

## Florida Division of Arts and Culture Scoring Rubric for General Program Support and Specific Cultural Project 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: Quality of Offerings, Impact and Track Record. 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.

#### Overall consideration for the applications:

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

### Quality of Offerings (Up to 35 Points)

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Quality of Offerings: Applicant Mission Statement, Applicant Goals/Objectives/Activities, Programming/Project Description, Partnerships and Collaborations and Required Attachments and Support Materials.

Excellent 32 – 35 points	Good 28 – 31 points	Fair 21 – 27 points	Weak 0 – 20 points
Mission statement clearly describes	Mission statement describes	Mission statement	Mission statement does not clearly
organization and programs/activities	organization and	describes organization and	describe organization and
fully support the mission	programs/activities fully	programs/activities do not	programs/activities do not fully
	support the mission	fully support the mission	support the mission
Identifies clear goals and fully	Identifies clear goals and	Identifies goals and limited	Does not identify goals and very
measurable objectives and activities	measurable objectives and	measurable objectives and	minimal objectives and activities
	activities	activities	
Clearly describes exemplary	Clearly describes proposed	Describes proposed	Proposed programing/project and
proposed programming/project and	programing/project and	programing/project and	their relevance to the intended
their relevance to the intended	their relevance to the	their relevance to the	participants, audiences and
participants, audiences and	intended participants,	intended participants,	communities are unclear
communities	audiences and communities	audiences and	
		communities	
Extensive and clearly describes	Clearly describes	Limited	Minimal and unclear
partnerships/collaborations	partnerships/collaborations	partnerships/collaborations	partnerships/collaborations
Required Attachments and Support	Required Attachments and	Required Attachments and	Required Attachments and Support
Materials clearly demonstrate	Support Materials clearly	Support Materials	Materials are unclear
exemplary programming	demonstrate programming	demonstrate programming	
Score:			

### Impact (Up to 35 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; location and reach of the programming/project; estimated number of individuals, youth, elders and artists benefiting; marketing/promotion/publicity plans and audience development/expansion; programming/project impact narrative; accessibility for all considerations; and physical as well as socioeconomic and geographic accessibility of facilities and programming/project.

Excellent	Good	Fair	Weak
32 – 35 points Provides vital arts and cultural services to community or service area	28 – 31 points Provides significant arts and cultural services to community or service area	21 – 27 points Provides arts and cultural services to community or service area	0 – 20 points Provides minimal arts and cultural services to community or service area
Provides compelling and specific information about extensive economic impact of programs / projects that relate to the organization's mission	Demonstrates significant economic impact of programs/projects that relate to the organization's mission	Describes limited economic impact of programs/projects that relate to the organization's mission	Describes very minimal economic impact of programs/projects or is not measurable
Extensive activities are proposed and are achievable within the grant period	Reasonable activities are proposed and are achievable within the grant period	Limited activities are proposed and/or concerns about the achievability within the grant period	Very minimal activities are proposed and/or serious concerns about the achievability within 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 and effective marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development/expansion efforts	Appropriate and effective marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development/expansion efforts	Limited and minimally effective marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development/expansion efforts	Very limited and minimally effective marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development/expansion efforts

## Impact (continued)

Excellent	Good	Fair	Weak
32 – 35 points	28 – 31 points	21 – 27 points	0 – 20 points
Very appropriate number of	Appropriate number of	Minimal number of individuals	Very minimal number of
individuals benefiting from the	individuals benefiting from the	benefiting from the	individuals benefiting from the
program/project	program/project	program/project	program/project
Has a staff person responsible for	Has a staff person responsible	Has a staff person responsible	Does not have a staff person
compliance with Section 504 of the	for compliance with Section	for compliance with Section	responsible for compliance with
Rehabilitation Act, Americans with	504 of the Rehabilitation Act,	504 of the Rehabilitation Act,	Section 504 of the Rehabilitation
Disabilities Act and Florida Statutes	Americans with Disabilities Act	Americans with Disabilities Act	Act, Americans with Disabilities
553	and Florida Statutes 553	and Florida Statutes 553	Act and Florida Statutes 553
Has completed the Section 504	Has completed the Section 504	Has completed the Section 504	Has never completed the
Self Evaluation Workbook from the	Self Evaluation Workbook from	Self Evaluation Workbook from	Section 504 Self Evaluation
NEA in the last 2 years or for 1 <sup>st</sup>	the NEA or the Abbreviated	the NEA or the Abbreviated	Workbook from the NEA or the
time self-evaluations the	Accessibility Checklist in the	Accessibility Checklist in the	Abbreviated Accessibility
Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist	last 5 years	last 6 or more years	Checklist
Has policy, procedures and	Has policy, procedures and	Has policy, procedures and	Does not have policy,
complaint processes that address	complaint processes that	complaint processes that	procedures and complaint
non-discrimination	address non-discrimination	address non-discrimination	processes that address non- discrimination
Organization's programming,	Some of the organization's	Plans are made for making	No effort is made towards
facilities, related materials and	programming, facilities,	programming, facilities, related	making programming, facilities,
communications demonstrate full	related materials and	materials and communications	related materials and
compliance with accessibility rights	communications demonstrate	in compliance with accessibility	communications in compliance
and Equal Protection rights as set	compliance with accessibility	rights and Equal Protection	with accessibility rights and
forth in the United States	rights and comply with Equal	rights as set forth in the United	Equal Protection rights as set
Constitution	Protection rights as set forth in	States Constitution	forth in the United States
	the United States Constitution.		Constitution
Score:			

### Track Record (Up to 30 points)

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Track Record: the applicant's reporting history and current compliance, Operating and Programming/Project Budget; Programming/Project Evaluation Plan; and Fiscal Condition and Sustainability.

Excellent	Good	Fair	Weak
28 – 30 points	24 – 27 points	19 – 23 points	0 – 18 points
Very confident in the	Very minimal concerns	Concerns about the	Multiple concerns about the
organization's fiscal stability and	about the organization's	organization's fiscal stability	organization's fiscal stability and
ability to carry out the proposed	fiscal stability and ability to	and ability to carry out the	ability to carry out the proposed
activities given the operating	carry out the proposed	proposed activities given	activities given the operating
budget, grant proposal budget and	activities given the	the operating budget, grant	budget, grant proposal budget
fiscal information	operating budget, grant	proposal budget and fiscal	and fiscal information
	proposal budget and fiscal	information	
	information		
Exemplary reporting history and	Very minimal concerns	Concerns about the	Multiple concerns about the
current compliance	about the applicant's	applicant's reporting history	applicant's reporting history and
	reporting history and	and current compliance	current compliance
	current compliance		
Evaluation methods are well-	Measurable evaluation	Evaluation methods are not	Evaluation methods are not
defined, clear and fully measurable	methods are utilized to	fully measurable and only	clear and/or measurable anddo
and are utilized to improve	improve	minimally utilized to	not help the organization
programming/project	programming/project	improve	improve programming/project
		programming/project	
Very confident in the ability of the	Very minimal concerns	Concerns about the ability	Multiple concerns about the
applicant to carry out the	about the ability of the	of the applicant to carry out	ability of the applicant to carry
programming/project during the	applicant to carry out the	the programming/project	out the programming/project
grant period and sustain it after the	programming/project	during the grant period and	during the grant period and
grant period	during the grant period	sustain it after the grant	sustain it after the grant period
	and sustain it after the	period	
	grant period		
Score:			