

Empowered History Micro-grant Application Scoring Rubric

Eligible: Community groups, including any nonprofit, religious organization, school, library, archives, museum and/or individual. Community-based groups that have partnered with history-based organizations such as historical societies and archives are also eligible. Special consideration will be given to community organizations that are underrepresented in the historical record.

Ineligible: For-profit businesses; organizations and individuals who are not affiliated with or working with the community connected to the materials (unless there is a valid explanation); projects using grant funds for capital projects, general operating support, salaries, and endowments/prizes/awards

Questions (each worth 5 points)

1. Who is the applicant? Are they capable of sustaining the historical materials beyond the life of the grant? Do they state a long-term vision for the project beyond the grant?
2. How compelling a case does the individual or group make with regards to the collection (archive, texts, photographs, oral histories, etc.) that they intend to collect/preserve/share? Do they effectively make a compelling case for why these materials or this activity is significant for the community and the preservation of its history?
3. How clear is the definition of the community that historical materials relate to? Does this community represent historically underrepresented groups (consider demographics such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, socioeconomic status, rural/suburban/urban status, sexual/gender identity, etc.)?
4. How clear is the plan of action (timeline, budget, partnerships, goals) for this grant project?
5. Overall, how compelling is this project? Will we be able to learn from it? Is this a project with which we'd like to be affiliated? Is this project one we're likely to want to share out with others?

Question	1 to 2 points	3 points	4 to 5 points	Points awarded
Is the applicant capable of sustaining the historical materials beyond the life of the grant? Do they intend to do so?	Applicant either seems too well-resourced (i.e. probably doesn't need this microgrant) or is not able to ensure the long-term survival of the materials.	Applicant seems moderately capable of carrying out the work and caring for the materials long-term, and is in need of the microgrant support.	Applicant is very appreciative of the materials and makes a clear case for the 'need' behind the microgrant request. They additionally have a clear vision for how to provide long-term care for the materials.	__ out of 5
Does the applicant make a compelling case as to why the historical materials are important and relate to the community's history?	Applicant does not make a compelling case as to why the materials are significant or how they relate to the community's history.	Applicant makes a relatively compelling case for the materials' significance and how they relate to the community's history.	Applicant makes a compelling case that the materials are significant and clearly relate to the community's history.	__ out of 5
Is the related community clearly defined? Does the community represent a group that has been historically underrepresented in archives?	The community is vague or not clearly defined. Application also does not seem to focus on the experiences of a historically underrepresented demographic.	The community is moderately well described and to some degree seems to reflect a historically underrepresented demographic.	The description of the community is clear and represents a historically underrepresented demographic. Additionally, the applicant has the experience and access to clearly work with this community.	__ out of 5
How clear is the plan of action (timeline, budget, partnerships, goals) for the project? Will it be effective?	The project is fairly vague, partnerships with the community are not clear, and the project is in its infancy in terms of planning.	The plan of action is relatively clear and seems doable, yet there are some questions currently unanswered or are not complete convincing.	The applicant lays out a clear plan of action for the project (for example: timeline, plan, goals) and has the capacity to complete this project.	__ out of 5
Overall, how compelling is this project? Is this a project the State Archives wants to be affiliated with? That the State Archives would share with others?	The project description falls short in more than one way. Might be doable, but not particularly compelling.	The applicant lays out a moderately clear plan of action and the project is moderately compelling.	The applicant lays out a convincing and compelling plan of action in terms of work, the historical materials, the impact on the community, and is one with which the State Archives would like to be associated.	__ out of 5
Add together the points you assigned for each question listed above and enter the total to the right. This is the final score				__ out of 25

