

Evaluation Rubric

The following rubric is for activity grant programs using three assessment criteria: artistic merit, impact and feasibility. The rubric is used as applicable, based on the context and/or priorities of each grant program, as described in the program guidelines. Applications must be graded as 3/5 or higher to be considered for funding.

I. Artistic Merit (40% of total score)

Rating: Excellent (5)

- **Clear and compelling** history and achievements.
- **Vital and relevant** artistic / cultural / aesthetic / geographic / language / community influences.
- **Distinctive and compelling** intended activity; support material demonstrates high artistic quality, clearly related to the project, and demonstrates the artistic skills necessary to complete the project successfully.
- Choice of artistic collaborators **highly relevant** to activity, clarity on what they will bring to the project, with the right expertise in the art form and appropriate cultural knowledge.
- **Distinct** artistic goals and rationale, robust ideas on outcomes.

Rating: Very Good (4)

- **Clear and defined** history and achievements.
- **Relevant** artistic / cultural / aesthetic / geographic / language / community influences.
- **Distinctive and interesting** intended activity; support material that is high quality, related to the project, and demonstrates the artistic skills necessary to complete the project successfully.
- Choice of artistic collaborators **relevant** to activity, clarity on what they will bring to the project, with good expertise in the art form and appropriate cultural knowledge.
- **Clear** artistic goals and rationale, good ideas on outcomes.

Rating: Good (3)

- **Defined** history and achievements.
- **Clear** artistic / cultural / aesthetic / geographic / language / community influences.
- **Distinctive intended** activity; support material that is good quality, related to the project, and demonstrates artistic skills relevant to the project.
- Choice of artistic collaborators **relevant** to activity, information on what they will bring to the project, with expertise in the art form and appropriate cultural knowledge.

- **Clear** artistic goals and rationale, reasonable ideas on outcomes.

Rating: Fair (2)

- **Vague or incomplete** history and achievements.
- **Imprecise** artistic / cultural / aesthetic / geographic / language / community influences.
- **General intended** activity; support material that doesn't sufficiently demonstrate quality of past work or evidence of artistic skills relevant to the project.
- Choice of artistic collaborators **not particularly relevant** to activity, insufficient information on what they will bring to the project, lack of expertise in the art form, some appropriate cultural knowledge.
- **Unclear** artistic goals and rationale, few ideas on outcomes.

Rating: Poor (1)

- **Poor** history and achievements.
- **Missing or irrelevant** artistic / cultural / aesthetic / geographic / language / community influences.
- **Unclear or irrelevant** intended activity; support material that doesn't demonstrate quality of past work or evidence of artistic skills relevant to the project.
- Choice of artistic collaborators not relevant to activity, little or no information on what they will bring to the project, little expertise in the art form, little appropriate cultural knowledge.
- **Unclear** artistic goals and rationale, with no details on outcomes.

II. Impact (40% of total score)

Note for Public Art Grant Program: When assessing impact, please consider the extent to which the public art project/artwork is accessible to the public.

Rating: Excellent (5)

- **Clear and relevant** goals and precise plans for having an impact on applicant, other artists, communities, audiences, participants.
- **Unique and compelling** contribution to applicant's development or group's objectives.
- If the project has collaborators: **well-chosen and highly appropriate** collaborators, with detailed and respectful interactions, and major contributions to the project.

Rating: Very Good (4)

- **Clear and achievable** goals and plans for having an impact on applicant, other artists, communities, audiences, participants.

- **Clear and appropriate** contribution to applicant's development or group's objectives.
- If the project has collaborators: **well-chosen and appropriate** collaborators, with detailed interactions, and significant contributions to the project.

Rating: Good (3)

- Goals and plans for having an impact on applicant, other artists, communities, audiences, participants.
- **Explicit** contribution to applicant's development or group's objectives.
- If the project has collaborators: appropriate collaborators, with **detailed interactions, and clear contributions** to the project.

Rating: Fair (2)

- **Vague** goals and plans for having an impact on applicant, other artists, communities, audiences, participants.
- **Unclear** contribution to applicant's development or group's objectives.
- If the project has collaborators: identified collaborators, with **unclear interactions, and unclear contributions** to the project.

Rating: Poor (1)

- Poor goals and plans for having an impact on applicant, other artists, communities, audiences, participants.
- No discernible contribution to applicant's development or group's objectives.
- If the project has collaborators: collaborators not described well, with little rationale, unclear interactions, and no contributions to the project.

III. Feasibility (20% of total score)

Rating: Excellent (5)

- Past history of project and budget management is **clear, relevant** to the current project and indicates a high probability of success.
- The work plan is **coherent and realistic**, includes all the major activities required, and has sufficient time and resources dedicated to each phase.
- Plans for raising sufficient funds to realize the project, including in-kind donations if **relevant**, are robust and realistic, and include an appropriate mix of revenues to the project, applicant and community; there is a strong contingency plan.
- Projections of fees and other expenses are backed up by careful **research and planning**, and compensate artists appropriately.

Rating: Very Good (4)

- Past history of project and budget management is clear, **relevant** to the current project and indicates a probability of success.
- The work plan is **realistic**, includes all the major activities required, and has sufficient time and resources dedicated to each phase.
- Plans for raising sufficient funds to realize the project, including in-kind donations if **relevant**, are appropriate and realistic, and include an appropriate mix of revenues (appropriate to the project, applicant and community); there is a realistic contingency plan.
- Projections of fees and other expenses are backed up by **research and planning**, and compensate artists appropriately.

Rating: Good (3)

- Past history of project and budget management is **relevant** to the current project and indicates some probability of success.
- The work plan is **realistic**, includes general categories of activity, and has sufficient time dedicated to each phase.
- Plans for raising sufficient funds to realize the project, including in-kind donations if relevant, are **realistic**, and include an appropriate mix of revenues (appropriate to the project, applicant and community); there is a contingency plan.
- **Most projections** of fees and other expenses are backed up by **research and planning**, and compensate artists appropriately.

Rating: Fair (2)

- Past history of project and budget management is **not relevant** to the current project and doesn't indicate probability of success.
- The work plan has **missing elements**, and has dedicated to one or more phase.
- Plans for raising sufficient funds to realize the project, including in-kind donations if relevant, are unrealistic, and don't include an appropriate mix of revenues (appropriate to the project, applicant and community); there is an **unrealistic contingency plan**.
- **Some projections** of fees and other expenses are backed up by research and planning, and artist compensation is **insufficient**.

Rating: Poor (1)

- There is **little past history** of project and budget management, and **no indicators** of the probability of success.
- The work plan is **unrealistic**, is **incomplete**, and has **insufficient** time and resources dedicated to each phase.
- There are **no plans** for raising sufficient funds to realize the project, including in-kind donations if relevant, and there is no appropriate mix of revenues (appropriate to the project, applicant and community); there is no contingency plan.

- Projections of fees and other expenses are **not backed** up by research and planning, and artist compensation is insufficient.