

CAP GRANT PROCESS: REVIEW CRITERIA AND SCORING RUBRIC

	10 POINTS – EXCELLENT <i>Very Confident about Applicant’s Abilities</i>	4 POINTS – AVERAGE <i>No Apparent “Red Flags” about Applicant’s Abilities</i>	1 POINT – WEAK <i>Concerns about Applicant’s Abilities</i>
Artistic Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presents compelling, specific information about commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Programming clearly contributes to further development of art form and/or audience. ▪ Project clearly advances organization’s overall artistic goals. ▪ Clearly illustrates ways in which applicant maintains commitment to artistic excellence and describes process(es) used to evaluate artistic quality of programming. ▪ Support clearly will lead to improved artistic product. ▪ Supplemental material demonstrates commitment to artistic quality, is thoughtful and is well-presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides persuasive, general information about commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Programming <i>may</i> contribute to artistic development of art form and/or audience. ▪ Project <i>may</i> advance organization’s artistic goals. ▪ Provides basic information about ways in which applicant maintains commitment to artistic excellence and process(es) used to evaluate artistic quality of programming. ▪ Support <i>may</i> to lead to improved artistic product. ▪ Supplemental material does not clearly demonstrate commitment to artistic quality and provides only basic information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lacks specific or convincing information about commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Programming does not or is unlikely to contribute to artistic development of art form and/or audience. ▪ Project does not clearly or is unlikely to advance the organization’s overall artistic goals. ▪ Has not clearly or convincingly described ways in which applicant maintains commitment to artistic excellence or process(es) used to evaluate artistic quality of programming. ▪ Support unlikely to lead to improved artistic product. ▪ Supplemental material unconvincing about commitment to artistic quality and is poorly presented.
Impact on Communities/ Audiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides specific demographics of communities and/or audiences reached. ▪ Narrative convincingly connects the organization’s mission and programming to the needs of the communities served. ▪ Compellingly and specifically demonstrates broad, significant impact on the communities served. ▪ Supplemental material clearly demonstrates commitment to broaden access and enhance communities served. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides basic demographics of communities and/or audiences reached. ▪ Narrative connects the organization’s mission and programming to the needs of the communities served. ▪ Organization has a measurable impact on the communities served. ▪ Supplemental materials help illuminate overall organizational/project commitment to broaden access and impact on communities served. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not offer specific information about demographics of communities and/or audiences reached. ▪ Narrative does not provide clear insight that connects the organization’s mission and programming to the communities served. ▪ Does not provide convincing information about the measurable impact on the communities served. ▪ Supplemental materials do not provide convincing information about commitment to broaden access or impact on communities served.
Capacity, Efficacy and Organizational Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application provides engaging, insightful overview of mission, programming, fiscal stability, administrative capacity, public value, planning and evaluation. ▪ Public value clearly stated and communicated through entire narrative. ▪ Clear, concise budgetary/financial information provided. ▪ Very confident about organization’s abilities as evidenced by quality of application and staffing. ▪ Supplemental material enhances and elevates application and reader’s understanding of the organization’s work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application provides basic information about mission, programming, fiscal stability, administrative capacity, public value, planning and evaluation. ▪ Public value not well-argued. ▪ Adequate budgetary/financial information provided. ▪ No apparent ‘red flags’ about organization’s abilities as evidenced by quality of application and staffing. ▪ Supplemental material provides basic support of application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application is confusing and unclear; does not provide clear mission statement, purpose, planning or evaluation processes. ▪ No or weak statement about public value. ▪ Weak or unclear budgetary/financial information provided. ▪ Concerns about organization’s abilities as evidenced by quality of application and staffing. ▪ Supplemental material does not provide insights into application.