



Florida Division of Arts and Culture Scoring Rubric for 2027-2028 Cultural Facilities 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: Scope of Work, Project Budget and Matching Funds, and Need for Project and Project Impact. Within each criterion, benchmark descriptions and corresponding point values are listed to serve as a guide in the scoring process.

Overall consideration for the applications:

Value	Description	Score
Excellent	Strongly demonstrates public value of arts and culture. Merits investment of State of Florida funding.	80 – 100
Good	Satisfactorily demonstrates public value of arts and culture. Does not strongly merit investment of State of Florida funding.	60 - 79
Fair	Does not sufficiently demonstrate public value of arts and culture. Does not merit investment of State of Florida funding.	40 - 59

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 - 39
------	--	--------

Scope of Work (up to 30 points)

Consider the following application information when evaluating the Scope of Work:

<i>Excellent</i> 24 – 30 points	<i>Good</i> 18 – 23 points	<i>Fair</i> 12 – 17 points	<i>Weak</i> 0 – 11 points
▪Scope of Work clearly describes the project and work to be completed in great detail.	▪Scope of Work adequately describes the project and work to be completed with some detail.	▪Scope of Work generally describes the project and work to be completed with few or vague details.	▪Scope of Work is too vague to be understood, is incoherent or contradictory and does not describe the project and work to be completed in any detail .
▪ Strongly meets intent of CF grant program.	▪ Satisfactorily meets intent of CF Grant Program.	▪ Questionable if project meets intent of CF grant program.	▪ Does not meet intent of CF grant program.
▪Architectural plans/drawings/foot prints strongly support scope of work.	▪Architectural plans/drawings/foot prints satisfactorily support scope of work.	▪Architectural plans/drawings/foot prints do not sufficiently support scope of work.	▪Architectural plans/drawings/foot prints are inadequate to support scope of work.
▪Proposal detail budget accounts for all elements of the scope of work	▪Proposal detail budget reflects most of the scope of work	▪Proposal budget detail does not provide sufficient detail	▪Proposal budget detail does not match up with Scope of work
▪Project timeline and spending plan is detailed and ensures project completed within grant period of July 1, 2022 to June 1, 2024	▪Project timeline and spending plan may not be detailed enough to ensure project completion within grant period.	▪Project timeline and Spending plan provide few specifics to insure project completion within the grant period.	▪Project timeline and Spending Plan is unclear or omitted from application.
▪ Confident in the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal; applicant has extensive history managing CF grants.	▪ Minimal concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal; applicant has previous or current CF grant management experience.	▪ Some concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal; applicant has no previous CF grant management but some experience with CF grant management.	▪ Multiple concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal; applicant has no previous DCA grant management experience.

Project Budget and Matching Funds (Up to 25 Points)

Consider the following application information when evaluating Project Budget and Matching Funds:

<i>Excellent</i> 20 – 25 points	<i>Good</i> 15 – 19 points	<i>Fair</i> 10 – 14 points	<i>Weak</i> 0 – 9 points
- Provides compelling, specific and detailed information on the project's total budget (state and match funds). - Budget categories address Scope of Work in detail. 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. - Matching Funds Statement provides extensive detail of strong local match and aligns with Match Summary. - Match documents convincingly support Matching Funds Statement. - Cash on hand meets or exceeds 50% of match or has dedicated government funding.	- Provides significant information on the project's total budget (state and match funds). - Budget categories address all areas of scope of work. 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. - Matching Funds Statement provides adequate detail of local match and aligns with Match Summary. - Match documents satisfactorily support Matching Funds Statement. - Cash on hand is at least 25% of match or has dedicated government funding.	- Provides general information on the project's total budget (state and match funds). - Budget categories address the general scope of work but not well defined. Some 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. - Matching Funds Statement provides limited detail of local match and conflicts with Match Summary. - Match documents somewhat support Matching Funds Statement. - Cash on hand is exactly 25% of match and is composed of a mixture of cash, irrevocable pledges, and in-kind donations.	- Provides very minimal information on the project's total budget (state and match funds). - Budget does not address all elements in the scope of work. 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. - Matching Funds Statement provides confusing and minimal information of local match and/or conflicts with Match Summary. - Matching documentation are not convincing; very limited sources of match and types. - Cash on hand just meets 25% but is heavily dependent on irrevocable pledges and in-kind donations.

Need for Project and Project Impact (Up to 45 Points)

Consider the following application information when evaluating Need for the Project, Project Impact, and Operating Forecast Detail:

<i>Excellent</i> <i>36 – 45 points</i>	<i>Good</i> <i>27 – 35 points</i>	<i>Fair</i> <i>18 – 26 points</i>	<i>Weak</i> <i>0 – 17 points</i>
▪ Strong evidence that use of facility is for cultural programming.	▪ Satisfactory evidence that use of facility is for cultural programming.	▪ Weak evidence that use of facility is for cultural programming.	▪ Insufficient evidence that use of facility is for cultural programming.
▪ Strong evidence demonstrates need for project	▪ Satisfactory evidence demonstrates need for project	▪Does not sufficiently demonstrate need for project	▪Provides inadequate evidence of need for project
▪Project has high impact in the community.	▪Project has significant impact in the community.	▪Project has some impact in the community.	▪Project has little or no impact in the community.
▪Demonstrates widespread local support.	▪Demonstrates some local support.	▪Demonstrates weak local support.	▪Demonstrates little or no local support.
▪Operating forecast is well-defined, clear, and fully measureable ; clearly documents organization's ability to complete project.	▪ Satisfactory operating forecast, clear and measureable ; documents organization's ability to complete project.	▪Operating forecast is not fully measureable and weakly documents organization's ability to complete project.	▪Operating Forecast is not clear and/or measureable and does not document organization's ability to complete project.