COMMUNITY CULTIVATION GRANTS: REVIEW CRITERIA AND SCORING RUBRIC

	10 POINTS – EXCELLENT *Very Confident about Applicant's Abilities*	4 POINTS – AVERAGE *No Apparent "Red Flags" about Applicant's Abilities*	1 POINT – WEAK *Concerns about Applicant's Abilities*
Program/Project Concept *Descriptions Budget/Narrative*	• Clearly enhances and/or supports organization's overall mission and goals • Clearly and fully thought through; no question that it is achievable • Very clear about purpose, objectives, goals, implementation and target audiences • Budget fully considered and is in keeping with the scope of the project.	• Has good potential to enhance and/or support organization's overall mission and goals. • Not fully thought through; some question about whether it is achievable as presented • Not fully clear about purpose, objectives, goals, implementation and target audiences • Budget is clear, but raises some questions about whether it is fully in keeping with the scope of the project	• Unlikely to enhance and/or support organization's overall mission and goals. • Poorly conceived; red flags about whether intended results are achievable • Doesn't full address purpose, objectives, goals, implantation and target audiences • Budget not well-presented and does not reflect the scope of the project
Accessibility/ Impact *Long description*	• Convincingly discusses how program/project will be accessible to *all* in our community • Provides specific demographics of audiences that will be served • Makes convincing case of impact on intended audiences	• Adequate discussion of how program/project will be accessible to *all* in our community • Provides general demographics of audiences that will be served • Adequate discussion of impact on intended audiences	• Does not address how program/project will be accessible to *all* in our community • Unspecific or no information about demographics of audiences that will be served • Inadequate or discussion of impact on intended audiences
Capacity, Efficacy and Organizational Stability *Overall Application Budget Work Sample Board Roster*	• Application and additional materials provide engaging, insightful and convincing information • Budget is well thought out, clear and concise; no concerns that expenses reasonable/in keeping with project scope • Very confident about organization's abilities to implement project as evidenced by the overall quality of the application	• Application provides adequate overview of organization and project. • Budget is reasonable; some questions about whether expenses are fully in line with project scope • Not fully confident about organization's abilities to implement project as evidenced by the overall quality of the application	• Application does not provide clear information about organization and/or project • Budget unclear and/or unreasonable; expenses out of line with project scope • Concerns about organization's abilities to implement project as evidenced by the overall quality of the application
Artistic Quality *Overall Application Work Samples*	• Clearly outlines current and future direction and strategies to achieve quality programming • Sample work clearly demonstrates the high quality level of the programming	• Does not clearly outline current and/or future direction and strategies to achieve quality programming • Sample work provides a sense of the kind and quality level of the programming	• Does not convincingly demonstrate that current and/or future direction and strategies will lead to quality programming • Sample work raises questions about the kind and quality level of the programming
	1 POINT		
Audiences Served	• Project is conceived specifically to serve at least one underserved population.		