

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 <i>Who are you? How do you do your work? How will you know it matters? Sample work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presents compelling, specific information about commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Clearly illustrates ways in which applicant strives for and provides artistic excellence and describes process(es) used to evaluate quality of programming. ▪ Supplemental material demonstrates commitment to and achievement of artistic quality, is thoughtful and is well-presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addresses commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Notes ways in which applicant strives for but may not achieve artistic excellence and describes the process(es) used to evaluate artistic quality of programming. ▪ Supplemental material does not clearly demonstrate commitment to and/or achievement of artistic quality and is not well-presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lacks specific or convincing information about commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Has not clearly or convincingly described ways in which applicant strives for artistic excellence or the process(es) used to evaluate artistic quality of programming. ▪ Supplemental material unconvincing about commitment to and/or achievement of artistic quality and is poorly presented.
Impact on Communities/ Audiences <i>To whom does it matter? How will you know it matters? Charting path to diversity?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrative convincingly connects the organization’s mission and programming to the needs of the communities served. ▪ Provides specific demographics of communities and/or audiences reached or strives to reach, as well as clear plans to expand that reach. ▪ Compellingly and specifically demonstrates broad, significant impact on the communities served. ▪ Public value clearly stated and communicated through entire narrative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrative addresses how the organization meets the needs of the communities served. ▪ Provides basic demographics of communities and/or audiences reached or strives to reach, without clear plans of how to expand that reach. ▪ Organization indicates it has some measurable impact on the communities served. ▪ Public value not well-argued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrative does not provide clear insight connecting the organization’s mission and programming to the communities served. ▪ Does not offer specific information about demographics of communities and/or audiences reached or strives to reach and does not present plans to expand the reach. ▪ Does not provide convincing information about impact on the communities served. ▪ No or weak statement about public value.
Capacity, Efficacy and Organizational Stability <i>Entire narrative Add’l Materials</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application narrative and materials provide engaging, insightful overview of mission, programming, fiscal stability, administrative capacity, public value, planning and evaluation. ▪ Clear, concise budgetary/financial information provided. ▪ Very confident about organization’s abilities as evidenced by the overall quality of the application and staffing qualifications. ▪ Supplemental material enhances and elevates application and reader’s understanding of the organization’s work and capabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application provides basic information about mission, programming, fiscal stability, administrative capacity, public value, planning and evaluation. ▪ Adequate budgetary/financial information provided. ▪ No apparent ‘red flags’ about organization’s abilities as evidenced by quality of application and staffing qualifications. ▪ Supplemental material provides basic information and supports the reader’s understanding of the organization’s work and capabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application is confusing and unclear; does not provide clear information about mission, programming, fiscal stability, administrative capacity, public value, planning or evaluation processes. ▪ Weak or unclear budgetary/financial information provided. ▪ Concerns about organization’s abilities as evidenced by quality of application and staffing qualifications. ▪ Supplemental material does not provide insights into application; some red flags about organization’s work and capabilities.
Project Concept <i>For Project Grants Only</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrative convinces that the organization has clearly thought through the project and clearly communicates the intended (and achievable) results desired. ▪ Compelling argument presented for how the project fits and/or enhances the organization’s mission. ▪ Project clearly advances organization’s overall artistic goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrative does not fully convince that the organization has fully worked through the project and its intended results; some question about whether the stated results are achievable. ▪ Project fits but may not enhance the organization’s mission. ▪ Project <i>may</i> advance organization’s artistic goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project is poorly or incompletely conceived; ‘red flags’ about whether the stated results are achievable. ▪ The project does not fit and/or enhance the organizations’ mission. ▪ Project does not clearly or is unlikely to advance the organization’s overall artistic goals.

The following is meant to guide the panelist's assessment of the organization's capacity, efficacy and stability.

	10 POINTS – EXCELLENT <i>Very Clear and Well-Presented</i>	4 POINTS – AVERAGE <i>Provides Basic Information, Raises Some Questions</i>	1 POINT – WEAK <i>Information Unclear or Missing, Raises Red Flags</i>
Narrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very well-written. ▪ Tells a captivating “story” of organization and its work. ▪ Presents compelling, specific information to further understanding of organization and/or project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate writing. ▪ Tells the “story” of organization and its work. ▪ Provides basic organization about organization and/or project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poorly written. ▪ Does not tell a clear or convincing “story” of organization and its work. ▪ Does not provide adequate information about organization and/or project.
Financial Information <i>Narrative</i> <i>Annual Operating Budget</i> <i>Financial Statements</i> <i>Project Budget</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents show solid fiscal status and management, raising no unanswered concerns or questions. ▪ Financial information presented as requested. ▪ Project budget (if appropriate) is reasonable and clearly presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents raise some questions or minor concerns about fiscal status and management; financial narrative may allay those concerns. ▪ Financial information presented as requested. ▪ Project budget (if appropriate) reasonable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents raise more questions or concerns than answered about fiscal status or management; financial narrative does not allay those concerns. ▪ Financial information not presented as requested. ▪ Project budget (if appropriate) is inappropriate and/or unclear.
Board Roster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board is well-balanced, with a range of sectors represented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board is fairly balanced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board does not seem balanced or appropriately sized given the organization.
Diversity & Inclusion Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well-articulated statement. ▪ Narrative convincingly indicates how the statement successfully plays out in the organization’s programming and organizational infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organization has a statement. ▪ Narrative not convincing about how the statement plays out in the organization’s programming and organizational infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organization does not have a statement. ▪ Nothing in the narrative talks about how the organization’s programming and organizational infrastructure is diverse and inclusive.
Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff clearly have the skills, training and/or experience appropriate to their positions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff appear to have most of the skills, training and/or experience appropriate to their positions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff clearly do not have the necessary skills, training and/or experience for their positions.
Demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimated audience numbers appear appropriate to the venue/event. ▪ Reinforces Diversity & Inclusion Statement and narrative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimated audience numbers seem inflated or raise concerns about the organization’s reach. ▪ Doesn’t fully reinforce Diversity & Inclusion Statement or narrative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information missing, or is well above or below what would be expected for the organization. ▪ Does not reinforce Diversity & Inclusion Statement or narrative.
Work Samples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly demonstrates the kind and quality of the arts/culture programming and/or its impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides a sense of the kind and quality of the programming and/or its impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Raises concerns about the quality of the programming and/or its impact.