

Cultural Fund Grant: Special Projects and Programs

Judge ID:	Category: SPP		Grant Number:	
Criteria	Fair	Good	Excellent	Points/Comments
Quality of Artistic Goals/Impact: 25	14-17 points <input type="checkbox"/>	18-21 points <input type="checkbox"/>	22-25 points <input type="checkbox"/>	Points Awarded:
Artistic quality of the work, program or services. Artistic or cultural impact on its audiences. Artistic mission / vision clearly expressed. Quality program or project.	Artistic quality not demonstrated. Mission, and/or vision are vague or not stated. Goals not stated. Quality minimal.	Quality of work demonstrated. Mission and vision stated. Goals defined.	Excellent quality of work demonstrated. Mission and vision stated. Project relevant to mission. Goals clear and measurable.	
Organizational Capacity: 15	7-9 points <input type="checkbox"/>	10-12 points <input type="checkbox"/>	13-15 points <input type="checkbox"/>	Points Awarded:
Qualifications of Board and Staff. Ability of organization to formulate and implement plans. Evidence of volunteer support, including the Board.	Board/staff lacks experience or diversity. Volunteer involvement not evident. Organization is new or lacks experience in project area.	Board/staff is adequate. Good bank of volunteers. Organization appears able to complete project.	Diverse and qualified board and staff. Significant volunteer participation. History of successful projects.	
Community Engagement: 15	7-9 points <input type="checkbox"/>	10-12 points <input type="checkbox"/>	13-15 points <input type="checkbox"/>	Points Awarded:
Arts programming or projects are accessible to all. Project enhances the social health of the community. Evidence of collaboration and/or community support.	Issues with accessibility. Benefit to community not clearly evident. Lack of meaningful partners or support.	Project accessible. Plan shows benefit to the community. Partnerships and community involvement evident.	Full accessibility. Significant benefit to the community. Strong partners; support clearly demonstrated.	
Program Finances: 20	12-14 points <input type="checkbox"/>	15-17 points <input type="checkbox"/>	18-20 points <input type="checkbox"/>	Points Awarded:
Project/program budget is sound and realistic. Ability of organization to control program or project expenses and stay within budgets. Financial reports provided present meaningful and useful information about projects/programs.	Budget does not make sense or misses key parts. Financial reports missing or irrelevant. Program expenses unrealistic or too vague.	Budget is logical. Expenses are realistic and well planned. Financial reports are accurate and demonstrate the health of the organization.	Detailed and sound budget provided and realistic. Financials show stability and ability to complete project and reflect a healthy organization.	
Strength of Programming: 25	14-17 points <input type="checkbox"/>	18-21 points <input type="checkbox"/>	22-25 points <input type="checkbox"/>	Points Awarded:
Project and services consistent with mission. Clear description of the implementation plan. Timeline for project is reasonable. Evidence of measurable outcomes and outputs and shared method for evaluating success or problems.	Project does not align with mission. Unclear plan for implementation. Timeline is questionable. Vague outcomes or lack of ability to measure outcomes.	Project falls within stated mission. Outline for implementation stated. Outcomes are clearly stated and measurable.	Project fits mission well. Detailed implementation plan. Realistic timeline. Outcomes clearly articulated and measurable.	

Note to judges: This form is intended as a guide only. Note that the categories start at “Fair”. If an applicant response in any of the five narratives is missing or “Poor”, judges have the discretion to assign a lower score than the minimal listed here (starting at 0/no points.) Please be aware that past applicants have found your comments invaluable as they work to strengthen their grant-writing and understand their score.

