

# PANEL RESULTS & COMMENTS

## 2019 PROJECT SUPPORT II



### iN Education, Inc.

**Your Project Title:** Battle of the Teal

**Your Project Summary:** iN Education's Battle of the Teal is a fun-filled annual event that showcases young artistic talents, brings awareness to higher education possibilities, connects youth with the community, builds youth self-esteem, and instills leadership skills in our youth, our future.

**Final Score:** No. Overall, the panel felt that the applicant provided insufficient evidence throughout the application that the funding criteria were met.

**CAC Grant Amount:** \$0

To ensure an impartial and transparent application review process, CAC convened an online panel of arts and cultural professionals from outside the region who evaluated and scored eligible applications.

Panelists scored each application based on the Funding Criteria—Public Benefit, Artistic and Cultural Vibrancy and Organizational Capacity—with an emphasis on Public Benefit. For more details regarding the panel process and full panelist bios, please review the [Panel Guide](#).



Rosalyn Escobar  
(Los Angeles, CA)



Trey Hartt  
(Richmond, VA)



Ashe Helm-Hernández  
(Atlanta, GA)



Alice Anne Dolbin  
(Philadelphia, PA)



Brett Swinney  
(Chicago, IL)

Below you will find each panelist's score and comment on your application in response to the question: **With an emphasis on public benefit, does the applicant demonstrate evidence that it meets CAC's three funding criteria?**

Note: Panelist scores and comments are presented in no particular order.

## Panelist 1

**Score:** No

**Comment:** iN Education, Inc. does not meet the funding criteria. Evidence of public benefit is not seen. The applicant fails to adequately define its community. The applicant failed to make the connection between this event and its mission, beyond the one-on-one coaching that happens. More information about the coaching is needed, who conducts it, and the outcomes associated with it. This proposal reads as the organization is working for the youth, instead with the youth. The applicant is paternalistic in the way they write about supporting "underprivileged youth" with the notion that "he had to change their outcome." I have ethical concerns about youth working the event for "educational purposes", what is the benefit of youth doing this? Youth should be paid for their labor. This event seems very specialized and exclusive.

## Panelist 2

**Score:** Yes

**Comment:** This project meets the funding criteria. Artistic and cultural vibrancy and organizational capacity is visible due to their continued engagement with returning partners, the low pricing for the event making it accessible to the public, the professional training and coaching benefits to artists, and the culminating celebration of artistic talents with the youth involved. The collaborative nature of the youth having to work together to execute this annual event seems like it's not only a great artistically vibrant event, but a resume builder and career driver. This can build both long-term organization capacity with a loyal constituency and evidence-based, programmatic changes.

## Panelist 3

**Score:** Yes

**Comment:**

The project meets the funding criteria. The applicant shows that it understands and works with its community, which is evidence of public benefit. Recognizing in the community the level of poverty in the area and high crime, the project seeks to use hands on training and mentoring to increase awareness in the arts. My only concern is that the contestants are paying \$50 for entry into the competition along with community members paying a fee to attend. As the applicant has expressed concerns with and plans to address poverty and lower income community members, a partnership with another organization or sliding scale for contestants paying for entry fee should be suggest or a partnership to offset cost for those who may need it.

## Panelist 4

**Score:** No

**Comment:** This project does not meet the funding criteria. The project is vague and doesn't express any details about how it will engage the public, resulting in weak evidence of public benefit. There are better ways to refer to your audience other than 'urban individuals' and in using that language very casually decreases the overall public benefit while not providing opportunities for the community to think creatively and/or differently.

## Panelist 5

**Score:** No

**Comment:** This project doesn't meet the funding criteria. The application was difficult to understand due to that key information was missing. I was unable to understand the structure and benefit of the program, which resulted in weak evidence of public benefit. The description of this program contradicted the mission of the organization. It read as not being for an underserved community that would benefit from an arts program of high quality. I didn't understand why final event was a competition and why they used words like "scouting talent". Overall, I didn't see how this project with benefit youth who are interested in the arts.

**Questions?** Cuyahoga Arts & Culture is here to assist. Please contact:

**Luis Gomez**  
program manager  
[lgomez@cacgrants.org](mailto:lgomez@cacgrants.org)  
216.515.8303 x106

**Heather Johnson-Banks**  
program manager  
[hjohnsonbanks@cacgrants.org](mailto:hjohnsonbanks@cacgrants.org)  
216.515.8303 x108

**Dan McLaughlin**  
program manager  
[dmclaughlin@cacgrants.org](mailto:dmclaughlin@cacgrants.org)  
216.515.8303 x101