

Application Review Criteria and Scoring Rubric

ARTS PROJECT GRANTS (APG)

**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
<b>Project Description</b>	CLEAR and SPECIFIC 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
<b>Goals</b>	CLEARLY IDENTIFIED and MEASURABLE goals are provided with an explanation as to how those goals serve the	IMPLIED goals are provided with an explanation as to how those goals serve the organization's mission.	NO DISCERNABLE goals of the project are provided in the Narrative.
<b>Artistic Merit</b>	CLEARLY EVIDENT and WELL ARTICULATED artistic value of the project and its significance to the community	IMPLIED but NOT SPECIFIC evidence of the value of the project and its significance to the community	HARD TO DETERMINE or NO evidence of the value of the project and its significance to the community
<b>Qualifications of Artists</b>	CLEAR and COMPELLING evidence of the qualifications of the primary artists –or–If artists are not yet known, there is a CLEARLY EXPLAINED criteria for selection.	SUFFICIENT evidence of the qualifications of the primary artists –or–If artists are not yet known, there is a VAGUE criteria for selection.	UNCLEAR evidence of the qualifications of the primary artists –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: 30-25 points	Average: 24-18 points	Weak: 17-0 points
<b>Planning Process</b>	CLEAR and EFFECTIVE planning process; identifies key people and specific collaborators and their roles in the project. Timeline is DETAILED and USEFUL as a planning tool.	BASIC planning process description without roles or names. Timeline is BASIC with FEW details.	UNCLEAR or INEFFECTIVE planning process; little evidence of planning and/or collaborations seem superficial. Timeline is INACCURATE, CONFLICTING and/or NOT DETAILED.
<b>Evaluation Process</b>	CLEAR and EFFECTIVE evaluation process that relates to the project's goals, describing what info will be gathered and 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
<b>Budget</b>	ACCURATE, ITEMIZED, REALISTIC budget that reflects what is proposed elsewhere in the application	ADEQUATE and FEASIBLE budget that reflects what is proposed	INCOMPLETE, CONFUSING, UN-REALISTIC budget and/or conflicts with other components of proposal
<b>Application Quality</b>	WELL-WRITTEN, with ATTENTION TO DETAIL; All components of proposal corroborate with one another (narrative, budget, bios, etc.)	ACCEPTABLY WRITTEN, components corroborate, sufficient detail provided to support proposal. Acronyms have been spelled out and explained, and the narrative contains no spelling errors	CONFUSING TO READ, components of application are inconsistent with one another; insufficient information to support the proposal

**OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT: Evidence that the project will positively impact the community**

20 points	Excellent: 20-17 points	Average: 16-13 points	Weak: 12-0 points
<b>Target Audience</b>	CLEARLY IDENTIFIED and REASONED target audience. Useful information such as current demographics describe audience and/or community.	VAGUE target audience referenced, but unexplained. Includes generic or unrelated demographics.	NO target audience referenced or explained. No demographics provided.
<b>Promotion</b>	EFFECTIVE promotion efforts planned to reach the intended audiences	ADEQUATE promotion efforts planned to reach the intended audiences	UNCLEAR or INEFFECTIVE promotion efforts planned
<b>Outreach and Accessibility</b>	SUBSTANTIAL education and/or outreach designed to increase accessibility and community participation (ex: activities taken into the community)	BASIC education and/or outreach designed to increase accessibility and community participation (ex: "post-show discussions or discounted tickets to seniors)	FEW if ANY education and/or outreach efforts designed to increase accessibility and community participation (ex: "we will never turn anyone away" )
<b>Engagement</b>	ACTIVE and DETAILED EFFORTS to engage the public through collaborations in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the project (ex: representatives of underserved populations on planning	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

**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
<b>Underserved Outreach</b>	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.	An Insignificant portion of participants are from underserved populations. INADEQUATE explanation as to how project serves and underserved audience.