**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 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: 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 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: 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 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. |