

**HAWAI'I STATE FOUNDATION ON CULTURE AND THE ARTS
OUTREACH INITIATIVE PROGRAM
EVALUATION RUBRIC**

CRITERIA PROPOSED ACTIVITIES (50%)	UNACCEPTABLE 0 to 15 Points	ACCEPTABLE 16 to 39 Points	EXCELLENT 40 to 50 Points
Description of arts and/or culture project is complete and clearly explained about what the applicant will do and how they will manage, coordinate, implement, and collaborate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete description of what the applicant intends to do or how the project will be implemented • Insufficient description or project management and coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description addresses what the applicant intends to do • Applicant describes project management and coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete details on what the applicant intends to do • Completely describes project management, coordination, and identifies/explains any collaborations
Timeline of arts and/or culture project activities is realistic and clear, with identified alternatives, if needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete information about timeline of project activities • Information does not match the project description • Timeline is not realistic for this project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides a timeline of project activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic and clear proposed timeline of activities • Applicant suggests timeline backup plan if needed and how it will work
Proposed locations of arts and/or culture activities is complete and clear, and identifies any collaborative support. The program/project services rural underserved communities. The program/project is regionally touring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete information about proposed location of activities • Information does not match the project description • Project/program is not regionally touring and may only service 1-2 islands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant identifies proposed locations for its project activities • Project/program services is not regionally touring, but does service 3-4 islands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and clear information for proposed location of activities Applicant suggests location alternatives, if needed • Identifies any collaborative support for use of facilities and space at locations • Project/program is regionally touring serving Oahu and all neighbor islands
Consideration of OPTIONAL work evidence- If work evidence was submitted, does it enhance understanding of the arts and/or culture project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPTIONAL work evidence does not clearly support this project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPTIONAL work evidence supports the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPTIONAL work evidence supports most recent work accomplishments • Demonstrates a high quality project • OPTIONAL work evidence supports what the applicant intends to do with the proposed project

CRITERIA Qualifications (25%)	UNACCEPTABLE 0 to 5 Points	ACCEPTABLE 6 to 19 Points	EXCELLENT 20 to 25 Points
Applicant's experience for implementing the arts and/or culture project is extensive, solid, resourceful, has an excellent reputation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has less than one year of experience with this type of project • Applicant does not explain its experience with this type of project • Applicant alludes to working relationships, but does not identify its partnerships and experience with the proposed partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has more than one year of experience with this type of project • Applicant explains its partnerships or other relationships for project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has extensive experience with this type of project • Applicant has solid relationships in the community for project implementation • Applicant has ready access to resources to support the project • Applicant has excellent reputation for implementing high quality projects
Project personnel to manage and coordinate the arts and/or culture project are highly qualified with clear roles and responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified project managing/ coordinating personnel do not have much experience with this type of project • Roles and responsibilities are not clear • Identified project personnel are poorly qualified for the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project personnel who will manage or coordinate the project, and their qualifications are identified • Roles and responsibilities are identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete list and description of personnel who will manage and coordinate the project, including their qualifications • Roles and responsibilities are clear • Identified project personnel are highly qualified
Proposed artists, presenters and other specialists are highly qualified with clear roles and responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified proposed artists, presenters and other specialists do not have much experience with this type of project • Roles and responsibilities are not clear • Identified artists, presenters and other specialists are poorly qualified for the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project artists, presenters and other specialists and their qualifications are identified • Roles and responsibilities are identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete list and description of proposed artists, presenters and other specialists • Roles and responsibilities are clear • Identified artists, presenters and other specialists are highly qualified for the project

CRITERIA Need, Benefit, Impact, Good Use of Public Funds (25%)	UNACCEPTABLE 0 to 5 Points	ACCEPTABLE 6 to 19 Points	EXCELLENT 20 to 25 Points
Intended audience(s) is/are clearly identified with complete explanations about reach or any new or special populations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little to no information about who the intended audience is and how that audience will be reached • Little to no explanation about the reason for the project's focus on the intended audience(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended audience(s) is/are identified • Applicant explains how the intended audience(s) will be reached 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and complete information about the intended audience(s) and how they will be reached • Identifies new and/or special populations, and describes how they will be reached • Applicant explains reason for project focused on intended audience
Community need; benefit and impact are completely and clearly explained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no information about community need or benefits and impact for the intended audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant identifies and explains the need, benefits and impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and clear explanation of community need for the project • Complete and clear explanation of benefits and impact for the intended audience(s)
How the applicant will know the project was successful- completely and clearly describes quantitative and qualitative evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant explains very little about its quantitative or qualitative data collection in relation to determining project success • Applicant is weak in qualitative evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant conducts both quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the project • Qualitative data includes feedback from project participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant conducts both quantitative & qualitative evaluation of the project • Quantitative data is relevant to the project and informative for project improvement • Qualitative data includes constructive feedback from project personnel, project partners and participants
Good Use of Public Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is undeveloped or somewhat developed • Project personnel are inadequate for this type of project • Need, benefits and impact are not appropriate for public funds • Grant request is not appropriate for the described project scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is developed, project personnel are capable, the need, benefit and impact are clear • Project can make good use of public funds • Grant Request is somewhat appropriate for the described project scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is well-developed and personnel are very capable for a successful project • Need, benefits and impact are very convincing • Very good use of public funds • Grant request is appropriate for the described project scope
TOTAL POINTS FUNDABLE/NOT FUNDABLE	0-25 POINTS NOT FUNDABLE	26 to 79 POINTS POSSIBLY FUNDABLE	80 to 100 FUNDABLE