

CAIG/CU REVIEW PANEL SCORING SHEET

Use the scoring criteria provided to determine the scores in each section. Feel free to provide comments on how the applicant could improve or responses that are well constructed. Should a score of 1 or 0 be received, provide specific comments on how the applicant can improve their response.

A. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND IMPACT (48 Points)

1. Planning (15)

Scoring Rubric	Response Missing	Response was general and too many non-specific statements. Data was not current.	Response was somewhat clear, but a more thorough discussion of specifics was needed.	Response was thorough, relevant, specific and clear. Data was current. No additional concerns.
Score	0	1	2	3

1. Planning REQUIRED GRANT INFORMATION		Max. score	Reviewer Score
a.	The specific location of the target community is identified.	3	
b.	Members of the target community and applicant’s school are listed and the role of each person in the planning is specific and clear.	3	
c.	The applicant clearly defined the unique needs of the target community and the needs are congruent with the project focus.	3	
d.	The applicant has clearly explained how the project focus was determined.	3	
e.	The applicant, in specific terms, described how the project will benefit the target community.	3	
Total Planning Score		15	

Reviewers Comments: Planning

2. Outcomes (9)

Scoring Rubric	Response Missing	Response was general and too many non-specific statements.	Response was somewhat clear, but more thorough discussion of specifics was needed.	Response was relevant, thorough, specific and clear. No additional concerns.
Score	0	1	2	3

2. Outcomes REQUIRED GRANT INFORMATION		Max. Score	Reviewer Score
a.	The outcomes for the project are in line with the needs found under planning and are specific.	3	
b.	The measure for each outcome is sufficient to provide reliable feedback on the project. Applicant has specifically explained what data will be gathered, how they will gather it, who will analyze the data and who will review and report the data.	3	
c.	The community impact/s is provided and determined.	3	
Total Outcomes Score		9	

Reviewer Comments: Outcomes

A. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND IMPACT Continue

Scoring Rubric	Response Missing	Response was general and too many non-specific statements.	Response was somewhat clear, but more thorough discussion of specifics was needed.	Response was thorough, relevant, specific and clear. No additional concerns.
Score	0	1	2	3

3. Implementation REQUIRED GRANT INFORMATION	Max. Score	Reviewer Score
a. All activities are specifically described	3	
b. Methods of inviting citizens to the project is broad enough to ensure success.	3	
c. Partners used to “get the word out” are specifically defined. Each partner’s role in “getting the word out” is specifically discussed and is adequate for accomplishing expected outcomes.	3	
d. Accessibility beyond their school community is specifically provided.	3	
e. The existing or new cultural assets being leveraged for supporting rural and/or underserved communities are presented.	3	
f. Specific community partners in the implementation are identified.	3	
g. All community partners’ roles in the implementation are defined.	3	
h. All implementation activities appear on the Timeline	3	
Project Implementation Total Score	24	

Reviewer Comments: Implementation

A. Community Engagement and Impact Components Score	Max. Score	Reviewer Score
1. Planning	15	
2. Outcomes	9	
3. Implementation	24	
Total Community Engagement and Impact Score	48	

B. CULTURAL/ARTISTIC MERIT OF PROJECT (30)

Scoring Rubric	Response Missing	Response was general and too many non-specific statements.	Response was somewhat clear, but more thorough discussion of specifics was needed.	Response was thorough, relevant, specific and clear. No additional concerns.
Score	0	1	2	3

1. Artistic Personnel and Timeline REQUIRED GRANT INFORMATION	Max. Score	Reviewer Score
a. Artistic manager’s qualifications sufficient to oversee project.	3	
b. Artistic manager’s specific role in implementation is sufficient to accomplish outcomes.	3	
c. All qualifications of other artistic personnel, from the school and/or community, are provided.	3	
d. All roles of artistic personnel needed to accomplish outcomes are defined.	3	
e. Arts and cultural experiences are high quality and relevant.	3	
f. Arts and cultural experiences will result in attracting a diverse citizenry.	3	
g. A timeline detailing all activities is provided.	3	
h. All arts and cultural experiences on the timeline also appear in the Implementation discussion.	3	
i. Activities on the timeline are reasonable for the expected citizenry and project.	3	
j. Allocation of time for specific activities is reasonable.	3	
Total Artistic Personnel and Timeline Score	30	

B. CULTURAL/ARTISTIC MERIT OF PROJECT	Score
1. Total Artistic Personnel and Timeline Score	

Reviewer Comments Cultural/Artistic Merit Reviewer Comments:

C. FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT (22)

Scoring Rubric	Response Missing	Response was general and too many non-specific statements. Budget items were added that did not match narrative.	Response and budget were somewhat clear, but more thorough discussion of specifics was needed. Some budget items missing.	Response and budget were thorough, relevant, specific and clear. No additional concerns. Budget matched the narrative.
Score	0	1	2	3

C. Financial and Administrative Oversight	REQUIRED GRANT INFORMATION	Max. Score	Reviewer Score
1.	The administrative staff for the project has sufficient qualifications	3	
2.	Each administrative staff's role needed for the project is defined.	3	
3.	The financial oversight staff qualifications are sufficient	3	
4.	The role of the financial oversight staff is sufficient to support the project.	3	
5.	The percentage of the request compared to the total project budget is reasonable.	3	
6.	Other funding or in-kind needed for the project has been clearly discussed and demonstrated in the budget.	3	
7.	Budget pages are complete and accurate and match the narrative.	3	
Total Financial and Administrative Oversight Score		21	

	Score
C. Financial and Administrative Oversight	

Reviewer Comments:

D. ATTACHMENTS (1)

If all attachments are provided, give the candidate **one point**. If any of the attachments are missing, no point will be added to the score. (Attachments Required: Budget, Timeline and Letters of Partnership)

	Score
D. All Attachments Provided	

TOTAL CAIG/CU GRANT SCORE

GRANT SECTION	MAXIMUM POINTS	REVIEWER SCORE
A. Community engagement and impact	48	
B. Cultural/artistic merit of project	30	
C. Financial and administrative oversight	21	
D. Attachments	1	
Maximum Total Score	100	

Reviewer Comments