

Applicant: _____ Reviewer: _____ MHC Application #: HU _____

Scoring: Please score the application relative to each question using the guidance in each category.

| Question(s) | Inadequate | Adequate | Strong | Score |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| A. Fit with Humanities Grants Program | | | | |
| Does the proposed project and its goals align with the intent of the Humanities Grants program and the MHC mission? | Connecting the public to quality cultural programs is not a primary program goal. The goals are not clear or focused. Even if successfully executed, the project will not foster greater understanding of, or engagement in, the humanities. (1-5) | The project clearly connects a public audience with a quality cultural program. Project goals will foster understanding of, or engagement in, the humanities to some degree. There may be evidence of other goals the grantee is intending to serve, unrelated to the Humanities Grants purposes. (6-10) | The project’s primary goal is focused on connecting the public to cultural heritage, historical resources and/or humanities topics through a quality program. The results of the project will foster a greater understanding of, or engagement in, the humanities in Michigan. (11-15) | _____/15 |
| Does the proposed project address a humanities theme or issue? | There is weak humanities-related content, interpretation and/or discussion or the humanities content is a peripheral part of the proposed project. (1-5) | The humanities content or theme is an important component of the overall project, though other included themes may be unrelated to the humanities. (6-10) | The humanities content is central to the project. The project directly addresses humanities themes and/or issues as primary objectives. (11-15) | _____/15 |
| Does the reach of the project result in expanded public humanities opportunities in Michigan? | Public humanities opportunities remain unchanged or only slightly enhanced by the project. Underserved areas or populations are not affected. Outreach and promotion are minimal. (1-3) | The project reaches into underserved areas of the state and/or serves new audiences with humanities programs to some degree. Outreach and promotion are adequate.(4-6) | The project provides opportunities for the public, including new audiences, to engage in humanities programs at increased levels, in regions of the state that are underserved. Strong outreach and promotion is included. (7-10) | _____/10 |
| Is the project unique in its approach to the topic and methods? | The project lacks creativity and presents a standard approach or methods that may have limited audience engagement. (1-3) | The project is creative and proposes an approach that is innovative with the potential to engage new audiences, though methods may be somewhat under-defined. (4-6) | The project proposes a creative and fresh approach that will effectively engage its intended audience, incorporating defined methods aimed at also engaging new audiences. (7-10) | _____/10 |
| Does the project include required public programming? | Public programming is cursory or there are concerns about public access, cost to attend, or limited benefits to a public audience. (1-3) | The project offers at least one opportunity for the public to attend or experience a humanities program that is accessible and of public benefit. There may be a cost but it is reasonable. (4-6) | There are significant and accessible opportunities for the public to experience or attend humanities programs in various venues. Attendance is free or at a reasonable cost. (7-10) | _____/10 |

Humanities Grants

Proposal Rating Rubric

| Question(s) | Inadequate | Adequate | Strong | Score |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| B. Work Plan | | | | |
| Does the project have a clear, well-organized timeline and project management structure? | The sequence of events and responsibility for them is not clear. The project appears to be inadequately planned, or susceptible to breakdowns in process, timing, or responsibility. (1-3) | The basic activities are laid out in an understandable timeline and responsibility to manage the project is assigned. Basic planning has occurred. (4-6) | The activities and timeline are clear and specific. Overall management of the project is clear. Issues or events that could disrupt the schedule are acknowledged and addressed in the proposal. (7-10) | ____/10 |
| Is an evaluation method proposed to gather feedback and measure outcomes? | Evaluation is not addressed or the plan is very limited. It is not clear what will be changed for the project's intended audience. The audience may not be clearly defined. (1-2) | A basic plan is proposed to capture audience feedback and measure outcomes including potential changes for the identified target audience. (3) | Evaluation methods are clearly described and the results will yield useful data on outcomes and audience reaction. The target audience, and the intended changes for the audience, are clear and measurable. (4-5) | ____/5 |
| C. Personnel | | | | |
| Is the staff qualified to execute the plan of work? | In critical ways, staff lacks sufficient experience or training to accomplish the proposal's plan of work, or staff is not adequately identified. (1-3) | Staff is adequately identified and appears, as a whole, to have appropriate credentials and background to accomplish the proposal's plan of work. (4-6) | Each member of the project personnel is well suited to their project role. Background and credentials of the project personnel is a strength of the proposal. (7-10) | ____/10 |
| Is there at least one appropriate humanities scholar or professional involved in the project? | The identified professional/scholar has weak credentials and/or is not involved in the actual execution of the project work plan in a meaningful way. (1-3) | The identified professional/scholar has appropriate credentials and some involvement in the actual execution of the project work plan. (4-6) | The identified professional/scholar has strong credentials and is significantly involved in the project work plan. (7-10) | ____/10 |
| Are there beneficial partnerships or collaborations? | The project does not feature any cross-organizational partnerships or collaborations. (1-2) | There are partners in the work, but the lead/applicant organization does the bulk of the work. Partner or collaborator contributions are minimal. (3) | Project partnerships or collaborations are central to making the project possible or valuable with a broad base of support. Cross-organizational sharing of information, perspectives, and contributions will occur. (4-5) | ____/5 |
| Note: Collaborators' participation and their roles should be substantiated with statements or letters of support. | | | | |
| <i>Total Score</i> | | | | ____/100 |

Threshold Items: Because threshold items can often be addressed or clarified to bring the proposal into line with funding criteria, **please score the application** even if it fails an item below, unless you feel the proposal’s threshold issues are so substantial that they could not be remedied.

| <i>Please mark an X under “Pass” or “Fail” on each line.</i> | PASS | FAIL | NOT SURE |
|---|------|------|----------|
| The project does not involve lobbying, advocating for a specific program of social action, or promoting a particular political, religious, or ideological point of view. | | | |
| If public policy or social action is addressed in the project, it is done from an educational or historical perspective. | | | |
| For repeat applicants: Staff has not identified concerns in the administrative review regarding previous project performance of the applicant. | | | |

Budget: The overall budget and each of the line items should be reasonable given the plan of work. If you have any concerns or questions about the budget as proposed, please note them here.

Other Comments:
