

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>
<p>Artistic Quality <i>Who are you? Who/What guides your work? Sample Work</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly outlines current and future direction and strategies to achieve quality programming ▪ Provides evidence of artistic growth ▪ Sample work clearly demonstrates the high quality level of the programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not clearly outline current and/or future direction and strategies to achieve quality programming ▪ Provides evidence of artistic growth ▪ Sample work provides a sense of the kind and quality level of the programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not convincingly demonstrate that current and/or future direction and strategies will lead to quality programming ▪ Does not provide evidence of artistic growth ▪ Sample work raises questions about the kind and quality level of the programming
<p>Impact on Communities/ Audiences <i>To whom does it matter? Charting path to diversity?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compellingly and specifically demonstrates broad, significant impact on the community or communities served ▪ Public value clearly stated and communicated ▪ Narrative regarding diversity provides convincing results from previous efforts and about current/future plans to increase the diversity of the organization and its audiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates some measurable impact on the community or communities served ▪ Public value not convincingly argued ▪ Narrative regarding diversity is vague about progress made from previous efforts and/or about current/future plans to increase the diversity of the organization and its audiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not present convincing argument about the impact on the community or communities served ▪ Public value poorly or not argued at all. ▪ Narrative regarding diversity raises red flags about organization’s commitment to increasing the diversity of the organization and its audiences
<p>Organizational Capabilities <i>Overall application Financial and Administrative Information</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application is very well-written and together with the other materials provides an engaging, insightful and convincing overview of the organization and its programming ▪ Application elicits confidence in the organization’s financial and administrative capacity, efficacy and stability ▪ Clear, concise financial information provided; raises no concerns. ▪ No concerns raised about staffing qualifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application provides adequate overview of the organization and its programming ▪ Application raises slight concerns about the organization’s financial and administrative capacity, efficacy and stability. ▪ Financial information raises some concerns ▪ Some concerns raised about staffing qualifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application does not provide a clear or engaging overview of the organization or its programming. ▪ Application raises strong concerns about the organization’s financial and administrative capacity, efficacy and stability. ▪ Financial information unclear and/or otherwise raises red flags. ▪ Concerns raised about staffing qualifications.