

Application Scoring RubricMusic Education Partnership Grants

	C	HIGHLY COMPETITIVE 5 points	VERY COMPETITIVE 4 points		COMPETITIVE PPLICATIONS 3 points	SOMEWHAT COMPETITIVE 2 points		MINIMALLY OMPETITIVE 1 point	NON- COMPETITIVE 0 points
Project Alignment & Desig	gn -								
Description & Need (20 po 1. Describe the work the community and if no	oints hat v	s total) will be done using				accessible opport	tunit	ies for group sir	nging in your
Proposed Partnership & Ability to Increase Access	•	Clear detailed des partnership and he access to music e	ow it increases	•	Applicant provides the partnership pro though there may clarity regarding the fulfills within the co	ogramming, be a lack of ne need this	•	The programming defined, or expla	g is not clearly described, ined.
Score									
Proposed Program Implementation	•	Applicant describes students will meet sequential learning available to provide engagement.	and the types of gopportunities	•	Applicant provides about the learning information regard implementation is	process, but more ling program	•	Information abou implementation is present at all.	t the program s severely lacking or not
Score									
Concept Alignment with Core Values	•	Concept strongly a America's core va		•	Concept is related America's core va		•		ot align with the priorities ortunity and Chorus
Score									
Skill Sets Matched to School Needs	•	Skill sets of individent intentionally match of the school(s) to	ned to the needs	•	Individuals involve to carry out progra	d have the skill sets im activities.	•		iduals involved are m the needs of the (s) to be served.
Score									
Total Score for Description & Need									

	HIGHLY COMPETITIVE 5 points	VERY COMPETITIVE 4 points	_	COMPETITIVE PPLICATIONS 3 points	SOMEWHAT COMPETITIVE 2 points		MINIMALLY OMPETITIVE 1 point	NON- COMPETITIVE 0 points
Community Informed Pro								
2. How was this progra						luen	cing your propo	sed project? How is
this project respons			es a				0 1 1 11	1. 1.
Program Catalyst & Co-Creation	Clear description the programming co-created with the be served.	and how it was	•	Unclear why the p created and wheth responding to a co	ner it was	•	by program leade	orogram was driven solely ership and not in the community to be
Score								
Community Voice		nas been informed ce and aligns with s value on co-	•	Program design h by experts or staff taken into conside voice.	but has not	•	makes assumption	ds of different cultural
Score								
Community Influence on Artistic Product	Students, parents educators strongl artistic product.		•	Diverse musical tr repertoire may be programming cho staff or musical di	planned, but ices are made by	•	Artistic product o and musical tradileadership.	nly reflects the cultural itions of program
Score								
Adapting to Changing School Needs	There is a proces outside input and changing school in	adapting to	•	The project has so adapt to changing		•	Project is at risk of school needs to of	of not succeeding if change.
Score								
Total Score for Com- Informed Prog. Design								
Goals & Understanding of 3. What are your spec			ou d	efine success?				
Understanding & Measuring Success	Meaningful chang defined and can be measured.		•	Some change is possible either not achieved relevance.	,	•		ot define success or understanding of what ng to achieve.
Score								
Defined Goals Increase Access	Clear goals have and will increase education.		•	Goals have been unclear whether a education will incr	ccess to music	•	No clear goals id access to music	entified. Unclear education will increase.
Score								
Total Score for Goals/Success								

	HIGHLY COMPETITIVE 5 points	VERY COMPETITIVE 4 points		OMPETITIVE PPLICATIONS 3 points	SOMEWHAT COMPETITIVE 2 points		MINIMALLY OMPETITIVE 1 point	NON- COMPETITIVE 0 points
Project Impact - 50%							-	
History with Students & C	ommitment to Equ	ity (25 total point	s)					
4. Describe your histor	y with the students t	o be served by yo	ur pi	roject. How is yo	ur programming t	ailor	ed to the needs	of the students you
are serving? What a	ctions are you taking	g to support equity	/?					
Relationships	 Demonstrates exi 	sting relationships	•	Demonstrates that	t relationship-	•	Does not demon	strate history working
	with the identified			building is occurri				schools identified in the
	indicate roots in the	ne community.		identified commun	nity.		application.	Γ
Score								
Cultural Competency	 Articulates how pr be provided in a c competent manner 	ulturally	•	Unclear how prog provided in a cultumanner.		•		t programming will be turally competent
Score								
Tailoring Programming to Students' Needs	 Can clearly articul demonstrate how conditions that allo to participate fully 	they are creating ow for all students	•	Programming only how they conditio created to allow s participate fully ar	tudents to	•	Programming is needs.	not tailored to students'
Score								
Communication	The staff and/or to speak (and mater the home language)	ials are available in)	•	Applicant in the p staff who speak th (and creating mat	ne home language	•		barriers between staff artists are present but ddressed.
Score								
Program Logistics Account for Student/Parent Needs	Transportation ne considered, and h programming are students and pare	ours of convenient for	•	There is an aware and parent needs program logistics, yet identified.	regarding	•	Program logistics transportation) do students and par	
Score				•				
Total Score for Student Hist. & Commit to Equity			•			•		
Cultural Exchange & Cros	s-Cultural Learning	g (25 points total))					
Describe the opport	unities for cross-cult	ural exchange and	d lea	rning in your pro	ject. What are the	mu	sical traditions,	repertoire, and
techniques that will	be explored and who	will teach them?		-				
Musical Learning Objectives	Applicant has ider traditions, repertor techniques to be t	ire, and/or	•	Applicant is explo musical traditions, techniques to be t	, repertoire, and/or	•		t identified musical pire, and/or techniques
Score				1			-	
Partners	Applicant is partner understand and he traditions outside		•	Partners may hav but relationships h built to support thi	nave not yet been	•	Artistic product o and musical trad leadership.	nly reflects the cultural itions of program
Score								
2010		1	1		l	1		l

	CO	HIGHLY MPETITIVE 5 points	VERY COMPETITIVE 4 points	_	OMPETITIVE PPLICATIONS 3 points	SOMEWHAT COMPETITIVE 2 points		MINIMALLY COMPETITIVE 1 point	NON- COMPETITIVE 0 points
Sharing Cultures	r \	Applicant also shamusical traditions way that demonst appreciation for distyles and repertors.	with others in a rates respect and ifferent musical	•	Sharing of culture one direction.	s may flow in only	•		a lack of sensitivity or stand musical traditions n.
Score									
Cultural Context	r			•	Limited opportunit to learn about mu context.		•		identified for students usic's cultural context.
Score									
Authentic & Mutually Beneficial Cultural Exchange	f	The project providor authentic and openeficial cultural	mutually	•	The project reflect exchange.	ts a lack of mutual	•	There are no opposed exchange present	portunities for cultural nt.
Score									
Total Score for Cultural Exchange & Learning									•
TOTAL SCORE Out of 100									

Equity Data

This grant program is committed to serving partnerships in specific communities where music education opportunities may be limited by socioeconomics, systemic racism, and/or geography. Additional points will be awarded based on the following to support increased access to music education.

music education.												
	10 points	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points						
Student Population (10 points total)												
What percentage of the you	What percentage of the youth served by your project represent historically marginalized communities?											
	90-100%	70-89%	50-69%	30-49%	10-29%	0-9%						
Score												
Leadership (10 points total	al)											
What percentage of artistic	and teaching leaders	ship identify as BIF	POC/People of the G	Global Majority?								
	90-100%	70-89%	50-69%	30-49%	10-29%	0-9%						
Score												
US-Based Projects Distres	ssed Communities	(10 points total)	L		<u> </u>	l.						
For US based projects, plea			ities you intend to se	erve. Per the Distr	essed Community I	ndex, these zip codes						
have been classified as:			,			<u></u> ,						
	All classified as distressed (red) or at-risk (orange)	Most of the project, but not all, will take serve distressed (red) or at-risk (orange) zip codes	Zip codes classified across all ranges from prosperous to distressed	Most of the project, but not all, will serve midtier (green) or comfortable (light blue) zip codes	Primarily, but not exclusively, serve mid-tier (green) or comfortable (light blue) zip codes	Exclusively serves zip codes classified as prosperous (dark blue)						
Score												
Canada-Based Projects D	istressed Commun	ities (10 points to	otal)									
For Canada-based projects				ICO-AT) map. Pe	er this map, your pro	ogramming will serve:						
	All programming will be serving regions that exceed 25% of people designated low-income (as defined by LICO-AT, families/persons expected to spend 20% more of their after-tax income on food, clothing, and shelter.)	Most of the project, but not all, will serve regions that exceed 25% of people meeting the LICO-AT designation.	Project will serve regions that vary from low (0-15%) to high (25%+) people meeting the LICO-AT designation.	Most of the project, but not all, will serve regions that report 10-25% LICO-AT rates.	Primarily, but not exclusively, taking serve regions reporting less than 10% of people meeting the LICO-AT designation.	Exclusively serves regions with a LICO-AT rate of less than 10%.						
Score												
Total Score												
for Equity Data												