

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? Who/What guides your work? Programming Staff Sample Work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly outlines current and future direction and strategies to achieve quality programming ▪ Demonstrates strong programming capabilities ▪ Sample work clearly demonstrates the high quality of the artistic product 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not clearly outline current and/or future direction and strategies to achieve quality programming ▪ Does not fully convince of programming capabilities ▪ Sample work raises some questions about the quality of the artistic product 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not convincingly demonstrate that current and/or future direction and strategies will lead to quality programming; ▪ Weak programming capabilities ▪ Sample work does not demonstrate a high- quality artistic product
Impact on Communities/ Audiences <i>To whom does it matter? Opportunities to grow audiences? Charting path to diversity?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compellingly and specifically demonstrates significant impact on the community or communities served ▪ Public value clearly stated and communicated ▪ Plan to grow/engage audiences is feasible ▪ 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 ▪ Plan to grow/engage audiences is not convincing ▪ 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 argued or not argued at all ▪ Plan to grow/engage audiences is weak or non-existent ▪ Narrative regarding diversity raises red flags about organization’s commitment to increasing the diversity of the organization and its audiences
Organizational Capabilities <i>Overall application Financial and Administrative Information Staffing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application is very well-written and 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 and materials provide good overview of the organization and its programming ▪ Application raises some questions about the organization’s financial and administrative capacity, efficacy and stability ▪ Financial information raises some concerns ▪ Some questions 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