

**SCORING MATRIX  
TRADITIONAL ARTS TOURING**

**For: Artistic Excellence (20 possible points) and Project’s Artistic Merit (40 possible points)**

	<b>0</b>	<b>Poor 1-5</b>	<b>Fair 6-10</b>	<b>Average 11-20</b>	<b>Good 21-25</b>	<b>Excellent 26-30</b>
	Responses do not provide any required information or respond to the criteria.	Responses are not fully formed. Project is difficult to understand.  Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.  Strategies are questionable.	Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.  Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. The project is described but a full picture is not evident.  Strategies seem under-developed.	Responses address the criteria.  Descriptions allow panelists to understand the project.  Strategies are effective.	Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.  The flow of the project is clear.  Strategies are strong and solid.  Responses demonstrate a well-developed project.	Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.  The project is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.  Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.

**For: Audience Development/Community Involvement (20 possible points)**

	<b>0</b>	<b>Poor 1-3</b>	<b>Fair 4-7</b>	<b>Average 8-13</b>	<b>Good 14-17</b>	<b>Excellent 18-20</b>
	Responses do not provide any required information or respond to the criteria.	Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.  Strategies are questionable.	Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.  Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. Process is described but a full picture is not evident.  Strategies seem under-developed.	Responses address the criteria.  Descriptions allow panelists to understand steps to achieve audience development & community involvement  Strategies are effective.	Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.  Strategies are strong and solid.  Responses demonstrate a well-developed process.	Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.  The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.  Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.

**For: Accessibility (10 possible points)**

	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<b>5-6</b>	<b>7-8</b>	<b>9-10</b>
Responses do not provide any required information or respond to the criteria.	Responds only that applicant adheres to minimum ADA physical accessibility requirements.	Response lists a variety of physical accessibility accommodations.  No outreach or strategies beyond physical accessibility.	Response lists physical accessibility accommodations.  Indicates that specific types of programmatic accessibility are available “upon request.”  Minimal or very general strategies beyond physical accessibility.	Response indicates an understanding of the diverse needs of individuals with disabilities.  Is proactive about providing some programmatic accessibility as a standard practice.  This project’s accessibility is reasonable and consonant with any past accessibility commitment.	Has included individuals with disabilities in planning.  Has specific outreach and/or strategies beyond free tickets.  Invests in programmatic accessibility specifically for this artform and/or targeted individuals and makes efforts to engage audience members who will use accommodations.  Considers participation by individuals with disabilities to be a measure of success.

**For: Organizational Capacity/Evaluation (10 possible points)**

	<b>0</b>	<b>Poor 1-2</b>	<b>Fair 3-4</b>	<b>Average 5-6</b>	<b>Good 7-8</b>	<b>Excellent 9-10</b>
	Responses do not provide any required information or respond to the criteria.	<p>Responses are not fully formed.</p> <p>Organizational capacity and evaluation plan is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Responses only partially respond to the criteria and lack detail.</p> <p>Strategies are questionable.</p>	<p>Responses do address the criteria but lack detail.</p> <p>Descriptions are weak and only partially developed. The organizational capacity and evaluation is described, but a full picture is not evident.</p> <p>Strategies seem under-developed.</p>	<p>Responses address the criteria.</p> <p>Descriptions allow panelists to understand the organizational capacity and evaluation process for the project.</p> <p>Strategies are effective.</p>	<p>Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.</p> <p>Organizational capacity is strong to complete the project.</p> <p>Responses demonstrate a well-constructed evaluation plan project.</p>	<p>Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.</p> <p>The organizational capacity is very clearly and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>Strategies and choices for evaluation are exemplary.</p>