

ARTISTIC QUALITY: Evidence that arts are integral to the project and project will have high artistic merit for Nebraskans			
40 points	Excellent: 40-33 points	Average: 32-25 points	Weak: 24-0 points
Project Description	CLEAR explanation of all activities with specific details (who, what, where, when, and why)	BASIC explanation of artistic activities, but the specifics are not clearly articulated	INSUFFICIENT OR UNCLEAR explanation of artistic activities; few or no specific details are provided
Artistic Merit	CLEARLY EVIDENT and WELL ARTICULATED artistic merit of the project and its value to the community	IMPLIED but NOT SPECIFIC evidence of merit of the project and its value to the community	HARD TO DETERMINE or NO evidence of the merit of the project and its value to the community
Qualifications of Artists	CLEAR and COMPELLING evidence of the qualifications of the primary artists in the Narrative and/or Required Materials –or– If artists are not yet known, there is a CLEARLY EXPLAINED criteria for selection	SUFFICIENT evidence of the qualifications of the primary artists in the Narrative and/or the Required Materials –or– If artists are not yet known, there is a VAGUE criteria for selection	UNCLEAR evidence of the qualifications of the primary artists in the Narrative and/or the Required Materials –or– If artists are not yet known, there is NO or an UNCLEAR criteria for selection

PLANNING & EVALUATION: Evidence that the project will be carried out successfully; completeness and accuracy of application			
30 points	Excellent: 30-24 points	Average: 23-17 points	Weak: 16-0 points
Planning Process	CLEAR and EFFECTIVE planning process, including goals, key people, collaborators and their roles in the project. Timeline is DETAILED and USEFUL as a planning/implementation tool.	BASIC planning process description without roles or name; implied goals. Timeline is BASIC with FEW details.	UNCLEAR or INEFFECTIVE planning; little evidence of collaborations or appear superficial; no discernable goals. Timeline is INACCURATE , CONFLICTING and/or NOT DETAILED .
Evaluation Process	CLEAR and EFFECTIVE evaluation process that relates to the project’s goals, describing what info will be gathered <u>and</u> how results will be used	BASIC evaluation process, describing what info will be gathered AND the use of the results	UNCLEAR or NO evaluation process describing what information will be collected or why
Target Audience	CLEARLY IDENTIFIED and REASONED target audience	VAGUE target audience referenced, but unexplained	NO target audience referenced or explained
Promotion	EFFECTIVE promotion efforts planned to reach the intended audiences	ADEQUATE promotion efforts planned to reach the intended audiences	UNCLEAR or INEFFECTIVE promotion efforts planned to reach the intended audiences
Budget	ACCURATE , ITEMIZED , REALISTIC budget that reflects what is discussed in the Narrative and Required Materials	ADEQUATE and FEASIBLE budget that reflects what is discussed in the Narrative and Required Materials	INCOMPLETE , CONFUSING , UN-REALISTIC budget and/or CONFLICTS with the Narrative and Required Materials
Required Materials	ILLUSTRATE , CLARIFY and CORROBORATE the other components of the application (ex: letters from collaborators, reviews, articles, brochures, media samples, etc.)	RELATE to the project , with little additional information	CONFUSE and/or CONFLICT with the other components of the application

OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT: Evidence that the project will impact the community; completeness and accuracy of application			
20 points	Excellent: 20-17 points	Average: 16-13 points	Weak: 12-0 points
Outreach	SUBSTANTIAL education and/or outreach designed to increase community participation.	UNCLEAR or INEFFECTIVE education and/or outreach efforts planned for community participation	FEW if ANY education and/or outreach efforts designed to increase community participation
Engagement	ACTIVE and DETAILED EFFORTS to engage the public through collaborations in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the project. (ex: community collaborators included on the planning committee)	PASSIVE EFFORTS to engage the public through collaborations in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the project (ex: “We’re free, anyone can attend” or “We put up posters in senior centers”)	FEW , NO or SUPERFICIAL EFFORTS to engage the public through collaborations in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the project (ex: “This is a great opportunity for underserved audiences to experience the arts.”)

UNDERSERVED COMMUNITY OUTREACH - for projects with substantial outreach to *underserved populations.

***An underserved community as defined by the NEA: ‘one whose residents often lack access to arts programs due to geographic isolation and/or have limited access to arts resources and programs due to economics, ethnic background, disability, or age.’**

10 points	High: 10-9 points	Medium: 8-7 points	Low: 6-0 points
Underserved	The majority of participants are from underserved populations. Includes DETAILED explanation as to how project serves underserved audience.	A significant portion of participants are from underserved populations. VAGUE explanation as to how project serves an underserved audience. A significant portion of participants are from underserved populations. VAGUE explanation as to how project serves an underserved audience.	An Insignificant portion of participants are from underserved populations. INADEQUATE explanation as to how project serves and underserved audience.