Welcome!
Cuyahoga Arts & Culture (CAC) welcomes you to the 2021 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 contact or communicate with panelists. See Audience Protocol for the Panel Review beginning on page 4 for more information. Thank you.

Follow @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. Please note that all times are subject to change.

Monday, October 5, 2020 at 10 am
1. BlueWater Chamber Orchestra
2. Carolyn L. Farrell Foundation for Brain Health
3. Cleveland Ballet
4. Cleveland Chamber Music Society
5. Cleveland Opera Theater
6. Cleveland Print Room Inc.
7. Collective Arts Network
8. Duffy Liturgical Dance Ensemble
9. Encore Chamber Music Institute
10. Environmental Health Watch
11. Foluke Cultural Arts Center Inc.
12. Greater Cleveland Urban Film Foundation
13. Heights Youth Theatre

Monday, October 5, 2020 at 2:00 pm
14. Les Délices
15. Literary Cleveland
16. Local 4 Music Fund
17. Open Doors Inc.
18. Talespinner Children’s Theatre
19. Tremont West Development Corporation
20. Aradhana Committee
21. Baldwin Wallace University
22. Brite Cleveland
23. The Cassidy Theatre Inc.
24. Fevered Dreams Productions
25. CityMusic Cleveland
26. Cleveland Arts Prize

Tuesday, October 6, 2020 at 9:30 am
27. Detroit Shoreway Community Dev. Organization
28. Downtown Cleveland Alliance
29. Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Assn.
30. Mandel Jewish Community Center
31. MidTown Cleveland Inc.
32. The City Club of Cleveland
33. University Circle Inc.
34. America SCORES Cleveland
35. Cleveland Classical Guitar Society
36. Cleveland Clinic
37. Cleveland School of the Arts Board of Trustees
38. Bureau of Drug Abuse Cleveland Treatment Center
39. convergence-continuum

Tuesday, October 6, 2020 at 1:30 pm
40. Historic Warehouse District Development Corp
41. Hospice of the Western Reserve Inc.
42. Jennings Center for Older Adults
43. Julia De Burgos Cultural Arts Center
44. Musical Upcoming Stars in the Classics
45. Maelstrom Collaborative Arts
46. Music and Art at Trinity Cathedral Inc.
47. Notre Dame College
48. Playwrights Local 4181
49. Praxis: Integrated Fiber Workshop
50. Fred and Laura Ruth Bidwell Foundation
51. Waterloo Arts
52. West Side Community House
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 a lead reader, who presents a detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the application and support materials. Each application will be reviewed for up to six minutes. The panel is managed by a nonvoting panel chair.

The panel review follows a specific sequence of actions:

1. The panel chair announces the applicant organization and presents an overview of the application.
2. The panel chair calls upon the lead reader to provide an assessment of the application, budget and support materials based on CAC’s funding criteria.
3. The panel chair then opens the discussion for full panel deliberation by supporting, disputing or adding comments about the application that were not presented by the lead reader.
4. After the panel has presented all 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.

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 recommended 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 23</td>
<td>24 – 33</td>
<td>34 – 38</td>
<td>39 – 42</td>
<td>43 – 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Artistic and Cultural Vibrancy: 35 Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Organizational Capacity: 20 Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 10</td>
<td>11 – 14</td>
<td>15 – 16</td>
<td>17 – 18</td>
<td>19 – 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Applications that receive a score between 75 and 100 points are eligible for funding. The higher the score, the more funding an applicant may 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 they will be recommended for funding via email by October 30, 2020. Panel scores and grant award amounts will be confirmed at CAC’s Board meeting on Tuesday, November 10, 2020. The board meeting will be a public virtual event; a public livestream will be available at cacgrants.org, but attendance is not required.

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

- Address the panel in any manner during the deliberations, electronically or otherwise.
- Take part in the panel deliberation 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 provide a “yes” or “no” question to the panel chair. CAC staff will provide the question to the applicant via email and the representative will then have an opportunity to provide a “yes” or “no” answer via email. The response must be received prior to the conclusion of the panel’s proceedings to be read into the record by the panel chair. This is not an opportunity to provide additional information, only to clarify what was submitted with the application. |
| If an applicant believes that a panelist has presented incorrect information regarding their application | During the deliberation, the applicant should complete the “Information Correction Form” available 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. An example of objective misinformation would be a panelist misstating the number of performances detailed in an application. This is not an opportunity to provide additional information. |
| If an applicant or audience member has a comment or question | 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. Audience members are encouraged to participate in the public comment session by submitting comments via our online form at http://bit.ly/CAC-comment or by tweeting @CuyArtsC. The deadline to submit comments is at the conclusion of the panel deliberation on Tuesday, October 6, 2020. Applications, scores and panel comments are not discussed at this time. |

Thank You!
Thank you for attending the 2021 Project Support I panel review. To learn more about Cuyahoga Arts & Culture, our staff or Board, visit our website at cacgrants.org.