

Nevada Arts Council Arts Education Program Grant Review Criteria And Scoring Rubric

Please use the following when scoring each application. **These three areas add up to 100 points.**

1. Clarity of Application/Quality and Effectiveness of the Organization Up to 25 points

Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application is confusing and unclear. • Does not provide clear mission statement, planning or evaluation processes. • Weak or unclear budgetary/financial information provided. • No statement about public value. • Concerns about ability to carry out the proposal. • Supplemental material does not provide an insight into organization. 	<i>0-7 pts</i>
Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application provides basic, clear information about history, mission, programming, administration, public value, planning and evaluation. • Clear budgetary/financial information provided. • No apparent 'red flags' about ability to carry out the proposal as evidenced by quality of the application. • Supplemental material provides basic overview of organization. 	<i>8-17 pts</i>
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application provides an engaging and insightful overview of organizational history, mission, programming, administrative, public value, planning and evaluation. • Public value clearly stated and communicated through the entire narrative. • Clear and concise budgetary/financial information provided. • Very confident about the organization's ability to carry out the proposal. • Supplemental material enhances the application and the reader's understanding of the applicant. 	<i>18-25 pts</i>

2. Commitment to Arts Education Excellence Up to 50 points

Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks specific information about how the organization defines its arts education goals and objectives. • Lacks specific information about how the organization relates the intent of the project/program to one or more of the "Areas of Focus: Arts Education, Arts Integration or Arts for Social Development." • Has not clearly described process to evaluate the educational quality and success of programming. • Has not clearly identified appropriate and highly qualified teaching artists for project/program. • Supplemental material is poor or poorly presented. 	<i>0-13 pts</i>
Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides basic information about how the organization defines its arts education goals and objectives. • Provides basic information about how the organization relates the intent of the project/program to one or more of the "Areas of Focus: Arts Education, Arts Integration or Arts for Social Development." • Provides basic information about the appropriateness and qualifications of selected teaching artists for project/program. • Provides basic information on process used to evaluate the educational quality and success of programming. • Supplemental material provides basic information. 	<i>14-34 pts</i>

Nevada Arts Council Arts Education Program Grant Review Criteria And Scoring Rubric

Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides specific information about how the organization defines its arts education goals and objectives. • Provides specific information about how the organization relates the intent of the project/program to one or more of the “Areas of Focus: Arts Education, Arts Integration or Arts for Social Development.” • Clearly describes the appropriateness and qualifications of selected teaching artists for project/program. • Clearly illustrates process used to evaluate the educational quality of programming and discusses ways in which the organization maintains commitment to successful programming • Supplemental material is thoughtful, well presented and demonstrates commitment to use artists of quality. 	<i>35-50 pts</i>
------------------	---	------------------

3. Community Impact and Involvement

Up to 25 points

Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not offer information about general demographics of community, or clarity about community(ies) applicant serves. • Does not provide clear insight to its connection or impact on the community. • Supplemental material was weak and did not provide additional information about applicant’s role as a community asset. 	<i>0-7 pts</i>
Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic demographics of community included and some identification of specific community (ies) served. • Relationship to community described. • Organization has a measurable impact on the community it serves. • Supplemental materials help illuminate overall organizational/project impact on community it serves. 	<i>8-17 pts</i>
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics of community (general and specific to applicant) are clearly stated. • Narrative connects the history, mission and programming of the applicant to the community and its particular needs. • Compelling and specific narrative information demonstrates the applicant has a broad and significant impact on the community it serves. • Supplemental material clearly demonstrates a commitment to broaden access to the public and enhance applicant’s community as described in the narrative. 	<i>18-25 pts</i>