

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 effectively answer questions. It will also be used by the assessment panel as they review and score each 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 growth and artistic practice, professional network, and the next stage of their career.
- Depth of knowledge transfer and skill sharing.
- Urgency of the project relative to the Early Arts Practitioner’s stated 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 Early Arts Practitioner’s 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 are 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the EAP’s artistic practice and connection to career goals is not clearly articulated. • EAP’s learning goals and career objectives are vague. • Urgency and timeliness of project relative to EAP’s career trajectory is not clearly articulated. • EAP’s previous training and work in the sector is adequate preparation for this project. • Host organization is aligned with EAP’s learning goals and career objectives, but does not have experience, capacity, or resources to support them in meaningful ways. • Mentor does not refer to EAP’s learning goals and career objectives, but has some experience, capacity, and resources to support them. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EAP’s specific learning goals and short- and long-term artistic and career objectives are provided with clear details. • Timeliness of project and urgency of outcomes and objectives relative to EAP’s learning goals and career objectives is clearly demonstrated. • Clear and direct connection is made between project activities and the EAP’s artistic practice, career goals, and future opportunities. • EAP has indicated how their previous training, experience, achievements, and work in the sector have prepared them to effectively participate in this project. Mentor and/or host organization have clearly expressed their understanding of the EAP’s learning goals and career objectives, and indicated their experience, willingness, capacity, and resources to support the EAP 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, including communities located outside major urban centres.
- Ethical approaches to research, collaboration, ownership, protocols, and issues of cultural appropriation.
- Respectful engagement with Indigenous peoples, communities, practices, materials, and beliefs.
- Impact on the Early Arts Practitioner’s community and reciprocal benefit for the mentor(s) or host organization.

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) |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 engage with. • Ethical engagement with equity-deserving artists or communities and materials has 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has minor significance and offers minor 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 minor 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits to specific arts practices are clearly described. For example, reclamation or preservation of traditional practices, or innovation in a field of practice. • Benefits to the arts sector are clearly described, including identifying and supporting specific needs or gaps in the sector. • Meaningful benefits to equity-deserving artists and communities are outlined. • Application clearly describes respectful relationships with communities they are engaging with, or outlines a detailed plan for building those relationships. • Application indicates respectful and ethical engagement with research practices, collaboration, materials, and beliefs, and directly addresses any potential concerns about cultural appropriation. • Meaningful benefits to artists and arts communities outside of major urban centres are described. • Project participants are compensated in alignment with industry standards within the field of practice. • The EAP indicates the relevant skills and experience they bring to the project, and describes how the mentor will benefit from the relationship. • The mentor(s) articulate how they will gain reciprocal learning and other related benefits from the project. |

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 and accessibility considerations.

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) |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work plan is not viable. 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 are described or included that will ensure a safe, respectful, and equitable working environment. • Accessibility challenges have been overlooked. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Request amount makes sense relative to the proposed activities, timeline, and goals of the project. • Budget is clear, detailed, and realistic. • Application describes how accessibility challenges have been considered and addressed, and includes comprehensive and specific policies and supports for those who experience barriers or disability. • All project participants are compensated fairly and equitably. |