Welcome!
Cuyahoga Arts & Culture (CAC) welcomes you to the 2022 Cultural Heritage panel review. The purpose of the Cultural Heritage (CH) grant program is to provide flexible support grants for qualifying cultural heritage organizations with a primary mission of arts and culture. During the panel review, arts and cultural experts from across the country (who are trained in CAC’s funding criteria) discuss and score applications.

Order of Review
Starting at approximately 2:15 pm*, each review should take between 10-15 minutes.

- AfricaHouse International
- Cleveland Association of Black Storytellers
- Djapo Cultural Arts Institute
- DuffyLit
- Foluke Cultural Arts
- Greater Cleveland Urban Film Foundation
- Julia De Burgos Cultural Arts Center
- LatinUs Theater Company
- Mojuba! Dance Collective
- Sankofa
- Slovenian Museum and Archives

*Start times and breaks will take place at the discretion of the panel chair, subject to change.

Follow our Progress
Don’t want to miss your review? Follow our progress on Twitter and listen to our live stream on September 29.
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 make 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. The panel is managed by a nonvoting panel chair.

Observe Panel Review
Your application will be reviewed for no more than ten minutes, following this sequence of actions:

- The Panel Chair will introduce the organization.
- The Lead Reader will begin the discussion by presenting their assessment of the application, budget and support materials based on CAC’s Funding Criteria.
- The other readers to continue the discussion by supporting, disputing, or adding comments about the application that were not presented by the Lead Reader.
- At the conclusion, panelists will submit their final scores.

Audience Protocol
Applicants and audience members are observers only and are not permitted to address the panel via the virtual meeting or contact the panelists otherwise. However, if an applicant believes that a panelist has presented incorrect information regarding their application, you can complete the Information Correction Form.

- The panel chair will review the correction to determine if it is objective in nature and confirms what is already in the application
- The panel chair will read the correction to the panel and for the public record.

*An example of objective information would be the panelist misstating the number of performances that an organization detailed in their application. This is not an opportunity to provide additional information.

End of Day: Public Comment
After the panel chairs adjourn the discussion and scoring is complete, CAC will hold an optional 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 using our online form at http://bit.ly/CAC-comment.
Scoring

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

- **PUBLIC BENEFIT**: An organization’s ability to meaningfully and authentically engage its community to achieve its mission.
- **ARTISTIC AND CULTURAL VIBRANCY**: An organization’s ability to create quality, mission-driven work that inspires and challenges its community.
- **ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY**: An organization’s ability to successfully manage resources to their best use now and for years to come.

Panelists will use the following scoring framework to score each application on the funding criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC BENEFIT (45 points):</th>
<th>ARTISTIC AND CULTURAL VIBRANCY (35 points):</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (20 points):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak: 1 - 23</td>
<td>Weak: 1 - 18</td>
<td>Weak: 1 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair: 24 - 33</td>
<td>Fair: 19 - 25</td>
<td>Fair: 11 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good: 34 - 38</td>
<td>Good: 26 - 29</td>
<td>Good: 15 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional: 43 - 45</td>
<td>Exceptional: 33 - 35</td>
<td>Exceptional: 19 - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Descriptions**

**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.
Scoring Descriptions, continued

**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**
Scores are calculated by combining and averaging the score of all three panelists. Applications that receive a score of 75 or higher are recommended for funding. CAC will calculate final scores and notify all applicants via email the week of October 18. Grant amounts will be confirmed at CAC’s Board of Trustees meeting on Wednesday, November 10, 2021, at 4 pm.
Meet the Panelists

LaShawnda Crowe Storm (she/her/they)
Indianapolis, IN

LaShawnda Crowe Storm is a mixed media and community-based artist, activist, community builder and occasionally an urban farmer. Whether making artwork or sowing seeds, she uses her creative power as a vehicle for dialogue around topics such as racial and gender violence, social change and justice. At the core of her practice is a desire to create community; any community in which the process of making art creates a space for difficult discussions with an eye towards community healing. She has received numerous awards for art and community activism. She received an M.F.A. from The School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Marcia Festen (she/her/hers)
Chicago, IL

Marcia Festen is the founding director of the Arts Work Fund for Organizational Development. Arts Work Fund was launched in January 2007 to ensure there were dedicated resources to help strengthen small arts and cultural organizations in Chicago and Cook County. Before starting her consulting practice in 1999, Marcia was a Senior Program Officer at the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Marcia is the former board chair of 3Arts and believes in the importance of putting money directly in the hands of artists. She currently sits on the board of an anonymous foundation that supports women and girls in the arts and sciences. She is also a painter with an active studio practice.
Jamaine Smith (he/him/his)  
Philadelphia, PA

Hailing from Bushwick, Brooklyn (pre-gentrified), Jamaine Smith is an artist, administrator, and “ruffler of feathers”. He is a firm believer in the innate dignity, creative genius, and worth of every person and is committed to dismantling systems of oppression that fight against that. Jamaine has been immersed in the robust arts and culture sector of Philadelphia, PA for the past 9 years and enjoys walking alongside and assisting others on their paths of self-discovery/rediscovery and helping organizations pivot for the better. Jamaine is currently the Senior Manager of Mission Nurture & Community Life at Project HOME in Philadelphia, PA. He holds an BS in Social Work (Nyack College), MA in Urban Studies (Eastern University), and MBA (Philadelphia University).

Kirkston Tyrone Spann (he/him/his)  
Hammond, IN

Kirkston Tyrone Spann’s professional experience includes over 24 years in the nonprofit and higher education fields. He currently serves as the Indiana Program Officer for Asset Funders Network. Mr. Spann worked for the Foundations of East Chicago for 18 years managing their scholarship and grant programs. He also served as a consultant for Lake Area United Way and as the program director for the Gary Alumni Pathway for Students organization. Additionally, he worked as the 21st Century Scholar coordinator and associate director of admissions for Ivy Tech’s Lake County Campus. He attended Florida A & M University in Tallassee, Florida where he received a BS degree in architectural studies. Mr. Spann continued his education at the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana where he received an MBA in real estate finance.