Early Career Development – Scoring Guide for Individual Applicants (Mentorship and Residency)

This scoring guide is to be used with the assessment criteria in the program guidelines as a tool to help applicants answer questions. It will also be used by the assessment panel to review and score each application. Keep these criteria in mind as you complete your application. **Some of the specific elements below may not apply to your proposed project. However, your application should clearly indicate how your project aligns with the three general areas of assessment**.

Criteria – IMPACT ON THE EARLY ARTS PRACTITIONER (EAP) – this section is worth 50% of the overall score

- Contribution to the Early Arts Practitioner's professional and artistic growth and the next stage of their career.
- Depth of knowledge transfer and urgency relative to the Early Arts Practitioner's learning and career development goals.
- Early Arts Practitioner's experience and capacity to undertake the project.
- Experience and capacity of mentors and host organizations relative to the learning goals and activities.

   A strong application will *address each of the criteria above.*

LOW – Barely or does not meet the assessment criteria (score 1-15)	MEDIUM – Meets the assessment criteria to some degree (score 16-30)	HIGH – Meets the assessment criteria to a high degree (score 31-50)
• EAP's previous training or work in the sector is inadequate preparation for this project. • EAP's learning goals and career objectives are not clearly articulated. • Learning activities do not align with the EAP's artistic practice, career goals, or future opportunities. • Project is not urgent and does not align with the EAP's career trajectory. • Neither the mentor nor the host organization seem aligned with or clear about the EAP's learning goals and career objectives. • Neither the mentor nor the host organization have the experience, capacity, and resources to support the EAP in meaningful ways.	• Impact on the EAP's artistic practice and career goals is not clearly articulated. • EAP's learning goals and career objectives are briefly described. • Project is timely and aligns with the EAP's career trajectory. • EAP's previous training and work in the sector is adequate preparation for this project. • Host organization understands EAP's learning goals and career objectives, and has experience, capacity, and resources to support them in meaningful ways. • Mentor refers to EAP's learning goals and career objectives, and has some experience, capacity, and resources to support them. .	• Project activities are directly aligned with and will have a significant impact on EAP's artistic practice, career goals, and future opportunities. • EAP's specific learning goals and short- and long-term career objectives are provided with clear details. • EAP's previous training, experience, achievements, and work in the sector have prepared them to effectively participate in this project. • Project is urgent and timely and directly supports the EAP's career trajectory. • Mentor and host organization understand the EAP's learning goals and career objectives, and have the experience, willingness, capacity, and resources to support them in meaningful ways.

Criteria – IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY AND THE ARTS SECTOR – this section is worth 30% of the overall score

- Support or benefit to specific arts and culture practices, including in relation to identified needs in the sector.
- Contribution to the artistic practices of equity-deserving arts practitioners and communities.
- Ethical approaches to research, collaboration, ownership, protocols, and issues of cultural appropriation.
- Respectful engagement with Indigenous peoples, communities, practices, materials, and beliefs.
- Contribution to communities located outside major urban centres (as applicable).
- Impact on the organization and mentor(s), and opportunities for reciprocal learning.

A strong application will clearly address most of the criteria above.

LOW – Barely or does not meet the assessment criteria (score 1-10)	MEDIUM – Meets the assessment criteria to some degree (score 11-20)	HIGH – Meets the assessment criteria to a high degree (score 21-30)
• Project will not impact or benefit specific arts practices or the sector. • Project does not acknowledge, include, benefit, or support equity-deserving artists and communities. • Applicant has not described relationships with communities they are engaging with. • Concerns about ethical engagement with equity-deserving artists or communities and materials have not been addressed. • Project raises concerns about ownership protocols and cultural appropriation. • Compensation levels are inadequate (below a living wage or industry standards). • Project does not directly benefit communities outside major urban centres. • Benefits and reciprocal learning for the mentor or organization are not described.	• Project has some significance and offers some benefit to specific arts and culture practices. • Project may benefit the sector. • Applicant aspires to relationships with communities they engage with but no active plan for engagement. • Equity-deserving artists and communities are acknowledged but plans to provide benefits not clear. • Ethical practices are considered with some evidence of respect for ownership, protocols, and cultural appropriation. • Ethical and respectful engagement is aspirational, but no details are provided about actions or process. • Plans to ensure cultural safety are vague and aspirational. • Compensation levels for all participants are in line with industry and community standards. Additional details are required. • Not clear how artists and arts communities outside major urban centres will benefit. • Not clear how the organization or mentor(s) will gain reciprocal learning and other related benefits.	• Project will have a significant benefit to specific arts practices through, for example, reclamation or preservation of traditional practices, or innovation in a field of practice. • Project promotes and benefits the sector, including, for example, identifying and supporting specific needs. • Applicant has effective and respectful relationships with communities they are engaging with, or a reasonable plan for building relationships. • Applicant has measures in place to ensure cultural safety. • Equity-deserving artists and communities will benefit in meaningful ways. • Project engages ethically and respectfully with research practices, collaboration, materials, and beliefs. • Concerns about cultural appropriation are addressed. • All project participants are compensated in alignment with industry standards within the field of practice. • Artists and arts communities outside major urban centres will benefit from this project. • EAP brings valuable skills and experience to the project, so that the organization and mentor(s) will benefit from the relationship.

Criteria - APPLICANT READINESS – this section is worth 20% of the overall score

- A realistic work plan that supports the learning outcomes.
- A realistic and reasonable plan for using the money.
- Plans and processes that confirm a safe, respectful, and equitable work environment, including fair compensation for all participants, and support for those who experience barriers or disability.

A strong application will address all the criteria above. For example, an application with a clear, detailed, and achievable work plan that does not indicate fair compensation for participants will be compensated will likely be scored in the lower range.

LOW – Barely or does not meet the assessment criteria (score 1-6)	MEDIUM – Meets the assessment criteria to some degree (score 7-13)	HIGH – Meets the assessment criteria to a high degree (score 14-20)
• Work plan is unrealistic. Expectations for the EAP are unrealistic and not appropriate to their experience or the work plan. • Expenses are unreasonable and the financial plan is unrealistic. • No plans, policies, or processes that will ensure a safe, respectful, and equitable working environment. • Accessibility challenges have been overlooked.	• Work plan is reasonable but does not indicate sufficient capacity to complete the project. • Expense form and request are somewhat realistic and reasonable although lacking details and clarity. • Some plans, policies, or processes are in place to create a safe, respectful, and equitable working environment. • Accessibility challenges are acknowledged but not addressed.	• Work plan is clear, realistic and indicates an appropriate amount of time to achieve or complete each phase of the project. • EAP's workload is realistic based on their experience, capacity, and supports in place. • Expense form is clear, detailed, and realistic. • Request amount makes sense relative to the proposed activities, timeline, and goals of the project. • Comprehensive plans and processes are described confirming a safe, respectful, and equitable working environment. • Cultural competency and accessibility challenges have been considered and addressed.