



SCORING MATRIX
Micro Accessibility Grants

For: Artistic Excellence (25 possible points) and Project’s Artistic Merit (25 possible points)

		Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50
	Responses do not provide any required information or respond to the criteria.	<p>Responses are not fully formed. Project 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 project 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 project.</p> <p>Strategies are effective.</p>	<p>Responses address the criteria clearly and with full descriptions.</p> <p>The flow of the project is clear.</p> <p>Strategies are strong and solid.</p> <p>Responses demonstrate a well-developed project.</p>	<p>Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.</p> <p>The project is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.</p>

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

	0	Poor 1-3	Fair 4-7	Average 8-13	Good 14-17	Excellent 18-20
	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: Organizational Capacity/Evaluation (30 possible points)

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
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>