

# Grants for Organizations (GFO) Review Criteria

## Review Criteria #1 - Artistic Merit

Evaluation is based on evidence that the organization is providing programs and services of high artistic quality. Glossary definition of Artistic Merit from FY 2016 GFO Guidelines: the aesthetic achievement and quality of activities produced and/or presented by an organization.

### Artistic Merit

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Clearly evident and well-articulated artistic aesthetic achievement, artistic programming on a superior level and continues to evolve creatively. Artistic decisions are made by highly qualified personnel or invitees. Organization is a leader in its field in artistic excellence.</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Clearly evident and well-articulated artistic aesthetic achievement, artistic programming on a high level</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> Adequate evidence of artistic aesthetic achievement, artistic programming remains consistent</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Implied but not specific evidence of artistic aesthetic</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Hard to determine, no evidence provided</p>
--	--	---	---	--

### Program Evaluation

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Excellent and effective evaluation techniques that are an ongoing part of the planning process and provide evidence the priorities are achieved. Model for the field in program evaluation and continued update of evaluation process</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Effective evaluation techniques are part of the planning process and provide evidence priorities are achieved.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> Evaluation techniques are in place and provide evidence priorities are achieved.</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Outlined evaluation efforts, but leaves questions as to how the information is to be used</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Fails to address how the organization will evaluate it programming</p>
---	---	---	---	---

### How Arts Reflect Mission

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Articulate and clear explanation of how the programs and services fulfill the organization's mission. Evident that the mission is regularly evaluated</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Clear explanation of how the programs and services fulfill the organization's mission.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> General statement on how the programs and services fulfill the organization's mission, but lacks clarity</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Statement on how the programs and services fulfill the organization's mission is not fully formed</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Lacks an explanation of how the programs and services fulfill the organization's mission</p>
---	---	---	---	---

## Review Criteria #2 – Organizational Effectiveness

Evaluation is based on evidence that the organization has and will successfully carry out its mission. Glossary definition of Organizational Effectiveness from FY 2016 GFO Guidelines: The ability of an organization to develop and organize the operational means necessary to support current and planned activities, as measured by the organization’s prior record and the soundness of plans of action.

### Financial Information

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Accurate &amp; realistic budget; development plans indicate good fiscal health with a variety of revenue sources. Applicant's budget reflects a broad base of revenue and support from earned, unearned and in-kind sources; Organization is financially stable or has articulated plans for stability. If applicable, applicant has a viable plan to reduce any accumulated deficit. Finances are regularly reported to board and revised as necessary. Major variances from year to year are explained clearly. Model in the field.</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Accurate and realistic budget reflecting a broad base of revenue and support from various sources. Appears to be financially stable. If applicable, applicant has a viable plan to reduce any accumulated deficit. Finances are regularly reported to board and revised as necessary. Major variances from year to year are explained clearly.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> Basic, itemized budget info appears realistic; revenue sources are specified, financial strength of the organization is not detailed. Finances are regularly reported to board and revised as necessary. Major variances from year to year are explained clearly.</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Confusing and unrealistic budget; Development plans leave doubts about the fiscal health of the organization</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Budget is incomplete and unacceptable</p>
---	---	--	--	--

### Planning

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Thorough planning indicated, including a relevant and timely strategic plan including vision, mission, appropriateness of goals and strategies, evaluation plans, adaptability, centrality of the arts, and clarity. Plan is updated regularly to keep it current.</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Thorough planning is indicated included a relevant strategic plan including vision, mission, appropriateness of goals and strategies, evaluation plans.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> A plan is in place that includes strategic planning, mission and goals and strategies. Evaluation plans could be included or strengthened.</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Vague statements about process and does not address future needs of the organization</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Absent or contradictory strategic planning to organization's stated mission</p>
--	--	---	--	--

## Organizational Effectiveness – Continued

### Management and Structure

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Clear evidence that the skills and capacity of the board and professional staff are high; demonstrated personnel structure (paid or volunteer) to implement projects and programs on a high level; evidence of sound management and planning including regular reporting to board. Applicant's artistic, educational and cultural activities are strengthened by qualified personnel.</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> The skills and capacity of the board and professional staff are high, personnel structure allows implementation of activities on a good level; regular reporting to the board is evident. Personnel are qualified.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> The skills and capacity of the board and professional staff are adequate to allow implementation of activities on a satisfactory level. Regular reporting to the board is stated. Personnel are mostly qualified.</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> The board and professional staff are not all adequate to meet the needs of the organization to produce activities on a satisfactory level.</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Board and staff structure and composition is not explained.</p>
---	---	--	--	--

### Review Criteria #3 – Service to Community

Evaluation is based on evidence that the organization is committed to serving the community. Community is defined as the constituents served by the applicant, and can be based on artistic discipline, geography, or it can be culturally based. Glossary definition of Service to Community from FY 2016 GFO Guidelines: The degree to which an organization's operations and activities display an understanding of and responsiveness to the community, as the organization defines that community.

#### Description of Community

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Thorough description of constituents served by the applicant including artistically, geographically, or culturally based. Leader in the field.</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Clear description of constituents served by the applicant including artistically, geographically, or culturally based.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> Basic description of constituents served by the applicant included.</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Unclear and confusing description of the constituents is provided.</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Inadequate description of constituents.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

#### Community Engagement and Outreach

<p><b>Excellent – Outstanding</b> Pro-active plan for attracting new audiences and audience development, including outreach programs and activities that go into the community. Evidence of understanding and responsiveness to the community. Clear plan and implementation of community engagement evaluation is in place. Leader in the field and model for community engagement.</p>	<p><b>Good – Very Good</b> Plan for attracting new audiences and audience development, including outreach programs and activities that go into the community. Evidence of understanding and responsiveness to the community. Plan for evaluation of efforts is in place.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> Open to new audiences, but not engaging new audiences proactively or reaching into the community. Basic audience and community engagement efforts need strengthening.</p>	<p><b>Marginal – Fair</b> Passive outreach to those that come to the organization's activities. No plan for attracting new audiences or engaging current audiences or reaching into the community.</p>	<p><b>Poor</b> Does not address audience engagement or outreach</p>
--	--	--	--	---