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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following report is submitted to the Congress in response to requirements of the 1985 amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, Public Law 99-194 (December 20, 1985), as codified at 20 USC 951 et seq. The report details the policies and procedures of the National Endowment for the Humanities that govern the selection of panelists and the administration of peer review panels.

The Endowment's peer review system has been designed to provide impartial, professional, and thorough assessment of applications submitted to the Endowment for discretionary grant support. The respective panels convened by each program unit within the agency provide recommendations about funding so that the Chairperson of the Endowment, the sole agency official authorized by law to make grants, might have the best counsel available.

The Endowment sponsors approximately 150 panels annually, and approximately 1,000 individuals sit on those panels. Professional members of the Endowment staff select panelists to assure that applications are evaluated by individuals knowledgeable about the topics and formats proposed and that panels have broad geographic and culturally diverse representation.
To avoid conflicts of interest, apparent or real, the Endowment strictly administers policies that preclude the involvement within the review process of any individuals who might have a real or apparent interest in a proposed project. Oversight for the quality of the peer panel system is the responsibility of the Chairperson of the Endowment in consultation with members of the National Council on the Humanities, a body of twenty-six individuals appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, who sit to advise the Chairperson about specific applications under review and about policies and funding priorities.
REPORT TO CONGRESS:

PEER PANEL REVIEW PROCESS OF

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

In Public Law 99-194 (December 20, 1985), which re-authorized the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities and amended the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, Congress stipulated:

Not later than October 1, 1987, each Endowment [The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities] shall submit to the Congress a report detailing the procedures used in selecting experts for appointment to panels and the procedures applied by panels in making recommendations with respect to approval of applications for financial assistance under this Act, including procedures to avoid possible conflicts of interest which may arise in providing financial assistance under this Act.

(Sec. 10 [f]).

This report is respectfully submitted to the Congress of the United States by the National Endowment for the Humanities in compliance with its responsibilities under the provisions of this section of the Act.
Overview and Purpose of the Peer Panel Review System

All applications submitted to programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities, with the sole exception of grants awarded pursuant to Section 8 (f) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, as amended, described as "emergency grants" by the National Endowment for the Humanities (see Note I), are assessed by professionally knowledgeable persons outside the Endowment who are asked for their judgments about the quality and significance of the proposed projects. In most programs panelists also assess the relative merits of each project in comparison with other applications in a given competition. The establishment of peer review panels is in accord with the provisions of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as Amended through December 20, 1985 (Sec. 10 [a] [4]):

In addition to any authorities vested in them by other provisions of this subchapter, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities, in carrying out their respective functions, shall each have authority . . . to utilize from time to time, as appropriate, experts and consultants, including panels of experts, who may be employed as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code. Provided, however, that any advisory panel appointed to review or make recommendations with respect to the approval of applications or projects for funding shall have broad geographic and culturally diverse representation. . . .

Furthermore, all Endowment panels are conducted in accord with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 USC, App. 2).
In FY 1986, 1,060 scholars, other qualified professionals, and civic leaders served on 141 Endowment panels. By agency policy, no panel shall have fewer than five nor more than eight members unless an exception has been specifically authorized by the Chairperson or her designee. The judgment of panelists is often supplemented by individual reviews or independent letters of reference solicited from specialists who have extensive knowledge of the specific subject areas dealt with in particular applications. Everyone who serves in any fiscal year as a panelist for the Endowment is listed by name and institutional affiliation in the agency's annual report to the Congress.

The Endowment constitutes each panel anew for the review of applications within each program. Normally, a given panel will have some members who have evaluated applications previously, along with other members either new to the program or new to the Endowment's panel system. A panel formally exists only for the one or two days its members meet as a whole. On rare occasions, however, panelists may be polled by mail or telephone subsequent to a panel meeting to clarify comments or evaluations or to review conditions or amendments to a recommendation made while the panel was sitting.

Most Endowment panels meet at the Endowment's offices in Washington, DC. Prior to the panel meeting, panelists receive all applications to be evaluated by that panel and write provisional evaluations for each application.
Once convened, the panelists assess the humanities content of a proposed project. Then they evaluate the application in light of the qualitative criteria published in the program's guidelines and the instructions to applicants.

Drawing upon both their original comments and the comments of their colleagues, panelists discuss each application on its own merits to arrive whenever possible at a consensus about its significance for research, teaching, learning, and/or public understanding of the humanities. In many programs, panelists also establish a recommended priority among the top-rated projects.

After all panels for any given competition have met, staff of the program division assembles the advice of the panelists and, where appropriate, that of the individual external reviewers; comments on matters of fact or policy; identifies issues or applications upon which panelists failed to reach consensus; and/or otherwise marks for further attention significant issues. These materials are then presented, with written staff comments, to the National Council on the Humanities, which meets four times each year to advise the Chairperson about the funding of applications and about policy. Taking into account the counsel provided by this review process, the Chairperson of the Endowment makes the final decision about funding.
In addition to evaluating applications before a specific Endowment program, each panel is also asked to comment upon the completeness and accuracy of program guidelines, the adequacy of instructions provided panelists, the clarity of criteria used to judge applications, and any policy matters about which the Endowment staff wishes professional advice. As appropriate, these comments are reviewed by members of the National Council on the Humanities in order to inform the counsel they provide the Chairperson about the programs of the Endowment.
The Endowment's Pool of Panelists and Reviewers

The Endowment maintains a computerized listing of some 13,000 scholars, teachers, professionals, and citizens qualified to serve on its panels. This past year, in an effort to make the system—which the Endowment's Chairperson has described as a "giant Rolodex"—more accessible and "user-friendly," a committee of administrative and program staff members has reviewed and revised the various indices to the system.

This computerized roster is not pre-selective. That is, the computer does not determine who will serve as a panelist. Rather, through the use of the computerized listing, a program officer may identify a variety of individuals whose credentials qualify them for a specific panel. Then, the officer may review the number of times and the specific panels upon which the listed individual has served, if ever; the credentials and publications of the individual; and other specific information supplied by the panelist so that the officer can determine whether or not to invite that individual to serve.

The Endowment has endeavored to make the placement of any individual's name in the roster as simple as possible. Program staff continually add names to the system: successful project directors; people whom staff members meet at
various conferences, workshops, and site visits; outstanding participants in institutes and seminars supported by the Endowment; and so on. Furthermore, the Endowment staff usually asks sitting panelists to provide the names of individuals who would be well qualified as panelists; and upon the receipt of recommendations, the staff writes those nominees to explore their interest. Frequently, organizations and institutions recommend people to serve; and the staff, in turn, sends the nominees an appropriate inquiry. Interested individuals may also nominate themselves to be reviewers and panelists, and their experience and qualifications are likewise encoded in the roster.

In order to maintain a pool of potential panelists that is as diverse as possible, the Endowment has made special efforts to place on the roster individuals from geographical areas, populations, institutions, and organizations that have traditionally not applied for Endowment support in large numbers. This outreach activity has been part of the agency's Access to Excellence Program; and the coordinator of this program has engaged in particular efforts to explain the Endowment's review system to rural, tribal, ethnic, and inner-city populations with which he has worked and to explain how individuals become panelists for, as well as applicants to, the agency.

While individuals need not be listed in the system to be invited to sit as panelists, once they are invited,
their names and relevant information about them are encoded into the computer. Each new potential panelist is asked to complete an informational survey (see Appendix A). Furthermore, with the development of new formatting and taxonomy, the agency intends to review all files on a scheduled basis in order to keep information as current as possible.

However, the computer list is not the only source of names for potential panelists. Professional staff consult such standard sources as The Directory of American Scholars, the agency's own lists of recent awards, and other similar references to identify people with the necessary credentials.
AGENCY WIDE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR
THE FORMATION OF PANELS

In the 1985 amendments to the Endowment's authorizing legislation, Congress stipulated:

In selecting panels of experts under clause (4) to review and make recommendations with respect to the approval of applications for financial assistance under this Act, each Chairperson shall appoint individuals who have exhibited expertise and leadership in the field under review, who broadly represent diverse characteristics in terms of aesthetic or humanistic perspective, and geographical factors, and who broadly represent cultural diversity. Each Chairperson shall assure that the membership of panels changes substantially from year to year, and that no more than 20 per centum of the annual appointments shall be for service beyond the limit of three consecutive years on a subpanel. In making appointments, each Chairperson shall give due regard to the need for experienced as well as new members on each panel.

Sec. 10 (a)

Long-standing policies and procedures--both agency-wide and division-specific--have assured that the Endowment's practices not only conform to the requirements in the new amendments but actually meet a higher standard.

The selection and invitation of panelists are the responsibility of the staff member in charge of the program for which applications are to be reviewed. At the same time, senior divisional officers have oversight responsibility for the quality of the panelists selected and for adherence to divisional and agency-wide policies and procedures. Final responsibility for the formation of panels
lies with the director of the division in which the program is administered. Each program division of the Endowment has specific policies and procedures governing the selection of panelists, but there are a few general guidelines that pertain throughout the agency:

1) Every panel shall consist of at least five and no more than eight individuals unless a specific exemption has been granted by the Chairperson or her designee.

2) The membership on a given panel shall reflect the nature of the projects under review before that panel; for example, applicants proposing to conduct research in history shall be reviewed by panels that include historians; projects for presentation in museums shall receive review by panels that include museum professionals.

3) All panelists shall receive in advance of the panel meeting the Endowment's conflict-of-interest statement (see Appendix B).

4) Each panel shall be chaired by a member of the Endowment's professional staff.

5) No panelist shall serve in the review of applications for a specific program for more than three consecutive review cycles.

6) There shall be official notes of the panel deliberations, and these notes shall be taken by a member of the staff other than the person chairing the meeting.

7) All sitting panelists shall submit written evaluations and recommendations, with a record of any change of recommendation and a written explanation for such a change.

8) Generally, a panelist shall serve on no more than two panels throughout the Endowment in any one fiscal year and on no more than one panel within a single division in a given fiscal year.
In addition to abiding by these formal principles, the program divisions also seek a balance between experienced panelists and individuals reviewing for the division or the Endowment for the first time. A panel is constituted anew for each competition. However, one-third to one-half of the members of a panel will generally be individuals who have evaluated applications previously. While this practice assures that new evaluators are brought into the review system, it also assures a reasonable continuity of review and standards among competition cycles.

Generally, to assure thorough review and a reasonable burden of work, several discrete panels will meet to review applications for any single program. Programs with a large volume of applications may have as many as fifteen to twenty panels to review all the applications for a given competition. In such instances applications are sorted in accord with the discipline or subdiscipline represented by the proposed projects, and panels are then organized to match those disciplines or subdisciplines. Consistency of recommendations among panels is assured by a staff review and by the general oversight of the National Council on the Humanities. In some programs with a small volume of applications, only one review panel sits, usually with a diverse membership of seven or eight members.

For all panels, the members receive by mail the applications they are to review at least two weeks before the
formal meeting of the panel. In that mailing, panelists also receive a letter of instruction detailing the panel procedures, calling attention to the program guidelines and criteria, and noting the conflict of interest policy. When the panel convenes, the professional staff member chairing the meeting paraphrases the written instructions, reviews the specific procedures to be used by the panel, and reiterates the conflict of interest policy.

Each Endowment division has established further principles and procedures to govern the selection of panelists.

Division of Education Programs

Within the Division of Education Programs, each review panel normally includes five or six evaluators whose disciplines, academic responsibilities, and institutional affiliations relate to the applications under review. Usually panel members are scholars, teachers, or administrators in either pre-collegiate institutions or colleges and universities (depending upon the type of applications under review), previous or current project directors, or individuals selected for other kinds of relevant expertise. In order to assure a breadth of competence as well as diversity among the panelists, proposed panel lists are submitted to the division director prior to the issuance of invitations. In the event that a panel fails to reach consensus on a proposal
or to bring to its review sufficient expertise to judge it thoroughly, the staff sometimes seeks additional judgments from independent external reviewers.

Division of Fellowships and Seminars

In competitions to conduct either college teacher or school teacher seminars, panels in this division consist of five individuals: at least one previous seminar director, at least one previous seminar participant, and at least one eminent scholar from the discipline represented by the applications under review. Panels are organized by humanities discipline (history, literature, art history, and so forth). For the various fellowship competitions, panels also consist of five members with a mixture of geographic, cultural, and institutional affiliations. Ideally, each fellowship panel will include at least one previous recipient of the kind of award under review as well as an eminent senior scholar within the disciplinary field. No panelist, of course, may have an application pending; and no panelist may be holding concurrently an Endowment fellowship. Generally, two of the five panelists will have reviewed proposals in the same or in a similar competition in preceding years. For all the seminar programs and for most fellowship programs, applicants must solicit
letters of reference from individuals who know the applicant's work. These referees submit their letters independently and directly to the Endowment, and the panelists receive the letters along with the applications to be reviewed.

Division of General Programs

Panels in the Division of General Programs are formed in response to the types of applications received. In addition to scholarly experts in disciplinary fields, the division selects professionals familiar with the project format (that is, filmmakers, exhibition designers, or librarians). Thus, panels are balanced between content and format specialists with an eye toward achieving diversity among the seven individuals who generally constitute a panel within the division. Two or three members will be individuals who have served on similar panels previously. Occasionally, a panel will be unable to arrive at consensus about an application; or the panelists or staff may believe that the experience of the panelists is insufficient to form a firm judgment about a proposed project. In such instances staff, following the panel meeting, may solicit independent evaluations from additional outside specialist reviewers. In these cases, the recommendations of the panelists as well as of the independent reviewers are presented to the National Council.
Division of Research Programs

Because of the technical complexity of the proposals submitted to the Division of Research Programs, each application is evaluated by six to eight independent specialist reviewers prior to its evaluation by a peer panel organized according to academic disciplines. Generally, half of the specialist reviewers are selected by staff using various guides to experts; the other half are selected from among eight names that have been suggested by the applicant. The applicant has certified that the eight suggested names do not have a conflict of interest with the proposal and, further, that the applicant has not discussed the proposal with them. In some regrant categories (Regrants to Centers for Advanced Study, for example) the place of the specialized reviewers is taken by a team of outside site evaluators who, under the leadership of a member of the NEH staff, visit the applicant's site in person and submit formal reports and recommendations for consideration by the panel. Most panels in the Research Division consist of five individuals selected to balance backgrounds, disciplinary specialties, institutional affiliations, geography, and professional specialties (editors, publishers, translators, lexicographers, librarians, and archivists, for example). The staff combines a majority of new panelists with a minority of experienced panelists. In addition, every effort is made to select experienced panelists who have not served the
division in the same category within the preceding year. Panels are assembled only after applications have been received and the numbers and types of panels have been determined. Some variations on this pattern occur when the characteristics of the group of proposals under review so demand. For example, in the Conferences category, one panel representing several disciplines discusses all the applications received, if the number of applications is not too large for a single panel. In the International Research and the Regrants in Selected Areas programs, an additional essential qualification for panelists is that they be familiar with other regrant programs and experienced in the organizational and administrative aspects of coordinated humanities research.

**Division of State Programs**

In addition to conforming to agency guidelines, the Division of State Programs selects for the review of the biennial applications from state humanities councils six to eight panelists who represent a diversity of academic disciplines and who also combine experience in academic administration, foundation work, work with public nonprofit cultural institutions (such as museums, libraries, and historical societies), or work with state councils and other public humanities programs. The division also seeks a balance among individuals from large population states
and small population states, urban and rural states, and different regions and cultures. In the review of applications from state councils for Exemplary Awards, the disciplinary backgrounds of panelists and their experience with public humanities programming are of more importance than is administrative experience. Prior to the convening of the panels, the division sends each biennial application to independent outside reviewers for comment. After panelists' initial discussion of a state's application, they then review the independent evaluators' comments before arriving at their final recommendations.

Office of Challenge Grants

Each Challenge Grant panel includes eminent scholars of the humanities who can evaluate the quality of the programming conducted by an applicant. In the Challenge Grant program, however, the panels are organized not by academic discipline but by institutional type. College and university applications are evaluated by a panel reviewing only applications from higher education institutions, museum applications by a museums panel, professional organizations by an organizations panel, and so on. Usually, Challenge panels have seven members. In addition to seeking diversity among the panelists, staff members look for panel members whose backgrounds include work in private philanthropy, financial and program development, and institutional administration
pertinent to the type of institutions before a given panel. In order to balance experienced evaluators with new panelists, the office usually invites to serve on a panel two or three individuals who have reviewed for the competition in prior years.

**Office of Preservation**

For applications in response to the Endowment's initiative for preserving original and critical materials in the humanities, the Office of Preservation generally invites five or six panelists, drawn from diverse geographic regions, who represent the preservation field, scholarly research, libraries, and administration of humanities institutions. Occasionally, the office will also invite knowledgeable foundation administrators to sit on panels. Within the United States Newspapers Project, panelists will include current or former project directors and newspaper librarians. The program regularly solicits up to six independent written reviews for each application, and these specialized reviews are also considered by the panelists as they discuss each proposal.
CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

In 1984, in response to a request from the Congress and as part of a broad-scope study about the implementation in federal agencies of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the United States General Accounting Office audited the Endowment's panel review policies and procedures, examining especially the Endowment's provisions for preventing conflicts of interest, real or apparent. The GAO survey generally found the Endowment's policies and procedures adequate. Auditors recommended some modifications that have since been incorporated into the agency's policies and practices.

The Endowment's policy prohibiting any applicant from sitting on panels in a competition to which he or she has applied has been long-standing. Furthermore, it is also part of the agency's policy that no individual who is a principal party within a proposed project, even if he or she is not the applicant of record, may sit in review of that application.

Prior to or simultaneous with the receipt of applications to be reviewed, individuals invited to serve on an Endowment panel receive a statement of the agency's conflict of interest policy (see Appendix B). As well, each Endowment staff member chairing a panel refers to the policy as part of the general charge to panelists prior to their actual discussion of applications.
In brief, the policy provides that no panelist may sit in review of an application in which she or he has a direct interest or potential interest, that a panelist may not review applications from individuals employed by the same institution as the panelist, that members of universities that are part of a state-wide system may not review applications from other components of that system without a specific waiver based upon a determination that no real or apparent conflict exists, that panelists with a potential or real conflict of interest must physically leave the panel meeting during the discussion of the application in question, and that the minutes of a panel meeting must stipulate when a panelist has been absent from the discussion. Furthermore, panelists are encouraged to excuse themselves whenever they believe a potential conflict of interest exists, even if that potential is not apparent to the professional staff member chairing the meeting. Additionally, former members of the Endowment staff, whether they had been permanently employed or had worked under contract through the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, may not sit in review of any application until at least one full year after the termination of their service.
OVERSIGHT OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

The primary responsibility for seeing that the Endowment's peer review process abides by all conflict of interest policies, that the system assures fairness and thoroughness of review, and that panels reflect an appropriate diversity falls, of course, to the Chairperson and her delegated officers. By law, the Chairperson makes all final decisions about applications; but informing those decisions is the accumulated set of recommendations and advice for each application.

The Council's quarterly review of panel recommendations culminates in the Chairperson's review, which examines as it must the quality and consistency of the peer review system. Meeting with each division following the quarterly meeting of the National Council, the Chairperson resolves pending policy issues and instructs the divisions about steps to be taken to improve and monitor the quality of review.

Of course, members of the National Council on the Humanities are central to the oversight of the panel process. The Council meets quarterly to review specific applications and recommendations, and during that review it is the Council's clear duty to comment upon the operation of the peer review system. Among other duties, the Council reviews policy recommendations that emerge from the panel meetings.
and recommends to the Chairperson new policies or procedures as warranted.

The responsibility for directly applying all policies and procedures and for enforcing all conflict of interest rulings falls to the agency's division directors and program office heads. One of the specific elements and standards for the evaluation of the job performance of each division head focuses upon that individual's oversight of the peer review process. Within each competition the director must be satisfied that the quality of judgment has been high and that all procedures have been fully abided by. In carrying out this mandate, the director, in turn, holds accountable the assistant directors and program officers responsible for the administration of their respective programs.
CONCLUSION

The Endowment's peer review system has been commended time and again, not only by individuals who have sat on panels, but also by leaders of humanities institutions and organizations throughout the nation. Consistently, they praise the Endowment for maintaining a system of review that is fair, thorough, and free of political bias. At the recent FY 1988 House Appropriations Public Witness Hearing, Professor Stanley Katz, President of the American Council of Learned Societies, declared: "Projects have been selected for awards on the basis of the quality of the work they propose, and only on that basis. That, in my view, is how it should be." At the same hearing Professor Alan Kraut from the Department of History at American University testified that because of its peer review system, NEH has a reputation throughout the academic community as an agency unencumbered by political judgments about projects.

Other testimonials about the quality of the Endowment's panels exist as well. In its 1984 report on "Priorities for the Humanities," the National Humanities Alliance argued that the Endowment's "rigorous standards for granting awards should be maintained." The 1981 report of the Presidential Task Force on the Arts and the Humanities concluded: "Panel
review has proved to be a fair and effective system for grant-making at both Endowments."

Of particular note is the fact that applicants may receive an account of panelists' comments about their proposals. Applicants have consistently informed the Endowment that such evaluations constitute free, expert consultation; and they note that it often markedly improves the quality of proposed work. Frequently, applicants who were unsuccessful in one competition consider the counsel of panelists and revise and resubmit applications that are successful in a subsequent competition.

While the Endowment is most pleased about the widely perceived fairness and thoroughness of its panel system, it remains ever watchful for ways to improve the quality of its review procedures. Indeed, the very occasion of this report has involved all program divisions and all senior staff in a systematic review of panel policies, procedures, and guidelines; and the ongoing quarterly review of the process by the National Council on the Humanities assures continuing accountability and oversight of the system.
NOTE I: EMERGENCY GRANTS

The only applications received by the Endowment that might not be reviewed within the peer review system are petitions for grants pursuant to The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, Sec. 8 (f). The Endowment has named such awards "emergency grants." The Chairperson has the authority to grant $30,000 or less without the prior review of the National Council although she must report back to the Council about any such awards. In a given fiscal year, the total amount of such grant awards may not exceed ten percent of the appropriated definite funds for the agency. In actual practice, emergency grants in each of the past five fiscal years have represented less than one-half of one percent of the agency's appropriated definite funds.

Although not legally required to do so, the Chairperson has nonetheless instituted rigorous review procedures in order to assure to the extent possible that emergency grants meet the same high standards required of all applicants submitting to regular program deadlines. First of all, a petition is only eligible for emergency grant consideration if the case for the review of the application outside the normal annual or semiannual grant cycle is compelling. Second, whenever possible, the application receives the same kind of specialized evaluation given to normal applications.

If an appropriate panel is sitting or will soon be sitting, the application may be reviewed out of cycle by that panel. If no suitable panel is available within the four-week decision period established for emergency grants, then divisional staff may seek independent external review by well-qualified people experienced in judging Endowment applications. If the option of external review is not viable, then the application receives systematic and thorough review by members of the Endowment's professional staff who are by academic training qualified to judge the merits of the proposed project.

All emergency grants are reviewed in their entirety by the Chairperson's senior advisory staff, and all evaluators provide independent recommendations about the proposal's merits. The Chairperson reviews in full each emergency grant request and all evaluations it receives before determining whether to support or reject the petition. The Chairperson reports to the next scheduled meeting of the National Council all decisions about emergency grant requests and the reasons for those decisions.
APPENDIX A

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
SHOREHAM BUILDING
806 15TH ST. N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

REVIEWER/PANELIST/EVALUATOR PERSONAL INFORMATION SHEET
Before filling out this form, please read the instructions carefully and note the appropriate lists from which you should draw responses to Blocks 4, 5, and 6. Please type or print legibly.

Please attach a copy of your curriculum vitae.

PRIVACY ACT

The following notice is furnished in compliance with the Privacy Act of 1974:

This information is solicited under the authority of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 951 et seq. This information is used to have applications for funding reviewed by appropriate individuals, which is the basis of our peer review system; disclosure may be made in response to an inquiry from a congressional office, made at the request of the individual about whom the record is maintained, and for use in Statistical Summaries and Analysis of Trends. Failure to provide information requested in Part I would mean the Endowment would be unable to make selection of reviewers, evaluators or panelists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>NEH - Reviewer/Panelist/Evaluator Personal Information Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Name &amp; Mailing Address</td>
<td>(Check One) 2) Education - Highest Degree (Check One)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: Less than high school 2: High school 3: Associate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4: Bachelor's degree 5: Master's degree 6: First professional degree 7: Doctorate 8: Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Fields or Subjects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Field (Refer to List 3):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you are or have been a state humanities committee member, indicate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization/Institutional Affiliation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Institution (Refer to List 2):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Academic Fields or Subjects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Field (Refer to List 3):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you are or have been a state humanities committee member, indicate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date Term Expires (O):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sectors of the public or academic communities with which you are familiar:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Professional Skills and Experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Publications/Products/Activities/Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Date Prepared</td>
<td>13) Type of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS

Before filling out this form, please read the instructions carefully and note the appropriate lists from which you should draw responses to Blocks 4, 5, and 6. Please type or print legibly.

Block #1 - Enter your name and the address to which correspondence may be sent. Enter a work telephone number where a message may be left.

Block #4 - Using list #1, enter your occupational category and the appropriate code.

Block #5 - Enter the name of the organization, whether public or private, the general type of organization, the appropriate code (consulting list #2), and your position. If you are not affiliated with an organization, note that in this block and be sure to fill in Block #4.

Block #6 - Using list #3, enter the major field of your research or work and the appropriate code. Many people will have only one major field, but, if you have two, please enter both.

Block #8 - The information provided here (and in blocks 9 and 10) will help determine the kind of applications the Endowment will ask you to evaluate. In this block, list your areas of academic specialization. To the extent possible, begin with a broad field and move to more narrow areas of interest within it. Wherever possible, note the country and date or period in which your work is focused. For example:

Example 1
American history, 1865-1945
Labor history, 1865-1935
Chicago politics, 1865-1920
Anarchism, America & Russia, 1870-1917
Gospel of Wealth
Debs, Eugene
Gompers, Samuel

Example 2
Comparative linguistics
Areal linguistics
Computational linguistics
American-Indian languages
Athabascan Family
Navajo language
Chipewyan language

Block #9 - List professional and methodological skills and experience. For example:

museum curator
exhibit designer
translator
archivist
field archaeologist
folklorist - living cultures
oral historian

scholarly editor
production manager
story editor
lexicographer
university administrator
development officer
librarian, reference

Block #10 - List sectors of the public or academic communities with which you are familiar. For example:

labor unions
senior citizens
continuing education students
medical students

rural communities
youth groups
Native Americans - Cherokees
Spanish-speaking adults

Block #11 - List up to four examples of your work which you consider most representative of both your recent interests and the range of your efforts. You may include publications (books, articles), products (a television script, a radio program), activities (an exhibit of historic photographs, a history day program for high school students), or dissertation or thesis. As appropriate, indicate the title, date, journal or publisher, and your role.

Block #13 - Indicate either that this brings up to date information provided earlier on a similar form or that it is an initial response.

Block #14 - While completion of this block is optional, if you are under thirty years of age and wish to be considered as a panelist for the Youthgrants Program, your date of birth will have to be indicated.
### LIST 1 - FOR BLOCK #4

#### OCCUPATION LIST

- (A1) ELEMENTARY TEACHER
- (A2) SECONDARY TEACHER
- (A3) ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY ADMINISTRATOR
- (A4) COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR
- (A5) COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATOR
- (A6) EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION OR ASSOCIATION OFFICIAL
- (A7) STATE EDUCATION OFFICIAL
- (A8) DEVELOPMENT OFFICER/FUND RAISER
- (A9) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS OFFICER
- (A10) INVESTMENT COUNSELOR
- (A11) DEFERRED PLANNED GIVING SPECIALIST
- (B1) LAWYER/JUDGE
- (B2) JOURNALIST
- (B3) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL
- (B4) ENGINEER
- (B5) ARCHITECT
- (B6) SCIENTIST
- (B7) FARMER/RANCHER
- (B8) PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR
- (B9) BUSINESS EXECUTIVE
- (B10) INFORMATION MANAGER
- (B11) SYSTEMS ANALYST
- (B12) LIBRARIAN
- (B13) LIFE-LONG LEARNING SPECIALIST
- (B14) ARCHIVIST
- (B15) MUSEUM/HISTORICAL ORGANIZATION ADMINISTRATOR
- (B16) MUSEUM INTERPRETATION SPECIALIST
- (B17) TELEVISION/FILM WRITER
- (B18) TELEVISION/FILM PRODUCER
- (B19) TELEVISION/FILM DIRECTOR
- (B20) TELEVISION/FILM EXECUTIVE
- (B21) INDEPENDENT FILMMAKER
- (B22) RADIO PRODUCER OR MANAGER
- (B23) VOLUNTEER
- (B24) STUDENT
- (B25) RETIRED
- (B26) OTHER (IF YOUR OCCUPATION IS NOT LISTED ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE IT IN BLOCK #4).

### LIST 2 - FOR BLOCK #5

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

WHENEVER SUB-CATEGORIES ARE LISTED, BE SURE TO ENTER THE SUB-CATEGORY AND THE APPROPRIATE CODE WHEN YOU COMPLETE BLOCK #5. E.G. ART MUSEUM.

- (A) MUSEUM
- (B) HISTORICAL ORGANIZATION
- (C) ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION
- (D) HIGHER EDUCATION
- (E) PUBLIC LIBRARY
- (F) SPECIAL LIBRARY
- (G) RESEARCH INSTITUTE
- (H) CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY
- (I) MEDIA
- (J) COMMUNITY/NATIONAL ORGANIZATION
- (K) FOUNDATION

#### MAJOR FIELDS

- (A1) HISTORICAL
- (A2) NATURAL HISTORY
- (A3) ART
- (A4) UNIVERSITY
- (A5) ANTHROPOLOGY/ARCHAEOLOGY
- (A6) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
- (A7) GENERAL
- (A8) ZOO/AQUARIUM
- (A9) NATURE CENTER/ENVIRONMENTAL PARK
- (A10) BOTANICAL GARDEN
- (A11) PLANETARIUM
- (A12) PUBLIC TELEVISION/FILM
- (A13) PUBLIC RADIO STATION
- (A14) INDEPENDENT RADIO STATION
- (A15) COMMUNITY/REGIONAL CENTER
- (A16) FOUNDATION
- (A17) CORPORATION
- (A18) FAMILY

#### MAJOR FIELDS (CONTINUATION)

- (B1) NATIONAL
- (B2) LOCAL AFFILIATE OF NATIONAL
- (B3) COMMUNITY-LEVEL
- (B4) YOUTH
- (B5) PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
- (C1) SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY
- (C2) MEDIEVAL
- (C3) EASTERN STUDIES
- (C4) NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES
- (C5) SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SOCIETY
- (C6) SEMIOTICS
- (C7) SOCIAL STUDIES
- (C8) STATE, LOCAL & REGIONAL STUDIES
- (C9) URBAN STUDIES
- (C10) WOMEN'S STUDIES

#### MAJOR FIELDS (CONTINUATION)

- (D1) DEFINED
- (D2) DEFERRED PLANNED GIVING
- (D3) MEDIEVAL
- (D4) EASTERN
- (D5) NATIVE AMERICAN
- (D6) SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SOCIETY
- (D7) SEMIOTICS
- (D8) SOCIAL STUDIES
- (D9) STATE, LOCAL & REGIONAL STUDIES
- (D10) URBAN STUDIES
- (D11) WOMEN'S STUDIES

OTHER (IF YOUR MAJOR FIELD IS NOT LISTED ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE IT IN BLOCK #6).
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