

Turaagaq Evaluation Criteria

/60

Turaagaq is designed for the delivery of large-scale activities that are focused and refined. Best suited for established artists or curators who want to: produce a well-planned project or body of work, impart skills or knowledge to others, exhibit work, and more. Priority will be given to proposals that demonstrate artistic vision, clear outcomes, and/or community engagement over those with a commercial* focus. Proposals from all disciplines will be considered for grants of **\$10,000** or **\$15,000**.

**Activities conducted with the goal of making a profit through selling work.*

Artistic Merit /25

(1 Poor, 2 Fair, 3 Good, 4 Very Good, 5 Excellent)

- /5 Artist Biography
 - Expertly describes who they are, their ties to Inuit Nunaat, and demonstrates they have an active arts practice
 - Expertly describes what kind of artwork they make and shares where and how they learned their artistic skills
 - Explains any opportunities to showcase their work that they have taken part in
- /5 Artist Statement
 - Clearly and concisely explains:
 - What they create (mediums, subject matter)
 - Why they create (their motivations, inspirations, or ideas)
 - How they create (their creative process, techniques they use)
 - Shares any artistic or career goals
- /5 Artist CV
 - History of showcasing artwork, education, and accomplishments reflect extensive time and effort into building a professional artistic career
 - Shows the applicant and any collaborators have the necessary professional experience to see their project through to a very high artistic level.
- /5 Proposal Description
 - Demonstrates creativity, sophistication, and clearly describes what they want to accomplish
 - Proposal is exciting, compelling, and/or distinctive
 - Demonstrates they have the artistic skills necessary to complete their proposal to a very high level.
 - Applicant and any collaborators bring extensive and appropriate artistic and cultural knowledge to their roles in the project.
- /5 Artistic examples
 - Examples provided demonstrate a very high level of excellence, skill, and voice
 - Examples provided relate to the proposed project

Viability and Impact /20

(1 Poor, 2 Fair, 3 Good, 4 Very Good, 5 Excellent)

- /5 Proposal Description
 - Details step-by-step how they plan to achieve the project outcomes
 - Clearly articulates intended use of funds
 - Project plan is realistic and demonstrates appropriate use of time and resources to complete the project.
 - If collaborators are needed for the project, they are well-chosen for the success of the project.
- /5 Budget
 - Budget is balanced
 - Revenue section has the correct grant amount selected and, if applicable, includes any additional funding sources.
 - All projected fees and expenses are listed, make sense, and compensate the artist and any participants appropriately.
 - Expenses are realistic and are eligible under the program parameters.
- /5 Artist Impact
 - Describes the importance of the project and demonstrates how it will have a high level of impact on their artistic career. Consider:
 - Does the project sound like a key stepping stone in development as an artist?
 - Will completing this project afford them future artistic opportunities?
- /5 Community Impact
 - Clearly identifies the community, audience, or participants who will benefit from the project and why it will be meaningful to them

Quality of Application /15

(1 Poor, 2 Fair, 3 Good, 4 Very Good, 5 Excellent)

- /5 Artistic Examples
 - Demonstrate professional quality, depending on the artist's medium:
 - Images:
 - are a good size and resolution to best show the artwork
 - are not blurry or cluttered with other items in the background
 - Do not exceed maximum image requirements
 - Video or Audio
 - Examples are clear and audible
 - Time stamps are indicated for easy review
 - Do not exceed maximum time requirements
 - Literature
 - Writing is free of errors
 - Do not exceed maximum word count
 - Files are correctly labeled in the requested format: Ashevak, Kenojuak_01, etc.
- /5 Documents
 - Necessary documents are provided, are properly labelled, and efficiently use the allotted word count
 - Each application component is easily identifiable
 - Consider whether their writing is considerably shorter or longer than the requested word count
 - Artist Bio: 250 words max
 - Artist Statement: 250 words max
 - Artist CV: 3 pages max
 - Proposal: 2 pages max
- /5 Application Form
 - Form is complete with all requested information, signed, and dated

Application Ratings

Must score "Good" or higher to be considered for a grant. "Fair" may be considered depending on available funding.

Excellent (52-60)- Application meets all requirements, is of superb quality and requires little to no suggestions for improvement. Peer Assessor has a very high level of confidence in the applicant's artistic skill and/or quality of application based on what was provided. Peer Assessor has a very clear understanding of the proposal, how it will be executed, and is not left with any lingering questions or confusion.

Very Good (42-51)- Application meets all the requirements, is of very good quality and requires minor suggestions for improvement. Peer Assessor has confidence in their artistic skill and/or quality of application based on what was provided. Peer Assessor has a very good level of understanding of the proposal, how it will be executed, and is left with very minimal lingering questions or confusion.

Good (32-41)- Application meets the majority of the requirements, is of acceptable quality with some areas that need improvement. Peer Assessor has some confidence in their artistic skill and/or quality of application based on what was provided. Peer Assessor has a decent level of understanding of the proposal and how it will be executed, but might be left with a few questions.

Fair (22-31)- Application has not done well to meet requirements and needs more work and attention to detail in order to improve. Peer Assessor has little confidence in their artistic skill and/or quality of application based on what was provided. Application is too vague and Peer Assessor is unclear on the proposal and lacks confidence in the plan for execution. Applicant would benefit from one-to-one assistance.

Poor (12-21)- Application is well below requirements and expectations and is of poor quality. Components may be missing and overall needs significant improvement. Peer Assessor has very limited confidence in their artistic skill and/or quality of application based on what was provided. The application is extremely vague and Peer Assessor did not receive adequate information on what the application is proposing or how it will be executed. Applicant would benefit from one-to-one assistance.