

## Dane Arts Grant Review Rubric -- Commission Reviewer

Review Criteria	OUTSTANDING (5 points)	VERY GOOD (4 points)	SATISFACTORY (3 points)	POOR (2 points)	Unacceptable (1 point)	Score
<b>Quality &amp; Creativity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project demonstrates exceptional creativity and high artistic and/or historical quality. Application provides engaging and insightful overview of project, e.g., applicant's history, capability, organization's mission, programming, administration, public value, planning and evaluation.</li> <li>• Clear and concise budget/financial information provided.</li> <li>• Public value clearly stated and communicated through entire narrative.</li> <li>• High confidence about applicant's ability to carry out project.</li> <li>• Supplemental materials enhance application and deepen understanding about applicant and project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project is creative and demonstrates artistic and/or historical quality. Application provides strong overview of project, e.g., applicant's history, capability, organization's mission, programming, administration, public value, planning and evaluation.</li> <li>• Budget/financial information provided is sound and application proves ability to carry out project.</li> <li>• Supplemental materials provide basic overview of applicant and project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has artistic and/or historical merit. Application provides basic, clear information about project, e.g., applicant's history, capability, organization's mission, programming, administration, public value, planning and evaluation.</li> <li>• Budget/financial information provided; application demonstrates competence to carry out project.</li> <li>• Supplemental materials provide some insight about applicant and project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project's artistic merit and/or quality is questionable. Application has limited information about project, e.g., applicant's history, capability, organization's mission, programming, administration, public value, planning and evaluation, and lacks details.</li> <li>• Budget/financial information may be provided but questions remain about ability to carry out project.</li> <li>• Supplemental materials may be present but do not provide valuable insight about applicant or project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete or not addressed.</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	OUTSTANDING (5 points)	VERY GOOD (4 points)	SATISFACTORY (3 points)	POOR (2 points)	Unacceptable (1 point)	Score
<b>Community Impact &amp; Public Benefit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application clearly identifies community need through detailed documentation and research. Application effectively demonstrates consideration for geographic, racial/ethnic, cultural, economic, age and gender composition factors. Application succinctly describes value-added, accessibility and opportunities for participation by community/ies served.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application identifies community need and details how it is addressed through project. Application incorporates geographic, racial/ethnic, cultural, economic, age and gender composition factors. Application describes accessibility to community/ies served.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application identifies community need project addresses. Application considers geographic, racial/ethnic, cultural, economic, age and gender composition factors. Application describes accessibility to community/ies served.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application fails to identify community need for project. Application mentions geographic, racial/ethnic, cultural, economic, age and gender composition factors but does not incorporate into planning. Application mentions accessibility to community served but fails to effectively describe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incomplete or not addressed.</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	OUTSTANDING (5 points)	VERY GOOD (4 points)	SATISFACTORY (3 points)	POOR (2 points)	Unacceptable (1 point)	Score
<b>Financial Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and concise budget/financial information provided. Budget is realistic considering target audience size and stated objectives, and may include narrative with justification and quotes, if available. Sufficient earned income and/or contributed funds are present from a variety of sources. Applicant demonstrates ability to develop and manage resources wisely.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget/financial information provided is sound and application proves ability to carry out project. Budget is realistic considering target audience size and stated objectives, and includes some justification within narrative. Earned income and/or contributed funds are present. Applicant outlines proficiency in managing financial resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget/financial information provided. Budget is realistic considering target audience size and stated objectives. Earned income and/or contributed funds may be present but weak. Applicant appears capable of managing financial resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget/financial information may be provided but questions remain about ability to carry out project. Budget is documented and included but questions exist. Little or no earned income and/or contributed funds present. Applicant fails to demonstrate competence for managing financial resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete or not addressed.</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	<b>OUTSTANDING (5 points)</b>	<b>VERY GOOD (4 points)</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY (3 points)</b>	<b>POOR (2 points)</b>	<b>Unacceptable (1 point)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan is specific, clearly outlined and objectives are defined. Goals and objectives of project are realistic and clearly stated. Timeline is clear and identifies specific activities and dates for completion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan is easily outlined and has sound integration of objectives. Goals of project are stated, realistic, and clear. Timeline is included, along with list activities and dates for completion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan is outlined and has some connection to objectives. Goals of project are stated but lack detail. Timeline lacks specificity and clarification regarding dates for completion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan is outlined and goals of the project are stated. Timeline included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incomplete or not addressed.</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
<b>Impact &amp; Influence of grant award (value-added for community &amp; project's success)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has potential to involve and engage large number of individuals and/or individuals representing multiple age groups and demographics, OR project offers deep involvement and engagement opportunities by small number of individuals representing narrow age range and/or demographics.</li> <li>• Project has wide or targeted reach, along with opportunity to grow, be replicated and sustained, serve as a model.</li> <li>• Project's success depends heavily upon grant award.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has potential to involve and engage large number of individuals and/or individuals representing multiple age groups and demographics, OR project offers limited involvement and engagement opportunities by small number of individuals.</li> <li>• Project has limited reach, and opportunity to grow, be replicated and sustained, serve as a model is not obvious.</li> <li>• Project's success not completely reliant upon grant award.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project's potential to involve and engage range of individuals may be large but is more likely small.</li> <li>• Project's reach may be wide, but is more likely narrow.</li> <li>• Project likely will succeed easily in absence of grant award, OR project has low probability for success.</li> </ul>