

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presents compelling, specific information about commitment to advancing artistic quality. ▪ Clearly illustrates ways in which applicant 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	<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. ▪ 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 the needs of the communities served and how the organization serves it. ▪ Organization has some measurable impact on the communities served. ▪ Provides basic demographics of communities and/or audiences reached. ▪ 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 provide convincing information about the measurable impact on the communities served. ▪ Does not offer specific information about demographics of communities and/or audiences reached. ▪ No or weak statement about public value.
Capacity, Efficacy and Organizational Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application provides 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 quality of application and staffing. ▪ Supplemental material enhances and elevates application and reader’s understanding of the organization’s work. 	<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. ▪ Supplemental material provides basic support of application. 	<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. ▪ Supplemental material does not provide insights into application.
Project Concept	<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.
Annual Operating Budget <i>Current year + prior 2 fiscal years</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget presented as requested (current year + 2 prior fiscal years, side-by-side) with appropriate amount of detail. ▪ Year-to-year comparative information shows solid fiscal management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget presented as requested. ▪ Year-to-year comparative information raises some questions, but financial narrative alleviates some or all concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget not presented as requested or is missing. ▪ Year-to-year comparative information raises concerns and financial narrative does not alleviate concerns.
Financial Statements <i>Required for GOS I + II</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submitted documents show solid fiscal status, raising no unanswered concerns or questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submitted information raises some concerns or questions about fiscal status and management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Missing a component or not submitted as required. ▪ Submitted information raises more questions and concerns than it answers.
Project Budget <i>Required for Project Applications</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well-conceived project budget. ▪ Budget income/expenses appropriate to the scope of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate budget. ▪ Budget income/expenses seem “off” in relation to the scope of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poorly conceived budget. ▪ Income/expenses unrealistic and/or not in line with the scope of the project.
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.
Strategic Plan <i>Required for GOS I + II</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides a clear path for the organization and dovetails with the narrative. ▪ Is current (within the past 5 years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides a generalized overview that is mostly reflected in the narrative. ▪ Is current (within the past 5 years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is overly vague or is contradicted by the narrative, <i>OR</i> was not submitted. ▪ Is not current (within the past 5 years).
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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimated audience numbers seem inflated <i>or</i> raise concerns about the organization's/program's reach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information missing, or is well above or below what would be expected for the organization.
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.