**NEH Merit review Criteria**

Please rate each application, as best you can, on a scale from 1 (weakest or least) to 5 (strongest or most) in each of the five NEH-provided merit review criteria, with **constructive comments and feedback for each**.

1. **Why?**On a scale from 1 (weakest) to 5 (strongest): **How strongly does the application present the case for the intellectual significance of the proposed project, including its value to humanities scholars, general audiences, or both?**In scoring this category, consider whether application convincingly or effectively conveys:
   1. What is the project about;
   2. The projects’ value to humanities scholars and/or general audiences;
   3. How the project will change scholarship;
   4. Who needs to read the book (or other work) and why;
   5. How the book (or other work) will change the way we/others understand the topic; and
   6. Whether the work will tell us/others anything larger.
2. **What?**On a scale from 1 (weakest) to 5 (strongest): **What is the quality of the conception, definition, organization, and description of the project? Also, what is the applicant’s clarity of expression?**In scoring this category, consider whether application:
   1. Clearly conveys the conception, definition, & organization of the project;
   2. Convinces you that the work will answer the applicant’s research question;
   3. Clearly conveys what the applicant will do during the grant period; and,
   4. Has a clear narrative that is succinct, well organized, and free of technical terms and jargon that would make it difficult for peer reviewers to understand the project.
3. **How?**On a scale from 1 (least) to 5 (most): **How feasible and appropriate does the proposed plan of work appear?** In scoring this category, consider the following questions:
   1. Is it clear which part of the project will be supported by the Stipend?
   2. Is there a clear list of activates or steps that that will be performed during a performance period of two consecutive months of full-time effort?
   3. Are the steps shown in a timeline?
   4. If the entire project will not be finished during the period of performance, is the plan for completing the project after the period discussed?
   5. Does the applicant’s ability to complete the work plan appear to be largely independent of factors beyond their control?
   6. Does proposed work appear feasible to accomplish during the grant period? Is the plan very specific?
   7. If the applicant and another researcher (collaborator) are seeking funds for the same project: Is the collaborator identified? Does the application state whether the collaborator has ever applied for or received NEH support? Is it clear how the work will be divided and the extent to which each collaborator’s contribution depends on that of the other?
4. **Who?**  
   On a scale from 1 (weakest) to 5 (strongest):   
   **What appears to be the quality or promise of quality of the applicant as an interpreter of the humanities, based on the information provided in the application packet?**In scoring this category, consider:
   1. Is it made clear why the applicant is the right person to do the project?
   2. Are applicant’s unique strengths for performing project communicated?
   3. Does the applicant demonstrate promise as an interpreter of the humanities?
5. **Likelihood of Success?**On a scale from 1 (least) to 5 (most): **How likely does it appear that the applicant will complete the project**? In scoring this category, consider:
   1. Does the applicant appear likely to complete the project (not necessarily during the period of performance)?
   2. Does the project/work appear likely to reach the intended audience(s)?
   3. Where relevant, how sound are the dissemination and/or access plans?
   4. Does the applicant’s publication record instill confidence in their ability to produce?

**Overall Score**

Overall, on a scale of 1 (least) to 5 (most), What is your overall assessment of the potential strength and competitiveness of this application?

**Overall Comments to Applicant:** Please provide constructive comments on the overall quality proposal, in terms of perceived strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

**Comments to Administrator:** If you have any comments for the administrator of the limited submission process, but not for the applicant, please share them in the   
**Comments to Administrator** box.