

City of Coronado Community Grant Program FY 20-21 | Evaluation Criteria Rubric

Contents

Economic Development	1
Social Services	5
Community Pride/Sense of Place.....	9
Arts and Culture.....	13

Economic Development

Economic Development Grants typically fund specific programs for Coronado-based nonprofit organizations that promote economic development beneficial to the broader community.

To be eligible for grant funding, proposed grant activities must achieve one or more of the following goals:

- 1) Promote the City of Coronado as a destination for local dining, shopping, and attractions.
- 2) Contribute to a vibrant local business environment by stimulating Coronado-based commerce through the awareness and patronage of Coronado businesses.
- 3) Promote the growth and sustainability of new and existing local, small businesses by enhancing the business district through infrastructure, landscape, façade, or signage improvements.

Evaluation Category	Economic Development Focus	Rating Scale
Activity Alignment (25 points) Weight: x5	Degree to which the proposed activity achieves at least one or more of the goals of the economic development grant program	5 – Program description is compelling and specific, provides information on the businesses/sectors proposed to be served and is clearly linked to at least one goal with qualitative and quantitative data. 4 – Program is clearly described. Impacts are linked to at least one goal with quantitative and qualitative data. 3 – Basic information on the program is provided. Links to at least one goal are identified but without support.

Evaluation Category	Economic Development Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>2 – Program and links to at least one goal are minimally articulated.</p> <p>1 – Program description is confusing and unclear. Does not link to at least one goal.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Organizational and Financial Capacity (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Organization has the necessary personnel, governance structure and financial capability to sustain the activity or program</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show how the qualifications of personnel result in positive project impacts. Caliber of leadership is high. Project team roles are articulated and connected to program outcomes. All applicable policies are provided and appear thorough. Clear and concise financial information is provided. Financial statements demonstrate the organization is financially secure and well-managed. The budget form is complete, and clearly and thoroughly describes all program costs. Included project expenses are realistic considering population size and stated goals.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show the qualifications of personnel are matched to the scale and scope of services proposed. A basic project team structure is in place. All required policies are provided. The budget form is completed in its entirety and provides details on project expenses.</p> <p>3 – Personnel are competent. All of the required policies have been provided. Financial statements have been provided and offer sufficient information on the organization’s fiscal health. Finances appear stable. The budget form is completed in its entirety and adequately lists project expenses.</p> <p>2 – Personnel have minimal experience. Only some of the required policies have been provided. Finances appear unstable. Budget form is provided but incomplete or not relevant to the proposed program.</p> <p>1 – There is little or no organizational history to determine financial health or competency of personnel. Required policies are not provided. Budget form is not provided.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>

Evaluation Category	Economic Development Focus	Rating Scale
<p>Past Performance (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Quality of examples and data provided demonstrating past success executing economic development initiatives</p>	<p>5 – Qualitative and quantitative data is provided to show that the organization has a successful track record of producing programs of similar or greater scale and impact. Evidence provided is clear, relevant to the proposed program and demonstrates organization has previously or can carry out the program successfully.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a track record of producing programs of similar scale and impact.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a record of producing programs but has not demonstrated experience with programs of a similar size or impact.</p> <p>2 – There is little organizational history provided and the organization’s past performance is minimal.</p> <p>1 – Organization has no experience implementing programs.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Economic Impact (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Expected economic benefit of the activity and return on investment for the City’s contribution</p>	<p>5 - Evidence is provided to show that the program has a significant, lasting positive impact for the Coronado business community using quantitative and qualitative data. It is evident return on investment would be high if proposed outcomes were achieved within the proposed budget.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the City funded project will have a positive impact on the Coronado business community.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to show that the program may benefit the Coronado business community, but it is not evident if the overall impact would be significant.</p> <p>2 – Evidence provided indicates program would have a minimal positive impact on the business community.</p> <p>1 – Program is not expected to have a positive economic benefit or return on investment for the City’s contribution or organization does not provide qualitative or quantitative data to ascertain expected economic benefit or return on investment.</p>

Evaluation Category	Economic Development Focus	Rating Scale
Innovation (5 points) Weight: x1	Degree to which the proposed program represents an innovative, unique or novel approach to stimulating economic growth	<p>0 – No response.</p> <p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the proposal presents a solid, innovative strategy for achieving anticipated goals. The proposed program includes approaches, methodologies, interventions, technologies or resources that are original and that show significant promise for stimulating economic growth. Benefits to the local business community are specific, and clearly articulated.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that program represents implementation of an emerging innovation or trend and outlines potential benefits to the local business community.</p> <p>3 – Program represents practice(s) commonplace within field, or an adoption of a change with well-established benefits.</p> <p>2- Program is already deployed within the City of Coronado and does not represent a new approach but benefits may be realized.</p> <p>1 – Program is already deployed within the City of Coronado or is redundant. Program benefits are not articulated or nonexistent.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
Collaboration (10 points) Weight: x2	Level of collaboration with other local economic development stakeholders to achieve the activity's goals	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization is engaging with other local organizations to further the program goals. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to improve effectiveness and/or eliminate duplication of service. These partners were already contacted, and a formal agreement is in place if the project is funded. Evidence of the agreement is provided. All partners know their roles.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization is engaging with other local organizations to further the program goals. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to improve effectiveness and/or eliminate duplication of service. These partners were already contacted, and an informal agreement is in place.</p>

Evaluation Category	Economic Development Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>3 – Organization has made some attempts to collaborate with other local economic development stakeholders. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to improve effectiveness and/or eliminate duplication of service and has made contact but there are no commitments to partner in place.</p> <p>2 – The organization is aware of and has identified potential organizations to partner with but has not made contact and does not have a commitment to collaborate.</p> <p>1 – The organization has not considered who else to involve in their proposed project to improve effectiveness and/or eliminate duplication of service.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>

Social Services

Social Services Grants provide funding for local nonprofit organizations in support of youth development, relations and crime prevention activities, youth and family counseling, youth leadership programs, and/or recreation enrichment activities for youth up to age 21. Social Services Grants may also provide funding for programs, promoting health and wellness beneficial to the broader community, including but not limited to activities serving the Coronado Senior population (50+ in age), military veterans and disabled residents.

To be eligible for grant funding, proposed grant activities must achieve one or more of the following goals:

- 1) Promote leadership and engagement in the community through mentoring and social development.
- 2) Encourage friendship, equality, acceptance, compassion and empowerment.
- 3) Encourage healthy families by improving the provision of health care services, youth coping skills, family communication and parenting skills.
- 4) Decrease substance abuse and encourage better health through education and prevention programs.
- 5) Support prevention of suicide through mental health prevention and intervention programs.
- 6) Support recreation and empowerment activities.

Evaluation Category	Social Services Focus	Rating Scale
Activity Alignment (25 points) Weight: x5	Degree to which the proposed activity achieves at least one or more of the goals of the social services grant program	5 – Program description is compelling and specific, provides information on the local population proposed to be served and is clearly linked to at least one goal with qualitative and quantitative data.

		<p>4 – Program is clearly described. Impacts are linked to at least one goal with quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>3 – Basic information on the program is provided. Links to at least one goal are identified but without support.</p> <p>2 – Program and links to at least one goal are minimally articulated.</p> <p>1 – Program description is confusing and unclear. Does not link to at least one goal.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Organizational and Financial Capacity (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Organization demonstrates the trained, experienced personnel, governance structure and financial capability required to provide services to the population served</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show how the qualifications of personnel result in positive project impacts. Caliber of leadership is high. Project team roles are articulated and connected to program outcomes. All applicable policies are provided and appear thorough. Clear and concise financial information is provided. Financial statements demonstrate the organization is financially secure and well-managed. The budget form is complete, and clearly and thoroughly describes all program costs. Included project expenses are realistic considering population size and stated goals.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show the qualifications of personnel are matched to the scale and scope of services proposed. A basic project team structure is in place. All required policies are provided. The budget form is completed in its entirety and provides details on project expenses.</p> <p>3 – Personnel are competent. All of the required policies have been provided. Financial statements have been provided and offer sufficient information on the organization’s fiscal health. Finances appear stable. The budget form is completed in its entirety and adequately lists project expenses.</p> <p>2 – Personnel have minimal experience. Only some of the required policies have been provided. Finances appear unstable. Budget form is provided but incomplete or not relevant to the proposed program.</p> <p>1 – There is little or no organizational history to determine financial health or competency of personnel. Required policies are not provided. Budget form is not provided.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>

<p>Program Quality (25 points) Weight: x5</p>	<p>Degree to which the proposed program represents an evidenced-based approach reflecting best-practice with measurable, reportable outcomes</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to demonstrate that the program is grounded in research and literature relating to the provision of the service and reflects best-practice. Clear measures to prove effectiveness (outcomes/results) are identified and plans on how data will be collected to track and communicate those results is clear, compelling and actively used to evaluate program efficacy.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to demonstrate the program is moderately informed by research and literature relating to the provision of the service or reflects best practice. Measures to prove effectiveness (outcomes/results) are identified and plans on how data will be collected to track and communicate those results is provided.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided indicating program has some aspects of an evidence-based approach or reflects best-practice. The proposal outlines some possible measures of gauging effectiveness at the project’s completion. Evaluation strategies are based more on output data than measurable outcomes.</p> <p>2 – Minimal evidence is provided to demonstrate the program is based on an evidence-based approach or reflects best practice. The proposal outlines some possible measures of gauging effectiveness at the project’s completion. Evaluation strategies are based more on output data than measurable outcomes.</p> <p>1 – Evidence is not provided or does not indicate program is grounded in an evidence-based approach or reflects best practice. There is no plan or a very poor plan to evaluate the project. The applicant does not list appropriate outputs and/or outcomes.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Past Performance (10 points) Weight: x2</p>	<p>Quality of provided data demonstrating the successful provision of social services to the proposed population</p>	<p>5 – Qualitative and quantitative data is provided to show that the organization has a successful track record of producing programs of similar or greater scale and impact. Evidence provided is clear, relevant to the proposed program and demonstrates organization has previously or can carry out the program successfully.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a track record of producing programs of similar scale and impact.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a record of producing programs but has not demonstrated experience with programs of a similar size or impact.</p>

		<p>2 – There is little organizational history provided and the organization’s past performance is minimal.</p> <p>1 – Organization has no experience implementing programs.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Need Identification and Outreach (15 points) Weight: x3</p>	<p>Organization’s approach to identifying the social service need within the community and information (data, examples, etc.) on organization’s efforts to outreach to the community</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to demonstrate the organization has a comprehensive plan to identify the need for the proposed services to be provided within the community. Compelling qualitative or quantitative data is provided to indicate there is a local demand for program services. Organization has conducted outreach to the community and demonstrates an understanding of the core local population to be served. Evidence indicates there is a significant, critical, localized and timely need for the services.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to demonstrate the organization has a plan to identify the need for the proposed services to be provided within the community. Organization has conducted outreach to the community and demonstrates a general understanding of the core local population served. Local demand for program services is communicated adequately. Evidence indicates there is a critical, local need for service.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to demonstrate organization has a basic approach to identify the social service need within the community and a basic outreach plan. Evidence demonstrates some local demand for the services but with minimal supporting data. A basic understanding of the local population to be served is demonstrated. Evidence indicates there is a local need for the service, but it is not critical.</p> <p>2 – Organization has conducted minimal outreach and has identified the need for proposed services. Local demand for the service is unclear. No real need is demonstrated.</p> <p>1 – Organization has not conducted outreach or employed any methods to ascertain the local, community need for the social service.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Financial Sustainability (5 points) Weight: x1</p>	<p>Level of effort and success in obtaining outside funds or in-kind services to leverage city grant contribution</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided showing a strong long-term program sustainability strategy and ability to successfully execute it, sources of future funding or in-kind services are continuous or already committed, agency has a realistic projection of full costs and has a strong plan/capacity to meet those costs. Evidence is provided to demonstrate organization can sustain program beyond City of Coronado Community grant funding.</p>

		<p>4 – Evidence is provided to show a long-term program sustainability strategy and is positioned to successfully execute it. Sources of future funding have been identified and organization provided a plan to secure commitments for future funding or in-kind services.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided showing a long-term organizational commitment to the program and is aware of potential future funders that align with project. Funding commitments are not yet in place. Organization has a basic organizational capacity to sustain project and expenses.</p> <p>2 – Organization has a weak organizational capacity to sustain project and expenses.</p> <p>1 – Evidence of a long-term funding strategy or capacity to sustain operations is not provided.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
--	--	---

Community Pride/Sense of Place

Community Pride/Sense of Place Grants provide funding to local nonprofit organizations to inspire community pride, celebrate Coronado’s unique patriotism, history and enhance the quality of life of residents.

To be eligible for grant funding, proposed grant activities must achieve one or more of the following goals:

- 1) Celebrate the unique patriotism, history and traditions of Coronado.
- 2) Highlight and/or improve the “hometown” feeling and pride of Coronado by promoting a sense of place and community.
- 3) Enhance the quality of life of residents by decreasing isolation through relationship building and the fostering of friendships.

Evaluation Category	Community Pride/Sense of Place Focus	Rating Scale
Activity Alignment (25 points) Weight: x5	Degree to which the proposed activity achieves at least one or more of the goals of the Community Pride/Sense of Place grant category	<p>5 – Program description is compelling and specific and is clearly linked to at least one goal with qualitative and quantitative data.</p> <p>4 – Program is clearly described. Impacts are linked to at least one goal with quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>3 – Basic information on the program is provided. Links to at least one goal are identified but without support.</p> <p>2 – Program and links to at least one goal are minimally articulated.</p>

Evaluation Category	Community Pride/Sense of Place Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>1 – Program description is confusing and unclear. Does not link to at least one goal.</p> <p>0 – No response</p>
<p>Organizational and Financial Capacity (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Demonstrated personnel (includes volunteers) and financial capability needed to ensure a successful activity or event</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show how the qualifications of personnel result in positive project impacts. Caliber of leadership is high. Project team roles are articulated and connected to program outcomes. All applicable policies are provided and appear thorough. Clear and concise financial information is provided. Financial statements demonstrate the organization is financially secure and well-managed. The budget form is complete, and clearly and thoroughly describes all program costs. Included project expenses are realistic considering population size and stated goals.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show the qualifications of personnel are matched to the scale and scope of services proposed. A basic project team structure is in place. All required policies are provided. The budget form is completed in its entirety and provides details on project expenses.</p> <p>3 – Personnel are competent. All of the required policies have been provided. Financial statements have been provided and offer sufficient information on the organization’s fiscal health. Finances appear stable. The budget form is completed in its entirety and adequately lists project expenses.</p> <p>2 – Personnel have minimal experience. Only some of the required policies have been provided. Finances appear unstable. Budget form is provided but incomplete or not relevant to the proposed program.</p> <p>1 – There is little or no organizational history to determine financial health or competency of personnel. Required policies are not provided. Budget form is not provided.</p> <p>0 – No response</p>
<p>Past Performance (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Evidence that the organization has prior experience executing successful programs or events</p>	<p>5 – Qualitative and quantitative data is provided to show that the organization has a successful track record of producing programs of similar or greater scale and impact. Evidence provided is clear, relevant to the proposed program and demonstrates organization has previously or can carry out the program successfully.</p>

Evaluation Category	Community Pride/Sense of Place Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a track record of producing programs of similar scale and impact.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a record of producing programs but has not demonstrated experience with programs of a similar size or impact.</p> <p>2 – There is little organizational history provided and the organization’s past performance is minimal.</p> <p>1 – Organization has no experience implementing programs.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Local Focus (15 points) Weight: x3</p>	<p>Proposed activity includes a clear, comprehensive targeted outreach plan to the Coronado community</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has created a clear, comprehensive outreach plan, including outreach to a diverse array of groups, to ensure activities are locally-focused while encouraging broad participation by Coronado residents. Plan employs a variety of outreach methods and success can be communicated with qualitative or quantitative data.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show the organization has a plan to outreach to the community to ensure activities are locally focused while encouraging broad participation by Coronado residents. Specific outreach methods are identified to ensure the proposed activity is locally focused.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to show the organization has a general plan to outreach to the community and has identified methods to ensure the proposed activity is locally focused.</p> <p>2 – Evidence provided indicates organization has a minimal outreach plan and methods to ensure proposed activity is locally-focused are unclear.</p> <p>1 – An outreach plan has not been provided.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Collaboration (10 points) Weight: x2</p>	<p>Degree to which the organization will partner with other Coronado-based groups to broaden the community benefit</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization is engaging with other local organizations to further the program goals. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community. These partners</p>

Evaluation Category	Community Pride/Sense of Place Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>were already contacted, and a formal agreement is in place if the project is funded. Evidence of the agreement is provided. All partners know their roles.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization is engaging with other local organizations to further the program goals. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community. These partners were already contacted and an informal agreement is in place.</p> <p>3 – Organization has made some attempts to collaborate with other local organizations. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to improve effectiveness and/or eliminate duplication of service and has made contact but there are no commitments to partner in place.</p> <p>2 – The organization is aware of and has identified potential organizations to partner with but has not made contact and does not have a commitment to collaborate.</p> <p>1 – The organization has not considered who else to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Leverage (10 points) Weight: x2</p>	<p>Level of funds or in-kind services, outside of City support, obtained, or expected to be obtained to accomplish the activity or event</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the activity or event resources are diverse and represent broad community commitment. Organization has identified significant funding or in-kind services outside of the Coronado Community Grant program and City provided in-kind services to produce the activity or event. Organization has identified and has provided detailed information/data on funding and/or in-kind services (can include volunteer hours) to be employed in support of the activity or event.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the activity or event resources are diverse. Organization has identified funding or in-kind services outside of the Coronado Community Grant program and City provided in-kind services to produce the activity or event. Organization has identified and provided general information on in-kind services (can include volunteer hours) to be employed in support of the activity or event.</p>

Evaluation Category	Community Pride/Sense of Place Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>3 – Evidence is provided to show that the activity or event draws on other resources, including volunteer hours, but is reliant on Coronado Community Grant funding and City provided in-kind services to produce the activity or event.</p> <p>2 – Evidence is provided to show that the activity is primarily reliant on Coronado Community Grant funds and City provided in-kind services.</p> <p>1 - Organization has not provided evidence of funds or in-kind services outside of City support to be obtained, or expected to be obtained, to accomplish the activity or event.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>

Arts and Culture

Arts and Culture Grants provide funding to local nonprofit organizations to foster the development of sustainable, fiscally and artistically strong arts and cultural organizations, programming, and services for the benefit of the community of Coronado.

To be eligible for grant funding, proposed grant activities must achieve one or more of the following goals:

- 1) Strengthen and/or diversify the arts in Coronado, encouraging excellence and providing more diverse opportunities for residential arts participation.
- 2) Build capacity of arts and cultural organizations.
- 3) Supports arts-specific performances, festivals, celebrations, and special events.
- 4) Stimulate the creative economy of our community through arts and culture.

Evaluation Category	Arts and Culture Focus	Rating Scale
<p>Activity Alignment (25 points) Weight: x5</p>	<p>Degree to which the proposed activity achieves at least one or more of the goals of the Arts and Culture grant category</p>	<p>5 – Program description is compelling and specific and is clearly linked to at least one arts and culture goal with qualitative and quantitative data.</p> <p>4 – Program is clearly described. Impacts are linked to at least one goal with quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>3 – Basic information on the program is provided. Links to at least one goal are identified but without support.</p>

Evaluation Category	Arts and Culture Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>2 – Program and links to at least one goal are minimally articulated.</p> <p>1 – Program description is confusing and unclear. Does not link to at least one goal.</p> <p>0 – No response</p>
<p>Organizational & Financial Capacity (25 points) Weight: x5</p>	<p>Demonstrated personnel (includes volunteers) and financial capability needed to ensure a successful activity or event</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show how the qualifications of personnel result in positive project impacts. Caliber of leadership is high. Project team roles are articulated and connected to program outcomes. All applicable policies are provided and appear thorough. Clear and concise financial information is provided. Financial statements demonstrate the organization is financially secure and well-managed. The budget form is complete, and clearly and thoroughly describes all program costs. Included project expenses are realistic considering population size and stated goals.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show the qualifications of personnel are matched to the scale and scope of services proposed. A basic project team structure is in place. All required policies are provided. The budget form is completed in its entirety and provides details on project expenses.</p> <p>3 – Personnel are competent. All of the required policies have been provided. Financial statements have been provided and offer sufficient information on the organization’s fiscal health. Finances appear stable. The budget form is completed in its entirety and adequately lists project expenses.</p> <p>2 – Personnel have minimal experience. Only some of the required policies have been provided. Finances appear unstable. Budget form is provided but incomplete or not relevant to the proposed program.</p> <p>1 – There is little or no organizational history to determine financial health or competency of personnel. Required policies are not provided. Budget form is not provided.</p> <p>0 – No response</p>

Evaluation Category	Arts and Culture Focus	Rating Scale
<p>Artistic Integrity (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Artistic quality is uniformly high and shows significant creativity or originality with outstanding artistic personnel</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided showing compelling and specific information about how the organization defines artistic success and/or excellence. Organization clearly describes the process utilized to select artists, seasons or other elements of artistic production or presentation. Process is thorough and documented. Organization clearly illustrates process used to evaluate the artistic quality of programming and discusses ways in which the organization maintains commitment to artistic excellence. Excellence is demonstrated with supporting reviews, comments or other qualitative information. Provided support material is of superior quality, thoughtful, well presented and demonstrates commitment to use artists of quality.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided showing specific information about how the organization defines artistic success and/or excellence. Organization clearly describes the process utilized to select artists, seasons or other elements of artistic production or presentation. Organization provides the process used to evaluate the artistic quality of programming and discusses ways in which the organization maintains commitment to artistic excellence. Provided support material is of high quality.</p> <p>3 - Organization provided basic information about how the organization defines artistic success and/or excellence in terms of its mission and services and community needs. Organization provides basic information on process utilized to select artists, seasons or other elements of artistic production or presentation. Organization provides basic information on process used to evaluate the artistic quality and success of programming. Support material provides basic information.</p> <p>2 – Evidence provided lacks specific information about how the organization defines artistic excellence in terms of its mission and services and community needs. Organization has not clearly demonstrated a process to evaluate the artistic quality and success of programming. Organization has not clearly described the process utilized to select artists, seasons or other elements of artistic production or presentation. Support material provides basic information.</p>

Evaluation Category	Arts and Culture Focus	Rating Scale
		<p>1 – Organization provided little to no information about how the organization defines artistic excellence in terms of its missions and services and community needs. There is no formal process to evaluate the artistic quality and success of programming. Organization does not have a formal process to select artists, seasons or other elements of artistic production or presentation. Support material is poor or poorly presented.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>
<p>Community Benefit (20 points) Weight: x4</p>	<p>Addresses a significant community need or is part of the community fabric, with community support and promotes accessibility with strong outreach to local audiences</p>	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a high-level of understanding of its core community/audience and project connects and is relevant to core community/audience. Evidence is provided to show that the project has a significant, positive impact for the community. Evidence is provided to show that the organization has integrated accessibility and inclusivity in the context of this project.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization understands its core community/audience and how the project connects and is relevant to core community/audience. Evidence is provided to show that the project has a positive impact for the community. Evidence is provided to show that the project is accessible and inclusive.</p> <p>3 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization has a basic understanding of the core community/audience and that project will have some impact to the community. Evidence is provided to show accessibility and inclusivity</p> <p>2 – Minimal evidence is provided to indicate an understanding of the core community/audience. Project will have a minimal impact on the community. Organization has minimally incorporated accessibility and inclusivity into the context of the project.</p> <p>1 – Evidence is not provided to indicate an understanding of organization's core community/audience and how the project is relevant to its core community/audience. No impact on the community is identified or expected. No information on accessibility or inclusivity is provided.</p>

Evaluation Category	Arts and Culture Focus	Rating Scale
		0 – No response
Collaboration (10 points) Weight: x2	Degree to which the organization will partner with other Coronado-based groups to broaden the community benefit	<p>5 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization is engaging with other local organizations to further the program goals. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community. These partners were already contacted, and a formal agreement is in place if the project is funded. Evidence of the agreement is provided. All partners know their roles.</p> <p>4 – Evidence is provided to show that the organization is engaging with other local organizations to further the program goals. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community. These partners were already contacted, and an informal agreement is in place.</p> <p>3 – Organization has made some attempts to collaborate with other local organizations. The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community but there are no commitments to partner in place.</p> <p>2 – The organization is aware of and has identified other local organizations to potentially partner with but has not made contact and does not have a commitment.</p> <p>1 – The organization has not considered other local organizations to involve in their proposed project to broaden the benefit to the community.</p> <p>0 – No response.</p>