



Opportunity Grants Application Criteria

Minimum Requirements

- An easily accessible public humanities event located in Washington State
- Applicant organization is a Washington State non-profit or public agency
- A humanities scholar is included in the project
- Start date is at least 8 weeks away from the application date
- Expenses are eligible for Opportunity Grant funding

Scoring Rubric Summary

1. Humanities Focus

- Exemplary: The humanities content focuses on a topic that's underrepresented or not often studied. The scholars are extremely qualified and fully involved. This project is likely to engage the participants in meaningful and lasting activities.
- Good: The project clearly focuses on humanities topics. It features solid public-programming components. The scholars' roles are clearly identified, and the scholars will likely contribute to the project's success.
- Acceptable: The project includes humanities elements or humanistic methods. The project does include scholars/experts, though their role may be incidental or not well defined. This is an adequate public humanities project, but it doesn't inspire.
- Unacceptable: The project's connections to humanities topics are weak. The public programming components are minimal. The scholars/experts listed are not legitimate or are questionable.

2. Program Goals & Impact

- Exemplary: The proposal makes clear that this a project Humanities Washington must fund. The writer demonstrates how the project is creative, innovative, and essential to the community. The proposal leaves no doubt as to the value of the project.
- Good: The proposal demonstrates why the project is important and clearly defines its community impact with enthusiasm and excitement. We know that if we fund this work, the team will carry it out with a sense of purpose and will create meaningful engagement.
- Acceptable: The proposal sheds some light on the value the project and how participants will benefit. We can tell that the project team will be engaged and committed to creating impact, but enthusiasm is not clear.
- Unacceptable: The proposal does not make a compelling case as to why this project is important to the community. The person writing the proposal does not "sell" the project, and the positive impact is unclear.

3. Capacity

- Exemplary: We can depend on this organization to do great work. It has prepared a concise and inspiring proposal with clearly outlined goals and a well-defined approach to achieving them. The timeline is clear and on target. The organization leaves no doubt that it will reach its audience.
- Good: A solid proposal. The planning is well thought out, and the timeline is achievable. The organization has a clear audience in mind and a method for reaching it. This organization has a reputation for delivering.
- Acceptable: It's likely the organization could adequately carry out this project. The team appears qualified, and the timeline seems sound. We feel the organization is positioned to achieve its attendance goals.
- Unacceptable: The organization's capacity is questionable. The team does not appear qualified, and/or the timeline and planning are weak. It does not appear that the organization has the capacity to draw an audience. The proposal is poorly developed.

4. Budget

- Exemplary: This is a model budget. It presents a thorough, well-researched accounting of how the grant dollars will be invested. The cash and in-kind cost-share calculations are detailed and reasonable. The budget's detail inspires confidence.
- Good: The budget is well prepared, offering sufficient detail to understand how funds will be spent. The organization has been thorough with calculating income/expenses, and we feel the budget does a good job of accurately reflecting the costs involved with the project.
- Acceptable: The budget is adequate. While not the most detailed, the organization has considered their finances, and we get a sense of how grant dollars will be spent. The figures seem reasonable for the project.
- Unacceptable: The budget is unclear how grant dollars will be spent. It doesn't seem reasonable, includes ineligible expenses, and/or the numbers don't add up. It raises questions about the ability to execute.

5. Funding Priorities

Humanities Washington is committed to equitable grantmaking and considers geographic diversity, audience diversity, and the importance of reaching underrepresented communities in its funding decisions.

Based on that commitment, Humanities Washington prioritizes funding for organizations with annual operating budgets under \$250,000, and organizations led by and serving underrepresented groups, including but not limited to rural communities and communities of color.