

# FY27 Cultural District Grant Application Evaluation Rubric

## Project Details – 25% of Total Score

<b>Arts Integration</b>	<b>0-2 points:</b> Arts, culture, and/or design are not mentioned or are disconnected from the project.	<b>3-6 points:</b> Arts, culture, and/or design are included, but integration appears supplementary or surface-level.	<b>7-10 points:</b> Arts, culture, and/or design are clearly and intentionally integrated into the project.	<b>11-13 points:</b> Arts, culture, and/or design are deeply woven throughout the project, demonstrating innovation.
<b>Public Engagement</b>	<b>0-2 points:</b> Project does not involve the public or does not have clear strategies for community engagement or connection.	<b>3-5 points:</b> Project uses arts-based activities to connect with the public passively or in non-participatory ways.	<b>6-9 points:</b> Project intentionally engages the public, where community members contribute ideas and benefit directly through meaningful participation in the arts.	<b>10-12 points:</b> Project embeds arts-based engagement as the core process for community and public engagement, fostering dialogue and deep relationships.

## Project Implementation – 25% of Total Score

<b>Key Administrative Personnel</b>	<b>0-1 points:</b> Administrative personnel bio(s) shows minimal or indirect experience related to the project area. Necessary leadership, relevant skills, or accomplishments that demonstrate readiness to manage the proposed project are limited or nonexistent.	<b>2-4 points:</b> Administrative personnel bio(s) shows some relevant experience, training, or roles, but leadership and/or expertise appears unrelated to the proposed project.	<b>5-7 points:</b> Administrative personnel bio(s) demonstrates clear, relevant experience and skills aligned with the proposed project. Bios reflect successful leadership or management in similar or related contexts.	<b>8-10 points:</b> Administrative personnel bio(s) reflects significant and relevant expertise, with a strong record of leadership, innovation, and experience that positions them to lead the project with depth and vision.
-------------------------------------	--	---	---	--

<b>Artistic Personnel</b>	<b>0-1 points:</b> Artistic personnel bio(s) shows minimal or no artistic experience. There is limited evidence of creative leadership, relevant artistic practice, or community engagement.	<b>2-3 points:</b> Artistic personnel bio(s) shows an active artistic practice with some relevant public experience. They demonstrate growing artistic direction, but community experience may be narrow relative to project scope.	<b>4-6 points:</b> Artistic personnel bio(s) demonstrates a strong artistic practice with relevant experience leading or contributing to creative projects. Bios reflect artistic excellence, and strong community engagement and collaboration experience.	<b>7-8 points:</b> Artistic personnel bio(s) reflects deep artistic expertise and public leadership. They demonstrate an established record of innovation, artistic vision, and community engagement.
<b>Non-Arts Partners</b>	<b>0-1 points:</b> Non-arts personnel bio(s) does not show involvement OR show minimal relevant experience or capacity to contribute effectively to the project.	<b>2-3 points:</b> Non-arts personnel bio(s) reflects some relevant experience. They demonstrate growing professional skill, but scope of experience is limited relative to project needs.	<b>4-5 points:</b> Non-arts personnel bio(s) demonstrates relevant experience and skills aligned with project needs. Effective collaboration and/or problem-solving in similar contexts are apparent.	<b>6-7 points:</b> Non-arts personnel bio(s) reflects extensive and highly relevant expertise. There is demonstrated strong collaboration and strategic thinking. They are clearly positioned to support or advance the project with skill and reliability.

### Project Impact – 25% of Total Score

<b>Project Goals</b>	<b>0-1 points:</b> There are no goals or outcomes, or they are vague or irrelevant. The goals and outcomes are lofty considering the given timeframe.	<b>2-4 points:</b> The goals and outcomes are general and lack specificity but are relevant and mostly achievable in the given timeframe.	<b>5-7 points:</b> The majority of the project goals and outcomes are specific, relevant, and achievable given the proposed timeframe.	<b>8-10 points:</b> Each project goal and outcome is specific, deliberate, and relevant. The time frame is highly realistic.
----------------------	---	---	--	--

<b>Strategic Plan</b>	<b>0-1 points:</b> Project goals show little to no connection to the Cultural District's strategic plan. Alignment appears incidental or superficial, with minimal evidence of intentional planning.	<b>2-3 points:</b> Project goals show some relevance to the strategic plan, but connections are partial or weak. Intentionality is limited or scattered across plan objectives.	<b>4-6 points:</b> Project goals clearly reflect the priorities or action steps in the strategic plan. There is intentional planning, and explanation of how the project advances the strategic plan objectives is present.	<b>7-8 points:</b> Project goals are deeply aligned with the strategic plan, demonstrating thoughtful, intentional alignment. The project advances multiple strategic priorities, reflects insight into long-term goals, and shows potential for meaningful impact on the district's vision.
<b>Success Measurements</b>	<b>0-1 points:</b> Methods for evaluation, reporting, and assessing public engagement are minimal or largely absent. There is no evidence that outcomes will inform future projects or community engagement.	<b>2-3 points:</b> Methods for evaluation are described but are basic or provide surface-level information. The evidence of public engagement assessment is limited; connections to goals or public impact are vague.	<b>4-5 points:</b> Methods for evaluation are clearly defined, relevant, and aligned with project goals. The approach demonstrates thoughtful measurement of outcomes and public engagement, with plans to report and use findings to inform future projects.	<b>6-7 points:</b> Methods for evaluation are comprehensive, purposeful, and directly aligned with project goals. The approach demonstrates rigorous, strategic evaluation that captures meaningful outcomes and engagement, and includes mechanisms for reflection, adaptation, and long-term learning.

### Communications Plan – 5% of Total Score

<b>Communications Plan</b>	<b>0 points:</b> Description of marketing or distribution is missing or generic. There is no evidence that outreach is purposeful or tailored to target audiences.	<b>1-2 points:</b> Marketing and distribution methods are described but are basic or general. Some thought has been given to purposeful public engagement.	<b>3-4 points:</b> Marketing and distribution are clearly planned, relevant, and intentionally designed to reach and engage diverse target audiences. Plan shows thoughtful consideration of relevant communication channels.	<b>5 points:</b> Marketing, distribution, and public awareness strategies are comprehensive, highly intentional, and deeply aligned with project goals. Plan demonstrates strategic, creative approaches that maximize audience engagement, reach, and impact a wide variety of community members.
----------------------------	--	--	---	--

## Budget – 15% of Total Score

<b>Project Budget</b>	<b>1-4 points:</b> The budget is not detailed and/or does not show adequate funding needed to complete the project.	<b>5-8 points:</b> The budget lacks detail but shows adequate funding needed to complete the project.	<b>9-12 points:</b> The budget is detailed and shows adequate funding needed to complete the project.	<b>13-15 points:</b> The budget is clear and detailed and shows strong financial resources needed to complete the project.
-----------------------	---	---	---	--

## Support Materials – 5% of Total Score

<b>Support Materials</b>	<b>0 points:</b> Support materials are missing, outdated, or only tangentially related to the proposed project. Materials provide limited evidence of organizational or artistic capacity.	<b>1-2 points:</b> Some support materials are relevant to the project and its arts components but may not be current, or in alignment with proposed project. Evidence of organizational capacity is emerging but not fully clear.	<b>3-4 points:</b> Support materials are clearly relevant, current, and thoughtfully selected to demonstrate organizational and artistic ability to carry out the project. Work samples illustrate past projects and their alignment with the proposed project's goals.	<b>5 points:</b> Support materials are highly relevant, current, and comprehensive, clearly demonstrating organizational and artistic capacity. Work samples effectively illustrate the quality, depth, and intentionality of past projects and their alignment with the proposed project's goals.
--------------------------	--	---	---	--