

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

State Historical Records Advisory Board Members Evaluation

Date evaluation due in Coordinator's office: _____
Proposal Number: _____
Applicant: _____
Proposal Title: _____

On a separate sheet, please comment on as many questions in Section I as you can. Also, complete Sections II and III. Return your evaluation form and narrative comments to the Coordinator as soon as possible. Unless the required number of members' evaluation forms and the Coordinator's summary are received by the Commission by the established deadline, the proposal will not be reviewed by the Commission at the meeting for which the proposal was submitted.

Non-identifying copies of evaluations may be made available upon request to applicants where these evaluations are relevant to the action taken by the NHPRC.

- I. On a separate sheet of paper, please offer your comments on the following:
 - 1. How does this proposal relate to any priorities established by the state board?
 - a. If the proposal falls within a priority category, how pressing is the need for support of this project in comparison to other proposals or potential proposals in this category?
 - b. If the proposal does not fall within a priority category, is there a special justification for its recommendation by the state board and its support by the NHPRC?
 - 2. The soundness of the plan of work, especially the appropriateness of the techniques to be applied, as described in the proposal.
 - 3. The qualifications of the personnel involved.
 - 4. The importance of the records to be dealt with, if relevant.
 - 5. Comment on the soundness of the budget.
 - 6. What is your opinion regarding the likely impact of this project a) on improving the institution's own archives and records program, and b) beyond the applicant's own needs and program.
 - 7. Note any areas in which you believe additional information is needed to fully understand and evaluate the proposal.
 - 8. Note any way in which you believe the proposal should be revised.
 - 9. Other comments.

II. Numerical Rating Section:

Although the Commission finds most useful the narrative comments of board members and the written summary prepared by the Coordinator, it would be helpful if you would numerically rate this proposal in the following areas using the following scale:

Excellent (5), Above Average (4), Average (3), Below Average (2), Poor (1)

Importance/Priority of the Proposal	Technical Merit of the Proposal
<input type="checkbox"/> The applicant's need for grant support for this proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> The soundness of the plan of work
<input type="checkbox"/> The relationship with the priorities of the board	<input type="checkbox"/> The soundness of the budget
<input type="checkbox"/> The importance of the records to be dealt with in terms of their research value	<input type="checkbox"/> The qualifications of the personnel to carry out this project
<input type="checkbox"/> Check the category, if any, which most applies: The project is important () as a model, () to provide leverage to the applicant in seeking additional resources, or () because of the report or other publication to be produced	<input type="checkbox"/> The appropriateness of the proposed policies, procedures, and techniques
<input type="checkbox"/> Importance/Priority Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Technical Rating

<input type="checkbox"/> Overall Rating (Technically flawed proposals should not receive a high overall rating)

III. Recommendation:

In my opinion the Commission should take the following action in this cycle:

- Fund
- Partially fund - How much? \$ _____
- Reject, with resubmission in a future cycle encouraged
- Reject, with resubmission not encouraged
- The state board should return the proposal to the applicant for additional development and resubmission in a future cycle. The Commission should take no official action at the present time.

Signature _____

Date _____