

## Criteria #1 – Compliance & Eligibility **STAFF ONLY** (10 points)

Is the project eligible for consideration? Is the project compliant with NEH and HM grantmaking regulations? How have the applicant and organization engaged with HM staff?

Questions	Poor (1)	(2)	Fair (3)	(4)	Good (5)
<b>Eligibility</b> Is the project eligible to receive a federal NEH subaward?	None of the following apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private nonprofit organizations</li> <li>• Institution of higher education</li> <li>• State, local, and federally recognized Indian tribal governments</li> <li>• Groups of persons that form an association to carry out a project solely for non-profit purposes</li> <li>• An individual (except for research fellowships).</li> </ul>	The organization and/or applicant currently have an overdue/outstanding final report for a previous HM award or program.	One or both of the following apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not consult with HM staff prior to submitting the application</li> <li>• History of late application or final report submissions</li> </ul>	All the following apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The organization designation is compliant with federal regulations.</li> <li>• All reports related to previous awards and programs have been timely and of high quality.</li> <li>• The applicant consulted with HM staff prior to submission.</li> <li>• The organization and/or project has previously received funding from HM.</li> </ul>	All the following apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The organization designation is compliant with federal regulations.</li> <li>• All reports related to previous awards and programs have been timely and of high quality.</li> <li>• The applicant consulted with HM staff prior to submission.</li> <li>• This is the first request for funding from HM.</li> </ul>
<b>Completeness</b> Is the application complete?	The applicant did not include required content and/or supporting documents for all required fields.	The organization and applicant profiles are incorrect or incomplete.	All questions have been answered and all required supplemental documentation has been uploaded. However, the information may be incorrect, or the wrong documents/formats have been uploaded.	All questions have been answered and all required supplemental documentation has been uploaded.	All questions have been answered and all required supplemental documentation has been uploaded. The application includes additional letters of support.

## Criteria #2 – Significance (20 points)

Is the significance of the project for the proposed audiences and/or the broader Montana community clearly stated?

Questions	Poor (1)	Fair (3)	Good (5)
<b>Evidence of need</b> Is the proposed project responsive to a clearly defined community need?	The project did not assess community needs and does not respond to a local or regional humanities topic relevant to Montana.	The project addresses a perceived local or regional humanities topic relevant to Montanans, based on the organization's regular activities.	The project clearly addresses an evidence-based gap in knowledge, skill, or available resources for the proposed audience. The project addresses a local or regional humanities-focused topic relevant to Montanans.
<b>Value/Benefit to the community</b> Does the project demonstrate the proposed benefit or value to their audience?	It is not clear how the project will benefit the proposed audiences.	The applicant makes a decent case for how the project will benefit the proposed audiences.	The applicant presents a strong case for why this project will have a significant impact on the proposed audiences.
<b>Audience representation</b> Does the project staff and/or project advisor demonstrate adequate knowledge and/or established rapport with the stated targeted communities and audiences?	It is not evident that the organization and/or project staff have established rapport and/or relationships with the targeted communities and audiences. The progress and success of the project might be hindered by the lack of established connections in the stated communities and audiences.	The staff and/or project advisor have some knowledge and/or familiarity with the targeted audiences and communities. But they still need to form strong relationships with targeted communities and audiences.	The applying organization and/or project staff demonstrate a long history of working with and for the targeted communities and audiences. They have established key knowledge and relationships with community and audience members that ensure the success of the project.
<b>Collaboration</b> Are there beneficial partnerships or collaborations?	The project does not feature any cross-organizational partnerships or collaborations.	There are partners in the work, but the applying organization does the bulk of the work. Partner or collaborator contributions are minimal.	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.

## Criteria #3 - Strategic Alignment (30 points)

Is the proposed project aligned with the mission, vision, and current strategic goals of Humanities Montana? Will the project enrich lives through discussion and consideration of humanities ideas and topics humanities important to Montanans?

Questions	Poor (1)	Fair (3)	Good (5)
<b>Humanities Content</b> Does the proposed project connect the public with humanities topics through its themes and activities?	Even if successfully executed, the project will not foster greater understanding of, or engagement in, the humanities.	The project connects a public audience with humanities topics but not as a primary focus and/or it is not as clear how the project will result in greater understanding of the humanities.	The project's primary goal is focused on connecting the public to humanities topics by increasing knowledge or encouraging skill acquisition through a quality program.
<b>Humanities Scholarship</b> Does the project engage humanities scholars/experts in development or implementation of its activities?	The project does not articulate how humanities scholars/experts will be involved in the design, planning, or implementation of activities.	The project includes involvement of at least one humanities scholar/expert in the design, planning, or implementation of activities.	The project involves participation of multiple humanities scholars/experts in project activities and provides letters of support from each confirming their contributions.
<b>Public Engagement</b> Does the project include public humanities activities and/or events that are relevant to Montana communities and accessible to the proposed audiences?	The project reaches a limited audience and is not easily accessible to the public.	The project reaches the proposed audience in specific locations and has potential to reach a larger audience.	The project reaches a large audience and provides several opportunities for the public, including proposed audiences, to engage in humanities programs (virtual and hybrid options, multiple locations, multiple events, etc.)
<b>Innovation</b> Does the project propose transformative practices that will advance public humanities in Montana?	The project involves a broad and common humanities topic and does not reach a new audience.	The project proposes responding to a current humanities topic important to Montanans and will reach a new audience.	The project involves notable interdisciplinary collaboration and/or collaboration between humanities and non-humanities community organizations to examine a current humanities topic. The project will advance the impact of and increase access to public humanities in Montana.

<b>Comprehensive Content</b> Does the project involve a comprehensive and meaningful presentation and interpretation of humanities ideas/content?	The project presents a one-sided, uncritical treatment of humanities ideas/content.	The project involves multiple interpretations of humanities ideas/content.	The project involves unique and/or new interpretations of humanities content through incorporating multiple/diverse perspectives.
<b>Priority Audience</b> Does the project propose to engage groups in Montana historically underrepresented in the humanities?	Groups historically underrepresented in the humanities are not engaged or affected.	The project engages at least one group in Montana historically underrepresented in the humanities.	The project engages more than one group in Montana historically underrepresented in the humanities.

## Criteria #4 – Quality (25 points)

Is the project work plan specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and realistic within the proposed period of performance?

Questions	Poor (1)	Fair (3)	Good (5)
<b>Clear goals</b> Does the proposed project include clear outcomes, outputs, and activities?	The project goals (outcomes, outputs, and activities) are not clearly stated.	The project has some strong goals and desired outcomes, outputs, and activities.	The project clearly outlines a number of strong goals, desired outcomes, outputs, and activities.
<b>Timeline</b> Does the project have a clear, well-organized timeline?	The sequence of events and responsibility for them is not clear.	The basic activities are outlined in an understandable timeline.	The activities and timeline are clear and specific.
<b>Outreach/Marketing &amp; Co-branding</b> Does the project include sufficient outreach and promotion strategies, and will they represent HM as a funder?	Outreach and promotion are minimal. Co-branding efforts are not mentioned.	Outreach and promotion are adequate. Co-branding efforts are mentioned but not specific.	Strong outreach and promotion are included. There is a clear plan for co-branding with HM.
<b>Measurement and Evaluation</b> Is an effective 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.	A basic plan is proposed to capture audience feedback and measure outcomes including potential changes for the identified target audience.	Evaluation methods are clearly described, and the results will yield useful data on outcomes and audience reactions. The target audience, and the intended changes for the audience, are clear and measurable.
<b>Sustainability</b> Will the project have lasting benefits for Montana communities?	It is unclear how the project will provide lasting benefit(s) to the community/intended audience.	It is clear how the project will provide immediate and short-term benefits to the community/intended audience.	It is clear how the project will provide long-term benefits to the community/intended audience.

## Criteria #5- Feasibility (10 points)

How strong is the organization's commitment to and capacity for achieving project outcomes? Does the project team possess the appropriate expertise to manage all the necessary aspects of the proposed activities?

Questions	Poor (1)	Fair (3)	Good (5)
<b>Project Management</b> Does the project have a well-organized project management structure and qualified personnel to successfully execute activities?	The project appears to be inadequately planned, or susceptible to breakdowns in process or responsibility. In critical ways, staff lacks sufficient experience or training to accomplish the proposal's work plan, or staff is not adequately identified.	Project management is assigned, basic planning has occurred, and personnel is adequately identified and appears to have appropriate credentials and background to accomplish project activities.	Overall management of the project is clear. Issues or events that could disrupt the schedule are acknowledged and addressed in the proposal.  Each member of the project personnel is well suited to their project role. Background and credentials of the project personnel are a strength of the proposal.
<b>Budget &amp; Cost Share</b> Is the budget organized, clear, and in compliance with HM fiscal policies?	Budget is poorly laid out, numbers do not make sense for the proposed project, ineligible expenses, inadequate match.	Budget is adequate and provides good descriptions of how award funds will be used and what aspects will be included in the cost-share.	Budget is well-organized and thoughtful and demonstrates how the award funds will be utilized. Descriptions match what is discussed in the project narrative.