

Creative Aging, Creative Futures Direct Grant Adjudication Rubric

Panelist Name:	
Date:	

Panelist considerations when scoring proposals:

1. The primary intention of the CACF grant program is to help SAAs deliver more arts learning programs (i.e., creative aging "classes") to more older adults in their state.
2. Criteria 1-3 are weighted at 3 points each. Criteria 4 is weighted at 3 points. Maximum score is 30 points.
3. Panelists may indicate a finer grain score within the 3-point spread in each tier of evidence. Please use whole number scores.
4. Panelists should review the Creative Aging, Creative Futures grant guidelines as a precursor to adjudication.
5. Panelists should review the Leveraging State Investments in Creative Aging final report as a precursor to adjudication.
6. If you have any questions about the application materials, supporting materials or scoring process, please contact NASAA's Arts Learning Projects Director Susan Oetgen, susan.oetgen@nasaa-arts.org

Thank you for your time and effort!

Threshold Criterion: Arts Learning Program Delivery Focus

In this application, is the primary focus on the delivery of arts learning programs for older adults?

Panelist observations:	Panelist score:	YES/NO
	If no, please do not score further.	

Criterion 1: Opportunity for Impact (9 points)

Do the application materials present a project that addresses specific opportunities to initiate or expand creative aging programs in their state?

When considering evidence of this criterion in the application, look for information such as, the prepared project:

- creator new or reizes current opportunities to initiate or expand creative aging in the state
- articulates benefits for older adults and creative aging providers in the state
- reflects an understanding of best practices for working with older adults, including equity and inclusion
- is informed by lessons learned from their own or other state arts agency's prior creative aging projects

The list of considerations above is not exhaustive. If this application offers additional evidence pertinent to the criterion, please make note of it below.

Strong Evidence (1-3 points)	Some Evidence (4-6 points)	Little Evidence (1-3 points)	No Evidence (0 points)	Criterion 1
Panelist observations:				Panelist score:
				0

Criterion 2: Access to Creative Aging in Underserved Communities (9 points)

Do the application materials present a project that will ensure access to creative aging in underserved communities?

When considering evidence of this criterion in the application, look for information such as, the prepared project:

- indicator which populations lack access to creative aging resources or programming
- includes strategies for serving older adults, teaching artists and/or program partners in underserved communities
- considers input from project beneficiary and stakeholders
- in ways that are appropriate for the specific state environment, embodies practices of diversity, equity, access and inclusion

The list of considerations above is not exhaustive. If this application offers additional evidence pertinent to the criterion, please make note of it below.

Strong Evidence (1-3 points)	Some Evidence (4-6 points)	Little Evidence (1-3 points)	No Evidence (0 points)	Criterion 2
Panelist observations:				Panelist score:
				0

Criterion 3: Project Feasibility and Management (9 points)

Do the application materials indicate that the state arts agency can successfully manage and complete the proposed project in a timely way?