PUBLIC ART & MURALS
SCORING RUBRIC

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 four criteria scored by panelists:
Project Excellence
Management Plan
Strategic Goals & Economic Impact
Community Impact & Engagement

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 the public value of arts and culture. Merits the investment of State of Kansas funding.	**92-100**
Good	Satisfactorily demonstrates the public value of arts and culture. Merits the investment of State of Kansas funding.	**80-91**
Fair	Does not demonstrate the public value of arts and culture. Does not merit the investment of State of Kansas funding.	**61-79**
Weak	Makes an incomplete and/or inadequate case for the public value of arts and culture. Information is confusing, unclear, lacks specific details, and/or is not arts-and-culture focused. **Does not merit investment of State of Kansas funding.**	**0-60**

EXCELLENCE

EXCELLENT 37-40 POINTS	GOOD 32-36 POINTS	FAIR 25-31 POINTS	WEAK 0-20 POINTS
Application clearly describes the project and its impact on community vibrancy; programs/activities described fully support the project goals	Application describes the project and its impact on community vibrancy; programs/activities described support the project goals	Application describes the project and its impact on community vibrancy; programs/activities described do not fully support the project goals	Application does not describe the project and its impact on community vibrancy; programs/activities described do not fully support the project goals
Clearly describes exemplary proposed public art installation and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities	Clearly describes proposed public art installation and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities	Describes proposed public art installation and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities	Inadequately describes proposed public art installation and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities
Application demonstrates exemplary creativity and quality of project design for maximum cultural impact.	Application demonstrates clear creativity and quality of project design for maximum cultural impact.	Application demonstrates satisfactory creativity and quality of project design for maximum cultural impact.	Application does not demonstrate creativity and quality of project design for maximum cultural impact.
Proposal will fully activate a publicly accessible space for artistic expression and public engagement, and it will very strongly increase community vibrancy	Proposal will significantly activate a publicly accessible space for artistic expression and public engagement, and it will significantly increase community vibrancy	Proposal will satisfactorily activate a publicly accessible space for artistic expression and public engagement, and it will satisfactorily increase community vibrancy	Proposal will not satisfactorily activate a publicly accessible space for artistic expression and public engagement, and it will not satisfactorily increase community vibrancy
Support materials clearly demonstrate exemplary programming	Support materials clearly demonstrate commendable programming	Support materials demonstrate adequate programming	Support materials are unclear or do not demonstrate arts and cultural programming.

MANAGEMENT

EXCELLENT 19-20 POINTS	GOOD 16-18 POINTS	FAIR 13-15 POINTS	WEAK 0-12 POINTS
Application demonstrates strong ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget and project management information	Application demonstrates satisfactory ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget and project management information	Application demonstrates acceptable ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget and project management information	Application does not demonstrate ability to carry out the proposed activities given the grant proposal budget, and project management information
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 there are concerns about achievability within the grant period	Very minimal activities are proposed and/or there are serious concerns about achievability within the grant period
Application demonstrates strong capability to sustain the project after the grant period; Ongoing installation maintenance plans are thorough	Application demonstrates satisfactory capability to sustain the project after the grant period; Ongoing maintenance of the installation is being considered	Application demonstrates an effort to sustain the project after the grant period; Ongoing maintenance of the installation is addressed	Application does not demonstrate effort to sustain the project after the grant period; Ongoing maintenance of the installation is not addressed
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 ineffective marketing/promotion/publicity and audience development and expansion efforts

GOALS + IMPACT

EXCELLENT 19-20 POINTS	GOOD 16-18 POINTS	FAIR 13-15 POINTS	WEAK 0-12 POINTS
Fully identifies clear goals and measurable objectives and activities	Identifies clear goals and measurable objectives and activities	Identifies some goals and limited measurable activities and objectives	Does not identify goals and very minimal objectives and activities
Evaluation methods are very well defined, clear, and fully measureable, and are employed to help the organization achieve the proposed installation	Evaluation methods are clearly outlined and employed to help the organization achieve the proposed installation	Evaluation methods are noted and considered to help the organization achieve the proposed installation	Evaluation methods are not clearly outlined nor employed to ensure success of the proposed installation
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
Provides compelling and specific information about extensive economic impact of proposed public art installation*	Demonstrates significant economic impact of proposed public art installation*	Describes limited economic impact of proposed public art installation*	Describes very minimal economic impact of proposed public art installation or is not measurable*

**Panelists should consider multiple factors involving economic impact including organization mission, geographic location, etc.*

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

EXCELLENT 19-20 POINTS	GOOD 16-18 POINTS	FAIR 13-15 POINTS	WEAK 0-12 POINTS
The benefit of the proposed project for the local community residents, regional residents, and state is exemplary.	The benefit of the proposed project for the local community residents, regional residents, and state is strong.	The benefit of the proposed project for the local community residents, regional residents, and state is satisfactory.	The benefit of the proposed project for the local community residents, regional residents, and state is not clear nor satisfactory.
Community outreach components fully serve the constituency and are thoughtful, applicable, and appropriate for the programming. The project is planning numerous engagement directions, though only one is required.	Community outreach components serve the constituency and are appropriate for the programming. The project is planning robust engagement to thoroughly fulfill the requirement.	Community outreach components serve the constituency and are appropriate for the programming. The project is planning engagement that fulfills the requirement.	Community outreach components do not serve the constituency nor are appropriate for the programming. The project proposal does not fulfill the engagement requirement.
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
Significant, exemplary, and measurable efforts towards access and outreach to all Kansans; Has accessibility policy, procedures and complaint process that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability	Adequate and measurable efforts towards access and outreach to all Kansans; Has accessibility policy, procedures and complaint process that address nondiscrimination on the basis of disability	Cursory or immeasurable efforts towards access and outreach; Has accessibility policy, procedures and complaint process that address nondiscrimination on the basis of disability	No effort towards access and outreach; Does not have accessibility policy, procedures and complaint process that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability