



Audience Guide

2020 Project Support I (PS I) Grant Program Panel Review
September 23, 2019, 10 am • September 24, 2019, 9 am
Miller Classroom, Idea Center at Playhouse Square
1375 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44115

Welcome!

Cuyahoga Arts & Culture (CAC) welcomes you to the 2020 Project Support I panel review. The purpose of this grant program is to promote public access and encourage the breadth of arts and cultural programming in our community by supporting Cuyahoga County-based projects. During the panel review, arts and cultural experts from across the country (who are trained in CAC's funding criteria) discuss and score applications.

To ensure a fair process, we ask that you do not speak to the panelists. See *Audience Protocol for the Panel Review* beginning on page 4 for more information. Please silence all cell phones. Thank you.



Follow [@CuyArtsC](https://twitter.com/CuyArtsC) on Twitter for progress updates or listen live at cacgrants.org/listen.

Order of Review

Applications will be reviewed in the following order. **Please note that this is not alphabetical order, and is not the same order that has been used in previous years.**

1. BlueWater Chamber Orchestra
2. Boys & Girls Clubs of Cleveland
3. Carolyn L. Farrell Foundation for Brain Health
4. Cleveland Ballet
5. Cleveland Center for Arts & Technology
6. Cleveland Chamber Music Society
7. Cleveland Print Room Inc.
8. Cleveland School of Dance
9. Duffy Liturgical Dance Ensemble
10. Foluke Cultural Arts Center Inc.
11. Greater Cleveland Urban Film Foundation
12. Heights Youth Theatre
13. Jones Road Family Development Corporation
14. Kulture Kids
15. Les Délices
16. Literary Cleveland
17. Open Doors Inc.
18. Shore Cultural Centre Corporation
19. Talespinner Children's Theatre
20. Tremont West Development Corporation
21. America SCORES Cleveland
22. American Hungarian Friends of Scouting
23. ARTneo
24. Cavani String Quartet
25. Chagrin Foundation for Arts & Culture
26. Cleveland Classical Guitar Society
27. Cleveland Cultural Gardens Federation
28. Cleveland School of the Arts Board of Trustees
29. convergence-continuum
30. Fred and Laura Ruth Bidwell Foundation
31. GSAD Inc.
32. Hospice of the Western Reserve Inc.
33. Jennings Center for Older Adults
34. Judson Services
35. Julia De Burgos Cultural Arts Center
36. Maelstrom Collaborative Arts
37. Music and Art at Trinity Cathedral Inc.
38. Musical Upcoming Stars in the Classics
39. Notre Dame College
40. Playwrights Local 4181
41. Praxis: Integrated Fiber Workshop
42. The Brecksville Theatre
43. University Hospitals Health System Inc.
44. Waterloo Arts
45. West Side Community House
46. Aradhana Committee
47. Baldwin Wallace University
48. Brite Cleveland
49. ChamberFest Cleveland
50. CityMusic Cleveland
51. Cleveland Contemporary Chinese Culture Association
52. Detroit Shoreway Community Development Organization
53. Doan Brook Watershed Partnership
54. Downtown Cleveland Alliance

- 55. Fevered Dreams Productions
- 56. Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association
- 57. Jewish Federation of Cleveland
- 58. Lexington-Bell Community Center
- 59. Mandel Jewish Community Center
- 60. Mercury Summer Stock

- 61. MidTown Cleveland Inc.
- 62. Slavic Village Development
- 63. The Cassidy Theatre Inc.
- 64. The City Club of Cleveland
- 65. The Lakewood Historical Society
- 66. University Circle Inc.

Panel Review Process

To ensure an impartial and transparent application review process, CAC convenes a panel of arts and cultural professionals from outside the region who discuss, evaluate and score applications. Panelists are chosen to represent a cross-section of professionals qualified to provide expert knowledge of specific arts or cultural disciplines, as well as for their management experience, professional knowledge of the sector and prior panel experience. CAC staff and trustees take every effort to ensure that the panel is diverse in all respects. All panelists receive an honorarium for their service.

All panelists read, review and score every application that they are assigned to. In addition, each application is specifically assigned to two panelists, called first and second readers, who present a detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the application and support materials. Each application will be reviewed for up to eight minutes. The panel is managed by a nonvoting panel chair (panel will be chaired by one of CAC’s program managers - Luis Gomez, Heather Johnson-Banks, Dan McLaughlin).

The panel review follows a specific sequence of actions:

1. The panel chair announces the applicant organization and calls upon the first reader to begin the discussion by presenting an overview and assessment of the application, budget and support materials based on CAC’s funding criteria.
2. The panel chair calls upon the second reader to continue the discussion by supporting, disputing or adding comments about the application that were not presented by the first reader.
3. The panel chair opens the discussion for full panel deliberation by asking for any new or different opinions about the application.
4. After the panel has presented all of the information on an application, the panel chair asks the panelists to submit their scores for the application, which are tabulated by CAC staff.
5. The above actions are repeated with each grant application.
6. After all applications have been reviewed and scored by the panel, the panel chair adjourns the discussion and scoring portion of the panel review.

Scoring

Panelists score each application on a point scale from 0 to 100 based using the following funding criteria:

Public Benefit: 45 points

CAC defines public benefit as an organization’s ability to meaningfully engage its community through its project.

Artistic and Cultural Vibrancy: 35 points

CAC defines artistic and cultural vibrancy as an organization’s ability to create a quality project that inspires and challenges its community.

Organizational Capacity: 20 points

Cuyahoga Arts & Culture defines organizational capacity as an organization’s ability to successfully plan for and manage its project.

A minimum score of 75 points is required for an application to be eligible for funding.

Scoring Framework

Panelists will use the following scoring framework and descriptions to score each application on the funding criteria areas of public benefit, artistic and cultural vibrancy, and organizational capacity.

Public Benefit: 45 Points

Weak	Fair	Good	Strong	Exceptional
1 – 23	24 – 33	34 – 38	39 – 42	43 – 45

Artistic and Cultural Vibrancy: 35 Points

Weak	Fair	Good	Strong	Exceptional
1 – 18	19 – 25	26 – 29	30 – 32	33 – 35

Organizational Capacity: 20 Points

Weak	Fair	Good	Strong	Exceptional
1 – 10	11 – 14	15 – 16	17 – 18	19 – 20

Scoring Descriptions

Panelists will use the following scoring descriptions when assessing applications, and while sharing their oral comments about each application at the panel review. Audience members should listen for these terms in context of the funding criteria to help equate panel comments to scores.

Exceptional: The applicant has provided overwhelming evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is fully met. Responses are clear and directly address this funding criterion. The support materials are clear, highly relevant and lead to a deeper understanding of how the criterion is met.

Strong: The applicant has provided clear evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is met. Responses are clear and address this funding criterion. The support materials are clear, highly relevant and lead to a deeper understanding of how the criterion is met.

Good: The applicant has provided sufficient evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is met. Responses are generally clear, but do not consistently address this funding criterion. The support materials are relevant but provide only some understanding of how the criterion is met.

Fair: The applicant has provided limited evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is met. Responses may not be clear and may not address this funding criterion. The support materials may not be relevant and may not provide additional understanding of how the criterion is met.

Weak: The applicant has provided insufficient evidence throughout the application that demonstrates that this funding criterion is met. Responses are unclear and/or do not address this funding criterion. The support materials may not be relevant and may not provide additional understanding of how the criterion is met.

Final Score and Funding Recommendations

Applications that receive a score between 75 and 100 points are eligible for funding. The higher the score, the more funding an applicant is likely to receive. Note: It is possible that some eligible applicants will not receive funding.

CAC staff will notify all applicants of their final score and whether or not they will be recommended for funding **via email the week of October 14, 2019.**

Panel scores and grant award amounts will be confirmed at CAC's Board meeting on Wednesday, November 13, 2019. Details regarding the time and location of the Board meeting will be shared closer to the date of the Board meeting.

All CAC Board meetings are open to the public.

Audience Protocol for the Panel Review

Generally, audience members and applicants are observers only and are NOT permitted to:



- Address the panel in any manner during the deliberations, breaks or when a panelist leaves the room.
- Take part in the panel discussion unless a panelist requests specific information from them.
- Introduce themselves, their organization, or present materials, exhibits or information to the panel.

However, a few specific exceptions allow for audience members and applicants to interact with the panel:

If a panelist has a question for an applicant



The panelist will alert the panel chair, who will ask the audience if a representative from the applicant organization is present. The representative will then have an opportunity to respond to a "yes" or "no" question from the panel chair.

	<p>This is not an opportunity to provide additional information, only to clarify what was submitted with the application.</p>
<p>If an applicant believes that a panelist has presented incorrect information regarding their application</p> 	<p>During the deliberation, the applicant should complete the “Information Correction Form” available at the reception table or online at https://bit.ly/2QFw7Vi. A staff member will deliver the form to the panel chair to determine if the correction is objective in nature. If it is, the panel chair will read the correction to the panel and for the public.</p> <p>An example of objective misinformation would be a panelist misstating the number of performances detailed in a particular application. This is not an opportunity to provide additional information.</p>
<p>If an applicant or audience member has a comment or question</p> 	<p>After the panel chair adjourns the discussion and scoring is complete, CAC will hold an informal session for public comment on the grant program and the panel review process.</p> <p>Audience members are encouraged to participate in the public comment session by attending in person or by submitting questions to CAC staff. Share your questions by using our online form at http://bit.ly/CAC-comment or by tweeting @CuyArtsC.</p> <p>Applications, scores and panel comments are not discussed at this time.</p>

Thank You!

Thank you for attending the 2020 Project Support I panel review. To learn more about Cuyahoga Arts & Culture, our staff or Board, visit our website at cacgrants.org.