

2010 Guidelines – Appendix 1

Project Support Application Review Criteria/Evaluation Measures

Public Value

Define what community need(s) this project will address; who it will impact; and how
Provide details regarding how this project will be a meaningful addition to the Columbus community and who and how will benefit from this experience.

Examples of community need: Showcasing an under-represented artistic discipline, targeted outreach, raising awareness of a global issue, creating a link between arts and science

Examples of impact: Utilizing local artists, engaging with students/education

Examples of benefit: Engagement of the community at large; Gain better understanding; Create greater awareness

Criteria	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community need(s) clearly stated and relevant ▪ Impact clear and well-reasoned ▪ Benefit is well defined and meaningful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public Value Statement

Excellent Project demonstrates impact to high need area or provide high benefit to community and/or artists
Statement is clear and exemplifies well thought out engagement and planning

Satisfactory Project outlines a general community impact to need area and slight artist benefit
Statement is defined, but not remarkable

Fair Project possesses narrow focus on need area or lacks meaningful impact
Statement is vague and too broad

Unsatisfactory Project does not clearly address the external impact to the community or artist benefit
Statement focuses on organizational benefit

Artistic and Project Quality

Describe the artistic goals of this project, and how GCAC funding would further those goals. How many artists will this project serve and how will they be selected? Other than this specific project, in what way(s) does your organization engage with artists?

Criteria	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project goals are clearly stated ▪ Quality of the artists, productions, exhibits, works of art and other project activities ▪ Qualified people are involved in making programming decisions ▪ Quality design is evident in graphic and printed materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant narrative ▪ Printed materials (programs, catalogs and newsletters) ▪ Press clippings ▪ Resumes or bios of artists, jurors and consultants ▪ Artistic documentation ▪ Final reports from previous projects

Excellent Project goals are clearly explained and realistic
Artist(s) are of the highest artistic quality as demonstrated by bio(s)/resume(s)
Project is an excellent example of a strong artistic/cultural program, may show examples of collaboration between disciplines
Program management strongly qualified to lead this arts/cultural project

2010 Guidelines – Appendix 1

Project Support Application Review Criteria/Evaluation Measures

- Satisfactory**
 - Project goals are explained and somewhat realistic
 - Artist(s) identified and are a mix of experience as demonstrated by bio(s)/resume(s)
 - Program is clearly artistic or cultural in nature
 - Program management identified and qualified to lead this arts/cultural project

- Fair**
 - Project goals are poorly defined
 - Artist(s) chosen but not secured or quality difficult to discern
 - Program is loosely or poorly portrayed as artistic or cultural
 - Program management identified, but not qualified to lead this arts/cultural project as demonstrated by their bio/resume

- Unsatisfactory**
 - Projects goals are missing from narrative
 - Artists not chosen
 - Program is not artistic or cultural in nature
 - Program management is not identified or qualifications difficult to discern

Organizational Goals & Project Implementation

Describe the purpose of the applicant organization, and explain how this project strengthens that purpose. Discuss the planning process for this project and how past evaluations of previously completed projects have contributed to this process. How will this project be evaluated? If GCAC cannot award the total request, activities outlined in this application may require prioritizing; describe the effect of partial funding. Discuss any budgetary items, or elements of the financial statements, that require further explanation. Provide the total board of trustees' contribution for this project, as well as the percentage of trustees that have contributed.

Criteria	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project fits well within organization's mission and purpose ▪ Evaluation measures are thoughtful and fit the organization's overall goals ▪ Organizational demonstrates ability to plan effectively ▪ Appropriate staff, board and committee members are involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant narrative ▪ Final reports from previous projects ▪ Organizational budget for project year ▪ Job descriptions/resumes of key personnel

Excellent

- Project a good fit with the organization's mission and purpose.
- Evaluation measures are clearly defined, methods used are thoughtful, and fit well within the context of the project, methods to implement into future planning evident
- Narrative demonstrates the organization's history of executing successful projects
- Qualified and proven people are involved in appropriate roles and duties
- Board support is clearly outlined and participated in fully

Satisfactory

- Project is an appropriate fit with the organization's mission and purpose
- Evaluation measures are explained and clear
- Narrative demonstrates the organization's ability to plan effectively
- Staff, board and committee members are identified and most are suited to roles/duties
- Board support is outlines and mostly participated in

2010 Guidelines – Appendix 1

Project Support Application Review Criteria/Evaluation Measures

Fair Project’s relationship to mission explained, but not apparent as to fit with the organization’s mission and purpose
 Evaluation measures are explained, yet not appropriate to activity and future implementation is unclear
 Board support is unclear and not fully supported

Unsatisfactory Project’s relationship to mission unclear
 Evaluation measures not identified
 Ability to plan not demonstrated
 Staff, board, and committee members are not identified
 Board support does not exist

Marketing & Audience

What is the marketing strategy for this project? What audience has been targeted and why? What is the project’s plan for Columbus community participation? What evidence exists of community support for previous activities? In what specific ways will this project include underserved audiences? How many audience members will this project serve, and upon what information is this estimate based?

Criteria	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marketing goals and results are clearly explained and documented ▪ The project audience has been identified and makes sense within context of the organization’s mission ▪ A realistic promotional/marketing plan is outlined ▪ Public component will primarily serve residents of Columbus ▪ Organization’s programming and facilities comply with federal ADA requirements ▪ Programs and activities are scheduled at times and locations to assure greatest public participation ▪ Educational programs are open to the public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant narrative ▪ Printed materials detailing the range of performance times, accessibility logos

Excellent Promotional/marketing plan is creative and will strongly impact success of the project
 Audience clearly defined, rationale fits with organization’s mission
 Public component is diverse and well defined

Satisfactory Promotional/marketing plan is reasonable and appears within the organization’s capacity
 Audience clearly defined, rationale fits with organization’s mission
 Public component is appropriate to the audience and outlined

Fair Promotional/marketing plan exists but is not clearly defined nor explained
 Audience is too broad and not clear about who the project is intended to reach
 Public component exists but is not clearly defined or explained

2010 Guidelines - Appendix 1

Project Support Application Review Criteria/Evaluation Measures

Unsatisfactory Promotional/marketing plan was not defined or explained
Narrative did not address target audience questions
Public component does not take place in Columbus or does not exist

Budgets	
Criteria	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Budget is accurate and realistic for the project▪ Budget shows a minimum 1:1 cash match▪ Organization has the ability to craft reasonable annual budgets and meet financial goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Project Budget (Income/Expense worksheets)▪ Internal Financial Statements

Excellent Cash match is from a broad range of sources including private donations
Project budget is balanced and/or indicates a profit
Internal financial statements are clear and demonstrate strong financial management

Satisfactory Cash match is from a small number of sources
Project budget is balanced and/or indicates a small profit
Internal financial statements are clear and demonstrate financial competency

Fair Cash match is from one source
Project budget is balanced, but leaves little room for shortfall management
Internal financial statements are unclear and demonstrate the need for better accounting practices

Unsatisfactory Cash match is from an unclear source, high level of anticipated income on the worksheet or is missing
Project budget is unbalanced and/or indicates a loss
Internal financial statements are missing

Awards

The Grants Committee will determine grant allocations based upon three criteria - the application evaluation/rating, one-on-one meetings and the amount of funds available - by applying a percentage to the request based upon these three factors.