

Instructions for panel members:

Each column corresponds to a question or set of questions from the application. We have tried to identify how to evaluate each organization's responses. This rubric should give you a general idea of what elements a 'best answer' would articulate in the top row (green), what is 'acceptable' in the second row (yellow), and 'needing improvement' in the bottom row (red).

Scoring:

You will be asked to assign a score of 8, 5, or 2 to each of the three scored sections (artistic excellence & museum best practice, community engagement, sound management). This should be generally representative of the section. For example, if an organization provides an exceptional answer to one question in a section, but their responses in the other two questions need a lot of work, then you might give the section a score of 5. If the majority of the work represented is fantastic, then give a score of 8. Please note that a score of 5 should not be considered to be a bad score - it is a median number that represents good but not extraordinary work. Do the best you can to be consistent in how you score all of your assigned applications.

Additional notes:

- Please check your bias! We all have biases and the Utah Arts & Museums grants program wants to serve all Utahns through this public granting program. Practice a spirit of generosity towards all grant applications.
- Do not compare an application to another application. Each grant application deserves to be reviewed on its own merits in relation to industry best practices and standards.
- Review the work of the organization rather than grammar or writing skills. Please do your best to focus on the content of the text rather than the format.

Section 1: Artistic Excellence/Museums Best Practice (35%)		
QUESTIONS ASKED: Mission statement + organization description+ artistic excellence or museum best practices.	QUESTION ASKED: Supporting documentation to demonstrate the quality of your work/institution.	QUESTION ASKED: What do you do to foster growth within your organization?
The mission of the organization is primarily arts or museums and the application gives a good understanding of the work they do. The organization clearly demonstrates how artistic excellence or museums best practices are reflected in their programming/events.	The work samples demonstrate either artistic excellence or museums best practices. As a panelist, you can clearly understand the quality of the organization and the programs they produce. It is acceptable for artistic excellence to reflect the community, which means that a rural organization should not be measured by the same yardstick as a multi-million dollar organization.	The organization is able to talk about what it is doing to adapt and improve. As described in the help text for this question, an organization could be talking about expansion, redirection of resources, investing in volunteers or staff with training, bringing in external experts in the field, or streamlining programs to address organizational resources. We appreciate thoughtful answers.
The approach that the organization uses to achieve artistic excellence or best practices in museum collections management are adequate, but perhaps not fully explained by the organization.	The work samples are adequate but do not reflect excellence or programming that is reflective of the community served.	We are looking for an answer that shows that the organization is giving some attention to its own internal health. An adequate answer may have a very limited scope or indicate that it is maintaining the status quo.
The organization did not explain how artistic excellence or museums best practice was evident in their programming/events or there are clear problems with the work of the organization.	The work samples are inadequate, they do not represent the organization well. Examples do not show artistic excellence or museum best practices.	The organization does not discuss what they are currently doing or what they plan to do to refine or advance their work. No examples are provided.

Section 2: Community Involvement and Access (30%)			
QUESTION ASKED: Describe the communities the organization serves. Describe who is engaging with the organization.	QUESTION ASKED: What would you tell a legislator about the value the community receives from the organization and why your organization merits public funding?	QUESTION ASKED: How have you partnered, collaborated, or engaged with historically underrepresented communities in the past two years?	QUESTION ASKED: How can people with varying disabilities access or request accommodations to participate in your organization's programs?
The answers demonstrate that the applicant understands and serves their community in a thoughtful and engaging way. The applicant provides census data as a reference in their answer.	The organization has a great "elevator speech" and you feel compelled to provide funding. The organization is a strong Utah asset.	The organization clearly explains how they have worked with underrepresented communities with programs and policies. They provide examples of ways they have fostered connections and what the impact of those connections are.	The organization has demonstrated how they will be inclusive of individuals by offering services for two or more types of disabilities. Organization may reference attending Breaking Barriers and/or may provide an accessibility plan.
The organization serves a limited, but clearly defined section of the community. They may not fully understand or articulate their role in the community. The applicant may or may not make reference to census data.	The organization does a good job of explaining the work of their organization and the benefit to the community.	The organization does an adequate job explaining how they have worked with or made connections with underrepresented communities. Organization does not discuss how these connections had an impact on their organization long-term.	The organization's accommodations for individuals with disabilities are limited (i.e. only wheelchair access). Additional plans for other accommodations are in the planning stages only.
The organization explains who they think are in their community but there are no statistics or the information is inaccurate.	The organization does not demonstrate their benefit to the community and does not make a compelling case for public funding.	The organization is not working with underrepresented communities to ensure inclusion in their programming or internal policies.	The organization has not prioritized or made accommodations for individuals with disabilities.

Section 3: Sound Management (35%)		
REVIEW: Uploaded budget form.	QUESTIONS ASKED: Budget narrative + Describe how you anticipate your budget will change next year.	QUESTION ASKED: What data do you collect and how does it influence your work?
The budget sheet was correctly completed and it appears that the organization is in good fiscal health.	The budget narrative provides helpful information and answers questions that you may have had when reading it. The organization provided a clear description of how their budget is expected to change in the next two years. They outlined how they would either grow, contract, or stay the same, and why.	The organization clearly explained what data they collect and how they collect, organize, and utilize this data to inform their current work and/or future programming.
The budget sheet has some noticeable errors but otherwise, the organization is in good fiscal health.	There is a budget narrative that provides explanations that are somewhat helpful. The organization provided a brief description of how their budget is expected to change in the next two years. The organization may have provided unrealistic growth expectations without justification.	The organization collects data but they do little to organize, or utilize the data to inform their work.
The budget has significant errors and there are concerns about the fiscal health of the organization. The organization is operating at a deficit.	The budget narrative provides very little explanation and leaves more questions than answers. The organization did not explain how or why their budget would change in the next two years.	The organization is not collecting any data to inform their programming or they collect data but do not explain how they organize or utilize it to inform their programming.
NOTE: The question about how the applicant will spend their GOS money is not scored, and therefore is not included in this rubric.		