SECA FY2019 Trial Evaluation Form
PROGRAMS AND PERFORMANCES

APPLICANT: _____
COMMISSIONER: _____

1. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT (xxxpoints)

Excellent	Strong	Good	Fair	Weak

Consider:

- Degree of artistic merit
- Appropriate artist selection
- Creative project/program design
- Skilled project administrators
- Clear statement of project objective

Comments:

_____
_____

2. BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY (xxxpoints)

Excellent	Strong	Good	Fair	Weak

Consider:

- Clear mission statement of organization
- Complementary to existing Programs and Performances
- Aesthetic and/or educational value to participants
- Accessible and inviting to the community
- Anticipated attendance
- Evidence of community support of project
- Evidence of organization's commitment to diversity
- Identification of appropriate community partnerships with clear roles

Comments:

_____
_____

3. BENEFIT TO THE ARTISTIC COMMUNITY (xxxpoints)

Excellent	Strong	Good	Fair	Weak

Consider:

- Alignment of the project with the organization's mission
- Complements existing arts community
- Involvement of local artists or beneficial relationship with touring artists
- Potential positive impact on organization, i.e. economic, public relations

Comments:

_____

_____

4. PROJECT SELF-EVALUATION PROCESSES (xxxpoints)

Excellent	Strong	Good	Fair	Weak

Consider:

- Evidence of clear and attainable project objectives
- Articulated evaluation methods
- Evaluation data is used for program improvement
- Past projects' history

Comments:

_____

_____

5. PROJECT FEASIBILITY (0-10 points)

Excellent	Strong	Good	Fair	Weak

Consider:

- Project budget commensurate with project scale
- SECA request complementary to other project's funding including in-kind
- Experience and qualifications of project administrators
- Demonstration of successful project management/past project history
- Evidence of sound organizational fiscal management and adequate planning process
- Project budget correlates to application narrative

Comments:

_____

_____

APPLICANT: _____

TOTAL POINTS: _____

COMMISSIONER: _____

Scoring Descriptions

Exceptional: The applicant has provided overwhelming evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that the specific funding criterion is fully met. Responses are clear and directly address the funding criterion. The support materials are clear, highly relevant and lead to a deeper understanding of how the criterion is met.

Strong: The applicant has provided clear evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this specific funding criterion is met. Responses are clear and address this funding criterion. The support materials are clear, highly relevant and lead to a deeper understanding of how the criterion is met.

Good: The applicant has provided sufficient evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this specific funding criterion is met. Responses are generally clear but do not consistently address this funding criterion. The support materials are relevant but provide only some understanding of how the criterion is met.

Fair: The applicant has provided limited evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is met. Responses may not be clear and may not address this funding criterion. The support materials may not be relevant and may not provide additional understanding of how the criterion is met.

Weak: The applicant has provided insufficient evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is met. Responses are unclear and/or do not address this funding criterion. The support materials may not be relevant and may not provide additional understanding of how the criterion is met.