

**2017 Individual Arts Partnership + Jade Presents Arts Partnership
Grant Application Review Criteria and Scoring Rubric**

	10 POINTS – EXCELLENT <i>Very Confident about Artist’s Abilities</i>	4 POINTS – AVERAGE <i>No Apparent “Red Flags” about Artist’s Abilities</i>	1 POINT – WEAK <i>Concerns about Artist’s Abilities</i>
Artistic Accomplishment and Promise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presents compelling, specific information about applicant’s commitment to advancing artistic excellence. ▪ Clearly illustrates process(es) used to evaluate the project and ways in which applicant maintains commitment to artistic excellence. ▪ Sample work is of a high artistic quality, and clearly demonstrates achievement of and commitment to such quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presents only generalized information about applicant’s commitment to advancing artistic excellence. ▪ Provides generalized information about process(es) used to evaluate the project and ways in which applicant maintains commitment to artistic excellence. ▪ Sample work demonstrates good artistic quality and/or strong <i>potential</i> for higher artistic quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lacks convincing and/or specific information about applicant’s commitment to advancing artistic excellence. ▪ Does not clearly describe process(es) used to evaluate the project and maintain commitment to artistic quality. ▪ Sample work is not of high artistic quality.
Impact on Artistic Growth and (if applicable) on Communities and Audiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project clearly advances the applicant’s overall artistic and career goals, both short- and long-term. ▪ Support clearly will lead to improved artistic product. ✓ Compelling, specific narrative information clearly identifies the intended community or audience for the work. ✓ Narrative clearly describes the project’s ability to have a broad, significant impact on the stated community or audience. ✓ Project clearly contributes to further development of audience for the artist and/or this art form. ✓ Public value clearly stated and communicated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project likely to advance applicant’s overall artistic and career goals, both short- and long-term. ▪ Support has potential to lead to improved artistic product. ✓ Narrative information vague about intended community or audience for the work. ✓ Narrative does not clearly demonstrate the project’s ability to have a broad, significant impact on the stated community or audience. ✓ Project <i>may</i> contribute to further artistic development of art form and/or audience. ✓ Public value not well-argued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project does not clearly advance the applicant’s overall artistic and career goals in the short-term and is unlikely to affect long-term goals. ▪ Support unlikely to result in improved artistic product. ✓ Narrative information poorly or does not discuss intended community or audience for the work. ✓ Project unlikely to have an impact on the stated community or audience. ✓ Project does not contribute directly to development of art form and/or audience. ✓ No or weak statement about public value.
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application provides engaging, insightful overview of career goals and accomplishments, capacity, planning and evaluation. ▪ Applicant’s career trajectory provides clear indication that applicant can complete the proposed project. ▪ Sample works and supplemental materials provide a convincing case for the applicant’s abilities. ▪ Clear, concise and well-conceived budgetary information provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application does not make a particularly well-argued case for funding. ▪ No apparent ‘red flags’ about ability to carry out proposal as evidenced by career trajectory. ▪ Sample works and supplemental materials provide adequate indication of applicant’s abilities. ▪ Vague budgetary information provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application overall is confusing and does not provide clear information about artistic goals, capacity, planning or evaluation. ▪ Given an unremarkable career trajectory, raises concerns about ability to carry out the proposal. ▪ Sample works and supplemental materials raise questions about the applicant’s abilities. ▪ Unclear or poorly conceived budgetary information provided.