

Implementation Grants FY2025

Connecticut Humanities

Evaluation Questions

Project Title

Name of Project

Character Limit: 150

CTH Funds Requested

Character Limit: 20

For demographic information on the town in which this organization is located/this project will take place, use this link and select the corresponding town.

Project Case Statement*

Using the following scale, rate the applicant's Project Case Statement:

0=Applicant made poor case for why project should be funded; project does not support any of CTH's funding priorities and/or the applicant organization's mission;

5=Applicant made case for why this project should be funded by CTH at this time and the project supports at least one CTH funding priority;

10=Applicant made an exceptionally strong case for why this project should be funded by CTH at this time, the project supports multiple CTH funding priorities and will advance the applicant organization's mission.

Scoring Options: 0 - 10

Project Description & Background*

Using the following scale, rate the project Description and Background.

0=Project description and background unclear, disorganized, missing information about the planning process that was utilized, about the project that will be delivered to the public, and/or does not describe the activities that they want CTH to fund;

5=Project is articulated, but lacking some details

10=Project plan is well-organized and cogent; the planning was well articulated; the project will very likely lead to desired goals and objectives; items CTH is asked to fund are clearly articulated and well justified.

Scoring Options: 0 - 10

Subject Matter Expertise and Community Input*

Using the following scale, rate the relationship between the grantee and their subject matter experts or relevant community/communities.

0=Grantee has not engaged or attempted to engage and integrate subject matter experts or the relevant community/communities in the planning, development, implementation, production, and/or marketing/distribution of the project;

3=Grantee has adequately attempted to engage and integrate subject matter experts or the relevant community/communities into the planning, development, implementation, production, and/or marketing/distribution of the project;

5=Grantee has done a model job of working with subject matter experts or the relevant community/communities throughout the entire project and fully integrated them into the planning, development, implementation, production, and/or marketing/distribution of the project.

Scoring Options: 0 - 5 or N/A

Humanities Themes and Issues Explored*

Using the following scale, rate the efficacy of the project's humanities content.

0=Humanities content of project is unclear; themes and issues either not identified or not humanities-centric; project will not help the audience better understand and appreciate human history, culture, values and beliefs;

5=Humanities content of project is articulated, but humanities themes and issues identified could be stronger and project could do better job of helping audiences understand human history, culture, values, and beliefs;

10=Humanities content of project is exceptionally strong, humanities themes are well identified and articulated, and project will do strong job of helping audiences better understand human history, culture, values, and beliefs.

Scoring Options: 0 - 10

Project Evaluation Plan*

Using the following scale, rate the efficacy of the Project Evaluation Plan as described in the application.

0=Evaluation techniques are not well articulated and/ or achievable; evaluation techniques do not relate to the project's humanities content.

3=Evaluation techniques are articulated but may not be sufficient for fully analyzing the project's ability to connect its target audiences to the humanities themes and issues explored.

5=Evaluation techniques are well articulated and will result in all the necessary information for successful analysis of the project's ability to connect its target audiences to the humanities themes and issues explored.

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Project Audience*

Using the following scale, rate the applicant's description of the intended target audience for the project:

0=Target audiences unidentified and/or inappropriate for project and no explanation given for their selection;

3=Target audience is defined and appropriate for project, however, additional, natural audiences for project not addressed and/or selection of audience not fully explained;

5=All target audiences for project identified, well defined, and appropriate for project and selection of audience fully explained.

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Marketing and Publicity*

Using the following scale, rate the plans to promote the project:

0=Marketing plan is weak or ineffective;

3=Marketing plan is adequate for proposed target audience;

5=Marketing plan incorporates a variety of media tactics to reach beyond traditional audience.

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Project Schedule*

Using the following scale, rate the proposal's project schedule:

0=Project activities occur outside of the grant period or the project schedule is inappropriate for the planning project;

3=Project schedule is adequate; some minor concerns with the schedule may exist;

5=Project schedule is well thought out, articulated, achievable, and likely to lead to a successful final product.

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Rate the quality of the Project Team.*

Using the following scale, rate the quality of the Project Team.

0=Inappropriate/non-pertinent humanities scholarship present in project;

3=Appropriate/ pertinent humanities scholarship evident in project;

5=Stellar humanities scholarship demonstrating multiple voices/perspectives

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Budget & Expenses*

Using the following scale rate the validity and clarity of grant budget expenses:

0=Unexplained, questionable expenses included with eligible expenses

3=Eligible expenses with little detail and/or minor budget concerns

5=Expenses are explained and well justified

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Financial Support*

Using the following scale rate the breadth of financial support for the project:

0=Entire 1:1 match made with in-kind contributions

3=Match includes mix of in-kind contributions and applicant cash, but no external cash

5=Match includes external cash in addition to applicant cash and in-kind contributions

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Attachments Packet*

Using the following scale, rate the applications additional required attachments:

0=Required attachments missing or incomplete; attachment materials provided are insufficient to fully evaluate project.

5=Attachment materials submitted are adequate for evaluating the project, but some weaknesses exist (i.e., minimum label copy submitted and additional examples would have been helpful in evaluating the project; humanities content is evident, but could be stronger; description of proposed programs given, but additional questions about programs remain).

10=Model application packet. All required materials are submitted, evidence of stellar humanities content presented, and project highly likely to be successful.

Scoring Options: 0 - 10

Interpretation and Connection to the Humanities*

After considering the overall description and information contained in the application, use the following scale rate to the overall quality of the humanities content:

0=Humanities theme(s) are not interpreted or well conveyed/ easily understandable by the audience;

5=Humanities theme(s) are adequately interpreted and conveyed to the audience;

10=Humanities themes are well interpreted and conveyed, allowing the audience to better analyze their complex society and make thoughtful, reasoned decisions based on inquiry, evaluation, and empathy

Scoring Options: 0 - 10

Funding Priorities*

Using the following scale rate how well the project meets CTH funding priorities:

0=Does not meet any CTHF funding priorities

3=Meets one CTHF funding priority

5=Meets multiple CTHF funding priorities

Scoring Options: 0 - 5

Additional Comments

Character Limit: 2000