

Utah State Historical Records Advisory Board
Competitive Grant Program
Evaluation Form

Application #: _____

Institution Name: _____

Funds Requested _____

Reviewer Name _____

REVIEWER'S TOTAL SCORES

	Maximum	Actual Score
Records Information (20%)	5	
Project Scope (25%)	5	
Plan of Work (25%)	5	
Staff and Volunteers (10%)	5	
Budget (20%)	5	
TOTAL SCORE FOR THIS GRANT APPLICATION	25	
Bonus	10	

RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING: Yes No Partial (please specify and explain)

Amount to fund: _____

Scoring Criteria

General required information:

Yes	No	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DUNS number provided.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	All blank sections filled and/or questions answered.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Records are in applicants' custody.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Letter of Digitization Agreement

If any of the above information is missing, the application will be considered incomplete and not eligible for consideration.

Section: Records Information (20%)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant has provided a clear and detailed description of the records and the information they contain. ● The applicant has provided evidence of historical significance to the region and demonstrated public benefit of the project. ● The applicant has provided detailed information about the volume of records, in the form of cubic or linear foot measurements, or detailed description of the number of boxes, folders, or individual records. ● The applicant has specified detailed date ranges of the records. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Records are partially described, with some details about the information they contain missing. ● There is evidence of historical significance to the region and benefit to the public but the applicant does not provide extensive details. ● Some information about extent and scope is provided but it is not detailed. ● Provided date ranges of material are unspecific or vague. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant has not provided enough description about the records or the information they contain to give a clear picture of their historical or research value. ● The applicant has not provided evidence of the historical significance of the records and does not indicate an understanding of the public benefit of this project. ● The applicant has not provided the extent of the records. ● The applicant has not provided date ranges of the materials.
Excellent (4-5 points)	Satisfactory (2-3 points)	Needs Improvement (0-1 point)
Total points:		

Section: Project Scope (25%)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant provides clear details about the objectives and goals for the proposed project. The applicant demonstrates that they understand the work necessary to complete the project in the allotted time frame. ● The project as described will promote the preservation of the records. The applicant demonstrates an understanding of the importance of long-term sustainability. ● The project includes a public access component that is achievable given the resources of the applying institution. The applicant demonstrates an understanding of why access is important. ● The applicant demonstrates an understanding of archival techniques, standards, and guidelines and provides a clear outline of the standards that will guide the proposed project. ● The applicant provides measurable outcomes and end products that will be used to determine the success of the project and clearly defines why those outcomes apply to the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant describes some objectives and goals for the proposed project but does not provide details or demonstrate an understanding of the time frame in which the project must be completed. ● There is some indication that the project as described will promote the preservation of the records, but the proposal lacks details. ● The applicant indicates that the project contains a public access component but does not provide details or demonstrate an understanding of why access is important. ● The applicant is familiar with archival techniques, standards, and guidelines but the proposal lacks specifics and the applicant does not indicate how standards will be used to guide the proposed project. ● The applicant indicates some outcomes or end products of the project but these are not measurable nor is it clear how they will determine the success of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant does not clearly indicate the objectives and goals of the proposed project. ● The project does not promote the preservation of the records. ● The applicant does not describe the public access component to the proposed project. ● The applicant does not demonstrate familiarity with archival techniques, standards, and guidelines. ● The applicant does not provide measurable outcomes or end products that will determine the success of the project.
<p>Excellent (4-5 points)</p>	<p>Satisfactory (2-3 points)</p>	<p>Needs Improvement (0-1 point)</p>
<p>Total points:</p>		

Section: Plan of Work (25%)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The project has been broken down into measurable steps that can be completed within the established grant time frame. ● Each step builds off the previous step and culminates in a successfully completed project. ● Project steps are manageable and the timeline realistic. ● The applicant demonstrates an understanding of the amount of work the project will entail and the number of staff or volunteers who will need to be involved at each point during the project. ● Each person's role is clearly defined, including the qualifications the person has to do the work assigned to them and the techniques they will use to complete their tasks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant provides a timeline for work but the steps are not measurable or easily accomplished within the established grant time frame. ● It is not clear how each step builds off of or supports the others. ● The applicant demonstrates some understanding of the work the project requires but does not convey how the work will be accomplished nor how the project gets from the start to a successful finish. ● The applicant provides some information about the number of staff or volunteers involved in the project or the amount of time the project will take, but the proposal lacks details about qualifications or the techniques to be used. ● The applicant does not clearly define each person's role in the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The applicant does not provide a timeline. ● No steps are provided that indicate how the project will be completed. ● The applicant shows little understanding of the work required of the project. ● The applicant does not provide information about staff or volunteers who will be working on the project. ● No roles have been defined.
Excellent (4-5 points)	Satisfactory (2-3 points)	Needs Improvement (0-1 point)
Total points:		

Section: Staff and Volunteers (10%)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Applicant clearly lists staff and volunteers involved in the proposed project. ● Applicant provides clear details about staff/volunteer qualifications that indicate the significance of their roles in the successful completion of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staff and volunteers involved in the proposed project have been listed but the applicant does not provide adequate details about their qualifications. ● Staff and volunteers involved in the proposed project have been listed but lack qualifications that would facilitate successful completion of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Applicant has not provided a list of staff/volunteers involved in the proposed project. ● Applicant provides no details about staff/volunteer qualifications. It is not clear what the staff/volunteer would be contributing to the success of the project.
Excellent (4-5 points)	Satisfactory (2-3 points)	Needs Improvement (0-1 point)
Total points:		

Section: Budget (20%)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Budget is detailed and itemized. The applicant clearly indicates how the requested funds will be used. ● Columns are totaled correctly. ● All activities described in the project scope and plan of work are represented by a dollar amount in the budget. ● The applicant provides adequate matching funds either in-kind or cash, or a combination of the two. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Budget accounts for the funds requested but lacks details or is not fully itemized. ● Columns have been totaled correctly. ● The budget accounts for most of the activities described in the project scope and plan of work but lacks details. ● The applicant provides adequate matching funds either in-kind or cash, or a combination of the two. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Budget does not account for funds requested. ● Columns are not totaled or have been totaled incorrectly. ● The budget does not account for activities described in the project scope and plan of work. ● The applicant does not provide adequate matching funds either in-kind or cash, or a combination of the two.
Excellent (4-5 points)	Satisfactory (2-3 points)	Needs Improvement (0-1 point)
Total points:		

Bonus (10 points maximum)

Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Institution applying for funding serves or represents an underserved community in Utah.* (5 points)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project highlights records that document the lives and/or history of diverse populations.** (5 points)

*Underserved communities include but are not limited to those in rural Utah (all counties except Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah), as well as those from diverse populations.

**Diversity is difficult to define but factors that are considered include and are not limited to race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, age, and ability.