Florida Division of Cultural Affairs

Scoring Rubric for Fast Track Grant Applications

How to use this rubric

Grant panelists will receive a copy of the rubric as a part of their panelist training materials. The rubric will be employed to ensure as fair and unbiased a panel process as possible. The scoring mechanism defines each of the three criteria scored by panelists: Excellence, Impact, and Management. Within each criterion, benchmark descriptions and corresponding point values are listed to serve as a guide in the scoring process.

Grant applicants can use the rubric as a guideline in completing their applications for the deadline.

Overall consideration for the applications:

Value	Description	Score
Excellent	Strongly demonstrates public value of arts and culture. Merits investment of State of Florida funding.	92 – 100
Good	Satisfactorily demonstrates public value of arts and culture. Merits investment of State of Florida funding.	80 - 91
Fair	Does not sufficiently demonstrate public value of arts and culture. Does not merit investment of State of Florida funding.	61 -79
Weak	Makes an incomplete and/or inadequate case for the public value of arts and culture. Does not merit investment of State of Florida funding. Information is confusing, unclear, and lacks specific details.	0 - 60

Excellence (Up to 40 Points)

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Excellence and Innovation: responses to the Applicant Mission Statement, Proposal Description, and Support Materials.

Excellent 37 – 40 points	Good 32 – 36 points	Fair 25 – 31 points	Weak 0 – 24 points
Mission statement clearly describes organization and programs/activities fully support the mission	Mission statement describes organization and programs/activities fully support the mission	Mission statement describes organization and programs/activities do not fully support the mission	Mission statement does not clearly describe organization and programs/activities do not fully support the mission
Identifies clear goals and fully measurable objectives and activities	Identifies clear goals and measurable objectives and activities	Identifies goals and limited measurable objectives and activities	Does not identify goals and very minimal objectives and activities
Clearly describes exemplary proposed programs	Clearly describes proposed programs	Describes proposed programs	Proposed programs are unclear
Confident in the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal	Very minimal concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal	Concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal	Multiple concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal
Support Materials clearly demonstrate exemplary programming	Support Materials clearly demonstrate programming	Support Materials demonstrate programming	Support Materials are unclear
Score:			

Impact (Up to 40 Points)

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Impact: the number of proposed events, opportunities for public participation, and counties served; the location of the project/programming; the estimated number of individuals, youth, elders, and artists benefiting; and accessibility.

Excellent 36 – 40 points	Good 32 – 35 points	Fair 25 – 31 points	Weak 0 – 24 points
Provides vital cultural services to community or service area	Provides significant cultural services to community or service area	Provides cultural services to community or service area	Provides minimal cultural services to community or service area
Extensive activities are proposed and are achievable within the grant period	Reasonable activities are proposed and these activities are achievable within the grant period	Limited activities are proposed and/or concerns about the achievability of the activities within the grant period	Very minimal activities are proposed and/or serious concerns about the achievability of the proposed activities during the grant period
Educational and outreach components fully serve the constituency and are appropriate for the program(s) or project(s)	Educational and outreach components serve the constituency, and are appropriate for the program(s) or project(s)	Limited educational and outreach components serve the constituency and are minimally appropriate for the program(s) or project(s)	Very minimal educational and outreach components do not serve the constituency and are not appropriate for the program(s) or project(s)
Very appropriate number of individuals benefiting from the program/project	Appropriate number of individuals benefiting from the program/project	Minimal number of individuals benefiting from the program/project	Very minimal number of individuals benefiting from the program/project
Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA in the last 2 years or for 1st time self-evaluations the	Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA or the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist in the	Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA or the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist in the	Has never completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA or the Abbreviated Accessibility

Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist	last 5 years	last 6 or more years	Checklist
Has accessibility policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability	Has accessibility policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability	Has accessibility policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability	Does not have accessibility policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability
Has a staff person responsible for compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Americans with Disabilities Act and Florida Statutes 553	Has a staff person responsible for compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Americans with Disabilities Act and Florida Statutes 553	Has a staff person responsible for compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Americans with Disabilities Act and Florida Statutes 553	Does not have a staff person responsible for compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Americans with Disabilities Act and Florida Statutes 553
Score:			

Management (Up to 20 points)

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Management: the applicant's reporting history and current compliance, Operating and Proposal Budget, and Evaluation Plan.

Excellent *19 – 20 points*	*Good* *16 – 18 points*	*Fair* *13 – 15 points*	*Weak* *0 – 12 points*
Very confident in the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information	Very minimal concerns about the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information	Concerns about the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information	Multiple concerns about the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information
Evaluation methods are well-defined, clear, and fully measureable, and are employed to help the organization achieve its mission and proposed programs	Measureable evaluation methods help the organization achieve its mission and proposed programs	Evaluation methods are not fully measureable and only minimally help the organization achieve its mission and proposed programs	Evaluation methods are not clear and/or measureable and do not help the organization achieve its mission and proposed programs
Exemplary reporting history and current compliance	Very minimal concerns about the applicant's reporting history and current compliance	Concerns about the applicant's reporting history and current compliance	Multiple concerns about the applicant's reporting history and current compliance
Score:			