



Florida Division of Cultural Affairs

Scoring Rubric for Artist Projects

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 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

Quality of Programs (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, Project Evaluation Plan, Required Attachments and Support Materials.

Excellent 37 – 40 points	Good 32 – 36 points	Fair 25 – 31 points	Weak 0 – 24 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.
Evaluation methods are well-defined, clear, and fully measurable, and are employed to help the artist achieve the goals of the proposed project.	Measurable evaluation methods help the artist achieve the goals of the proposed project.	Evaluation methods are not fully measurable and only minimally help the artist achieve the goals of the proposed project.	Evaluation methods are not clear and/or measurable and do not help the artist achieve the goals of the proposed project.
Extensive and clearly described partnerships and collaborations.	Clearly described partnerships and collaborations.	Limited partnerships and collaborations.	Minimal and unclear partnerships and 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 project; estimated number of individuals, youth, elders, and artists benefiting; marketing/promotion/publicity plans and audience development/expansion; project impact narrative.

Excellent 28 – 30 points	Good 24 – 27 points	Fair 19 – 23 points	Weak 0 – 18 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.
Provides compelling and specific information about extensive economic impact of the project that relates to the artist statement.	Demonstrates significant economic impact of the project that relates to the artist statement.	Describes limited economic impact of the project that relates to the artist statement.	Describes very minimal economic impact of the project and is not measurable.
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 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 and expansion efforts.	Appropriate and effective marketing, promotion, publicity, and audience development and expansion efforts.	Limited and minimally effective marketing, promotion, publicity, and audience development and expansion efforts.	Very limited and minimally effective marketing, promotion, publicity, and audience development and expansion efforts.
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.
The project's programming, facilities, related materials, and communications are fully accessible.	Some of the project's programming, facilities, related materials, and communications are accessible. Plans are made to continue to improve accessibility.	Plans are made for making programming, facilities, related materials, and communications accessible.	No effort is made towards making programming, facilities, related materials, and communications accessible.
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, Project Budget; Project Evaluation Plan; and artist resume.

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:			