

# VISITING ARTISTS 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:

- Overall Project Excellence
- Artistic Merit
- Community Impact & Engagement
- Community Integration

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
<b>Excellent</b>	Strongly demonstrates the public value of arts and culture. Merits the investment of State of Kansas funding.	<b>92-100</b>
<b>Good</b>	Satisfactorily demonstrates the public value of arts and culture. Merits the investment of State of Kansas funding.	<b>80-91</b>
<b>Fair</b>	Does not demonstrate the public value of arts and culture. Does not merit the investment of State of Kansas funding.	<b>61-79</b>
<b>Weak</b>	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. <b>Does not merit investment of State of Kansas funding.</b>	<b>0-60</b>

# PROJECT EXCELLENCE

**EXCELLENT**  
**37-40 POINTS**

**GOOD**  
**32-36 POINTS**

**FAIR**  
**25-31 POINTS**

**WEAK**  
**0-20 POINTS**

<p>The proposed project demonstrates exemplary overall excellence and conceptual foundation. The arts programming will have deep and lasting impact for the target community through interaction with professional artist(s).</p>	<p>The proposed project demonstrates strong overall excellence and conceptual foundation. It will provide substantial impact of arts programming for the target community through interaction with professional artist(s).</p>	<p>The proposed project demonstrates satisfactory overall excellence and conceptual foundation. The arts programming will have some impact for the target community through interaction with professional artist(s).</p>	<p>The proposed project does not demonstrate overall excellence nor conceptual foundation. The arts programming will not have sufficient impact for the target community through interaction with professional artist(s).</p>
<p>Clearly describes exemplary proposed programming and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities</p>	<p>Clearly describes proposed programming and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities</p>	<p>Describes proposed programming and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities</p>	<p>Inadequately describes proposed programming and its relevance to the intended participants, audiences, and communities</p>
<p>Support materials clearly demonstrate exemplary programming</p>	<p>Support materials clearly demonstrate commendable programming</p>	<p>Support materials demonstrate adequate programming</p>	<p>Support materials are unclear or do not demonstrate arts and cultural programming.</p>

# ARTISTIC MERIT

**EXCELLENT**  
**28-30 POINTS**

**GOOD**  
**24-27 POINTS**

**FAIR**  
**19-23 POINTS**

**WEAK**  
**0-18 POINTS**

Application demonstrates exemplary artistic merit and professionalism of the proposed visiting artist(s).	Application demonstrates strong artistic merit and professionalism of the proposed visiting artist(s).	Application demonstrates satisfactory artistic merit and professionalism of the proposed visiting artist(s).	Application does not demonstrate artistic merit nor professionalism of the proposed visiting artist(s).
If no specific artist is chosen at time of application, applicant clearly outlines a rigorous and thoughtful process for artistic selection which demonstrates high standards of the host organization for the Visiting Artist programming proposed.	If no specific artist is chosen at time of application, applicant clearly outlines a considered process for artistic selection which demonstrates high standards of the host organization for the Visiting Artist programming proposed.	If no specific artist is chosen at time of application, applicant outlines a process for artistic selection which demonstrates acceptable standards of the host organization for the Visiting Artist programming proposed.	No specific artist is chosen at time of application and applicant does not clearly outline a satisfactory process for artistic selection nor demonstrate high standards of the host organization for the Visiting Artist programming proposed.
Artist work samples are of top quality and demonstrate the breadth and depth of artists' proposed primary presentation program.	Artist work samples are strong and thoroughly demonstrate artists' proposed primary presentation program.	Artist work samples are satisfactory and demonstrate artists' proposed primary presentation program.	Artist work samples are not satisfactory nor demonstrate the artists' proposed primary presentation program.

# COMMUNITY IMPACT + ENGAGEMENT

<b>EXCELLENT</b> <b>19-20 POINTS</b>	<b>GOOD</b> <b>16-18 POINTS</b>	<b>FAIR</b> <b>13-15 POINTS</b>	<b>WEAK</b> <b>0-12 POINTS</b>
Evaluation methods are well defined, clear, and fully measurable, and are employed to help the organization achieve its proposed programs	Measureable evaluation methods are employed to help the organization achieve its proposed programs	Evaluation methods are not fully measureable and/or only minimally help the organization achieve its proposed programs	Evaluation methods are not clear and/or measureable and do not help the organization achieve its proposed programs
Extensive, thoughtful, and thorough complementary 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 the achievability within the grant period	Very minimal activities are proposed and/or there are serious concerns about the achievability within the grant period
Educational and outreach components fully serve the constituency and are appropriate for the programming	Educational and outreach components serve the constituency and are appropriate for the programming	Limited educational and outreach components serve the constituency and are minimally appropriate for the programming	Very minimal educational and outreach components do not serve the constituency and are not appropriate for the programming
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

# COMMUNITY INTEGRATION

**EXCELLENT  
10 POINTS**

**GOOD  
8-9 POINTS**

**FAIR  
7 POINTS**

**WEAK  
0-6 POINTS**

Clearly describes extensive partnerships/collaborations	Clearly describes satisfactory partnerships/collaborations	Limited partnerships/collaborations	Minimal and/or unclear partnerships/collaborations
Has completed the Section 504 Self Evaluation Workbook from the NEA in the last 2 years or (for first 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 nor the Abbreviated Accessibility Checklist
Significant, exemplary, and measurable access and outreach efforts to all Kansans. Has accessibility policy, procedures, and complaint process that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability.	Adequate and measurable access and outreach efforts to all Kansans. Has accessibility policy, procedures, and complaint process that address nondiscrimination on the basis of disability.	Cursory or immeasurable access and outreach efforts. Has accessibility policy, procedures, and complaint process that address nondiscrimination on the basis of disability.	No access and outreach efforts. Does not have accessibility policy, procedures, and complaint process that address non-discrimination on the basis of disability.