Scoring Rubrics for STARTUP Program Grants

The following descriptors are designed to guide panelists in their discussion and ranking of organizations that have applied for STARTUP Program Grants. These descriptors elaborate on the Evaluation Criteria, as outlined in the *STARTUP Program Application Guidelines.*

Artistic Quality (40% of score)	Artistic Product/Process/Services	Interpretative materials and/or educational activities	Ingenuity, Vitality, Relevance	Program Evaluation
Exemplary (5 pts)	• Articulates clearly the organization's standards of artistic quality in product, process, or service • Provides detailed information on the qualifications of artists engaged in programming, and/or the process used to select artists	• Provides detailed information on types of interpretive materials and/or activities used to enhance the participant's arts experience and understanding • Provides detailed information on how audiences/participants are engaged for an active arts experience	• Demonstrates intentionality (planning) and ingenuity in programming that is purposeful and relevant • Demonstrates innovative programming or delivery of programming (e.g., willingness to "take risks") • Provides programming not otherwise available locally	• Board and staff engage in multi-faceted program evaluation, document program impact, and modify programming accordingly
Exceeds Expectations (4 pts)	↕	↕	↕	↕
Meets Expectations (3 pts)	• Provides general explanation of artistic standards for artist selection. • Provides general information on the programming, including information on artist qualifications, and/or the selection process for choosing artists	• Provides limited information on types of interpretive materials and/or activities used to enhance the audience's/ participant's arts experience and understanding • Demonstrates an effort to engage participants to enrich their experience	• Programming demonstrates an effort to provide variety • Programming demonstrates limited ingenuity in delivery or interpretation (i.e., tends to present "safe" programming only) • Provides programming not otherwise available locally	• Board and staff engage in basic program evaluation, and modify programming accordingly
Needs Improvement (2 pts)	↕	↕	↕	↕
Deficient (1 pt)	• Lack of information on standards of artistic quality in product, process, or service • Lack of information on artistic qualifications and/or criteria used to select artists	• Lack of information on how interpretative or educational materials are used to enhance the participant's arts experience and understanding • Lack of information on efforts to engage participants	• Programming tends to be repetitive or static (i.e., Lack of innovation in program selection and/or presentation) • Lack of originality or variation in programming • Provides programming being duplicated in other local venues	• Lack of evidence of routine program evaluation

Availability of the Arts/ Service to the Community (30% of score)	Fulfillment of community needs	Audience Development	Outreach and Collaboration*
Exemplary (5 pts)	• Provides information that demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of, and familiarity with, the community • Provides detailed information on how arts programming serves community needs as articulated by the community—particularly unmet needs, including underserved audiences and/or people with disabilities • Demonstrates expanding audience and patron base	• Provides detailed information on diverse marketing efforts to reach target audiences • Demonstrates innovative marketing/promotional efforts to build new audiences or cultivate existing patron base, particularly underserved audiences • Participates extensively in cross-marketing efforts with other arts organizations	• Demonstrates active collaborations* with arts and non-arts organizations to achieve mutually beneficial goals • Presents concrete examples of outreach and community engagement through collaborations* that reach multiple constituencies
Exceeds Expectations (4 pts)	↕	↕	↕
Meets Expectations (3 pts)	• Identifies community being served, including target audience(s) • Provides information on how arts programming aligns with unmet community needs, and how those needs are determined • Sustains a stable audience and patron base	• Provides information on traditional marketing and promotional activities • Demonstrates standard marketing and promotional efforts to sustain or expand participation • Participates modestly in joint promotional activities	• Demonstrates efforts to collaborate with other community organizations on mutually beneficial projects/programs • Participates in community discussions about the arts and the needs of the community
Needs Improvement (2 pts)	↕	↕	↕
Deficient (1 pt)	• Lack of information about the community being served • Lack of information on how community need(s) are determined and/or are being served by the programming • Demonstrates a declining audience and/or patron base	• Demonstrates little or no marketing and promotional efforts to sustain or expand participation • Lack of information on efforts to draw new audiences, underserved populations, and/or people with disabilities • Lack of information on any joint promotional activities	• Provides little or no information on efforts to collaborate with other organizations for mutual benefit • Programming and planning tends to be insular, without demonstrating efforts to collaborate

*NOTE: Collaborations represent multiple organizations coming together as equals to **co-plan and execute** events, activities, or programs for **mutual benefit** and mission fulfillment. Venues or vendors that are paid for space rental or services rendered, but not engaged in the actual planning and implementation of the artistic programming, do not constitute collaborations, in the true sense of the word.

Management (30% of score)	Board/staff qualifications and governance	Fiscal Responsibility	Operational Evaluation
Exemplary (5 pts)	• Staff qualifications are exemplary and responsibilities are clearly delineated and aligned with organizational needs • Board represents a diverse set of skills, expertise, and time on the board; and is representative of the community it serves • Board structure identifies key areas of oversight: finance, governance, development • Board/committees meet regularly to conduct business and review finances	• Financial information provides adequate and accurate detail in all financial reports • Strong financial position with board-approved plans to address any financial weaknesses • Demonstrates a well-balanced revenue stream between earned, private, and public revenue • Organization retains adequate cash reserves, positive liquidity, and positive financial indicators	• Board and staff regularly engage in, and document, operational evaluations, and modify management procedures and operations accordingly • Board and staff engage in training and/or professional development to enhance knowledge and skills • Board and staff routinely engage in staff/personnel review
Exceeds Expectations (4 pts)	↕	↕	↕
Meets Expectations (3 pts)	• Staff qualifications and responsibilities are delineated and aligned with organizational needs • Board represents a diverse set of skills expertise, and experience; and is representative of the community it serves • Board structure identifies key areas of oversight: finance, governance, development • Board/committees meet regularly to conduct business and review finances	• Financial information provides adequate and accurate detail in all financial reports • Stable or improving financial position with board-approved plans to address financial weaknesses • Demonstrates moderate diversity of revenue streams • Organization retains adequate cash reserves with primarily positive financial indicators	• Board and staff regularly engage in, and document, operational evaluations, and modify operations accordingly • Board and staff engage in training and/or professional development to enhance knowledge and skills • Board and staff routinely engage in staff/personnel review
Needs Improvement (2 pts)	↕	↕	↕
Deficient (1 pt)	• Lack of information about staff qualifications • Lack of information about whether the board has a broad range of professional expertise, or how it represents the community, or board membership is static or insular • Lack of information about key areas of board responsibility: finance, governance, development • Lack of information about convening of board/committees	• Financial information is poorly presented and/or contains errors, inaccuracies, or inconsistencies between financial reports • Poor financial position with no board-approved plans to address weaknesses • Demonstrates unhealthy balances in revenue, (i.e., heavy reliance on limited sources of earned or contributed revenue) • Multiple negative financial indicators suggest a vulnerable financial position	• Lack of evidence of routine operational evaluations • Lack of evidence of professional development or training • Lack of evidence of routine staff/personnel reviews