

**SCORING MATRIX  
MICRO-ACCESSIBILITY  
GRANTS**

**For: Artistic Excellence (20 possible points)**

	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-8</b>	<b>9-12</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<b>17-20</b>
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 underdeveloped.</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-thought-out project.</p>	<p>Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.</p> <p>The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.</p>

**SCORING MATRIX  
MICRO-ACCESSIBILITY  
GRANTS**

**For: Project's Artistic Merit (40 possible points)**

	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1-8</b>	<b>9-16</b>	<b>17-24</b>	<b>25-32</b>	<b>33-40</b>
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 underdeveloped.</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-thought-out project.</p>	<p>Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.</p> <p>The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.</p>

**SCORING MATRIX  
MICRO-ACCESSIBILITY  
GRANTS**

**For: Audience Development/Community Involvement (30 possible points)**

	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1-6</b>	<b>7-12</b>	<b>13-19</b>	<b>20-25</b>	<b>26-30</b>
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 underdeveloped.</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-thought-out project.</p>	<p>Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.</p> <p>The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.</p>

**SCORING MATRIX  
MICRO-ACCESSIBILITY  
GRANTS**

**For: Organizational Capacity/Evaluation (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.	<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 underdeveloped.</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-thought-out project.</p>	<p>Responses are fully developed, providing information and details directly addressing the criteria.</p> <p>The process is described very clearly and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>Strategies and choices are exemplary, demonstrating excellent planning and leadership.</p>