

Scoring Rap Tax Cultural Applications:

- 1) Artistic/Cultural Vibrancy = 7 points
- 2) Public Benefit/Outreach = 7 points
- 3) Organizational Capacity = 7 points

Total of 21 points possible per organization

Score	Rank	Rank Descriptions
7	Exemplary	A "perfect" application with virtually every criteria surpassing requirements. Fully meets or exceeds all four aspects of Artistic/Cultural Vibrancy, all five aspects of Public Benefit/Outreach, and all seven aspects of Organizational Capacity. The application is fully complete, well organized, and clear. Such an applicant has a history of being awarded and making excellent use of past RAP Tax grants.
6	Excellent	An application that addresses all aspects of Artistic/Cultural Vibrancy, Public Benefit/Outreach, and Organizational Capacity. <u>This rating is indicative of one which is complete in every detail but does not consistently surpass the categorical considerations as would an exemplary application.</u> Demonstrated past effective use and accounting of past RAP Tax grants is critical for this ranking.
5	Very Good	An application that adequately addresses <u>nearly all</u> of the categorical considerations to the extent the organization has demonstrated a high likelihood of successfully utilizing a grant should it be awarded. If this is a returning applicant, demonstrated effective use of past RAP Tax grants should be evident.
4	Good	<u>Sufficient evidence</u> is provided throughout the application that demonstrates funding criteria are met. The application is mostly clear and seems appropriate. The budget is realistic and reasonably aligned with the narrative. The applicant documents their activities are of good or average quality and relevant. A reasonable accounting of good use of past RAP grant funding is presented.
3	Average	The applicant provides <u>limited</u> evidence throughout the application that demonstrates funding criteria is most likely met. The application is appropriate but with limited detail. The budget is not particularly well-aligned with the narrative. The applicant provides limited documentation of the quality of the activities.
2	Marginal	The applicant provides <u>very limited</u> evidence throughout the application that demonstrates funding criteria are met. The application has limited detail to the extent the use of funds and proposed activities are unclear. The budget is not well-aligned with the narrative. The applicant provides limited or no documentation of the quality of the activities.
1	Weak	<u>Applicant fails to demonstrate</u> funding criteria are met. Proposed use of funds and quality of activities are unclear. The budget request is not supported by the narrative. Ideally, feedback is given that would help the applicant submit an acceptable grant request in the future.
0	Unacceptable	The applicant provides insufficient information and does not meet the minimum requirements.