

Early Career Development – Scoring Guide for Organizations (Internship, Cohort, Basic Training)

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. 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 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 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. • EAP’s previous training or work is inadequate preparation for requirements of this project. • Project is not urgent and does not align with the EAP’s career trajectory. • Outcomes and objectives lack strength, clarity, and urgency • 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 applicant 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. • Applicant 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 is clearly demonstrated. • Clear demonstration of how project activities directly align with and will have a significant impact on EAP’s artistic practice, career goals, and future opportunities. Project’s direct support for the EAP’s career trajectory is clearly articulated. • EAP and organization have indicated how the EAP’s previous training, experience, achievements, and work in the sector have prepared them to effectively participate in this project. • Mentor and host organization have clearly expressed their understanding of the EAP’s learning goals and career objectives. They clearly describe their experience, willingness, capacity, and resources to support the EAPs 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 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)
<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. • Organization 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. • Project does not directly benefit communities outside of major urban centres. • Compensation levels are inadequate (below a living wage or industry standards). • Benefits to the organization are not articulated. • Benefits and reciprocal learning for the mentor are not described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has minor significance and offers minor benefit to specific arts and culture practices. • Equity-deserving artists and communities are acknowledged but plans to provide benefits not clear. • Organization aspires to relationships with communities they engage with but no active plan for engagement. • Ethical practices are considered with some evidence of respect for protocols, and cultural appropriation. • Ethical and respectful engagement is aspirational, but no details are provided about actions or process. • Organization's plans and policies to ensure cultural safety are vague and aspirational. • Not clear how artists and arts communities outside of major urban centres will benefit. • Compensation levels are in line with a living wage or industry standards. • Additional details are required regarding compensation for all project participants. • Not clear how the mentor(s) will gain reciprocal learning and other related benefits. • EAP and the project may have minor positive impacts on the organization. 	<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. • Meaningful benefits to equity-deserving artists and communities are outlined. • Application clearly describes the organization's respectful relationships with communities they are engaging with, or outlines a detailed plan for building those relationships. • Application describes policies and practices related to cultural safety. • 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 skills and experience they bring to the project, and describes how the organization 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 including support for those who experience barriers or disability.

A strong application will address most of 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 and indicates a lack of capacity necessary to complete the project. • 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. • Organization does not have sufficient capacity or experience in similar or related projects. • Partners, contributors, and supporters are not identified. • 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. • Budget and financial plan are somewhat realistic and reasonable although lacking details and clarity. • Organization has previously managed similar projects. • Partners, contributors, and supporters are identified but details of participation and contribution are vague and not confirmed. • Some plans, policies, or processes are in place to create a safe, respectful, and equitable work 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 activities, timeline, and goals of the project. Budget is detailed and realistic. • Application confirms organization's capacity and experience to meet project goals; tangible examples are provided confirming successful in realizing comparable projects. • Partners, contributors, and supporters are identified and confirmed; letters from partners indicate relationship, nature of their contribution, and impact on them; participation is integrated into the project description, timeline, and budget. • Comprehensive policies and processes are described confirming a safe, respectful, and equitable work environment. • Application indicates that EAP will be paid at or more than the Living Wage for their location, or a reasonable explanation for compensation levels is included. • 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.