



Florida Division of Arts and Culture

Scoring Rubric for Artist 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: Artist Statement, Project Description, Partnerships and Collaborations, Required Attachments and Support Materials.

Excellent 32 – 35 points	Good 28 – 31 points	Fair 21 – 27 points	Weak 0 – 20 points
Artist statement clearly describes the artists’ work and fully supports the proposed project	Artist statement describes the artists’ work and supports the proposed project	Artist statement describes the artists’ work and does not support the proposed project.	Artist statement does not describe the artists’ work and does not fully support the proposed project
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 project and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities	Clearly describes proposed project and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities	Describes proposed project and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences and communities	Proposed project and its 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
Clearly describes how the project is artistically strong, and how it will advance their career and creative practice	Describes how the project is artistically strong, and how it will advance their career and creative practice	Describes how the project is artistically strong but does not describe how it will advance their career and creative practice	Does not describe how the project is artistically strong, or how it will advance their career and creative practice
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; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion 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 the project that relate to the artist statement	Demonstrates significant economic impact of the project that relate to the artist statement	Describes limited economic impact of the project that relate to the artist statement	Describes very minimal economic impact of the project 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 project	Educational and outreach components serve the constituency and are appropriate for the project	Limited educational and outreach components serve the constituency and are minimally appropriate for the project	Very minimal educational and outreach components do not serve the constituency and are not appropriate for the project
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 project	Appropriate number of individuals benefiting from the project	Minimal number of individuals benefiting from the project	Very minimal number of individuals benefiting from the project
Project’s programming, facilities, related materials and communications are fully accessible and consider issues of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	Some of the project’s programming, facilities, related materials and communications are accessible and consider issues of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Plans are made to continue to improve accessibility.	Plans are made for making project’s programming, facilities, related materials and communications accessible and consider issues of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	No effort is made towards making project’s programming, facilities, related materials and communications accessible and does not consider issues of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

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 artist’s ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget, and artists past projects	Very minimal concerns about the artist’s ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget, and artists past projects	Concerns about the artist’s ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget, and artists past projects	Multiple concerns about the artist’s ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget, and artists past projects
Confident in the ability of the artist to carry out the proposal. Artist has long standing history of successfully completed projects.	Very minimal concerns about the ability of the artist to carry out the proposal. Artist has some history of successfully completed projects.	Concerns about the ability of the artist to carry out the proposal. Artist has little history of successfully completed projects.	Multiple concerns about the ability of the artist to carry out the proposal. Artist has no history of successfully completed projects.
Evaluation methods are well-defined, clear, and fully measurable, and are employed to help the artist achieve the proposed project.	Measurable evaluation methods help the artist achieve the proposed project.	Evaluation methods are not fully measurable and only minimally help the artist achieve the proposed Project.	Evaluation methods are not clear and/or measurable and do not help the artist achieve the proposed project.
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:			