



Scoring System.

- > How does the jury panel come to a decision?

After reading through your background information to understand your organization or project, they will be providing scores in two sections:

- First, the jury members provide scores on the information you provide in the "Jury Questions" section. Jury members provide a score of 1-8 for each jury question.
- Second, the jury members are asked to provide additional points on two focus areas: 1) for Boulder-based Organizations and 2) on issues of equity and fairness. A maximum of 4 additional points is available to the jury members for each question. See the rubrics, below, for more details.

The scores for each jury member are added together to establish a preliminary score for the application. There is no weighting of individual questions. Those preliminary scores are then averaged across all the jury members to establish an averaged preliminary score. It is this average preliminary score that ranks your application for consideration during the meeting. For each grant category, the Arts Commission will establish a threshold score (equal to a whole number that is approximately 50% of the maximum possible score) over which an application is considered eligible for an award. Please note that meeting the threshold score does not automatically approve an application for funding.

In addition to providing a score, the commissioners will include questions or comments for that score. This will be a brief statement that describes their thoughts on the answer to the jury question. These statements will be provided to you prior to the meeting. During the meeting, you will be given the opportunity to provide a three-minute statement to answer the questions raised, or further inform the jury panel about your application. After your presentation, the jury members may ask a few brief clarifying questions.

Later in that same meeting, the jury panel will discuss each application and individual jury members may decide to change specific scores based on new information you provide during your presentation. Once this rescore is complete, the applications are re-ranked. The members of the Boulder Arts Commission then deliberate on a decision of final approval of the applications which will receive a grant. The Arts Commission may a) accept the top scores in the ranking, b) choose to adjust the ranking, or c) ask the jury panel to reconsider specific scores.

For the Large Organization Operational Grants, the decision of the Boulder Arts Commission must also be approved by City Council.

- > How do the jury panel members use the 1-8 scoring system?

Jury panel members use the following rating scale descriptions to help align their decisions about each score.

| Score | Descriptor | Strengths/Weaknesses |
|-------|--------------|--|
| 8 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong (a model for field or discipline with essentially no weaknesses). |
| 7 | Outstanding | Very strong with some minor weaknesses. |
| 6 | Very Good | Strong with numerous minor weaknesses. |
| 5 | Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness. |
| 4 | Satisfactory | Some strengths but with some moderate weaknesses. |
| 3 | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness. |
| 2 | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses. |
| 1 | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses. |

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact.
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact.
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact.

Rubrics.

- > How do the members of the jury panel interpret the scoring system for each application?

Each definition and associated score in the scoring system will have a specific interpretation when applied to each jury question and across the different grant categories. The matrix of these interpretations as compared to scores is captured in a set of rubrics. It will be the responsibility of the Commission to agree on an articulation of each interpretation, and all the members of the jury will need to be trained on these interpretations. That said, it is important to keep in mind that the decision on scores is a subjective one; a rubric of interpretations should be a guide by which the members of the jury can support their opinions.

Below are the rubrics for each applicable grant category:

General Operating Support Grants, page one.

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Capacity Building. How will this grant increase the capacity of your organization to a) meet goals in your strategic plan or other planning document b) increase your organization's sustainability, c) improve innovation, growth, or new community benefits?</p> | | | |
| <p>1-2: Poor to Marginal</p> <p>None, or only a few, strong strategies to improve capacity, sustainability, innovation, growth, or community benefits. Numerous or a few major weaknesses.</p> | <p>3-4: Fair to Satisfactory</p> <p>Some strong strategies to increase capacity, sustainability, innovation, growth, or community benefits. At least one major weakness or some moderate weaknesses.</p> | <p>5-6: Good to Very Good</p> <p>Many strengths to increase capacity, sustainability, innovation, growth, or community benefits. But, with at least one moderate weakness or numerous minor weaknesses.</p> | <p>7-8: Outstanding to Exceptional</p> <p>Very strong case for creating organizational capacity, and improvements to sustainability, innovation, growth, or community benefits. Few or no minor weaknesses.</p> |
| <p>Community Priorities. In what way will this grant funding increase your organization's ability to contribute to one or several of the Community Priorities described in the Community Cultural Plan?</p> | | | |
| <p>1-2: Poor to Marginal</p> <p>Does not or minimally addresses how strategies will contribute to the Community Priorities.</p> | <p>3-4: Fair to Satisfactory</p> <p>Few or some strategies on how the organization will address the Community Priorities.</p> | <p>5-6: Good to Very Good</p> <p>Strong strategies on how the organization will address the Community Priorities.</p> | <p>7-8: Outstanding to Exceptional</p> <p>Very strong or exceptional strategies on how the organization will address the Community Priorities.</p> |
| <p>Proposed Outcomes and Evaluation. Describe your evaluation strategy for understanding the success of this grant over time. Please include the goal(s), the measures by which you will understand progress towards those goals, and the strategy for collecting this data. Note: Funding recipients will be asked to include this evaluation as part of their annual reporting.</p> | | | |
| <p>1-2: Poor to Marginal</p> <p>Evaluation strategy for understanding program / project success is lacking; goals, measures and plans for data collection are not in place.</p> | <p>3-4: Fair to Satisfactory</p> <p>Provides only limited descriptions of evaluation strategies and goals with moderate weaknesses.</p> | <p>5-6: Good to Very Good</p> <p>Provides clear and thoughtful evaluation strategies and goals with a few moderate or minor weaknesses.</p> | <p>7-8: Outstanding to Exceptional</p> <p>Evaluation strategy is comprehensive. Contains detailed information on goals, benchmarks and data collection and how to measure success.</p> |

General Operating Support Grants, page two.

Artistic Excellence.

Describe how your organization commits to high artistic standards. Include information on one or more of the following: a) professional artists are involved in leadership and the potential impact on artists and the artistic field (including direct payment); b) your curatorial approach or artistic mission is realized in your programming; c) your audiences, peers, or critics respond to your programming; and/or d) other ways by which you measure the quality of your art and the results of those measures.

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Artistic excellence is not or is inadequately addressed; there are pervasive gaps in justifying artistic excellence.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Artistic excellence is addressed in only a few ways with only minor justifications and measures.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Artist excellence is addressed in some or many ways; several significant justifications and measures are included.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

The project demonstrates very good or exceptional artistic excellence with strong measures.

Boulder Focus (Small/Medium GOS Only).

Are you a Boulder organization serving Boulder or are you an organization outside of Boulder and to what degree do you focus on Boulder programming?

1

Not based in Boulder; programs only occasionally offered in Boulder.

2

Not based in Boulder; programs regularly offered in Boulder. Or, based in Boulder with very few programs offered in Boulder.

3

Not based in Boulder; programs primarily in Boulder; strong community ties. Or, based in Boulder with several programs in Boulder.

4

Based in Boulder; programs primarily offered in Boulder; strong ties to the community.

Community Project Grant, page one.

Community Priorities.

In what way will this project contribute to one or several of the Community Priorities described in the Community Cultural Plan? Does the project contribute to one Priority thoroughly? Or, does it address many? What specific benefits to the community are planned? How will success be measured?

1-2:

Poor to Marginal

Does not or minimally addresses how the project will contribute to one or several of the Community Priorities.

3-4:

Fair to Satisfactory

Few or some aspects of the project will address one or several of the Community Priorities.

5-6:

Good to Very Good

Several aspects of the project will significantly address one or several of the Community Priorities.

7-8:

Outstanding to Exceptional

The project will address one or several of the Community Priorities in very strong or exceptional ways.

Cultural Offerings.

In what way does your project fill a gap in the variety of cultural offerings in Boulder? What is exciting or new about your project?

1-2:

Poor to Marginal

Minimally fills a gap in the cultural offerings of Boulder with major weaknesses.

3-4:

Fair to Satisfactory

A few aspects of the project may fill gaps in cultural offerings with a few major or moderate weaknesses; only modest innovations are proposed.

5-6:

Good to Very Good

Some or many aspects of the project fill gaps in cultural offerings with moderate or minor weaknesses; some new or innovative programming.

7-8:

Outstanding to Exceptional

The project fills gaps in cultural offering in very good or exceptional ways with a few or no minor weaknesses; the project is new and innovative.

Full Access.

Describe how your project will address affordability, availability, accessibility, accommodation, and acceptability to diverse groups?

1-2:

Poor to Marginal

The project does not or minimally addresses issues of access with many major weaknesses.

3-4:

Fair to Satisfactory

The project addresses issues of access in a minor way with several major or moderate weaknesses.

5-6:

Good to Very Good

The project addresses issues of access in a moderate way with many or a few minor weaknesses.

7-8:

Outstanding to Exceptional

The project addresses issues of access in very good or exceptional ways with one or no minor weaknesses.

Proposed Outcomes and Evaluation Strategy.

Describe your evaluation strategy for this project and how you will collect data. Please also include your goals for this project and how the benefit to the community will be measured.

1-2:

Poor to Marginal

Evaluation strategy for understanding program / project success is lacking; goals, measures and plans for data collection are not in place.

3-4:

Fair to Satisfactory

Provides only limited descriptions of evaluation strategies and goals with moderate weaknesses.

5-6:

Good to Very Good

Provides clear and thoughtful evaluation strategies and goals with a few moderate or minor weaknesses.

7-8:

Outstanding to Exceptional

Evaluation strategy is comprehensive. Contains detailed information on goals, benchmarks and data collection and how to measure success.

Community Project Grant, page two.

Artistic Excellence.

Describe how your project commits to high artistic standards. Include information on how: a) professional artists are involved in leadership and the potential impact on artists and the artistic field (including direct payment); b) your curatorial approach or artistic mission is realized in the project; c) your audiences, peers, or critics respond to your programming; and/or d) other ways by which you measure the quality of your art and the results of those measures.

1-2:

Poor to Marginal

Artistic excellence is not or is inadequately addressed; there are pervasive gaps in justifying artistic excellence.

3-4:

Fair to Satisfactory

Artistic excellence is addressed in only a few ways with only minor justifications and measures.

5-6:

Good to Very Good

Artist excellence is addressed in some or many ways; several significant justifications and measures are included.

7-8:

Outstanding to Exceptional

The project demonstrates very good or exceptional artistic excellence with strong measures.

Boulder Focus.

Are you a Boulder organization serving Boulder or are you an organization outside of Boulder and to what degree do you focus on Boulder programming?

1

Not based in Boulder; programs only occasionally offered in Boulder.

2

Not based in Boulder; programs regularly offered in Boulder. Or, based in Boulder with very few programs offered in Boulder.

3

Not based in Boulder; programs primarily in Boulder; strong community ties. Or, based in Boulder with several programs in Boulder.

4

Based in Boulder; programs primarily offered in Boulder; strong ties to the community.

Equity.

Among the goals of the Boulder Arts Commission is to encourage the equitable, fair, and just distribution of funds in support of the community. This includes providing support to a) applicants who have not yet received a grant in this cycle, and/or b) applicants whose organizational leadership or audience represent groups who are typically underserved by arts programming and funding models (i.e. culturally diverse groups, organizations focused on age diversity, etc.) Describe how your project does or does not fulfill one or several of these categories.

1

Received a grant this year; and/or offers no or few advancements for equity and diversity

2

Received a grant this year; and/or offers some advancement for equity and diversity

3

Did not receive a grant this year; and/or offers some advancement for equity. Or, did receive a grant but offers significant advancement for equity.

4

Did not receive a grant this year; and/or offers exemplary advancement for equity and diversity.

Arts Education Projects Grant, page one.

Benefit to Students.

In what ways will this project directly benefit the students and their growth as cultural participants or in the creative industries? What new skills or experiences will be offered?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Benefits to students in cultural participation or skill development are not or inadequately addressed with many major weaknesses.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

The project will benefit students' cultural participation or skill development in only a few minor ways.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Many significant benefits to cultural participation or skill development are proposed with a few minor weaknesses.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

Benefits to cultural participation or skill development are very good or exceptional with only a few or no minor weaknesses.

Complementing Curriculum and Offerings.

How does this project enhance, or fill a gap in, the generally available curriculum and offerings?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

The project does not demonstrate any enhancements to curriculum.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Enhancements to curriculum or offerings are modest with many major or moderate weaknesses.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

There are clear enhancements to curriculum and offerings with only a few minor weaknesses.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

The project has very good or exceptional enhancements to curriculum and offerings with only a few or no minor weaknesses.

Proposed Outcomes and Evaluation Strategy.

How will the benefits to the students be measured?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

The outcomes and evaluation strategy are not or inadequately addressed with many major weaknesses.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

The outcomes and evaluation strategy are addressed in a few minor ways.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

The outcomes and evaluation strategy are addressed in a significant and positive way, with a few minor weaknesses.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

The project addresses outcomes and evaluation in a very good or excellent way with only a few or no minor weaknesses.

Artistic Excellence.

Describe how your project commits to high artistic standards. Include information on how: a) professional artists are involved in leadership and the potential impact on artists and the artistic field (including direct payment); b) your curatorial approach or artistic mission is realized in the project; c) your audiences, peers, or critics respond to your programming; and/or d) other ways by which you measure the quality of your art and the results of those measures.

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Artistic excellence is not or is inadequately addressed; there are pervasive gaps in justifying artistic excellence.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Artistic excellence is addressed in only a few ways with only minor justifications and measures.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Artist excellence is addressed in some or many ways; several significant justifications and measures are included.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

The project demonstrates very good or exceptional artistic excellence with strong measures.

Arts Education Projects Grant, page two.

Boulder Focus.

Are you a Boulder organization serving Boulder or are you an organization outside of Boulder and to what degree do you focus on Boulder programming?

1

Not based in Boulder; programs only occasionally offered in Boulder.

2

Not based in Boulder; programs regularly offered in Boulder. Or, based in Boulder with very few programs offered in Boulder.

3

Not based in Boulder; programs primarily in Boulder; strong community ties. Or, based in Boulder with several programs in Boulder.

4

Based in Boulder; programs primarily offered in Boulder; strong ties to the community.

Equity.

Among the goals of the Boulder Arts Commission is to encourage the equitable, fair, and just distribution of funds in support of the community. This includes providing support to a) applicants who have not yet received a grant in this cycle, and/or b) applicants whose organizational leadership or audience represent groups who are typically underserved by arts programming and funding models (i.e. culturally diverse groups, organizations focused on age diversity, etc.) Describe how your project does or does not fulfill one or several of these categories.

1

Received a grant this year; and/or offers no or few advancements for equity and diversity

2

Received a grant this year; and/or offers some advancement for equity and diversity

3

Did not receive a grant this year; and/or offers some advancement for equity. Or, did receive a grant but offers significant advancement for equity.

4

Did not receive a grant this year; and/or offers exemplary advancement for equity and diversity.

Risk Capital Fund, page one.

Value of the Experiment.

Do the goals and desired outcomes promise to have real and positive impact on the organization, their audience, or the community?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Positive impact is not or is minimally apparent. There are major weaknesses in how the outcomes will be valuable to the organization.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Only a few aspects have potential for positive impact, with one major or a few moderate weaknesses.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Many significant outcomes are proposed that are likely to have positive impacts with a few minor weaknesses.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

Potential for positive impacts on the organization are very good or exceptional with one minor or no weaknesses.

Organized and Strategic Approach.

Does the proposal have a realistic plan, capacities, resources, timeline, and budget? Does the organization have the capacity and organizational health to take on this experiment?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Has very few examples of organized strategy and planning, with major weaknesses.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Demonstrates some strengths in strategy and planning with one major or a few moderate weaknesses.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Strong organization of strategy and planning with a few minor weaknesses.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

Exceptionally organized and thoughtful strategy and planning with one minor or no weaknesses.

Community Priorities.

Does the project described align with the stated community priorities for culture found in the Community Cultural Plan?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Does not or minimally addresses how the project will contribute to one or several of the Community Priorities.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Few or some aspects of the project will address one or several of the Community Priorities.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Several aspects of the project will significantly address one or several of the Community Priorities.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

The project will address one or several of the Community Priorities in very strong or exceptional ways.

Evaluation.

Do the plans for data collection, measurement of success, and interpretation seem reasonable and accurate?

1-2:
Poor to Marginal

Evaluation strategy for understanding program / project success is lacking; goals, measures and plans for data collection are not in place.

3-4:
Fair to Satisfactory

Provides only limited descriptions of evaluation strategies and goals with moderate weaknesses.

5-6:
Good to Very Good

Provides clear and thoughtful evaluation strategies and goals with a few moderate or minor weaknesses.

7-8:
Outstanding to Exceptional

Evaluation strategy is comprehensive. Contains detailed information on goals, benchmarks and data collection and how to measure success.

Risk Capital Fund, page two.

Boulder Focus.

Are you a Boulder organization serving Boulder or are you an organization outside of Boulder and to what degree do you focus on Boulder programming?

1

Not based in Boulder; programs only occasionally offered in Boulder.

2

Not based in Boulder; programs regularly offered in Boulder. Or, based in Boulder with very few programs offered in Boulder.

3

Not based in Boulder; programs primarily in Boulder; strong community ties. Or, based in Boulder with several programs in Boulder.

4

Based in Boulder; programs primarily offered in Boulder; strong ties to the community.

Equity.

Among the goals of the Boulder Arts Commission is to encourage the equitable, fair, and just distribution of funds in support of the community. This includes providing support to a) applicants who have not yet received a grant in this cycle, and/or b) applicants whose organizational leadership or audience represent groups who are typically underserved by arts programming and funding models (i.e. culturally diverse groups, organizations focused on age diversity, etc.) Describe how your project does or does not fulfill one or several of these categories.

1

Received a grant this year; and/or offers no or few advancements for equity and diversity

2

Received a grant this year; and/or offers some advancement for equity and diversity

3

Did not receive a grant this year; and/or offers some advancement for equity. Or, did receive a grant but offers significant advancement for equity.

4

Did not receive a grant this year; and/or offers exemplary advancement for equity and diversity.