

Guidelines for Proposal Reviewers

The TPS Mid-Atlantic and US Territories Region issues subgrants to educational organizations through two Library of Congress programs.

Teaching with Primary Sources (TPS) grants fund initiatives grounded in engagement with primary sources and tailored to the unique needs of learners in specific communities.

The **Lewis-Houghton Civics and Democracy Initiative (LHI)** supports civics, history, and democracy education using creative-arts based primary sources for secondary students.

Before you meet with the other members of your group, please carefully review the proposals and complete the proposal review rubric for each submission. Instructions for completing the proposal review rubric are included below.

As you review proposals, please consider the following guidelines:

- Proposals may be considered for either LHI or TPS funding using the criteria listed below.
- AHA staff will identify any proposals that meet the specific criteria for LHI funding.
- Proposals should identify specific Library of Congress sources and collections. They may also engage with primary sources held by other institutions.
- The project budget should be realistic, align with project activities, and indicate clearly how TPS funds will be allocated.
- Matching funds and in-kind contributions from the organization are not required but are always welcome.
- In 2022, the Library expanded the scope of TPS beyond the K-16 scholastic community to include all relevant educational organizations. Any references to “K-12 students” and “teachers” should be interpreted to include learners and educators in any setting.

The Library of Congress and regional partners for the TPS program have established the following criteria for evaluating the viability of Regional Subgrant proposals:

- The scope of the proposed educational project and its likely success in helping learners achieve learning objectives.

- The professional development activities, partnerships, and previous educational experience of the proposing organization.
- The sustainability of an awardee's use of TPS content within their professional development programs for teachers and other educational programs.
- The extent to which the project plan describes sound planning, recruitment, implementation, evaluation, and resource allocation.
- The access that the proposed project will offer to geographic areas and populations not currently served by TPS Consortium members.

Proposal Review Rubric

For each criterion, select the appropriate rating between 1 (poor) and 5 (exemplary) that best reflects the quality of the proposal. A rating of 5 indicates an exemplary proposal that provides compelling evidence that a project is feasible within the constraints of the project timeline and meets a clear educational need.

I. Scope and Content

Please rate the following components of the project proposal on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest).

- Project scope and potential impact
 - How clear are the project goals and objectives?
 - Are they realistic and achievable within budget and time constraints?
 - How significant is the potential impact of the project?
- Engagement with specific Library of Congress and other primary sources
 - How likely are project activities to generate meaningful engagement with Library of Congress primary sources?
 - Does the proposal clearly articulate how these sources will be used to enhance teaching and learning?
 - How appropriate are the sources and collections identified in the proposal for the purposes of this project?
- Soundness and/or creativity of pedagogical approach
 - Is the proposal grounded in sound pedagogy?
 - How innovative or creative are the educational strategies that inform this project?

Comments on scope and content:

II. Audience and Access

Please rate the following components of the project proposal on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest).

- Justification for target audience(s)
 - Who is the primary target audience for this project (e.g., K-12 teachers, librarians, pre-service educators)?
 - Is the target audience clearly defined and justified?
- Viability of recruitment and/or dissemination plan
 - How viable is the plan for recruitment and/or dissemination?
 - Is this project likely to reach and support its intended audience(s)?
- Increased access to Library of Congress methods and resources
 - How likely is this project to expand access to Library of Congress resources and materials?

Comments on audience and access:

III. Feasibility

Please rate the following components of the project proposal on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest).

- Clarity and feasibility of project budget
 - Is the budget clear, reasonable, and justified in relation to the proposed activities?
- Clarity and feasibility of project timeline
 - Is the project timeline clear, feasible, and logically sequenced?
 - Does the proposal provide a clear plan for implementation?
- Plan for project evaluation
 - What metrics will the applicant use to measure the success or failure of project activities?
 - How effective is this evaluation plan?

Comments on feasibility:

IV. Sustainability

Please rate the following components of the project proposal on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest).

- Evidence of existing institutional capacity and partnerships
 - Does the proposal include adequate evidence of institutional capacity to complete this project?
 - Are any partnerships proposed? Are these likely to enhance the project?
 - Does the proposal identify qualified project leadership and personnel with relevant experience?
- Alignment with state academic standards or nationally recognized professional guidelines
 - How useful will educators find the results of this project?
 - Does the approach align with best practices in primary source education?
- Potential for project sustainability beyond funding cycle
 - Does the proposal address the sustainability of the project's outcomes beyond the grant period?
 - Will educational materials be published online? How likely is PD programming to shift teaching and learning?

Comments on sustainability: