

Historical Resource Development Program – Scoring Rubric

Panelists will use the Historical Resource Development Program Scoring Rubric to evaluate grant applications. Each section has criteria and corresponding point values to ensure a fair review process. The rubric is on a scale of 30 points.

| Significance: Up to 6 Points | | |
|---|--|--|
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Applicant clearly identifies the historical resource and presents a strong evidence-based argument for why this historical resource has value to the people of Iowa. Applicant provides clear evidence to support their argument for historical significance. Reviewer has no questions about the significance of this historical resource. | Applicant identifies the historical resource and presents an adequate argument for why this historical resource has value to the people of Iowa. Applicant provides some evidence to support their argument for historical significance. Reviewer has some questions about the significance of this historical resource. | Applicant fails to identify the historical resource and/or fails to present an adequate argument or sufficient evidence to support their claim of historical significance. |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Applicant clearly explains how the historical resource has national or international significance or has a connection to national or international issues. | Applicant clearly explains how the historical resource has state or local significance or has a connection to state or local issues. | Applicant does not make a case for the historical resource's international, national, state or local significance or its connection to international, national, state or local issues. |

| Project Implementation: Up to 9 Points | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Applicant clearly explains what they will do, why it is the right thing to do and how they will do it. Applicant references appropriate professional standards and how they will be applied to this project. Reviewer has no questions about what the project is and has confidence that the project will be done according to appropriate professional standards and will be successfully implemented. | Applicant explains the project, but leaves the reviewer with questions about the specifics of the project, whether it is the right thing to do, whether appropriate professional standards will be followed or if the project will be successfully implemented. | Applicant provides little or no explanation about what they will do or how it will be done or the work proposed does not meet appropriate professional standards. There is no mention of appropriate professional standards and reviewer does not have confidence that professional standards will be followed or that the project will be successfully implemented. |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| The timeline is appropriate for all proposed work elements. | The timeline is appropriate for some of the proposed work elements, but reviewer questions if certain work elements can be completed in the proposed timeframe. | The timeline is not appropriate for most of the work elements or reviewer questions if the entire project can be completed in the grant contract period. |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| The relevant supporting material, including photographs of the resources, letters of support, and descriptions of resources provided in the application help the reviewer understand the need for all elements of the proposed scope of work. | The relevant supporting material, including photographs of the resources, letters of support, and descriptions of resources provided in the application help the reviewer understand the need for some elements of the proposed scope of work. | The relevant supporting material, including photographs of the resources, letters of support, and descriptions of resources provided in the application do not help the reviewer understand the need for the proposed scope of work. |

| Community Impact: Up to 9 Points | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| <p>Applicant clearly identifies the local community or audience and makes an evidence-based argument for how this project will have an impact on the local community or audience. The applicant indicates how they will measure if the project is successful.</p> <p>Country Schools: Applicant clearly identifies a strong plan for the educational uses of the school building.</p> | <p>Applicant identifies the local community or audience and makes an argument for how this project will impact the local community or audience, but the reviewer has questions about the potential for impact or how the project's success will be measured.</p> <p>Country Schools: Applicant identifies a plan for the educational uses of the school building, but the reviewer has questions about the proposed plan.</p> | <p>Applicant does not identify the local community or audience nor does the applicant make a convincing argument for how this project will impact the local community or how the project's success will be measured.</p> <p>Country Schools: Applicant does not identify a plan for the educational uses of the school building.</p> |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| <p>The historical resource and relevant work products of this grant are or will be accessible to the public.</p> <p>The applicant identifies a strong plan for how the resource will be shared on site and across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media.</p> | <p>The historical resource and relevant work products are accessible to the public, but on a limited basis.</p> <p>The applicant identifies a plan for how the resource will be shared on site and across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media, but the reviewer has questions.</p> | <p>The historical resource and relevant work products are accessible to the public on a very limited basis, or not at all.</p> <p>The applicant does not identify a plan for how the resource will be shared on site or across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media.</p> |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| <p>Applicant clearly explains how the resource is part of the public trust* or publicly owned.</p> | <p>Applicant explains how the resource is part of the public trust* or publicly owned, but the reviewer has questions.</p> | <p>Applicant provides little or no explanation to demonstrate how the resource is part of the public trust* and/or the resource is privately owned.</p> |

| Budget: Up to 6 Points | | |
|--|--|---|
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| <p>Project budget and intended use of requested funds are clear. Applicant identifies match beyond staff salaries and in-kind match.</p> | <p>Project budget and intended use of funds are clear, but the applicant does not identify potential sources of match or they only include staff salaries and in-kind match.</p> | <p>Project budget or intended use of requested funds is unclear.</p> |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| <p>Budget is appropriate for the type of work proposed and there is a clear connection between the scope of work and the budget items.</p> | <p>Budget is appropriate for most work items and/or there is not a clear connection between the scope of work and all budget items.</p> | <p>Budget is not appropriate for most work items and/or there is not a clear connection between the scope of work and budget items.</p> |

*Taken from the American Alliance of Museums Code of ethics, museums "... are organized as public trusts, holding their collections and information as a benefit for those they were established to serve."