUs subgrantees have. What exactly does this applicant do? Community need assessment. Pivot evaluation, does not really discuss how. Vague, no mention of referral services. Discussion of pgms that have and have not applied for continued funding. Extensive discussion about other initiatives. Discussed PD it will provide/participate in. Does not address specifics of data. Does not address program administration. Each subgrantee is its own non-profit. Does include citations but relavance?
13	2	My comments in this section are applicable to NMCL’s response to the first question, but also to NMCL’s responses to other questions below. I found the applicant’s responses to be surprisingly unprofessional throughout the application. Question responses were indirect, incomplete, confusing, and cloying. I had to search for responses to individual sub-questions; quite a few were missing or incomplete, and the responses I found were often unclear. The applicant seemed to question the necessity of re-applying for funding at all at this time and seemed to disparage other applicants’ quality and integrity. This and other responses in this application contained careless mistakes in grammar, punctuation, and style that contributed to my difficulty in reading; they also contained unattributed or poorly cited quotes, memes, and article excerpts. Although I made a good faith effort to comb through this extremely long application and find answers to the questions, my overall impression of this applicant is negative and made me wonder deeply about the quality of the organization’s work, as this is what resulted in response to an important RFA. I would not recommend funding this organization based upon this application. Again, this was a long, indirect response to a straightforward question in this RFA. The response contained some of the information requested, but also borrowed heavily from the writings of others (using no discernible style, such as APA), to the extent that I could not tell which words belonged to the applicant. The applicant seemed to have cut and pasted parts of staff members’ resumes into the application as well. I do not believe the applicant responded, as far as I could tell, to the question in the third bullet point above. The response to this question was extremely hard to follow and it remained largely unanswered. On the basis of this response, I do not understand explicitly how the organization would coordinate with other resources in the impacted communities. The response here seems to be incomplete and submitted in draft or notes form. Again, the response to this question is broad and offers little

		<p>specificity. After reading this response, I do not have clear understanding of or confidence in the organization’s strategies to identify and engage with those who are in need of services. There is an opaque reference to being “a King or Queen.”</p> <p>This response is very low on detail, so that I am not confident about the applicant’s ability to meet the needs of individuals with disabilities. The applicant mentions that they typically “refer” eligible individuals to, apparently, others, but they do not mention to whom or on what basis these referrals are made. They said they will revise their Powerpath curriculum but make not mention of what this is. This response seems to largely dismiss service to adults with disabilities. Given that such a high percentage of adult learners with literacy needs have learning disabilities, I find this concerning. This response was particularly hard to follow. It was full of incomplete sentences and half-explained ideas, and made confusing references that were not explained, such as “industrial revolution principles” that contrasted with their own “fairly timeless model” that they have yet to create or at least to share. Part of the response seemed to disparage other programs’ abilities. This response contained a photo of the ED of the applicant organization with the caption “#legends” which I found particularly unprofessional.</p> <p>Again, response is incomplete and difficult to follow. It says that part of the response to this question could be found in the Project Plan at the end of the document, but I had trouble finding this plan at the end of the document and what I found did not seem to answer this question. This was a particularly incomplete response. It directs the reader to an attached report, but it was difficult for this evaluator to find and locate the answers therein. The applicant mentions that reporting requirements will be “improved” but does not specify how. This response had more specificity than others, though sentence fragments and an incomplete narrative – not to mention the fact that it begins with a cut-and-pasted editorial and unattributed figure from another source and ends with a photo that has no caption – contributed to my average score for this response. Weak at best. A few foundational sources were cited but not explained in any detail in terms of their clear relationships to the proposed project elements. The resource list is a mess with numerous serious errors, incomplete sources and lack of adherence to any style.</p>
<p>318</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>This application was perplexing for me to review. - Organization (?), Scattershot, must hunt for information, purple(?), pig picture? 300 pages. Superfluous throughout. hard to get to actual descriptions. Text Color hard to read Longstanding Statewide, direct services of subcontracting Is Concerned about Services for the least served, most vulnerable adults. have to swim around to find L the pertinent information. Make your case, don't attack others, pejorative Language? - ProLiteracy ESL, Voxy, Leamos -</p>

		<p>Volunteer tutors in ProLiteracy training - mostly standard, increasing distance options - Community events, family literacy - Partnerships in many instances, robust cross-referrals has been overseeing training certification (ProLiteracy). should have more info like bottom of pg. 36. helped in launching new program. While I believe the organization has deep networks, longstanding experience, and unique perspectives, multitude of community partnerships, the tone doesn't sound collaborative. Referencing community and networks above, they seem to have a well-developed System. "Lifespan Literacy" - Survey Community. Needs improvement. Referrals. Learning Rx, Bridges to Practice Training, Industrial Revolution principles, ? - Nameless framework. direct trainings a direct distance instruction - Needs assessment -LACES training - Pilot programs. Offering the resources of other sites. Personnel training (Canned finance). ProLiteracy Led Network/ mobileLearning COPS</p> <p>- Volunteer training. why Refer to project plan and not offer detailed answer? Standard tracking -monthly meetings. Survey needs assessment - again referred to project plan. standard intake, flexible scheduling; assessment -Referral to other programs - multiple modalities -tutoring ix week @ 2hrs. wraparound and variety of services. "Emancipatory". Pre-recorded trainings- media literacy. I do have a deep appreciation for what NMCL is trying to convey philosophically in their application, I feel, however, they may have missed the mark. They have asked for the moon, but not left a clear argument or impression on the reader. I am struggling to work through the lengthy document, identify answers, and offer scores or Commentary. -One aspect that is not lost on me is that in times of crisis, resources are often moved away from female led organizations, especially when they are community oriented. I'm not qualified to comment - There may be a tinge of hubris in the "We need the whole pie" approach. I'm not familiar with the regional politics of the field, however, the clash seems familiar. As an outside evaluator, the whole thing strikes me as awkward. If it's to tell someone off, that seems off as well. How do I respond? As a teacher and editor, I would offer feedback, ask questions, request revisions, But as a grant reviewer, my role is quite different. I am to offer a view on which applicants would be good stewards of public resources, and leaders in the profession. This creates a quandary. Can anyone claim a monopoly on Collaboration? Working to integrate more tech –mentor, tutor & facilitator program.</p>
209	4	<p>Neither clear nor concise; difficulty locating requested information; cannot find measurable outcomes; instructional approach undefined; "will not provide its playbook in the contents of this application;" op/eds are opinions not facts; how services provided not clearly addressed in section; where services will be provided not addressed; collaborations not noted; lack of clarity regarding 2 versions of LACES database and</p>

		<p>unnecessary/expensive duplication; how will you assess and track student progress not addressed with specificity, especially regarding subgrantees. Not following directions; too much extraneous information; 15+ pages is not brief, clear, or concise. Certain paragraphs lack clarity – Example: “To take a risk at a time of uncertainty is to shake the core and foundation for communities and would render a return to a ‘new’ normal all but impossible” (have no idea what this has to do with an improved referral system). Lacks specificity regarding how to identify and engage individuals. No current ability to serve individuals with disabilities; refer them out. Lacks specificity; nothing noted about data validity or assessment administrator certification; will mandatory participation in PR activities be covered by this grant – if so, what does this look like. Lacking information about project management training specific to initiative – it’s not part of the narrative as requested. Information not included in narrative of data collection and maintenance for themselves and their subgrantees as requested; lacks specificity about how program will ensure compliance; training and technical assistance lack specificity. Extraneous information; an editorial has nothing to do with program administration and processes or other efforts to support student persistence and progress; assessing “as possible” – what other criteria would be used to determine eligibility if not an assessment; collaboration with wraparound service providers minimal; unclear if processes pertain to subgrantees; lacking formal training for database and test administration; nothing noted on formal subgrantee auditing and data validity. “Guideposts” for what; nothing research based cited; lacking specificity for operations, choice of materials, and activities.</p>
<p>290</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>this application is extremely difficult to follow. There is much extraneous information that is not relevant to the RFA. In addition, the grant writer seems to be projecting a defensiveness that would indicate a reluctance to work with the community. There seems to be an inherent threat to the proposal - if you don't fund this, all of the programs we fund will go away. Based on the negative tone of this proposal, I cannot recommend that this program continue in its present form. Again, very difficult to follow and much unnecessary information in the proposal. the grant writer is off topic much of the time.</p>

ReadWest		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
280	1	1 on 1 tutoring, long standing program. ProLit Accred Standards. Identifies Central Region partners and areas that are underserved. Court and health lit classes. Referrals to PMS, DVR, SWIDA. Zoom mtgs w/ Central Region. Discussion of PD and how will provide. A list of data collected, not descriptive. Discussion of pgm operation. Sources are not cited, limited.
329	2	<p>Their response is thorough, giving a clear overview of their work and plan. There is evidence of a student-centered orientation and a solid evidence of knowledge of some best practices in literacy instruction. Nice description of innovation in the past that these funds would help support. I liked the specific plans for increased outreach. Some activities are listed here but they do not seem to be a comprehensive plan to identify and engage learners. I was glad that they addressed physical disabilities and described their process for referral. Since such a large percentage of this population likely has learning disabilities, I would like to see a stronger answer here with a better demonstration of issues related to disability and a plan for helping their tutors address them effectively. The specificity here seems average. Would be nice if this organization had a more clearly-articulated vision for theoretically-based instruction in their sub-grantees in the central region. This is a start, particularly since they have a national organization with whom they work to provide PD. However, I do not get a sense that PD will be ongoing for individuals, and I do not have enough information to determine how PD reflects best practices in the field and how it might be innovative. This seems lackluster.</p> <p>Seems like a solid plan. This does not really answer the question; it does not provide evidence of theoretical underpinnings and research in best practices that inform the work of the organization.</p>
339	3	<p>Adequate description, clear, concise, addressed questions. maintain current practices. Standard approaches, somewhat hands-off. Key community partners llegal, health, employers, social services, Safe Houses. expertise, loose referral System DVR, SHUA. Volunteers & Admin, Meetings & tech support, col, basic instructional materials, salaries, wages. Online tutor training, directors ProLiteracy mngat training</p> <p>Quarterly PPD , Laces training. Oversight, sub-contractors' data mngmt. postsecondary engagement, follow-up stopouts. LACK of framework informing programming and practice.</p>

<p>328</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Missing specific instructional materials used – recommend or required curricula or content – just notes possible publishers; the two measurable outcomes don't match vision (employability, citizenship, further education; rigid instructional schedule. How money would improve or enhance doesn't match subgrantee intentions in question 1. This appears to be predetermining its subgrantees as opposed to coordinating services. Comprehensive. No training for staff in place to help serve individuals; refer out instead of serve. Minimal support and oversight for subgrantees noted. No plan for electronic training – only if no other choice for core program personnel (the tutors); TABE and CASAS mentioned but not requiring test administrators to be certified by test manufacturer for test validity. Lacking formal training for database and test administration; nothing noted on formal subgrantee auditing and data validity. Nothing on following test manufacturer/sate guideline for post assessing – just reassess continuing students in November and April; rigid scheduling; cannot serve students with learning disabilities; no mention of how to promote student persistence and progress other than follow up if missing appointments. Anecdotal referencing; no research or theoretical structure noted for operations, activities, etc.</p>
<p>385</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>overall good but would like to know more about how this program will support and oversee subcontractors, especially those "fledgling enterprises. could be stronger. this is weaker than it could be with more partnerships. this is not clear. not much here.</p>

Reading Works		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
350	1	Detailed descriptions, clear presentation. Comprehensive answers. Collaboration, not duplication of services. Extensive outreach activities. Solid curricular resources for students with disabilities. Workshops, operational/materials. Discussed in-person to webinars, types of PD. Uses Apricot database; will require LACES of subgrantees. Discussion about enrollment and tutor recruitment. Vague, chart.
350	2	I thought this was clear and concise outline of the project, well thought-out. There were some details that helped bring their program to life for me, such as the hand-sewn bag of supplies that students receive. I like their focus on the particular learning needs of adults and their descriptions of some of their innovations. Although the answer is strong overall, I was troubled by their reliance on two refuted and outdated bodies of work: learning styles inventories, which have been shown to be ineffective for students and for teachers in nearly 30 years of research; and the “million word gap” finding, which was drawn from a study many years ago with few participants, and which has been sharply criticized for racial and cultural bias. While the “million word gap” seemed to be foundational to their way they think about their program’s benefit to the community (but not the content of their work I would want to recommend that they re-think their use of learning styles inventories with students. Nice description of the organization’s primary mission and how the funds would enhance their work. It occurs to me that they would serve only a portion of the state (while their partner would serve another portion of the state) and they do not articulate a vision for how their model might be replicated or expanded to serve more learners over time and bring in other partners, as other applicants have proposed. That said, they have a vision for how they accomplish their work and address the needs in their community, and the funds would support them in this. I think they make a good case for the type of collaboration they have been using thus far and the value of doing a certain thing well, rather than trying to be all things to all people. I liked the way they illustrated the strength and utility of the work they do, in this section. They point out that they are good at what they do and how they use collaboration. That said, it’s also useful to note that they really are not suggesting in this response that they would use the grant funding to enhance or improve or expand the work they are currently doing. The scope of their work would remain the same; they are not emphasizing growth and improvement. Really nice description of an engagement strategy that really takes it to the people in the community; this seemed very strong and commendable to me. I like that they include physical disabilities in their response; this wasn’t always present in other applications. While they admit that they had some

		<p>difficulties addressing learning disabilities in the past, they have recently applied for a grant (for presumably staff) to learn more about certain disabilities. Though this is a good start, I would have liked to see a bit more in the narrative here about they think they will support adult learners with disabilities with the additional funding, in addition to one-off trainings for staff, which are notorious for how little they can influence practice. Solid explanation. Since their curriculum is so central to their approach, I would like to see an excerpt of it and more detail about the approach or framework used for the development and implementation of the curriculum. More detail on the pedagogical worldview for this curriculum would be very useful; all literacy curricula are not created equal.</p> <p>This PD plan strikes me as somewhat lackluster. In addition to (or instead of) one-off trainings and workshops, I might like to see some more innovative approaches to PD that are evidence-based and more contemporary; just one example is the hybrid approach to PD experiences that helps support learning and a change in practice over time. There is much recent research about approaches to PD that promote real change. Straightforward and clear. Solid description of current practices. Research findings on student persistence don't seem to be incorporated here into the plan. It would be good to speak less anecdotally and more informatively about evidence-based plans²² to support student progress. This response felt incomplete. The diagram was not visible for me, but nonetheless I would have liked to hear more about how and why the diagram is more appropriate as a foundation for their work. Much more could have been written about how relevant (and more recent) research impacts key parts of their work, including design and instruction. Again, a more in-depth description of the curriculum (including its theoretical foundation) would be helpful to reviewers.</p>
<p>423</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Fiscal agent, thorough description CRO, liked the outlined learning outcomes, data tables, ITPs, learning Contracts did a comprehensive Program Review. Detailed background, descriptions, approaches, 1 - award winning. Solid networks and soordinating locally. recruitment Strategies Pilot project in Public Library. on-Call Volunteers, limited Capabilities. Personnel -Sub-Contracts, Workshops, materials Curriculum - technical Support, site visits, cross-training. the hours online trailing, 4hrs f2f, 1-2 Workshops a year Cadditional where needed) - Converting to Webinars - Contract m Natil trainer - multiple formats and Support. >40 hr instruction data mnamit -midlend-of-year reports. Apricot (same as ATD). Sutvey Monkey -Train subgrantees in fiscal reporting, clata collection, testing, and diagnostics -Site ovisits, technical Support. Discussed in detail Collaborative, flexible, robust cross-referrals. detailed theoretical model m diagram, diversity, it matters.</p>

429	4	Comprehensive. Should be noted that this is not a “permanent source of recurring funds”. Lacking referral system to help. Minimal support and oversight for subgrantees noted. Plan for subgrantees not noted; nothing mentioned about database and test administration training and certification or grant compliance; bring in a national trainer for what specifically. Apricot case management system information isn’t clear; will this program use LACES as required; compliance doesn’t mention anything about NMHED’s and the grant’s requirements; oversight and technical assistance for subgrantees minimal; nothing about certification for test administrators, data validity, or database training and assistance. Scheduling lacks specificity. Lacking specificity.
400	5	overall good but need more info on how this program will support and oversee subcontractors and how it will work with VC Literacy Council. need more info on this. this should be stronger. this needs a lot more info. this is not very strong.

Rio Arriba Adult Literacy Program		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
375	1	Clear description of coalition action plan. History of org. Comprehensive explanation of partnerships/coordination. Describes org. outreach and partnerships. Vague description of wraparound services. Describes how funds will be used. Discusses PD and coalition plans. Coalition data practices. Coalition plans. Extensive list of cited sources.
430	2	<p>This is the same as other project partners, so my comments are the same: I thought this was a very strong outline. It was clear and they made an effort to be evidence-based, citing recent literature that reflects the direction of the field. I appreciated their emphasis on the socioeconomic context of literacy and hope to hear more about that in the future, in terms of how it would be addressed in their model. These programs have demonstrated an ability to work well together in the past. I would have liked to read more about the nature of the proposed “kit” and how that would be used – it seems key to the overall model. Regarding the introduction of the CASEL framework for social and emotional learning: since it was included, I guess I would like to hear a bit about why they believe this is critical in literacy instruction or why that is a critical piece of their outcomes. I think that it’s a prudent plan to focus first on the northern and central regions as a pilot focus, and then expand as they refine their model; I liked this part of the plan. While I recognize the need for literacy services in the southern part of the state, I think it’s realistic to use this not-large amount of money to pilot a new model before expanding. As in the Taos and ABQ-ALC applications: this is a strong plan, though ambitious. Given the amount of funding, I wonder if it is too ambitious. Ambitious, again. They discuss work they have done before on this topic. They do demonstrate an evidence-based understanding of learning disability and appropriate accommodations. They don’t discuss serving individuals with other (non-learning) disabilities. I think it would have been useful to think through this and include it in their overview.</p> <p>I think the coordinator is a crucial role for the coalition but since many of the funds will go to this, I would like to see more about the duties of the coordinator (I know this role is mentioned elsewhere in the application). Would like a little more on the nature of the PD and what evidence (research, experience, etc.) leads to the choice of that type of PD. More than who delivers it – the justification for the model. Solid and thorough Same comments as the other proposals in this consortium: This ambitious proposal makes me think that they may want to consider subscribing to a more unified curriculum. The strategies mentioned in this section and others and solid and evidence-based, but the realistic ability of the typical teacher to implement these (with time and money and training and</p>

		<p>experience constraints) should not be down-played.</p> <p>Something to consider: Packaged programs and curricula are not theoretical underpinnings in and of themselves. Ideally, I would be looking for theory-based approaches and understandings that inform the choice of packages like Khan Academy or any other.</p>
421	3	<p>Well written, Addresses questions, clear picture, data provided, Consortium, subcontract. Small operation, Organization and activities adequately described. Well coordinated, capacity building, several partners, housed in public library, Site visits, cross-training Opportunities Relying heavily on partners. 1 for director, coordinator, adapting offerings, a little "Kitchen Sink" for a small operation, high-need region. on-call volunteers, limited Capabilities. Provide materials Guidance to programs & instructional support, echnical Support, site visits, Crosstraining</p> <p>small operation, low#s. Coordination with Coalition Remote outpost of Coalition. EBPS, Holistic "Solid theoretical model, Brain, Individual, Learning Ecology, Sociocultural Context. Well written and thought out proposal - Small operation, but has potential - Coalition with sound Capacity building vision.</p>
419	4	<p>Subgrantee doesn't appear to be thought out. What will they do with the money if they don't have enough applicants? "Anticipate strong collaboration with other providers" with no mention of how. "Boasts longstanding and exemplary collaborative partnerships" without providing any proof to back up the statement. Comprehensive. Note subgrantees will be sought out but without specificity of how; professional development noted but not detailed. Missing both activities and how they will identify individuals in need, as well as what their "more robust and systematized approach to publicity and referral" will be. Nothing in place to help serve; no staff training provided. Lacks specificity. Comprehensive. Lacking specificity for scheduling and collaboration. Research cited throughout.</p>
420	5	<p>Overall good. Would like to see more of how these programs are going to work together. this is a bit weak. this is pretty weak.</p>

San Juan College		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
415	1	Clear description of coalition action plan. Mission, values, History of org. Comprehensive explanation of partnership and coordination. Outreach and partnerships. Institutional resources, on-boarding/advising practices, support services. Tech assistance and data plans. Coalition plans. funded positions, supports. Coalition plans. Comprehensive list of cited sources.
430	2	<p>This is similar in many ways to other project partners, so most of my comments are the same: I thought this was a very strong outline. It was clear and they made an effort to be evidence-based, citing recent literature that reflects the direction of the field. I appreciated their emphasis on the socioeconomic context of literacy and hope to hear more about that in the future, in terms of how it would be addressed in their model. These programs have demonstrated an ability to work well together in the past. I would have liked to read more about the nature of the proposed “kit” and how that would be used – it seems key to the overall model. Regarding the introduction of the CASEL framework for social and emotional learning: since it was included, I guess I would like to hear a bit about why they believe this is critical in literacy instruction or why that is a critical piece of their outcomes. I think that it’s a prudent plan to focus first on the northern and central regions as a pilot focus, and then expand as they refine their model; I liked this part of the plan. While I recognize the need for literacy services in the southern part of the state, I think it’s realistic to use this not-large amount of money to pilot a new model before expanding.</p> <p>San Juan seems like a strong partner; they have served more students in two years that some other applicant programs have served in larger amounts of time. Maybe more information about how they assess benefit to the local community could have been provided here. I love the focus on innovation and moving the state conversation on literacy forward that this and other applicants in this consortium have. As in the Taos, Rio Arriba, ABQ-ALC applications: this is a strong plan, though ambitious. Given the amount of funding, I wonder if it is too ambitious. Ambitious, again. They discuss work they have done before on this topic. They do demonstrate an evidence-based understanding of learning disability and appropriate accommodations. They don’t discuss serving individuals with other (non-learning) disabilities. I think it would have been useful to think through this and include it in their overview. I think the coordinator is a crucial role for the coalition but since many of the funds will go to this, I would like to see more about the duties of the coordinator (I know this role is mentioned elsewhere in the application). Would like a little more on the nature of the PD and what evidence (research, experience, etc.) leads to the choice of that type of PD. More than who delivers it – the justification for the model. I</p>

		<p>like the options. Solid and thorough. Same comments as the other proposals in this consortium: This ambitious proposal makes me think that they may want to consider subscribing to a more unified curriculum. The strategies mentioned in this section and others and solid and evidence-based, but the realistic ability of the typical teacher to implement these (with time and money and training and experience constraints) should not be down-played.</p> <p>Something to consider: Packaged programs and curricula are not theoretical underpinnings in and of themselves. Ideally, I would be looking for theory-based approaches and understandings that inform the choice of packages like Khan Academy or any other.</p>
452	3	<p>HE, Consortium, Well written, well described. Clear, coordinated. Streamline Coordinate ABE, Dev Ed, Post Sec, Career Pathways, integrated curriculum -aligned in State & WIOA. Interacting w standing student Services, multiple community partners, Mental health & Cultural Competency training - Academic coaching, Individualized instruction + digital literacy, wraparound support, robust cross-referral. use Bridges to Practice model</p> <p>Referral disabilities Coordinator, Onboarding, advising - Universal design - Coordinate MVR -HE setting can leave most vulnerable behind. EBPs, Provide materials, Guidance to instructional programs, & resources, technical support. Solid PD modules (+ dig.lit), on-demand training Remote, +2+, site visits(pre-recorded webinars) end-of year meeting. Coordinated "TECC .</p> <p>aligned with State NRS, LACES - Come data entry mngmt, Good posttest rate land level gains</p> <p>-Stakeholder participation in decision-making. principle admin model</p> <p>- Nice add. Solid theoretical basis Brain, Individual, I Learning Ecology Sociocultural Context.</p>
446	4	<p>Subgrantee doesn't appear to be thought out. What will they do with the money if they don't have enough applicants? "Anticipate strong collaboration with other providers" with no mention of how. "Boasts exemplary collaborative partnerships" without providing any proof to back up the statement. Comprehensive. Note subgrantees will be sought out but without specificity of how; professional development noted but not detailed. Nothing on how they will identify individuals in need. Comprehensive services available. Lacks specificity. Lacking specificity for scheduling and collaboration. Research cited throughout.</p>
435	5	<p>overall good, would like to know more about how these programs are going to work together. this is weaker than it should be for the area.</p>

Taos Education and Career Center		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
430	1	Lit. ARC consortium plan, Fiscal agent plans. Vision, mission, history of UNM-Taos specifically. Coalition coordination. Description of outreach and pgm activities. Coalition disability practices; coordination of services with other entities. Coalition grant expenses. Coalition OD and support to be offered. Comprehensive coalition data and fiscal management. 7 key program admin. principles. extensive list of cite sources.
443	2	<p>I thought this was a very strong outline. It was clear and they made an effort to be evidence-based, citing recent literature that reflects the direction of the field. I appreciated their emphasis on the socioeconomic context of literacy and hope to hear more about that in the future, in terms of how it would be addressed in their model. These programs have demonstrated an ability to work well together in the past. I would have liked to read more about the nature of the proposed “kit” and how that would be used – it seems key to the overall model. Regarding the introduction of the CASEL framework for social and emotional learning: since it was included, I guess I would like to hear a bit about why they believe this is critical in literacy instruction or why that is a critical piece of their outcomes. I think that it’s a prudent plan to focus first on the northern and central regions as a pilot focus, and then expand as they refine their model; I liked this part of the plan. While I recognize the need for literacy services in the southern part of the state, I think it’s realistic to use this not-large amount of money to pilot a new model before expanding. Solid response; the organization has demonstrated successes. This is a strong plan, though ambitious. Given the amount of funding, I wonder if it is too ambitious. Again, strong but ambitious. Demonstrates an evidence-based understanding of learning disability and appropriate accommodations. They don’t discuss serving individual with other (non-learning) disabilities. I think it would have been useful to think through this and include it in their overview. I think the coordinator is a crucial role for the coalition but since many of the funds will go to this, I would like to see more about the duties of the coordinator (I know this role is mentioned elsewhere in the application). The significant strengths of this are the two “options” that recognize differences in capacity around the state, as well as inclusion of literacy programs that may not necessarily be a part of this coalition or funded by this coalition. This demonstrates a commitment to students and teachers throughout our state.</p> <p>Simple = good (though it doesn’t really sound all that simple in its description!). This seemed solid and well considered; the organization has clear experience in this. Well-considered. Good. This is relevant research that reflects the modern direction of the field.</p>

		This comment may be more relevant for another section, but this ambitious proposal makes me think that they may want to consider subscribing to a more unified curriculum. The strategies mentioned in this section and others and solid and evidence-based, but the realistic ability of the typical teacher to implement these (with time and money and training and experience constraints) should not be down-played.
453	3	<p>appreciate philosophy of approach. HE, Consortium, Fiscal agent Streamline, coordinate ABE dev. ed. Postsecondary, Career pathways, integrated curriculum - aligned with state and WIOA - partners bring in various services, angles. well coordinated capacity building integrating with standing student and Community services. clearly described, comprehensive, Collaborative well developed training Supports Wraparounds established, robust cross referral</p> <p>Strong Statewide coordination. Can refer to UNM-T disabilities coordinator, orientation and advising offered</p> <p>- Universal Design, Partner with Voc Rehab - HE sometimes leaves most vulnerable behind. UNM-T Provides materials, coordinated training 4 FD multiple formats, Comp. Supports tech support. Solid PD modules - Regular and remote PD options</p> <p>[Cross Community learning, Onsite visits - Year end meeting. Train Subcontractors I-clear data management plan, Strategic play -Stakeholder participation - Aligned State/WIOA. principle admin model - Nice add, Solid theoretical basis Brain, Individual, Learning Ecology, Sociocultural context, Clearly organized and coordinated partners. - Appreciate the clear, well organized proposal</p> <p>that is easy to follow - Consortium with Solid Capacity building Vision - solid #s - ?? most Vulnerable learners</p>
436	4	<p>Subgrantee guidelines don't appear to be thought out. What will they do with the money if they don't have enough applicants? They anticipate funding in the initial year will be located across the north and central regions. What happens after that? Those subgrantees will automatically lose funding in subsequent years? "Anticipate strong collaboration with other providers" with no mention of how. "Boasts exemplary collaborative partnerships" without providing any proof to back up the statement. Comprehensive. Note subgrantees will be sought out but without specificity of how; professional development noted but not detailed. Nothing on how they will identify individuals in need. Comprehensive services available. Lacks specificity. Lacking specificity for scheduling and collaboration. Research cited throughout.</p>
445	5	<p>good, but I would like to see more info on how this program will fund and work with other programs statewide, not just in the Northern region,</p>

		starting in the first year - and it should be clear how they are going to keep smaller independent programs from getting lost in the shuffle.
--	--	---

Valencia County Literacy Council		
Points	Reviewer	Comments
200	1	Collab with UNM-V; Consortium with Reading Works. Mission/Vision/History of org. Connections in the community. Word of mouth, tabling events. UNM-V only, no other referrals. Only salary support; does not really explain how will support. Possibly work with Jeff fantine? Use LACES, no specifics. Discussed duties of key personnel. Vague, no citations.
242	2	This could have been clearer and both more concise and better detailed. It did not seem as strong as that of their partner, Reading Works. They have a mission and vision and a track record of service. Like their partner, they would serve only a portion of the state (while their partner would serve another portion of the state) and they do not articulate a vision for how their model might be replicated or expanded to serve more learners over time and bring in other partners, as other applicants have proposed. That said, they have a vision for how they accomplish their work and address the needs in their community, and the funds would support them in this. Would like to read more specifics about how the organization has worked and will work with the numerous resources listed in the application. How specifically do they coordinate? Some of this information is included but overall the answer could provide more information. It sounds like they are using community-based outreach strategies, which is great. Would be wonderful to hear about other potential, more innovative strategies for reaching a larger number of individuals. Would have liked a lot more specificity here. Like other applicants, they do not address physical disabilities. In terms of learning disability, they say that they will address them, but hardly any information on how or specifics about different types and the plan they have for developing and implementing expertise within the program to meet needs. The answer here does not fully respond to the questions in this item. In addition, part of the answer seems to address the previous question, not this one. Not much effort or detail went into this response. Their partner answered it much more thoroughly, and the difference between the two throughout these applications give me some concern about their ability to coordinate well. There just isn't enough detail here to evaluate their plan. The plan that is addressed here does sound a bit lackluster and lacking in foundational evidence, similar to their partner's – but their partner provided more detail and a better-developed, more comprehensive plan overall. Very little specificity here; as such, is hard for me to evaluate. More specificity here helped me understand their plan, though part of it seems to just be pasted-in responsibilities of the ED. Some of the answers are missing here, particularly a more detailed and founded discussion of how to support persistence and progress in the program and

		with the potential grant funds. I was disappointed with this answer. Contracting with Jeff Fantine is not a theoretical underpinning of their work. It seemed that they put little effort into this question (and large parts of the application itself), so that I do not leave with a sense that they are planning on doing work based on current research and best practices, nor that they are planning to innovate and use the funds to better serve a larger number of adults in their area. Their partner was much stronger, in my opinion.
408	3	Volunteer CBO, Consortium with Reading Works, Goals, objectives, and measures, questions answered. Central Region, longstanding, clear MVV, Complimentary services, experience, collaborative, Long list of partners, UNM-V for PD, strong cross referrals, reliant on other orgs but freedstanding agreements. Community events, bi-lingual promotion, website and social media, family literacy services, Mariposa. Established history, referral to UNM-V for services. Continuing PD, Coordination, Salaries. Collaborate with Reading works and UNM-V, Online ProLiteracy training for tutors monthly bring in natll trainer. Coordinate w/ Reading Works. Discussed and described, Collaborative, flexible. Relying on Reading Works' model - Looking to grow and learn.
334	4	Students co-enrolled with Next Steps receive more comprehensive services, difficulty relating goal objectives with measurable outcomes relative to the grant. Nothing on how it would enhance or improve services. Not tied to how the funding helps with coordination, can't tell what's currently happening; noted additional paid staff is needed when the program is "able to fully provide services" yet they've been around for years; cannot tell what's currently happening in program. Missing both activities and how they will identify individuals in need, as well as what their "more robust and systematized approach to publicity and referral" will be. Don't serve students equally, must be co-enrolled in another program to receive services or be referred out. No real support noted. Minimal PD support mentioned, no specificity. Reading Works developed the literacy training? Unclear. Bring a national trainer in for what? Tutors "invited" – is there any mandatory training? Compliance and technical assistance not addressed. Processes not addressed. Relevant research or theoretical structure not addressed; no mention if Reading Works' curriculum is research based or what it entails.
410	5	overall good but some areas not clear, and how are they working with Reading Works? there needs to be more coordination with community. very good. this is not clear at all. need more info here.