

Pelican Players
Name of Applicant

Ambers
Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011_Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score Weight Points

(1-5) 2 5 10

How well does/will this project increase tourism?
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?

(1-5) 2 5 10

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project?
Is the budget and plan realistic?
What is the potential to succeed?
Is management and/or administration capable?

(1-5) 3 2 6

Is there demonstrated community support?
Is there evidence of in-kind support?
Are there endorsements by community groups?

(1-5) 2 1 2

Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive?
Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.

(1-5) 2 2 4

Is there a strong evaluation method?
How will the applicant document the impact?
Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 32

Add Preference Points

0-10 4

Shoulder Season – before June and after September

0-10 2

Outlying Areas

0-10 5

Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure

0-10 4
16

Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10 8

Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS 40

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 2000⁰⁰

Linkville Players

Name of Applicant

K. MARQUEZ

Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011_Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score Weight Points

(1-5) 2 5 10

How well does/will this project increase tourism?
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?

(1-5) 3 5 15

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project?
Is the budget and plan realistic? - *high?* *Budget seems high -*
What is the potential to succeed?
Is management and/or administration capable?

(1-5) 2 2 4

Is there demonstrated community support?
Is there evidence of in-kind support?
Are there endorsements by community groups?

(1-5) 3 1 3

Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive?
Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.

(1-5) 3 2 6

Is there a strong evaluation method?
How will the applicant document the impact?
Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

*- need #s currently
sold out of area fix*

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 38

Add Preference Points

0-10

8

Shoulder Season -- before June and after September

0-10

Outlying Areas

0-10

Length of Stay -- encourage early arrival and/or late departure

0-10

8
16

Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10

Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS 54

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: Cost seems high for expected return. Great local shows.
Impressive organization.

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ _____

LIVEVIEW

CHIP

Name of Applicant

Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score Weight Points

(1-5) 2 5 10

How well does/will this project increase tourism?
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?

(1-5) 5 5 25

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project?
Is the budget and plan realistic?
What is the potential to succeed?
Is management and/or administration capable?

(1-5) 2 2 4

Is there demonstrated community support?
Is there evidence of in-kind support?
Are there endorsements by community groups?

(1-5) 3 1 3

Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive?
Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.

(1-5) 2 2 4

Is there a strong evaluation method?
How will the applicant document the impact?
Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

SUB-TOTAL POINTS:

46

Add Preference Points

0-10

5

Shoulder Season – before June and after September

0-10

Outlying Areas

0-10

2

Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure

0-10

2

Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10

-10

Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS

45

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ _____

Linkville Players
Name of Applicant

Danielle Thomas
Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>4</u>	5	<u>9</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>8</u>	Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project? Is the budget and plan realistic? What is the potential to succeed? Is management and/or administration capable?
(1-5) <u>2</u>	2	<u>4</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>4</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>5</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>30</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>8</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		<u>0</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10		<u>0</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		<u>3</u>	Family Friendliness
<u>Deduct Penalty Points</u>			
-10		_____	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINTS		<u>41</u>	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: Would have liked to see some commitment from businesses mentioned (restaurants, hotels)

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ _____

JK

Name of Applicant Pelican Playous Inc.

Name of Reviewer B. Sullivan

Abn. Zubillio Program
Ticket Sale for out. of towners
Upgrade website.

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

5000.00 Prog.

<u>Score</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Points</u>	
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits? <u>JSB drawn</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>	Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project? Is the budget and plan realistic? What is the potential to succeed? Is management and/or administration capable?
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>45</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>10</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September (<u>Sept - thru June</u>)
0-10		<u>8</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10		<u>2</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure <u>1</u>
0-10		<u>2</u>	Family Friendliness
<u>Deduct Penalty Points</u>			
-10		<u>0</u>	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS 67

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments:

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 3,500.00

CWS
\$11,000.00