

# PANEL RESULTS & COMMENTS

## 2021 PROJECT SUPPORT II



### Gardening in the District

**Your Project Title:** Bringing the Arts Alive

**Your Project Summary:** We will be putting arts and a mural on a fence in a vacant lot that my nonprofit is revitalizing to beautify the community and give them a space lively and inviting for them to come back to the community

**Final Score:** No. Overall, the panel felt that the applicant provided no 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](#).



Krissy Harmen  
(Athens, OH)



Kirkston Tyrone Spann  
(Chicago, IL)



Kavita Mahoney  
(Indianapolis, IN)

Below you will find the panel's scores and any feedback 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

I did not get a very clear understanding of the organization's short and long term goals of the project and how they will truly measure the success and/or failures to achieve them. It would have been helpful to have seen examples from artist and the organ

### Panelist 2

**Score:** No

The applicant demonstrated a service to the community through art; however, the application was generally written throughout and the project development was hard to follow. For example, the use of the "them" to describe the members of the community or no description of how they planned to garner community involvement. Lastly, the budget request is more than the 50% of the total budget. The plans to spend the money adds up to \$5100, with a total project budget (including matching funds) of \$10,300 not \$9,500 as stated in the application. This discrepancy, and lack of specific details, call into question their ability to implement the project and achieve stated goals

### Panelist 3

**Score:** No

Audience members and participants aren't clearly defined and referred to as "them" in project summary. "Putting arts" on a fence could also be elaborated upon. It's great that the organization is making the effort to talk to neighbors and get them involved. I think it would be beneficial to include the neighbors in selecting what goes on the mural, aside from only picking paint colors for the benches. I would love to see support materials - photos, links, other projects, etc. Grant amount requested is more than 50% of the total project expenses in Project Summary. In the finances breakdown, the grant funds don't add up (they're \$100 more). The matching funds also don't add up and match what is listed in the Project Summary.

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

**Heather Johnson-Banks**  
senior program manager  
[hjohnsonbanks@cacgrants.org](mailto:hjohnsonbanks@cacgrants.org)  
216.306.0108

**Luis Gomez**  
program manager  
[lgomez@cacgrants.org](mailto:lgomez@cacgrants.org)  
216.306.0114

**India Pierre-Ingram**  
senior associate  
[ipierreingram@cacgrants.org](mailto:ipierreingram@cacgrants.org)  
216.306.0110