

Native American/Native Hawaiian Library Services Peer Review

Project Justification

- Has the applicant selected an appropriate program goal and one or more associated objectives of the Native American Library Services Enhancement Grants program described in Section A2?
- How well has the applicant used relevant data and best practices to describe the need, problem, or challenge to be addressed?
- Has the applicant appropriately defined the target group(s) and beneficiaries, as applicable, for this work?

Notes/Comments:

Project Work Plan

- Are the proposed activities informed by appropriate theory and practice?
- Are the goals, assumptions, and risks clearly stated?
- Do the identified staff, partners, collaborators, consultants, and service providers possess the experience and skills necessary to complete the work successfully?
- Are the time, financial, personnel, and other resources identified appropriate for the scope and scale of the project?
- Is the proposed Performance Measurement Plan likely to generate the required measures of Effectiveness, Quality, and Timeliness (see Section D2c Item 7)?
- If present, does the Digital Products Plan reflect appropriate practices and standards for creating and managing the types of digital products proposed?
- Is there an effective plan for communicating general findings and/or lessons learned?

Notes/Comments:

Project Results

- Are the project's intended results clearly articulated, realistic, meaningful, and linked to the need, problem, or challenge addressed by the project?
- Is the plan to effect meaningful change in knowledge, skills, behaviors, capabilities and/or attitudes of the target group solidly grounded and appropriately structured?
- Will the products created by the project be made available and accessible to the target group?
- Is the plan to sustain the benefits of the project beyond the conclusion of period of performance reasonable and practical?

Notes/Comments:

Review Scoring Definitions		
5	Excellent	The proposal exemplifies all the indicators of a successful projects (as described in the NOFO). You recommend funding the proposal <u>without reservation</u>.
4	Very Good	The proposal demonstrates most of the indicators of successful projects but require minor improvements. You recommend funding the proposal.
3	Good	The proposal demonstrates some of the indicators of successful projects but requires some improvements. You recommend funding the proposal but acknowledge it could be more successful with some changes.
2	Some Merit	The project does not demonstrate the indicators of successful projects. You do not recommend the proposal for <u>funding but think it could be strengthened for resubmission in a future grant cycle</u>.
1	Inadequate	The proposal does not demonstrate the indicators of successful projects. You do not recommend the proposal for funding or for resubmission.

Overall Score: _____