

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B: Program Design & Implementation
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Ruth Williams Opera House	Stabilization of Arts Organizations	97	35		14
Ruth Williams Opera House	Stabilization of Arts Organizations	94	Excellent - depth of clarity, focus, and overview of the 35 work and legacy of the Ruth Williams Opera House.		14
Ruth Williams Opera House	Stabilization of Arts Organizations	84	33		9

C: Deliverables & Work Plan		D: Detailed Budget		E: Outreach & Community Engagement	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
In this section, I also wanted to see Pacific Islander and Asian American communities elevated as well because of their representation in the population of the area, especially the 94132 which was mentioned in Section C.					
This isn't to say that the applicant has no relationship to these communities but I wanted to see that elevated in this section.	15		10		8
RWOH proposes to offer a suite of capacity-building services. The two that will drive the most individual and community impact are the Marketing Strategy Labs and the Professional Development and Leadership Coaching Track. The others seem more like General Operating Support initiatives and tangential to the pieces above.		Here, they should elevate the first two programs and provide more information on deliverables for Marketing Strategy and PD & Leadership Coaching Track.		There should be more funds going directly to support community artists and individual artists through the programmatic efforts as described.	
		Also, what other 'Key Partnerships' does RWOH call upon. Could get more detail here. This section looks internally, instead.		The budget needs more differentiation and detail on how it's being used. Unclear what the PD/Training funds are for internal staff. How many artists in residence, event leads, and micro-grant	
		Would be good to know more here what the plan may be if artist recruitment strategies fall short for the two lead programs.		7 recipients will benefit? How is this amount divided?	10
Appreciate the structure and comprehensive nature of the workplan.					
Feedback to grantee: clarify the program's intended long-term impact. What is the the long-term vision of the program (for instance, what does "success" look like for the participants in the coaching track?)	13		9		8

F: Evaluation & Reporting		G: Letters of Recommendation	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
<p>Although I do believe the applicant's stated neighborhoods that they center strongly reflects historically underrepresented communities, I wanted to see outreach to Pacific Islander and Asian American communities elevated as well because of their representation in the population, especially the 94132 which was mentioned in Section C.</p>	10		
<p>This isn't to say that the applicant has no relationship to these communities but I wanted to see that elevated in this section.</p>		5 Points	
<p>Appreciate the lean on community partnerships here.</p>	<p>This section is comprehensive and clear. Could use more information about the frequency of artist interviews, partner check-ins, and grant recipients. How will those be documented? Where will that info be stored? Also, provide more information about how staff will share observational data. Where will that be</p> <p>9 documented?</p>	5 Points	Great letters of support.
<p>What has been the impact of the grantee's extensive relationships and collaborations on the organization?</p>	<p>In the grantee's process of collecting data, what are the indicators of the program's "success" when measuring</p> <p>7 KPI?</p>	5 Points	