Council on Library and Information Resources
Digitizing Hidden Special Collections and Archives
Reviewer Questions

Scholarship

1. Are you confident the proposed project would have a significant impact on teaching, learning, and the creation of new knowledge?
2. Will the proposed project make available materials that are not otherwise available to scholars and the public?
3. Will the availability of project content in digital form make possible new kinds of research, and/or make it possible to ask new kinds of research questions?
4. Do the applicants have outreach strategies for this project that are likely to be effective for engaging interested communities?

Comprehensiveness

1. Do the applicants justify the significance of the entirety of the collections they are nominating for digitization?
2. Will the proposed project result in the availability of a sufficient quantity of related materials to support research?
3. Do the materials to be digitized relate to a sufficiently broad range of topics of high interest to researchers in or across disciplines?

Connectedness

1. Do the applicants have a good command of the broader scholarly and professional contexts for their work, and do they understand the relationships between the nominated collections and related materials at other institutions?
2. Are the applicants using appropriate standards, tools and services that will make the materials easily discoverable and expose the relationships between theirs and other collections?
3. Are applicants willing to share their metadata in ways that support the aggregation of their content with related materials at other institutions?

**Collaboration

1. Do the choices of project staff and institutional partners (if any) seem appropriate to the ambitions of the project as well as strategic in their service of long-term institutional goals?
2. Does the project plan avoid unnecessary duplication of capacity and effort?
3. Do all the project participants seem prepared to undertake project work?

Sustainability

1. Do the applicants have a feasible project plan that maximizes efficiency of throughput while providing for appropriate levels of description to support discoverability long-term?

2. Are the applicants' plans for digital preservation appropriate for the formats of the materials to be digitized?
3. Does the approach to project work have the potential to be a model for the applicants, partners, and others to follow in the future?

Openness
1. Do the applicants seem to understand the legal and ethical issues related to digitizing their nominated materials and are they prepared to address these issues and accept any associated risks? If so, will the applicants display information about intellectual property rights and offer any guidance for attribution in a way that is clear and comprehensible for users?
2. Will the digital files created through the project be made fully available to users, for free? If not, are the strategies for opening access appropriate to the nature of the collections, without any new or unnecessary restrictions, fees, or other barriers being imposed by the applicant institution?
3. If the applicants have identified user communities with special access needs, have the applicants considered feasible strategies to improve accessibility for these communities (e.g. visually or hearing impaired; users with limited internet access; foreign language speakers, etc.)?

** *Note on collaboration: All proposals are expected to be collaborative in spirit, even if they are carried out by a single institution. Most projects involving multiple institutions will also qualify for extra collaboration incentives. Multi-institution collaborations may request:*
- *additional funds (up to $500,000 instead of up to $250,000);*
- *additional time (project length of up to 36 months instead of up to 24 months);*
- *up to $10,000 in administrative support for the collaboration (e.g. funds toward the salary of an accountant);*
- *additional funds for equipment ($12,500 instead of $7,500).*

Questions to help reviewers determine whether applicants qualify for collaboration incentives:
1. *Have the applicants proposed a meaningful partnership that advances the missions and meets the priorities of each of the institutions involved and enhances the capacity of the project to support the creation of new knowledge?*
2. *Have the applicants adequately described benefits of the project that would not be possible if the partners worked individually?*
3. *If the applicants have identified the project as collaborative, but reviewers decide that the proposal does not qualify for CLIR's collaboration incentives, could the proposal be viable as a single-institution project?*

Note: vendors do not qualify as collaborating institutions, even if the vendor is a non-profit organization.