

CULTURE BLOCKS REVIEW RUBRIC

CRITERIA	SUBCATEGORIES KEY REVIEW POINTS	1 – NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	2 – BELOW AVERAGE	3 - SATISFACTORY	4 - STRONG	5 - EXCELLENT
Feasibility (The ability of the applicant to successfully implement the program)	Experience (<i>There is compelling evidence that the organization and/or creative individual can carry out this program effectively</i>)	The proposal lacks clear evidence that the applicant can execute the program. No timeline, resource, or capacity details are provided, and the proposed plan appears unrealistic for successful implementation.	Limited evidence that the applicant can deliver the program due to unclear logistics, missing details, or insufficient planning.	Some feasibility details are provided, but key aspects like timeline, resources, or capacity need further development. The proposal is generally feasible, though clarification is needed on timeline, staffing, or resources.	Strong feasibility with a realistic plan, well-structured timeline, and sufficient resources for successful implementation.	Excellent feasibility with compelling evidence that the applicant can successfully execute the program through a clear, well-structured, and realistic plan.
	Eligibility of Expenses (<i>Ensuring that the budget primarily supports direct program costs and does not include ineligible expenses</i>)	Budget contains ineligible expenses and does not prioritize direct program costs.	Some ineligible expenses are included and ineligible.	Mostly eligible expenses, but some aspects need refinement.	Budget primarily supports direct program costs with only minor concerns.	Fully compliant budget that prioritizes direct program costs effectively, demonstrating proper allocation of resources.
	Program Scope (<i>The extent to which the budget reflects the proposed program's scale and scope, ensuring it is reasonable and aligned with program activities</i>)	Budget is unrealistic, lacks detail, or does not align with the program scope.	Budget contains unclear or excessive expenses with weak justification, making feasibility uncertain.	Budget is somewhat reasonable but requires adjustments to better align with program activities.	Strong budget that aligns well with the proposed program activities.	Clear, well-justified budget that fully supports the program scope, demonstrating strong financial planning and feasibility.
CRITERIA	SUBCATEGORIES KEY REVIEW POINTS	1 – NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	2 – BELOW AVERAGE	3 - SATISFACTORY	4 - STRONG	5 - EXCELLENT
Mission Alignment (<i>How well the proposal aligns with Culture Blocks' goal of providing enriching arts, science, and history programming to Charlotte-Mecklenburg residents where they live.</i>)	Provide free arts, science, and history experiences.	The program does not align with Culture Blocks' mission and lacks cultural, artistic, or scientific engagement. It does not provide free access to participants.	Weak alignment with Culture Blocks' mission; program goals and purpose are unclear or need further development. Free access is not well defined or guaranteed.	Some alignment with Culture Blocks' mission, but aspects of the proposal need further refinement to fully meet program objectives. The program is free but may lack clarity on accessibility.	Strong alignment with Culture Blocks' mission, offering free, engaging, and enriching arts, science, or history experiences.	Fully aligned with Culture Blocks' mission, delivering high-quality, free cultural programming with clear strategies to ensure broad community access and participation.
	Themes by Block (<i>The program must align with themes identified by community members in each Block, as outlined in the Community Feedback Document and shaped by direct community input</i>) Community Feedback Document	The proposal does not align with the identified Themes for the Block(s) and lacks cultural, artistic, or scientific engagement. It does not reflect community input.	Weak connection to the Themes and limited incorporation of community input; the program's goals and purpose need clearer articulation.	Some alignment with the Themes, but key elements require further development to fully reflect community input and expectations.	The program demonstrates strong alignment with the Themes, incorporating community input to create engaging and enriching cultural experiences.	Fully aligned with the Themes, effectively integrating community input to offer a meaningful contribution to community arts, science, or history engagement.
	Geographic Areas (<i>The program effectively targets and increases access for residents in designated geographic areas and within the facility partners locations or other aligned facilities in the Blocks</i>) Geographic Areas	Proposed facility is not within the designated Culture Blocks geographic areas. No clear geographic focus or plan for reaching designated residents.	Weak geographic focus; unclear how the program increases access to creative experiences.	Some focus on geographic areas, but outreach strategies could be improved.	Strong geographic alignment with clear accessibility efforts.	Excellent geographic alignment, ensuring increased creative access for target communities.

CRITERIA	SUBCATEGORIES KEY REVIEW POINTS	1 – NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	2 – BELOW AVERAGE	3 - SATISFACTORY	4 - STRONG	5 - EXCELLENT
Community Engagement (How well the program involves and benefits the community, particularly in the target geographic areas)	Cultural Relevance (The extent to which the program is meaningful, inclusive, and accessible to diverse residents)	The proposal lacks a plan for engaging or benefiting the community. The program lacks cultural relevance or does not provide meaningful engagement.	Minimal community engagement: unclear how the program will involve residents or respond to community needs. Limited efforts toward cultural inclusiveness; accessibility is unclear or weak.	Some effort to engage the community, but lacks details on inclusivity and accessibility. Some cultural relevance and inclusivity, but the proposal could be more intentional in its approach.	Strong plan for community involvement with clear strategies for outreach and engagement. Strong cultural relevance with inclusive programming that reflects community diversity.	Excellent community engagement strategy; well-integrated resident input, inclusive outreach, and clear community benefits. Highly relevant and inclusive program with well-integrated cultural engagement strategies, ensuring meaningful impact.
	Impact & Outcomes (The extent to which the program will deliver clear, measurable benefits to the community, aligning with Culture Blocks' mission of providing enriching experiences rather than professional-level training)	No clear outcomes or community benefits identified.	Limited or vague outcomes that do not strongly align with Culture Blocks' goals.	Some measurable outcomes are identified, but they could be more specific or impactful.	Strong, measurable outcomes that clearly align with the program's goals.	Clear, well-defined, and measurable outcomes that strongly demonstrate community benefits and align with Culture Blocks' mission.
CRITERIA	SUBCATEGORIES KEY REVIEW POINTS	1 – NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	2 – BELOW AVERAGE	3 - SATISFACTORY	4 - STRONG	5 - EXCELLENT
Marketing & Communications (The effectiveness of the applicant's plan to reach their intended audience and communicate their program to the community) NOTE: Costs should not exceed 10% of the total project budget.	Outreach Strategy (How well the proposal outlines a plan to promote the program and engage the target audience.)	No clear outreach strategy; lacks details on how the program will reach the target audience and unclear how the program will attract participants.	Weak outreach strategy; limited efforts to engage the intended audience.	Outreach strategies are present but need more development, and the marketing plan lacks specific tactics and targeted outreach.	Strong marketing strategy with clear, well-defined outreach and promotional efforts.	Comprehensive marketing plan that effectively reaches the intended audience with well-targeted outreach and engagement strategies.
	Promotional Methods (The use of appropriate marketing tools (social media, flyers, community partnerships, etc.) to maximize program visibility.)	No promotional plan provided; unclear how the program will be advertised.	Minimal or vague promotional efforts; lacks diversity in marketing channels.	General promotional plan included, but it could be more detailed and targeted.	Strong promotional strategy utilizing multiple marketing channels effectively.	Well-integrated, strategic promotion using diverse and effective marketing channels to maximize community awareness.
	Accessibility & Inclusivity in Marketing (How well the applicant ensures their marketing efforts are inclusive, culturally relevant, and accessible to diverse audiences.)	No consideration for accessibility or inclusivity in marketing materials and outreach.	Limited inclusivity; outreach may not effectively reach diverse or underserved populations.	Some efforts to make marketing materials accessible and inclusive, but more intentionality is needed.	Clear attention to inclusive and accessible marketing, ensuring diverse community engagement.	Highly inclusive and accessible marketing approach that intentionally reaches a broad and diverse audience.