



Feedback from the Peer Jury

Since October 2023, after artsnb releases the results of its program competitions, general constructive comments and recommendations from the peer jury evaluation are available. Please note that these comments are summarized from the discussions in the peer jury meetings, and do not necessarily relate to every application submitted to that deadline. The goal of sharing this feedback is to provide some insight into the jurying process, and to strengthen future applications.

Summary of the peer jury feedback from the September 1, 2023 – Artist in Residence competition

General feedback and data:

- The jury found this to be a very strong competition, both in artistic merit and also in the quality of the applications.
- The jury evaluated 9 applications and was able to award 9 grants with the available budget (100%).
- Additional funding for the Artist in Residence program was provided by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture (THC).

Recommendations on application components:

- The jurors recommended that applicants write their proposals with a multidisciplinary artistic audience in mind: be sure to describe your project and your residency in a way that will be understandable by a jury of arts professionals from a variety of artistic backgrounds, as one or more jurors may not be as familiar with the technical terms of your specific art form.
- Many of the applications in this competition contained small budget discrepancies or errors. The jury recommends taking a closer look at your application budget, and perhaps uploading a detailed budget file with extra information about the total costs of the project. Please refer to artsnb's Application Toolkit for tips on preparing a budget.
- There is a 350-word limit on the project description section for this program, and the jurors recommended using the full word count with details about the residency and the applicant's rationale for participating in this specific residency. What is the connection between the artists' practice and this location or this organization? How would this opportunity affect the applicant's artistic trajectory or the host organization's mandate? Addressing these potential questions in your proposal help convince a jury of the strength and feasibility of your application.
- When it comes to selecting samples of work, the jury recommended including clearer viewing instructions to showcase the best excerpts; applicants have the option to



include timestamps or page ranges to direct jurors to the most relevant part of a sample. The Application Toolkit also contains tips on selecting samples of work.

Summary of the peer jury feedback from the September 1, 2023 – Career Development competition

General feedback and data:

- The jury evaluated 23 applications and was able to award 13 grants with the available budget envelope for this competition (56.5% success rate).
- In addition to the 13 recommended applications, the jury ranked 6 more applications highly, but since the competition budget could not grant all of the meriting applications, these 6 applications received a Merit status. Evaluated applications may receive one of these three statuses: Recommended (received funding), Merit (recommended by jury, but did not receive funding), and Not Recommended (did not receive funding).
- The jury assigned 4 applications the status of Not Recommended. If an application isn't successful, it doesn't necessarily mean that the work lacks merit. Grant assessment is a competitive process and budgets are limited. Remember that every competition has a different set of applicants and a different jury.
- One application was disqualified due to ineligibility prior to jury evaluation, and one application was withdrawn by the applicant due to a change in the project travel plans.

Recommendations on application components:

- The jurors were particularly interested in seeing how this project would develop the applicant's practice or push them forward in their careers. There is a 350-word limit on the project description section for this program, and the jurors recommended using the full word count with details about the proposed project. What festival/exhibition/event will you be attending, and why is it important to you? How is this training opportunity relevant or important for your artistic practice? What is the timeline of your project? Why is this promotional tool necessary for your continued development in your field? Addressing these potential questions in your proposal help convince a jury of the strength and feasibility of your application.
- Strong applications in this competition included a detailed project description, a feasible and clear rationale for how this would push the applicant forward in their practice, a balanced and well-justified budget, and a selection of relevant samples of work with precise viewing instructions. The jurors especially appreciated when an applicant included contextual details on a concept/festival/opportunity and did not require the jurors to do supplementary research in order to understand the application.
- Many of the applications in this competition contained small budget discrepancies or errors. The jury recommends uploading a detailed budget file with extra information



about the total costs of the project rather than focusing only on the costs for the portion of the project that would be covered by this grant program. Please refer to artsnb's Application Toolkit for tips on preparing a budget.