City of St. Petersburg

Department of Arts, Culture and Tourism
Arts Advisory Committee

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 for the deadline. Along with grants this year, the rubric very closely mirrors the state Division of Cultural Affairs grants and rubric.

Overall consideration for the applications:

Value	Description	Score
Excellent	Strongly demonstrates public value of arts and culture. Merits investment of City of St. Petersburg funding.	92 – 100
Good	Satisfactorily demonstrates public value of arts and culture. Merits investment of City of St. Petersburg funding.	80 - 91
Fair	Does not sufficiently demonstrate public value of arts and culture. Does not merit investment of City of St. Petersburg funding.	61 -79
Weak	Makes an incomplete and/or inadequate case for the public value of arts and culture. Does not merit investment of City of St. Petersburg 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, Programming/Project Description, Partnerships and Collaborations, Programming/Project Evaluation Plan 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 programing/project and their relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities	Describes proposed programing/project and their relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities	Proposed programing/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

Impact - Reach (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 programs and/or 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 projects/programs that relate to the organization's mission	Describes very minimal economic impact of programs/projects 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 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 appropriate marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development/expansion efforts	Very limited and minimally effective marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development/expansion efforts

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 1st 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 are fully accessible and consider issues of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Some of the organization'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 programming, facilities, related materials, and communications accessible and consider issues of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	No effort is made towards making programming, facilities, related materials, and communications accessible and 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 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 to 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