**Review Form for Arts & Humanities Seed Funding Applications**

Reviewer:

(Principal) Applicant Name:

(Principal) Department:

*Please assign a number to each evaluation criteria.* ***No = 1, Somewhat = 2, Yes = 3***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Summary** | **Assigned Score (1, 2 or 3)** |
| The proposed project is intellectually significant, including its value to arts/humanities scholars, general audiences, or both. |  |
| The proposed activities are clear. |  |
| Milestones/outcomes are clear and can be reasonably accomplished during the grant period.  |  |
| The proposed project meets all eligibility requirements listed in the Call for Applications. |  |
| The project has a high potential for external funding. |  |
| **Subtotal** |  |

Please explain a low score:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Budget and Funding Potential** | **Assigned Score (1, 2 or 3)** |
| The targeted funding agency, foundation, institution, etc. for the planned proposal are appropriate. |  |
| The proposed budget items are clearly explained and reasonable. |  |
| All proposed expenses are allowable (see call for applications)  |  |
| **Subtotal** |  |

Please explain a low score:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Work Plan** | **Assigned Score (1, 2 or 3)** |
| Work plan is feasible and well-organized to accomplish the milestones/outcomes listed in the proposal?  |  |
| The amount of time allocated to complete the project is reasonable given the requested budget amount. *(For example, if a proposal requests two months of summer salary, do the activities in the work plan reflect 2 months of full-time work?)* |  |
| **Subtotal** |  |

Please explain a low score:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOTAL (Sum of Subtotals above)** | # out of 30 |

Please mark X next to one of the following statements that best reflects your overall assessment.

\_\_\_\_ The proposal is very worthy of funding because it clearly addresses all aspects of the call for applications

\_\_\_\_ The proposal has some positive attributes that may warrant seed funding

\_\_\_\_ The proposal has some attributes that raise questions about the appropriateness of AWARDING the seed funding

Please briefly explain your overall recommendation: