**For: Artistic Excellence (20 possible points)** Criteria:*Quality of arts mission and company programs. What is the organization's portfolio of offerings?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| **0** | **1-5** | **6-10** | **11-15** | **16-20** | **21-25** |
| Responses do not provide any required information or respond to the criteria. | Responses are not fully formed. Project is difficult to understand.Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.Strategies are questionable. | Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. The project is described, but a full picture is not evident.Strategies seem underdeveloped. | Responses address the criteria.Descriptions allow panelists to understand the project.Strategies are effective. | Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.The flow of the project is clear.Strategies are strong and solid.Responses demonstrate a well-thought-out project. | Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership. |

**For: Project’s Artistic Merit (20 possible points) –** Criteria:*Quality of project - and degree to which these funds will support the success of the project. Is the program well planned and supports the organization’s artistic or cultural goals?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| **0** | **1-5** | **6-10** | **11-15** | **16-20** | **21-25** |
| Responses do notprovide any required information or respond to the criteria. | Responses are not fully formed. Project is difficult to understand.Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.Strategies are questionable. | Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. The project is described, but a full picture is not evident.Strategies seem underdeveloped. | Responses address the criteria.Descriptions allow panelists to understand the project.Strategies are effective. | Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.The flow of the project is clear.Strategies are strong and solid.Responses demonstrate a well-thought-out project. | Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership. |

**For: Audience Development/Community Involvement (30 possible points)** Criteria:*Degree of audience development efforts. For example: how do you engage the disability community? How do you know if the program or project is needed in your community? Is there evidence to support the accessibility need?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| **0** | **1-6** | **7-12** | **13-19** | **20-25** | **26-30** |
| Responses do notprovide any required information or respond to the criteria. | Responses are not fully formed. Project is difficult to understand.Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.Strategies are questionable. | Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. The project is described, but a full picture is not evident.Strategies seem underdeveloped. | Responses address the criteria.Descriptions allow panelists to understand the project.Strategies are effective. | Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.The flow of the project is clear.Strategies are strong and solid.Responses demonstrate a well-thought-out project. | Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership. |

**For: Organizational Capacity/Evaluation (20 possible points)** Criteria:*Presenter’s ability to carry out and evaluate the project. What are the qualifications of the people working on the project?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| **0** | **1-4** | **5-8** | **9-12** | **13-16** | **17-20** |
| Responses do notprovide any required information or respond to the criteria. | Responses are not fully formed. Project is difficult to understand.Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.Strategies are questionable. | Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. The project is described, but a full picture is not evident.Strategies seem underdeveloped. | Responses address the criteria.Descriptions allow panelists to understand the project.Strategies are effective. | Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.The flow of the project is clear.Strategies are strong and solid.Responses demonstrate a well-thought-out project. | Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership. |