

## ***SECTION I: HUMANITIES***

1. How consistent is the proposal with the mission and goals of the NMHC?
2. How defined is the project? How clearly are the project goals stated?
3. How appropriate, achievable and realistic are the project goals?
4. How well does the project focus substantially on one or more humanities disciplines? (i.e. philosophy, literature, religion, music, history, language)
5. How well does the project address uncommon or innovative topics?
6. How well are the project location(s) described?

## ***SECTION II: PROPOSAL***

7. How well does the proposed program aim at a balanced presentation and broad public understanding?
8. How well is proposal written? (Strong, concise, understandable, complete?)
9. How well does the proposal topic consider multiple viewpoints/voices?

## ***SECTION III: PRINCIPALS***

10. How well does the applicant demonstrate sound planning and programming?
11. How qualified are the scholars included in the application?
12. How involved are the scholars in the planning?
13. How clearly does the proposal describe the role of each scholar?

## ***SECTION IV: AUDIENCE***

14. How well will this project benefit underserved communities?
15. How well does the project avoid advocacy, bias and calls for direct action?
16. How much Q&A and audience interaction are planned?
17. How accessible is this program/project to the public? (Is the program free? What time of day is it offered? Is it offered in a large city or small town?)

## ***SECTION V: BUDGET***

18. How understandable is the budget? (Are NMHC grant funds budgeted appropriately?)
19. How reasonable is the budget? (Does it clearly explain proposed expenditures and the sources of funds)
20. How well does the applicant explain evidence of cost sharing (minimum 1:1)?

## ***SECTION VI: PROMOTION***

21. How comprehensive is the publicity plan? (i.e. effective use of social media, traditional marketing/PR, paid and earned media, use of existing audiences)
22. How well does the project leverage partnerships?

***SECTION VII: EVALUATION***

23. How well does the evaluation criteria provide for an accurate assessment of the success of the project?
24. How well-informed and competent is/are the evaluator(s)? How distanced is/are the evaluator(s) from the project to provide a non-biased perspective? How many events will they attend?