

Board Member's Name:  
Date evaluation due in Coordinator's office:  
Proposal Number:  
Applicant:  
Proposal Title:

## NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

### State Historical Records Advisory Board Members Evaluation

INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS: In preparing your review, address the following areas in your answers to the five (5) general questions listed at the bottom of the page. The boxes may help you check that you covered the topic, but not all topics may apply to the proposal. Effective reviews are most often no longer than 3 pages.

#### *Planning, Readiness and Needs:*

- Evidence of appropriate planning for the nature and scope of the project.
- The qualifications of the personnel and the endorsement of the necessary partners.
- Awareness of, and capacity to learn about, existing records management and archival standards.
- Appropriateness of the proposed solution to the defined needs.
- Value of the records to increasing public access and understanding of our democracy, history, and culture.

#### *Likelihood of Success and Sustainability*

- Ability to accomplish the project goals in the time allotted.
- The value of the products to be produced.
- Contributions of the institution and other partners to the project.
- Indications of ongoing support for the project after end of project.

#### *Applicability to Other Institutions and the Archives and Records Management Field*

- A plan of work that could be used as a model by others.
- Methods of disseminating the results of the project outside their own institution.
- Need of other institutions to learn the results of this project.

#### *Persuasiveness and Clarity*

- A clearly-stated definition of the scope and methods of the project.
- Effectiveness of the proposal in terms of argument, prose, and style.
- Logic of the work plan.

**Your signature or an email accompanying your review confirms that the following comments are based on your evaluation of the proposal.**

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 1) What are the strengths of the proposed project?
- 2) What are the weaknesses of the proposed project?
- 3) Is the cost of the project reasonable given the value of the materials and/or contribution to the field? Does the proposal contain sufficient detail to make the proposed expenditures understandable?
- 4) Do you think the project will succeed? If so, what will be the most valuable contribution to the institution and the historical community? If not, what do you think the applicant needs to change to increase the likelihood of the project's success?
- 5) What additional information would have helped you to fully understand and evaluate the proposal?

**Numerical Rating Section:**

Although the Commission finds most useful narrative comments, please numerically rate this proposal in the following areas using the following scale:

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Flawed</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Importance of the Project:</b> Based on the value of the records to increasing public access to, and understanding of our history, democracy, and culture; the project's importance to the applicant institution; and the importance beyond the applicant institution of the products or of the work to be accomplished.	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Technical Merit of the Project:</b> Based on the soundness of the plan of work and budget; the qualifications of the personnel to carry out this project; the appropriateness of the proposed policies, procedures, and techniques; and the level of institutional support for the project	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Recommendation:**

In my opinion, the Commission should take the following action:

- Provide full funding
- Provide partial funding of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- Reject the proposal
- Other (Please advise the Coordinator on the action you wish to take):