Downtown Arts and Culture Overlay Revitalization Grant Program Scoring Rubric

Instructions to Applicants:

Please review this scoring rubric carefully as each project will be ranked based on the scoring methodology outlined above.

Scoring Objectives and Qualifying Scores:

A total of 90 points are available per submission. A minimum score of 60 total points is required to be considered for funding. Meeting a minimum threshold of 60 points does not guarantee that a project will be funded. Instead, projects that do not meet the minimum score threshold will not be considered for funding. The Review Committee may ask that proposals that do not meet the minimum threshold for scoring resubmit applications at a later date. Applications are reviewed on a rolling basis thus high scoring applications submitted at a later date may not be funded as funding may not be available. Additionally, applications that score high, may not be recommended for funding based on a variety of factors, such as tax delinquencies, outside of this scoring rubric.

Scoring Process:

Applications will be scored by the five review committee members. This Committee was designated by Ordinance 2023-14 and convened by the Community Development Director. Each member will review applications independently and then scores will be tabulated by the Community Development Director. Scores for each criteria will be averaged and then compiled to create one preliminary score. If the average score meets the minimum threshold (60 points), applicants will be invited to give a presentation to the review committee to pitch their project. Once a presentation is given, the Review Committee will have the opportunity to review the original score and issue a final score after presentations.

Documentation Required:

- Proof of Ownership or Long-term lease
- Detailed Cost Estimates
- Long-Term Plan for the Project
- Narrative that explains how funds will be used
- Proof of additional financing and/or funding to cover remainder of project
- Timeline with specific dates for project milestones
- **Please Submit a Self-Score Assessment of your project with your application**

Criteria	Excellent (9-10)	Good (6-8)	Average (3-5)	Poor (0-2)	Comments
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Project description is clear with strong evidence of careful planning, thought and research. Project is broken down into distinct and manageable parts.	Project description is general but it is still a good project/idea that can be understood.	Project description needs clarity and further planning. Still, it is possible to understand what the project/idea is.	Unclear project description or lacks planning and research.	
EVALUATION OF PROJECT	There is a detailed and clearly defined and outlined plan for documenting and evaluating the success of the grant. Each element has documentation, quotes, and/or designs associated with it.	There is an outlined plan for documenting and evaluating the success of the grant.	Plan for documenting and evaluating the success of the grant is present but not extensive.	No plans for documenting and/or evaluating the success of the grant, or plans are limited or unclear.	
BUDGET	The submitted budget is clear and detailed. Budget items are directly tied to budget activities. All planning activities are incorporated into the budget and can be completed in the established timeline.	The budget identifies specific activities but is lacking detail. One or more project activities may not be feasible within the established timeline.	The budget description is scant, lacks detail, and may not completely match the project description. At least one budget item is not tied to project activities.	Budget significantly lacks detail, does not match the project activities and cannot be accomplished within the timeline.	

Criteria	Excellent (9-10)	Good (6-8)	Average (3-5)	Poor (0-2)	Comments
IMPACT ON COMMUNITY	Potential to profoundly impact a significant and diverse amount of people in the community through enhancement of local character and contribution to economic development.	Potential for impact on a specific group within the community. Modest contribution to local character and/or economic development.	Potential for some impact on community character and economic development.	Lacks potential to impact student learning or how it would influence learning is unclear.	
FEASABILITY	Personnel, project activities timeline, and budget expenditures congruent with project description and outcomes. A clear narrative outlining the processes that will take place to ensure the project reaches completion within the allotted timeframe is attached.	Deficiencies or overestimations exist in personnel, timeline, or budget within tolerable range, outcomes appear achievable despite gaps or leaps.	Project's assembled personnel, timeline, or budget expose weaknesses in plan design. Outcomes unlikely to be achieved in project's current form.	Insufficient information about personnel, project activities timeline, or budget expenditures to gauge feasibility.	

Criteria	Excellent (9-10)	Good (6-8)	Average (3-5)	Poor (0-2)	Comments
INNOVATION	Idea distinguishes itself from others. It is original, innovative, and creative. Demonstrates a new way of thinking and meets a current or emerging need within the community.	An engaging and interesting idea. Somewhat creative or innovative. Community experience would be positive.	A good idea but not very creative or innovative. Community would find the idea enjoyable.	Not creative, not innovative, not enriching to the community.	
SUSTAINABILITY	Evidence presented that project or its impact can be sustained locally beyond grant period, if results warrant.	Project is temporary, designed to end when grant ends, or some effort to secure commitment beyond grant period is represented.	Plans for future are stated as assumptions without supporting arguments or evidence.	No meaningful plans for future beyond funding term appear in proposal.	
TIMELINE	Timeline gives specific and doable start and end dates for the duration of the project.	Timeline gives start and end dates for the duration of the project. Some dates are questionable or unrealistic.	Timeline does not consist of all elements of the project; dates given are unrealistic.	Timeline is incomplete or nonexistent; no estimates for start or end dates were provided.	

Criteria	Excellent (9-10)	Good (6-8)	Average (3-5)	Poor (0-2)	Comments
FUNDING AMOUNT REQUESTED	Project is requesting minimum grant award ($15,000)	Project is requesting award amount of $15,001 to $25,000	Project is requesting award amount of $25,001 to $35,000	Project is requesting award amount of $35,001 to $50,000 (Note: awards of $50,000 receive o points)	
Column Score					
Total Score					