



**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 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 |

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 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 programming/project and their relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities | Clearly describes proposed programming/project and their relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities | Describes proposed programming/project and their relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities | Proposed programming/project and their relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities are unclear |
| Extensive and clearly describes partnerships/collaborations | Clearly describes partnerships/collaborations | Limited partnerships/collaborations | Minimal and unclear partnerships/collaborations |
| Required Attachments and Support Materials clearly demonstrate exemplary programming | Required Attachments and Support Materials clearly demonstrate programming | Required Attachments and Support Materials demonstrate programming | Required Attachments and Support Materials are unclear |
| 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 32 – 35 points | Good 28 – 31 points | Fair 21 – 27 points | Weak 0 – 20 points |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provides vital arts and cultural services to community or service area | Provides significant arts and cultural services to community or service area | Provides arts and cultural services to community or service area | 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 32 – 35 points | Good 28 – 31 points | Fair 21 – 27 points | Weak 0 – 20 points |
|---|---|--|---|
| 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 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 |
| Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA in the last 2 years or for 1 st time self-evaluations the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist | Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA or the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist in the last 5 years | Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA or the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist in the last 6 or more years | Has never completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA or the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist |
| Has policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination | Has policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination | Has policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination | Does not have policy, procedures and complaint processes that address non-discrimination |
| Organization’s programming, facilities, related materials and communications demonstrate full compliance with accessibility rights and Equal Protection rights as set forth in the United States Constitution | Some of the organization’s programming, facilities, related materials and communications demonstrate compliance with accessibility rights and comply with Equal Protection rights as set forth in the United States Constitution. | Plans are made for making programming, facilities, related materials and communications in compliance with accessibility rights and Equal Protection rights as set forth in the United States Constitution | No effort is made towards making programming, facilities, related materials and communications in compliance with accessibility rights and Equal Protection rights as set forth in the United States 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 28 – 30 points | Good 24 – 27 points | Fair 19 – 23 points | Weak 0 – 18 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 |
| 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 |
| Evaluation methods are well-defined, clear and fully measurable and are utilized to improve programming/project | Measurable evaluation methods are utilized to improve programming/project | Evaluation methods are not fully measurable and only minimally utilized to improve programming/project | Evaluation methods are not clear and/or measurable and do not help the organization improve programming/project |
| Very confident in the ability of the applicant to carry out the programming/project during the grant period and sustain it after the grant period | Very minimal concerns about the ability of the applicant to carry out the programming/project during the grant period and sustain it after the grant period | Concerns about the ability of the applicant to carry out the programming/project during the grant period and sustain it after the grant period | Multiple concerns about the ability of the applicant to carry out the programming/project during the grant period and sustain it after the grant period |
| Score: | | | |