Grant Evaluation Rubric

Georgia Humanities awards grants through a competitive peer-review process using a standardized scoring rubric. Applications are reviewed for eligibility and completeness, then evaluated by reviewers based on the criteria below. Scores reflect the overall strength of the proposed project, and funding decisions consider both numerical ratings and reviewer comments.

Categories	Scale: 0-2	3-5	5-7	7-10
Project Narrative	Little or no connection to Georgia Humanities' mission	General connection stated, but vague or unsupported	Clear connection to mission and public humanities goals	Strong, explicit alignment with GH mission and clear public value
Humanities Focus	Humanities content is unclear or minimal	Humanities content present but largely descriptive	Clear humanities focus with some interpretation	Strong, well-articulated humanities content centered on interpretation and ideas
Audience Engagement	Audience not clearly identified or engaged	Audience identified; engagement limited or passive	Audience engagement is clear and appropriate	Strong plan for meaningful audience engagement and participation
Humanities Scholars	Scholar does not represent appropriate humanities expertise	Some humanities relevance, but unclear or weakly connected	Scholar expertise is appropriate and relevant	Scholar clearly represents strong humanities expertise aligned with the project
Project Involvement	Scholar role is minimal or unclear	Scholar involved, but role is limited	Scholar has a defined and meaningful role	Scholar is deeply and clearly integrated into project planning and delivery
Publicity and Marketing	Promotion plan is missing or ineffective	Promotion methods identified but limited	Promotion methods are appropriate and realistic	Promotion strategy is clear, effective, and well matched to audience
Audience Reach	Unlikely to reach intended audience	Some audience reach, but limited	Reasonable reach for intended audience	Strong potential to reach substantial and diverse audiences
Timeline	Timeline is unclear or confusing	Timeline may be feasible but raises concerns	Timeline is clear, logically organized, reasonable and achievable	Timeline is detailed, well structured, and clearly support successful project implementation
Outcomes	Outcomes are unclear or not stated	Outcomes are stated but vague	Outcomes are clear and measurable	Outcomes are well defined and clearly demonstrate project impact
Budget	Proposed costs are unclear or not allowable	Costs generally appropriate but need clarification	Costs are appropriate and aligned with project	Budget is clear, appropriate, and strongly aligned with project activities