

Peer Review Panel Handbook

GEORGIA COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS

260 14TH STREET, NW

ATLANTA, GA 30318

General Telephone: 404/685-2787

www.gaarts.org

Peer Review Panel Handbook Table of Contents

I.	Introduction, About the Panelists & Panel Orientation	pg. 3
II.	Overview of GCA Grant Programs.....	pg. 4
III.	Overview of Panel Service & Panelist Responsibilities.....	pg. 5
IV.	Introduction to the Panel Meeting.....	pg. 6
V.	Onsite Reviews	
	a. Introduction & Scheduling the Administrative Review.....	pg. 8
	b. Conducting the Administrative Review.....	pg. 9
	c. Preparing the Administrative Reviewer’s Written Report.....	pg. 9
VI.	Preparing for the Panel	
	a. Introduction & The Panel Packet.....	pg. 11
	b. Continuation Review.....	pg. 13
	c. Conflict of Interest Policy.....	pg. 14
VII.	After the Panel.....	pg. 15
	a. Confidentiality	
	b. Funding Decisions & Applicant Notification	
VIII.	Appendix	
	a. Tips for Reading Applications.....	pg. 17
	b. Narrative/Criteria Review.....	pg. 28
	c. Onsite Reviewer’s Report.....	pg. 36
	d. Instructions for Accessing Grant Applications On-Line.....	pg. 38

Introduction

Georgia Council for the Arts uses peer review panelists for the evaluation of grant applications. GCA appreciates the time, effort and commitment of the panelists in ensuring a fair process and assessment.

This handbook provides an overview of the role of the panelist and the procedures and standards of the process. Questions about any information contained in this handbook should be directed to the Program Manager.

About the Panelists

Panelists are chosen from throughout the state and represent a broad range of experiences and expertise.

Considerations in making panel appointments include:

- Professional qualifications and experience in (or knowledge of) a particular arts discipline
- Multicultural or ethnic representation
- Knowledge of Georgia's arts community
- Geographic distribution
- Communication and decision-making skills
- Teamwork perspective and ability to function cooperatively in a group setting
- Representation of various positions within the arts community (for example: artists, administrators, board members, educators and arts patrons)

Panelists are appointed to a one-year term, which may be extended for a maximum tenure of three years.

GCA is always seeking qualified individuals to serve as panelists. If you know people who would make good panelists, please submit their contact information to any GCA staff member.

Panel Orientation

All new panelists are required to participate in a Panel Orientation session with a GCA Program Manager. Panel Orientations will be held via conference call. The orientation has two distinct purposes:

1. Familiarization with the purpose and procedures of the Peer Review Panel
2. Review of changes made to that fiscal year's Grant Guidelines and application requirements

Returning panelists are required to participate in a brief conference call that will review highlights of the panel process and introduce any changes that have been made to the application or review process.

Overview of GCA Grant Programs

Operating Support (OS) (Formerly **General Operating Support (GOS) and Community Arts Programs and Services (CAPS)**) *Operating Support (OS)* grants are for arts organizations whose annual budgets are over \$125,000, these award funds may be applied to any part of the applicant's operating budget, except those items deemed ineligible expenses by the state of Georgia. Award amounts are determined by a funding formula. Panelists score applicants based on the funding criteria, and scores impact award amounts. Applicants in Year 2 or 3 of the Continuation funding cycle are evaluated on evidence of overall stability and scored on a scale of 5 to 1.

Project Grants (PG): *Project Grants (PG)* support individual arts programming productions or events. To be eligible for funding, all arts programs must include a public component. Additionally, eligibility is limited to a single arts project. The program or event may have multiple components and/or performances; however applying for support for a full season is not eligible.

Georgia Artist Initiative Georgia Council for the Arts (GCA) helps support the development of the state's arts infrastructure through the Georgia Artist Initiative (GAI), a collection of 12 programs and services offered to Georgia artists. Among these services are artist rosters, adjudicated listings of qualified Georgia artists: *Touring Artists Roster (TAR)*, *Traditional Artists Roster (TRAR)*, *Arts Education Consultant Bank*, and *Teaching Artist Bank*.

Overview of Panel Service

The Georgia Council for the Arts (GCA) uses peer panels to review applications for funding. Our panelists are absolutely central to the application review process at GCA, providing local constituent input to the agency and specific, scored evaluations of the applications for funding.

Panelist Responsibilities

Panelists are expected to complete the tasks listed below. Each is explained in this handbook.

- Attend one Panel Orientation conference call session as a first-time panelist
- Conduct, via teleconference, Administrative Review(s) and write and then submit a report to the GCA Program Manager, as assigned
- Prior to the Peer Review Panel meeting review, comment on and score all eligible applications. (Panelists have approximately 30 days to review applications.)
- Actively participate in the Peer Review Panel held via teleconference
- Objectively review and score applications relative to the available resources of the applicant.
- Maintain confidentiality about all decisions made during the panel review process; when approached by an applicant, panelists are instructed to direct the applicant to GCA staff

Although Peer Review Panelists bring their own particular experiences and backgrounds to application review, **panelists are not appointed to represent particular geographic areas, organizations or special interests.**

Expenses

Panelists should discuss anticipated costs with Program Managers prior to incurring costs. GCA will only cover previously approved hard costs incurred by panelists at State GCA Reimbursement Rates.

Introduction to the Panel Meeting

Information on preparing for the panel meeting begins on page 11. The following is provided to give panelists an introduction to what happens during the panel teleconference.

Attendance

Panelists are required to participate in the entirety of the panel discussion, final scoring and consensus process via teleconference. Panelists will not be allowed to excuse themselves from any part of the meeting barring a Conflict of Interest with a specific application (information on conflict of interest is provided on page 14).

Logistics

FY 2012 Panel Meetings will be held via teleconference and last a maximum of three hours. Panelists will need to be at a computer with internet access for the call.

Structure of the Panel Teleconference

1. Call to Order by GCA Advisory Board Member and Chairman of the panel meeting
2. Review of Ground Rules
All panels are governed by the same set of meeting ground rules to ensure consistency in the review process. The Ground Rules are as follows:
 - Criteria are discussed by concern or commendation
 - Respect all panelists right to express his/her opinion
 - One person speaks at a time
 - If you are speaking to anyone other than the panel, please put your phone on mute
 - All panelists voices are encouraged, welcomed, invited and respected
 - Factual inaccuracies will be corrected
 - Discussion is limited to the GCA Staff Report, Onsite Reviewer's Administrative Report, the application content and Support Material

3. Application Review (repeated for each application)

Finalize Consensus Statement

The panel is required to approve the Consensus Statement for each applicant including, where applicable, the Arts Education Bonus Question Consensus Statement. The Consensus Statement will be drafted from the comments (commendations or concerns) submitted by each panelist to the Program Manager prior to the panel meeting. The initial draft will be emailed to the panel prior to the teleconference. During the call panelists will be asked to make any necessary modifications to the Consensus Statement; resolving where necessary any outstanding questions or concerns, and finally coming to consensus on and approving the final language. The Consensus Statement must be expressed using the following language: "Panel commends... Panel recognizes... Panel is concerned that..."

As Peer Review Panels may be observed by a representative of the applicant, panelists are asked to choose their words carefully during this discussion. Sarcasm, innuendo, humor at the applicant's expense, and comments that are personal rather than organizational in nature are never appropriate.

Score Reconciliation

Following the discussion and approval of the Consensus Statement, panelists will be given the opportunity to adjust their final score (per criterion and including, where applicable, the Arts Education Bonus Question score). Panelists should take the discussion and final Consensus Statement language into consideration when deciding whether or not a change in their initial score is warranted.

The opinions expressed during discussion must support the scores given. If a panelist has given an applicant a particularly low or high score on one or more of the criteria, he/she must express concerns or commendations that provide the reasons/justification for the score.

Year 2 and Year 3 Applicants

As with Single Year and Year 1 applicants, the panel is required to approve the Consensus Statement given for applicants in Year 2 or Year 3 Continuation. Panelists are only required to provide specific concerns for applications scoring a 3 or below. Neither Consensus Statements for applicants scoring a 4 or 5, nor commendations for any applicant regardless of score will be solicited. The Consensus Statement will be drafted from the concerns submitted by each panelist to the Program Manager prior to the panel meeting. The initial draft will be emailed to the panel prior to the teleconference. See the Appendix, page 24 for guidance on scores and correlating rationale.

4. Conclusion

Prior to adjourning, panelists will be asked to provide process feedback to GCA Staff. Panelists will also be asked to complete and submit via email the *Peer Review Panel Evaluation*.

5. Adjourn

Administrative Review

Organizations applying for Year 1 funding may be assigned an Administrative Reviewer. The GCA Administrative Reviewer is a current panelist, former panelist or GCA Advisory Board Member who has been appointed to obtain current, first-hand information about an applicant organization. In past years, the Reviewer traveled to the organization to conduct a Review; however, because of budget cuts, the Administrative Review is now conducted via phone.

The applicant's Executive Director and Board Chair are required to participate and initiate the call to the Onsite Reviewer on the scheduled date and time; other Board or staff members may also participate.

The Administrative Reviewer should gather as much information on the applicant organization as instructed by the GCA *Administrative Evaluation Form* which must be submitted electronically to the Program Manager by the deadline assigned, which is generally 6 weeks prior to the panel. The Program Manager will attach the reports to each application in e-Grant so that the other panelists are able to read them before the panel meeting.

The Administrative Reviewer should be prepared to answer questions from the panel during the call.

Scheduling an Administrative Review

Administrative review assignments are made by GCA Program Managers. The panelist is responsible for contacting the applicant's Executive Director (or other personnel indicated by GCA Staff) as soon as possible for scheduling of the review. The applicant's Executive Director is responsible for contacting the Board Chair to assure his/her participation in the Administrative Review. Early contact enables both the Reviewer and the applicant a more mutually satisfactory scheduling experience. Use your best judgment and treat the applicant in the manner that your organization would want to be treated. Once the review date is scheduled, please notify the Program Manager.

If you have difficulty setting the appointment, contact the GCA Program Manager immediately. GCA will work to facilitate the scheduling.

If, for any reason, a scheduled Administrative Review must be missed or postponed, notify the applicant immediately and attempt to schedule an alternative date. If no alternative is available, contact GCA immediately. Under no circumstances should an assigned Administrative Review not be conducted. GCA Staff will attempt to locate another panelist or former panelist to conduct the Administrative Review. These reviews are of the utmost importance to the Peer Review Panel process, as well as to the applicant; completion of the Administrative Review should be of the highest priority.

Conducting the Administrative Review

The role of the Administrative Reviewer is objective observer, not an advocate for the organization. Avoid the temptation to offer advice. Similarly, if advice is requested from the applicant, refuse the request. The credibility of the GCA's Peer Review Panel process is called into question if an applicant acts on the advice of a panelist. Other members of the Peer Review Panel might have a different opinion or an incorrectly understood or implemented piece of advice may be detrimental to the organization. If the applicant needs assistance, refer the applicant to GCA staff.

Similarly, do not answer questions about the grant application process. Again, a misstatement or a statement incorrectly understood may be detrimental to the applicant. Refer the applicant to the GCA Program Manager.

Most importantly, never indicate to the applicant the level of funding thought to be deserved. Statements such as "I can't understand why you didn't get more money" or "You're doing such a great job I can't imagine that you won't be recommended for funding" are inappropriate. They set the applicant up for disappointment if the other panelists assess the applicant differently. Remember, the Final Score is a consensus score.

Should the applicant directly ask for a personal opinion on the quality of the work observed, reply "Administrative Reviewers may not share opinions with anyone except the other members of the Peer Review Panel." The ***Administrative Review Report*** becomes part of the applicant file; it is available for viewing after contracts are awarded and by appointment at GCA offices. GCA appreciates that this may be awkward, but applicants are informed that the Onsite Reviewer is not allowed to provide advice or offer opinions.

Preparing the Written Report

The Administrative Review report must be objective and contain only factual information. Please include your observations on how the applicant meets the funding criteria.

The report should also be as complete and thorough as possible. Remember the audience being written for: peer panelists. Think about:

- (a) What you want to know
- (b) What you would want the panel to know if you were the applicant

This report is not an advocacy piece and comparisons against other applicants are discouraged. Also, take care that the tone of the report is not condescending or patronizing. Resist the temptation to provide the applicant with advice.

The information obtained through the interview should be treated as confidential. It will be communicated to GCA Staff and other Panelists before being made part of the public record.

SPECIAL NOTE: Administrative Reviewer's Report is due six (6) weeks prior to the panel meeting date. GCA continues to experience difficulty in receiving written reports by the deadline for distribution to the other panelists prior to the panel session. This places an undue burden on the other panelists, who may not have sufficient time to review the document prior to the panel session, and as a consequence, the applicant is not treated fairly.

[The Administrative Reviewer Report Form can be found on page 36 of this Handbook.](#)

Preparing for the Panel

GCA applicants submit their applications electronically via the *e-GRANT SYSTEM*. Panelists will review all application materials electronically; e-GRANT Application PDF, Required Attachments, and Support Material. Instructions on accessing the complete application through *e-GRANT* are included at the end of this manual. Please note that the Program Manager will provide notification when access to the applications is available, approximately 30 days before the panel. At that time Program Managers will also email panelists a link to access the Support Material online, along with a username and password to access the site. Support Material is viewed through an independent site, not through *e-GRANT*.

Panelists are required to read, score and comment on all of the applications prior to the panel meeting. Initial scores and comments for the Consensus Statement will be submitted via email to the Program Manager on the Score and Consensus Statement Worksheet.

Panelists are expected to participate in the meeting familiar with the content of the application and with notes to guide their contributions to the panel discussion. Panelists are expected to comment constructively on the strengths and weaknesses of each application, according to funding criteria. The following links provide tips on analyzing the application:

[Tips for Reading Applications: Budget can be found on page 17](#)

[Tips for Reading Applications: SOS can be found on page 19](#)

[Tips for Reading Applications: Narrative can be found on page 20](#)

[Tips for Reading Applications: Scoring can be found on page 23](#)

[Tips for Reading Applications: Scoring AE Bonus Question can be found on page 25](#)

Scoring:

A scoring matrix has been provided at the top of each scoring worksheet to assist panelists in scoring relative to the strengths and weaknesses of an application. This sample grid shows point allocations specific to each criteria sub-category. Scores should reflect your impression of the applicant's ability to comprehensively answer the narrative questions in a satisfactory manner. The maximum score should be given when the applicant has excelled on all elements within that standard and the application represents outstanding effort and achievement. Zero (0) is not a usable score and only whole numbers may be given. One (1) is a non-fundable score.

****NEW**** The OS Panel will evaluate Continuation Year 2 and Year 3 applications in budget order, from smallest to largest (FY 2010 actual expenses determine budget size). Applications will be evaluated on evidence of overall stability and scored on a scale of 5 to 1. A criterion

for each ranking is provided on the scoring worksheet and can be found on page 24 of this Handbook.

Consensus Statement Comments:

The panel is required to form a Consensus Statement for each criterion. The most important question for panelists to ask while crafting feedback for the Consensus Statement is: ***“Does this affect my scoring?”*** The Consensus Statement is intended to provide applicants with insight and justification for the panel score and funding decision. Comments must illuminate what influenced the panel score. To that end, panelists are cautioned not to provide commendation on things that are standard business practices. (For example, a panel should not commend a nonprofit organization for having a Board of Directors.)

The Consensus Statement must be expressed using the following language: “Panel commends... Panel recognizes... Panel is concerned that...”

Recognition is neither a positive nor a negative judgment, but an assurance to the applicant that the point was noted; Commendation is a positive, and Concern is a negative statement.

Arts Education Questions

Before the conclusion of each application review, panelists will evaluate responses to the optional Arts Education narrative questions. The questions allow for OS applicants to discuss their arts education programs and compete for additional grant dollars. The highest overall panel scores will result in additional grant money for the organization’s support of arts education programming. [AE Bonus questions and criteria are found on page 25 of this Handbook.](#)

The Panel Packet

Panelists will receive the following information via e-mail approximately 30 days prior to the panel meeting:

Panel Memo: This document outlines all logistics concerning the Panel Teleconference, a description of panel preparation support documents, and guidance on accessing, reviewing and judging applications and Support Material.

Panel List: The panel list includes the name, address, telephone, and e-mail of each panelist.

Order of Review and Score Comparison Sheet: This chart provides the order in which GCA asks panelists to read, review and give preliminary scores to the applications. Remember, GCA uses Relative Scoring, which means that you should consider the budget size and resources of an organization when scoring. Applicants are reviewed from smallest

budgets to the largest as determined by the applicant's previous year's expenses (PYE).

In addition to serving as the Order of Review, this chart may be used to compare your scores for each application. As you evaluate the applications, both at home and during the panel meeting, it will allow you to quickly review your scores for each criterion as you compare applicants with like-sized budgets to each other. This document is for your use only and it is not submitted to GCA.

FY2012 Score and Consensus Statement Worksheets: The *Score and Consensus Statement Worksheet* must be emailed back to GCA for every applicant, regardless of grant type. **You are required to enter a TOTAL SCORE for each criterion in the box indicated as well as Consensus Statement comment(s) for each criterion.** Remember that scores must be justified by Consensus Statement comments. You will have the opportunity to adjust your scores during the conference call if, after the discussion, you feel that your initial score was inaccurate.

Links to Grant Guidelines: These links will take you to the specific guidelines for each grant type that you will be reviewing.

Links to Tips for Reviewing the Application: The six tools in the appendix of this Handbook are intended to guide panelists in their review of the application budget, narrative, and Scope of Services (including definitions and counting audience numbers) as well as to provide guidance in scoring. Links to these documents on the GCA website will be provided in the Panel Packet.

Continuation Review

Continuation applicants (Year 2 or Year 3) must have been approved for Continuation funding the previous year (Year 1 or Year 2). In the second and third year of continuation funding, the application process is shorter.

The panel is responsible for reviewing the applicant's budget, including the Three-Year Financial Comparison and Fiscal Stability Report, *as well as the* Scope of Services to determine if the applicant is in good financial standing and will be able to fulfill the proposed Scope of Services. The panel will evaluate the overall stability of the organization and score it on a 5 to 1 scale according to the criteria provided (see page 24 of this Handbook). Panelists will use the OS Continuation *Score and Consensus Statement Worksheets* to submit their votes to the Program Manager.

If there are questions regarding the application due to omissions or inconsistencies in information, the GCA Program Manager will attach a list of stipulations to the application. If the applicant is funded, the applicant will have to respond to the stipulations, and GCA staff will have to approve the response before a contract is fully executed.

Conflict of Interest

Georgia Council for the Arts has adopted a Conflict of Interest Policy that governs both the actions of its Advisory Board and appointees to Peer Review Panels. Panelists are expected to be familiar with this policy; it will be reviewed at both the Panel Orientation sessions and at the beginning of every Peer Review Panel. This policy should guide both the deliberations and actions of the panelists

Conflicts of interest are inevitable when experts are asked to review the work of their peers. Simply stated, this policy prohibits the review, discussion, and scoring of any application presented to the Peer Review Panel in which the panelist has a conflict of interest, defined as when the applicant organization has a formal relationship to or involvement with:

- The panelist, panelist's spouse, child, or partner
- A nonprofit organization in which the panelist either currently serves or has served in the last three years as an officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee
- Any person or organization with whom the panelist is negotiating or has a written agreement

Panelists with a conflict of interest should follow these procedures:

- Notify the GCA Program Manager that you will be excusing yourself for the specific organization's review. You do not need to state your reason.
- Do not submit scores or Consensus Statement comments for the application
- During the call, without comment, mute your phone before any presentation by GCA Staff or any discussion about the application
- Do not discuss the application with any other panelist
- At the conclusion of the panel evaluation and discussion, GCA Staff will invite back those who have excused themselves due to a conflict of interest

Apparent conflicts of interest occur when a panelist does not technically have a conflict (as defined above), but believes that any evaluation or discussion would reflect his/her bias created by the personal affiliation with the applicant and the consequent implication that this bias may cloud his/her judgment. Under this circumstance, the panelist should follow the same procedures as outlined above.

In either circumstance (actual or apparent conflict of interest), the panelist is advised to seek the counsel of the GCA Staff leading the Peer Review Panel prior to the Panel Meeting.

After the Panel Meeting

Confidentiality

Panelists are required to maintain confidentiality about all decisions made during the panel review process. If approached by an applicant, panelists are instructed to direct the applicant to GCA staff.

Funding Decisions & Applicant Notification

After all panels have met, and the Georgia General Assembly has passed and the Governor has signed the budget, GCA Staff applies the panelists' scores against funds available for award. This report is presented to the GCA Executive Director for recommendation to the GCA Advisory Board and then to the Governor.

It is the Governor's privilege to inform those applicants who have been awarded contracts. Contract awards are announced on July 1 or immediately after the first day of the fiscal year. The GCA Executive Director informs those applicants who were not funded.

Appendix

Tips for Reading Applications

Tips for Reading Applications: *Budget*

Panelists should use this information as a guide. The Application Budget should be reviewed in relationship to other aspects of the application, such as the Scope of Services chart, the Employee & Volunteer Report (for OS applicants) and the application narrative.

Budget Expenses

When reviewing the Annual Budget Expenses, consider these items:

For OS applications:

- What services (quality & quantity) are proposed in relationship to the proposed budget?
- Are the salaries of Administrative and Artistic Personnel comparable to others in the same industry?
- How many staff members are employed?
- Is the organization understaffed?
- Is there a staff member solely responsible for the applicant's fundraising efforts?
- Are contracted artists and technicians paid a competitive wage?
- What percentage of the applicant's budget is dedicated to marketing?
- Is the amount of the budget dedicated to administrative expenses appropriate relative to the amount spent on program expenses?
- What other expenses consume the applicant's budget?

For PG applications:

- Is the proposed budget realistic relative to the scope of the services (quality & quantity) proposed in the narrative?
- Does the budget include all expenses and are the listed expenses realistic?
- Have adequate marketing expenses been included to accomplish the goals of the project?
- Are contracted artists paid a competitive fee?

Budget Income

When reviewing the Annual Budget Income, consider these items:

For OS applications:

- Are the applicant's funding sources diverse, representing a good balance between earned and contributed income?
- Is there financial commitment from the local community?
- Is the applicant seeking support from various sources including individual donors, other private and public funding?
- Does the board provide substantial financial support?
- Does the organization have a clear, realistic plan in place to achieve their income goals?

For PG applications:

- Are the income goals realistic?
- Does the organization have a clear, realistic plan in place to achieve those income goals?

Three-Year Financial Comparison: (For ALL applicants)

The Three-Year Financial Comparison should be reviewed in relationship to other aspects of the application narrative. The Three-Year Financial Comparison provides the applicant's true operating budget since it includes ineligible expenses that were omitted from the GCA budget to meet State requirements.

When reading the Three-Year Financial Comparison, consider these items:

- Is the organization's operating budget (expenses & income) growing, decreasing, or stable?
- Are there decreases of 10% or more from one fiscal year to the next? If so, has an explanation been provided in the narrative?
- Did the applicant close the last fiscal year in the black?
- Is there an accumulated surplus or deficit?
- Has the applicant explained how the deficit will be resolved?
- How will the surplus be expended?
- Is the applicant's endowment fund growing?
- Are there any capital expenditures?
- Do the capital expenditures explain the rise in operating budget from year to year?

For each column (Last Fiscal Year, Present Fiscal Year, and Next Fiscal Year), compare Line 30 and 31. If there is an operating surplus or deficit in any fiscal year, the amount (surplus or deficit) should be accurately reflected, for that column, in Line 32.

If a debt or deficit appears on line 32 or line 33, review the applicant's response to the Fiscal Stability question for clear plans to eliminate it. All applicants are required to clearly address plans to eliminate debt/deficit, speak to the measures the organization has taken to ensure financial stability during the current economic recession and provide evidence of stability. If the response does not address the numbers in the Three-Year, or clearly answer the Fiscal Stability question, points should be deducted from the score.

Tips for Reading Applications: *SOS*

These tips are specific to OS applications. Panelists should use this information as a guide; adjusting their review based on the specifics of the grant.

Scope of Services

The Scope of Services should be reviewed in relationship to other aspects of the application, including the Annual Budget Expenses and the application narrative. For OS, the number of services in *e-GRANT* should align with the Two-Year Comparison of Scope of Services in the Required Attachments. For each service and quantity of service listed in *e-GRANT*, a corresponding description should be included in the Two-Year Comparison.

The Two-Year Comparison of Scope of Services should provide an overview of the types of services that the Applicant intends to provide in the application fiscal year. It also should provide a quick comparative glimpse into whether services (type & quantity) are increasing or decreasing from one fiscal year to the next. When reading the Two-Year Comparison of Scope of Services, consider these items:

- How many services are produced by the applicant in comparison to the number and types of services presented by the applicant? Do the services provide Georgia artists with professional opportunities (residencies, workshops, innovative programming)? Are the services diverse so that they attract various audiences?
- Do the proposed services align with the applicant's mission statement?
- Do the proposed services align with the application budget?
- How do the proposed services compare with the services rendered in the previous fiscal year?

It is important to note the following when reviewing the accuracy of the information presented in the Scope of Services:

- Applicants may only count services produced, presented, or coordinated by the applicant.
- When entering the number of productions, applicants enter the number of different productions, such as two (2), one for *Swan Lake* and one for *Nutcracker*.
- When entering the number of total performances, applicants add the total number of performances, such as seven (7) for *Swan Lake* and ten (10) for *Nutcracker* for a total of seventeen (17).

**Tips for Reading
Applications: *Narrative***

Panelists should use this information as a guide; adjusting their review based on the specifics of the grant.

The Grant Proposal Narrative should be reviewed in relationship to all other aspects of the grant application and read in comparison with scoring criteria.

When reading the Grant Proposal Narrative, it is important to identify the applicant's strengths and critical areas that need improvement. It is also important to consider these items:

For OS applications:

- Is there evidence that the goals for the application fiscal year will be met?
- Is there evidence that the applicant will be successful at delivering the proposed Scope of Services?
- Are the marketing and evaluation plans comprehensive?
- Is the budget sound and are there qualified staff members in place to meet the income goals?
- If the Three Year Financial Comparison Chart in *e- GRANT* listed a surplus or a deficit, does the narrative sufficiently address the plans to retire the debt or use the surplus?
- Is the organization adjusting to the current recession and taking steps to ensure the financial stability of the organization for the future?
- Is there evidence of a concerted effort to develop new audiences and to build relationships with other organizations within the community?
- Is the applicant attempting to reach underserved audiences in its community?
- Does the narrative clearly address the narrative questions that are detailed in the application instructions?
- How well does the narrative succeed at meeting the criteria for funding?

For PG applications:

- Does the narrative clearly explain the project?
- Are there sufficient staff, board and/or volunteers to successfully carry out the project? Do they have sufficient qualifications?
- Is the marketing plan sufficient to meet the goals of the project?
- Is there a plan to adequately evaluate all facets of the project?
- Does the organization have a way to ensure the artistic quality of the project? Are the artists involved qualified?
- Is the applicant attempting to reach underserved audiences in its community?
- Does the narrative clearly address the questions that are detailed in the application instructions?

- How well does the narrative succeed at meeting the criteria for funding?

For TAR applications:

- Does the applicant have the ability to schedule and manage out-of-town engagements?
- Are the fees appropriate for each type of program?
- Has the applicant shown high artistic standards and high quality work?
- Does the applicant have an outreach program? Does it increase the audience's understanding or appreciation of the art form?
- Does the narrative clearly address the questions that are detailed in the application instructions?
- How well does the narrative succeed at meeting the criteria for funding?
- If the artist is added to TAR, can GCA confidently tell presenting organizations that this artist is prepared to tour and does high quality work?

Any pages beyond the page limitation delineated in the Application Instructions should not be considered part of the eligible narrative response and may not be read.

Additional Requirements: Items listed under Additional Requirements should be reviewed in relationship to other aspects of the grant application as appropriate.

OS applicants that applied for funding in the previous fiscal year are required to address the panel concerns stated on the previous year's Consensus Statement. When reading the **Consensus Statement Response**, take note whether the applicant clearly addressed the concern, and whether the response is passive or active. Have actions been taken to resolve the concern(s)? Is there a plan in place to resolve the concern(s)? Are the plans too abstract, lacking specificity?

When reading the **Condensed Biographies**, take note whether the individuals are qualified to perform their responsibilities within the applicant organization. If applicant has provided biographies of contracted artists and/or technicians, take note of their qualifications. Is the applicant bringing in qualified artist, consultants and/or technician? Compare the Condensed Biographies with the grant application narrative and the Annual Budget, specifically Personnel (Administrative, Artistic, Technical/Production) and Outside Fees/Services (Artistic & Other). Each biography must include the person's current position within the applicant organization and educational and professional credentials that are relevant

to the person's current position. If the biographies do not meet these criteria, make a note of this.

When reviewing the **Board of Directors List**, take note of the professional expertise of the board members. Is the professional expertise diverse? Take note of the ethnic background. How does this information compare to the community demographic information provided in the Environmental Scan?

A **Community/Citizen Advisory Committee** list is required of all colleges, universities, and units of government. At least 60% of the membership of this Committee must be representative of members in the community (not students, faculty, or staff members of the institution). When reviewing the Community/Citizen Advisory Committee List, take note of the professional expertise of the members. Is the professional expertise diverse? Take note of the ethnic background. How does this information compare to the community demographic information provided in the Environmental Scan?

When reviewing the **In-Kind Contributions Report**, take note of the types of services or goods rendered in-kind. Does this report provide a clear indication that the community is supportive of the applicant?

**Tips for Reading
Applications: *Scoring***

Panelists should use this information as a guide, adjusting their review based on the specifics of the grant.

Relative Scoring

The Order of Review most often presents the applications in smallest to largest budget order. This is done to accommodate the relative increases in the level of expectation. Larger-budget organizations’ applications should be read with higher levels of expectations.

Panelists are expected to review an application based upon its relative size (i.e., budget, staff, facility), assessing it against other applicants of similar size. As example, a performance of Mozart’s *The Magic Flute* by the NYC Metropolitan Opera with its multi-million dollar budget is expected to achieve a much higher level of artistic quality than an all-volunteer organization’s production of the same opera performed at a civic auditorium. But, both organizations can produce performances that, given their relative size, receive the same score for artistic excellence.

Without the use of relative scoring, smaller organizations and most new organizations could never score enough points to receive an award. And oftentimes, these smaller organizations provide the only arts programming in the state’s underserved communities.

Scoring Matrix

The scoring matrix is provided to assist panelists in scoring relative to the strengths and weaknesses of an application. A similar grid is provided on the Scoring Worksheet for each application type with relevant point allocations.

Total Available Points	POOR	FAIR	AVERAGE	GOOD	EXCELLENT
12	1-3	4-6	7-8	9-11	12
11	1-2	3-5	6-7	8-10	11
10	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10
9	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9
6	1	2	3-4	5	6

Scoring OS Single Year vs. Continuation Year 1

Applicants applying for OS Single Year funding are applying for a one-year grant. Applicants applying for Continuation Year 1 are submitting the same application as Single Year applicants; however they are applying in the first year of three-year Continuation cycle. If funded for Continuation, in Year 2 and Year 3 the applicant will submit an abbreviated application and will receive relatively the same grant amount

awarded in Year 1; grant awards will only change if the GCA budget changes.

In both cases the panel will discuss and each panelist will score each criterion. The average panel score is then calculated by discounting the highest and lowest scores (to protect the applicant from any personal consideration by a panelist) and averaging the remaining scores.

Scoring Continuation Grants in Year 2 or 3

Applicants applying for Continuation funding (Year 2 or Year 3) must have been approved for Continuation funding the previous year (Year 1 or Year 2). In the second and third year of continuation funding, the application process is shorter and the grant award amount remains relatively stable from Year 1. The panel is responsible for reviewing the applicant’s budget, including the Three-Year Financial Comparison and Fiscal Stability Report, and Scope of Services to determine if the applicant is in good financial standing and will be able to fulfill the proposed Scope of Services. The panel will evaluate the overall stability of the organization and score it on a 5 to 1 scale according to the criteria provided below. Panelists will use the OS Continuation *Score and Consensus Statement Worksheets* to submit their score to the Program Manager. GCA staff will then calculate the average score (based on Olympic scoring) and draft a Consensus Statement from the published criteria for that score. During the panel conference call, panelists will be given the opportunity to re-score the application, if necessary.

If there are questions regarding the application due to omissions or inconsistencies in information, the GCA Program Manager will attach a list of stipulations to the application. If the applicant is funded, the applicant will have to respond to the stipulations, and GCA staff will have to approve the response before a contract is fully executed.

Please Note: Continuation applicants that have responded to the optional AE Bonus Question must receive a score for their response and a Consensus Statement. The score and comments will be recorded on the Scoring Worksheet along with this score.

Score	Criteria
5	Evidence of overall stability. There are no concerns about finances or ability to deliver the proposed Scope of Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financially stable • Diverse income sources • No debt or deficits • No stipulations • SOS and budget are stable
4	Evidence of overall stability, however minor concerns exist about finances and ability to deliver the proposed Scope of Service

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financially stable • Diverse income sources • Small amount of debt/deficit but a strong plan to eliminate it • Minor stipulations • SOS and budget are relatively stable
3	<p>Stability is questionable. Multiple concerns exist about finances and the ability to deliver the proposed Scope of Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial stability is questionable • Moderately diverse income sources • Moderate amount of debt/deficit and a questionable or unclear plan to eliminate it • Multiple stipulations • SOS and/or budget are decreasing
2	<p>No clear evidence of stability. Numerous concerns exist about finances and the ability to deliver the proposed Scope of Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financially unstable • No diverse income sources • Moderate to significant debt/deficit and a weak/incomplete plan to eliminate it • Multiple stipulations • SOS and/or budget are decreasing
1	<p>No evidence of stability. Significant concerns exist about finances and the ability to deliver the proposed Scope of Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financially unstable • No diverse income sources • Significant debt/deficit and no plan to eliminate it • Significant stipulations • SOS and/or budget are significantly decreasing

Grant Amounts: After the panel meeting, a funding formula computes the grant award for each OS SY or Y1 grantee. Award calculations are based on the applicant's score and the maximum amount the applicant is eligible to receive, which has never been more than 2% of their previous year's budget. Y2 and Y3 applicants that are approved will receive the same amount they did in the previous year. All other types of grants are fully-funded, which means all organizations receiving a fundable score receive 100% of their request, up to the maximum award.

**Tips for Reading
Applications: *AE Bonus***

The Arts Education Bonus Question is a temporary solution for the agency's recessionary budgets. It dedicates GCA's arts education budget to the state's nonprofit arts organizations only, providing the opportunity for extra dollars dedicated to arts education programs for those applying for Operation Support, regardless of their budget size.

Allocation of these additional grant dollars is highly competitive and will be based on combined panel scores on a five-point scale. Panelists are reminded to use the utmost discretion in reviewing AE Bonus responses; keeping to the standards of artistic and program excellence, impact and access that GCA values in all grant reviews. Additionally, panelists must judge responses using Relative Scoring. The following has been provided to further assist with the evaluation of the AE Bonus Question responses:

1. There are four types of arts education programming for K-12 students as defined by the NEA that the Arts Education dollars may fund.
 - a. **Classes:** These can be in any art form and can be scheduled for after school or summer school. The most valuable of these are programs are tied to the curriculum: those that are based on either national or Georgia curriculum standards, whether arts activities designed to support other curricular coursework or activities that support arts curricula.
 - b. **Lectures/Demonstrations:** These are programs that explore an arts discipline through a presentation that provides the history, the methods, and/or the means of artistic creation. Some visiting artists not only provide a performance, but may also provide a Master Class or Lecture/Demonstration.
 - c. **Residencies:** These are in-school educational programs that may be either arts curriculum based or that utilize arts activities to support other curricula. The key difference between these and classes is that they happen during the school day. The best are tied to curricular standards and have been designed in a partnership between the school/teacher and resident artist.
 - d. **Performances:** These are presentations by contracted arts organizations performed live before age-appropriate students. The best are accompanied by pre-performance Guides for Teachers and/or post-performance activities for the students. Again, the best support national or Georgia curricular standards.

Any organization offering information on programs that exist outside of these four services areas in response to the AE Bonus Question should not be considered. Only programs that fit within these NEA definitions are viable for bonus grant dollars. For the NEA there is no value differentiation between these four types of arts education programming. Individually, however, and as described by the applicant, the value of one type of programming may be much higher than that of another applicant. The difference could be in the preparation of the programming (a collaboration with school and artists), in the number/type of curricular

standards met, in the type of hands-on activities employed, or even in the evaluation instruments designed. It is up to the Peer Review Panel to decipher and judge the differences and score accordingly.

2. Budget: Assess the dollar amount and percentage of the organization's total annual budget provided for arts education. This should be the first comparison between the applicants. A very small-budget applicant that is using a higher percentage of its overall budget for arts education should benefit from a higher score than others.
3. Relative scoring must be employed. As an example, a multi-million dollar arts organization may provide hundreds of students with after school classes of high educational quality (meeting state or national standards). An all-volunteer arts organization with a budget of only \$25,000 may also provide after school classes of high educational quality, but reach only dozens of students. These two organizations could receive the same score.
4. The Scoring Matrix below is provided to assist panelists in giving scores that reflect their intent. Therefore, panelists believe that the application:

Score	Panelist Evaluation
1	Is not fundable.
2	Reflects ineffective strategies, provides no descriptions, and no expectations were met.
3	Reflects questionable strategies, provides inadequate descriptions, and few expectations were met.
4	Reflects effective strategies, provides adequate descriptions, and expectations were met.
5	Reflects exemplary strategies, provides complete and detailed descriptions, and exceeded expectations. This score should be reserved only for the most exceptional responses.

Remember that zero (0) is not a usable score.

Narrative Questions/Criteria for FY2012 Grants

Arts Education Bonus Question /Criteria

1. Provide the total annual budget for arts education programming as both a dollar amount and a percentage of the total annual budget as presented in *e-GRANT*.

NOTE: **Arts Education expenses** are those that directly fund the K-12 programming; they are a portion of the applicant's total budget. These could include: salaries for teaching staff and contractors, instructional materials, rental or cost factors for instructional space, and a percentage amount for administrative support by staff, whether secretarial, financial, executive or other.

2. Delineate (by type and number) the K-12 arts education programming offered, and group these according to the four NEA Arts Education categories: arts instruction, curriculum development, lectures/demonstrations, and residencies. Describe the programs, citing, for example how they follow sequential and comprehensive arts learning or adhere to state or national arts standards. And, based on previous years, provide the average number of student participants in each type.

Arts Education Evaluation

When scoring the arts education bonus question, review by budget size. Compare like-sized organizations; those with larger budgets and number/types of arts education programs should score higher.

Consider the variety of arts education programs: Are all grades and ages (within K-12) offered some programming? Is the programming offered after-school only? Or does the applicant also provide in-class residencies or other arts programming? Does the applicant provide instructional materials to the classroom teacher to support the arts programming presented?

GCA expects that very few of its applicants will receive a perfect score for this bonus question. When reviewing, consider what else the applicant could do to support the arts education of Georgia students. And remember, that the size of the arts education budget against the entire budget should be a key element in your assessment.

**OS SY & Y1 Narrative
Questions/Criteria**

Panelists will evaluate and score all eligible FY2012 applications based on responses to the following questions. The first two are not scored, but provide the context for the panelists' evaluation.

1. Mission Statement

Present the organization's mission statement.

2. Environmental Scan

- a. Briefly discuss the organization's history and objectives. Describe what makes the organization unique in your community.
- b. Describe the community or market area the organization serves. Include whatever demographics are pertinent to the area, such as: age groups, geographic location, economic makeup, rural-urban-suburban character, educational achievement, and cultural-ethnic mix. (Demographic data may be cited and is available in the [GCA Georgia County Demographic Chart](#), which will be available to the panelists.)

3. Organizational Capacity (40 Points)

- a. **Governance:** (10 points) Describe the management structure of the organization, including the working relationship between the board and staff and formalized systems for communication and decision-making. Describe the board's recruitment plan, selection criteria, and rotation policy.
- b. **Fiscal Management:** (12 points) Discuss the organization's overall fiscal health, including the impact of the recession on the organization and its response. Included in your answer:
 - If the organization has any debt or shows a deficit on lines 32 or 33 of the Three Year Financial Comparison in Section IV of *e-Grant*, **clearly explain the plans to eliminate it**
 - Describe efforts to diversify the organization's income sources
 - Provide evidence that the organization is financially secure and will be able to carry out the proposed Scope of Services.
- c. **Personnel and Leadership:** (10 points) Describe the organization's goals and specific progress it has made in ensuring diversity and participation from all segments of the community on the organization's board and among its staff and volunteers. Briefly describe the credentials and

experience of those individuals making administrative and artistic decisions for the organization.

- d. **Evaluation:** (8 points) Detail how the organization evaluates its artistic programs, administrative programs, staff, and board. Include evidence that past evaluations have resulted in change.

4. Artistic Excellence (35 Points)

- a. **Program Quality:** (18 points) Describe the artistic and professional quality of the arts programming. Address the following in the response:
- How does the organization define artistic quality
 - How are artistic programs chosen
 - How does the organization ensure quality and high professional standards?
 - Give an example of a recent artistic achievement
- b. **Meaningful Experiences:** (17 points) Explain how the artistic programs provide meaningful experiences for audiences, volunteers and/or Georgia artists.

5. Community Impact (25 Points)

- a. **Partnerships:** (10 points) Give recent examples of partnerships and/or collaborations with other organizations and detail the benefits of these for all of the partners as well as for the community.
- b. **Access:** (10 points) Describe how the organization ensures *diversity* and participation by *underserved audiences*. In your description, include the fee structure for admission, including any discounted or free ticket programs.
- c. **Economic Impact:** (5 points) Describe the economic impact of the organization on its local economy, citing, for example, the number of audience members that attend from outside the community, how the organization partners with local government and/or other business, the impact of the events on local restaurants and shops, or other local events that piggyback on the arts programming to attract audiences.

NARRATIVE QUESTIONS FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

1. Mission Statement

Present the organization's mission statement.

2. Environmental Scan

- a. Briefly discuss the organization's history and objectives. Describe what makes the organization unique to the community that is served.
- b. Describe the community the organization serves, including the service area and the types and number of clients. Include whatever demographics are pertinent such as: geographic location, economic makeup, rural-urban-suburban character and cultural-ethnic mix. (Demographic data may be cited and is available in the GCA Georgia County Demographic Chart, which will be available to the panelists.)

3. Organizational Capacity (70 Points)

- a. **Governance:** (13 points) Describe the management structure of the organization, including the working relationship between the board and staff and formalized systems for communication and decision-making. Describe the board's recruitment plan, selection criteria, and rotation policy.
- c. **Fiscal Management:** (18 points) Discuss the organization's overall fiscal health, including the impact of the recession on the organization and its response. Included in your answer:
 - If the organization has any debt or shows a deficit on lines 32 or 33 of the Three Year Financial Comparison in Section IV of *e-Grant*, **clearly explain the plans to eliminate it**
 - Describe efforts to diversify the organization's income sources
 - Provide evidence that the organization is financially secure and will be able to carry out the proposed Scope of Services.
- b. **Personnel and Leadership:** (13 points) Describe the organization's goals and specific progress it has made in ensuring diversity and participation from all segments of the community on the organization's board and among its staff and volunteers. Briefly describe the credentials and experience of those individuals making decisions for the organization.
- c. **Delivery:** (13 points) Describe the organization's technical and administrative capacity to deliver its services. If a website, listserv or other electronic medium is involved, how does it support the service(s) and how is it maintained?

- d. **Evaluation:** (13 points) Detail how the organization evaluates its programs, staff, and board. Include evidence that past evaluations have resulted in change.

4. Community Impact (30 Points)

- a. **Georgia Artists:** (15 points) How does the organization support Georgia artists and the state's arts infrastructure?
- b. **Partnerships:** (15 points) Give recent examples of partnerships and/or collaborations with other organizations and detail the benefits of these for all of the partners as well as for the community.

Project Grant Narrative Questions/Criteria

Panelists will evaluate and score all eligible FY2012 applications based on responses to the following:

1. **Mission Statement**

Provide the organization's mission statement and a brief history of the organization.

2. **Project Description**

Describe the proposed project. Include the following in the description:

- a. Artists involved, including a brief synopsis of their credentials, history and/or awards
- b. Dates and locations
- c. Components of the project (i.e. performances, master classes, residencies, exhibits, folk life projects, etc.)
- d. Reasons the applicant chose the project

3. **Organizational Capacity (40 Points)**

- a. **Management:** (12 points) Describe the credentials and experience of the individuals making administrative and artistic decisions for the project. Provide evidence that they will be able to successfully manage the project.
- b. **Marketing Plan:** (8 points) Discuss the project's marketing plan. Include a description of the project's target audience(s), reasons why each specific audience group is being targeted, if there have been historic challenges or barriers to participation for this group, and efforts to reach and involve that audience.
- c. **Evaluation Plan:** (8 points) Discuss how the project will be evaluated. Include the specific goals for the project and describe the tools that will be used to measure the success of each goal. Describe how board members, staff members, participating artists, and audiences will each participate in the evaluation process.
- d. **Fiscal Stability:** (12 points) Discuss the organization's overall fiscal health, including the impact of the recession on the organization and its response. Include the following in your answer:
 - If the organization has any debt or shows a deficit on lines 32 or 33 of the Three Year Financial Comparison in Section IV of *e-Grant*, **clearly explain the plans to eliminate it**
 - Provide evidence that the organization is financially secure and will be able to carry out the proposed project

4. Quality of Project (30 points)

Describe how this project demonstrates high artistic and/or professional quality. Address the following:

- How does the organization define artistic quality?
- How are artistic programs chosen?
- How does the organization ensure quality and high professional standards?

5. Community Impact (30 points)

Describe the compelling reasons the project was chosen and its cultural and economic benefit for the community. Describe how the project will reach people underserved by your programs/services or the arts in general. Discuss how members of the target audiences will be involved in the planning, marketing and evaluation of the project.

**TAR Narrative
Questions/Criteria**

Panelists will evaluate and score all eligible FY 2012 applications based on responses to the following questions, in addition to information provided in the *Artist Profile Form* and Support Material (including the *Presenter Reference Forms*).

1. **Introduction:** Provide a brief description of the artist(s) and the artist's work.

2. **Management/Touring Experience** (40 Points)
In addition to the questions below, panelists will review and score up to 15 points for the artist's website. The panel will be looking for a website that is well organized, clearly presents the types of programs offered, offers a means for presenters to see and/or hear the artist's work, and describes the artist's experience, history and awards/honors.
 - a. **Management (20 points)**
Discuss the applicant's success and experience with scheduling and conducting tours/performances, exhibitions, demonstrations, and/or educational outreach efforts. Include a description of promotional methods the applicant employs to increase public visibility to potential presenters: mass media, print advertisements, web-based media, etc.

 - b. **Fees (5 points)**
Discuss why the applicant's fees listed in the *Profile Form* appropriately represent the scope and artistic quality of the touring program(s), community outreach, residency and/or educational program(s).

3. **Artistic Excellence (50 points)**
In addition to the questions below, panelists will review and score up to 25 points to the artistic quality of work samples provided in the Support Material.
Experience/Qualifications (25 points)
Describe the art form and discuss the artist's/group's qualifications and experience practicing/performing the art form. Include details that support these experiences and qualifications and establish the applicant has expert knowledge of the form.

4. **Community Involvement (10 points)**
Describe in detail any outreach/educational programs offered and how these programs create access and/or a better understanding of the art form. This can include classes, workshops, master classes, residencies, etc. for students as well as adults.

Georgia Council for the Arts
Evaluation Report - Administrative/Governance

On-Site Reviewer: _____ Date of Call: _____
Organization Evaluated: _____
Individuals Interviewed: Board Chair _____
Chief Admin. Officer _____
Artistic Director/Curator _____
Other _____

Organizational Capacity

1. Assess the effectiveness of the organization's leadership including the working relationship among the artistic leadership, board and management. Do all parties have a clear understanding of the organization's mission, goals and objectives? Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood by all parties?

2. Assess how well the organization manages its fiscal resources.

3. Assess the effectiveness of the organization's planning and evaluation processes.

4. Assess the extent to which the organization is involving the wide range of diversity that exists in its service area in both its administration and governance.

5. Other administrative and governance observations:

Artistic Excellence

6. Assess the degree to which the organization's programming is consistent with its mission statement. How well is the organization meeting the needs of the diverse populations in its community?

7. Assess the degree to which the organization's season reflects high professional standards and artistic and program quality

8. Assess the degree to which the organization supports Georgia artists.

Community Impact

9. Assess efforts to educate new audiences. Are special educational or outreach programs in place?

10. Comment on how the organization addresses multicultural diversity issues administratively and through its programming.

11. Are the organization's programs and services accessible for people with disabilities? YES NO

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ACCESSING GRANT APPLICATIONS ON-LINE (all grant types)

1. Log into *e-GRANT*
Using the log-in and password emailed to you in the registration e-mail, log into <http://gca.egrant.net>
2. You will be presented with a “Review Groups” drop list containing the names of any Peer Review Panel review group to which you were assigned. (See image below)

To review applications choose a group name from the “Review Groups” drop list. The next screen will display the applications that have been assigned to the Review Group for review.

Each review group contains a specific type of application to be reviewed by the panel. Please review applications according to the Order of Review which was emailed with your Panelist Packet:

3. On the “Application Review” screen you will see a list of the eligible applications to be reviewed. To the far right you will see a REVIEW button. Click on the REVIEW button.

4. At the top of the page you will see the applicable criteria names, followed by the scoring range and space for entering an initial score. (To view the criteria questions, hover over the green question mark.) Beneath the criteria list, there is a box entitled “Comments.”

While space has been provided to score and comment on the application on this screen, panelists are required to provide scores and Consensus Statement comments to GCA on the SCORING WORKSHEET emailed with the Panelist Packet. At this point, we cannot be assured that all comments recorded on this page will be fully accessible. Therefore, GCA prefers that panelists have a verified method for communicating initial scores and comments for the Consensus Statement via the SCORING WORKSHEET.

To review the grant, scroll to the bottom of the page. There will be two tabs marked Application and Attachments. To see the *e-GRANT* data entry click Application, and scroll down to view the submission.

To review each Required Attachment (narrative, SOS, budget breakdown, etc.) click on the Attachment tab, then click each link shown. These documents will open in a new browser window. Review them on-line or, if you so choose, print them for a paper-based review. Please remember that Excel spreadsheets often have information presented on multiple worksheets. Be certain to look for multiple tabs.

Clicking on the SAVE button will return you to the Application Review screen where all applicants are listed.

Remember to record your initial score and comments, commendations or concerns on the draft SCORING WORKSHEET.

You may click on the LOG OUT tab at the top of the screen at any point to exit the system and you can return to continue your review of other applications on a later date.