

General Grant Review Rubric

Panelist Instructions: Please review and score the proposals prior to our review panel meeting, during which we will rank and discuss each proposal, from highest to lowest, according to the resulting rank. Each question asks you to provide a rating on a scale of 1-5 (5 being highest). We encourage you to make notes regarding the scores if you wish. Questions are grouped according to our funding criteria. You will find further instructions within each question group.

1. Quality of the Project's Humanities Content

The quality of the project's humanities content: determined by whether qualified and actively involved community representatives, humanities scholars and professionals use significant and appropriate humanities resources—e.g., texts, art or artifacts, data, narratives—to craft audience opportunities for reflection, critical analyses, and interpretation.

Rating the Quality of Project Content (Score 0-5)

Please rate the extent to which the content is critical and analytical, rather than merely descriptive.

Rate the Humanities Advisory Team (Score 0-5)

Please rate the qualifications and involvement of the humanities advisory team. Please consider the following when rating the advisory team:

- Does the project have the appropriate humanities scholars and professionals? Are they directly involved with the planning and execution of the project?
- Does the project content necessitate humanities advisors with lived experience in the subject area, and are those advisors directly involved with the planning and execution of the project?

Rate the Humanities Texts/Methodologies (Score 0-5)

Please rate the significance and appropriateness of humanities texts and/or methodologies utilized by the project.

Rate the Humanities Standards Reflected in the Project (Score 0-5)

Humanities Tennessee's Board of Directors holds the expectation that the foundational approach, interpretive themes, and narrative content for all funded projects are guided by the following standards: • Accountability • Agency • Complexity • Empathy • Inclusivity • Specificity.

Please rate the extent to which the proposal is guided by these standards in its approach, interpretive themes, and desired audience outcomes?

2. Appropriateness and Potential Involvement of the Audience

The appropriateness and potential involvement of the audience: determined by the degree to which the project serves, and makes accommodation for, an audience that may not have access to engage actively, critically, and analytically in the study of the humanities.

Rate the Level of Audience Engagement (Score 0-5)

Please rate the extent to which the project engages the public actively, critically, and analytically in the study of the humanities.

Does the project reach an underserved audience? (Score 0-5)

Please rate the degree to which the project serves an audience that would otherwise have limited access to education in the humanities.

Rate the Accessibility of the Project (Score 0-5)

Please rate the accessibility of the project to the intended audience. Does the project provide appropriate accommodation or publicity for the intended audience?

3. Continuing Impact of the Project

Continuing impact: determined by the likelihood the project's humanities activities will further Humanities Tennessee's core values—shared knowledge, empowerment, equity, civility, community—among audiences.

Rate the Continuing Impact of the Project (Score 0-5)

Please rate how the project activities will further Humanities Tennessee's core values. Do the examples provided demonstrate that the core values are central to the project? Are the project activities clearly linked to the desired impact on the audience?

4. Economy of the Project

The economy of the project: determined by the extent to which the project budget demonstrates an economical use of public funds and by the amount and quality of the project's cost-sharing support.

Rate the Use of Public Funds (Score 0-5)

Please rate the extent to which the project budget demonstrates an economical use of public funds. Are the project expenses realistic and prudent?

Rate the Amount and Quality of Cost Sharing (Score 0-5)

Please rate the amount and quality of the project's cost sharing. Are the cost sharing expenses relevant to the project? Are the cost sharing expenses justifiable?