Following comprehensive evaluations with CSGP stakeholders, significant changes were made to the CSGP application and hearing procedures in FY2017. The changes emphasized the CSGP evaluation criteria from the CSGP ordinance (Chapter 118, Part 6) and also focused on streamlining the grant process. The process was held steady for three years, so that through consistency, the organizations, CSGP Committee members and staff could thoroughly evaluate the process improvements.

Process evaluation surveys were conducted each of those three years for applicants and CSGP Committee members. Following the third year of implementation for FY2019, the Cultural Council convened a task force to review the survey feedback and act as a sounding board. The task force represented applicant, CSGP Committee, Cultural Council board and Cultural Council staff perspectives. Overall, the changes to CSGP that had been implemented for three years were found to be very effective. However, there were a few points that repeatedly popped up and these have been addressed in process improvements, which are being implemented for FY2020, and are reflected in the following chart:

**CSGP Process Changes – 2019-2020**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WHAT IS AFFECTED** | **CHANGE** |
| APPLICATION | Identify responses to each scoring statement by noting corresponding question number (i.e. Q1, Q2, Q3, etc.) within the narrative. |
| APPLICATION | Budget Narrative added to SECTION FOUR (B) |
| APPLICATION | Q17-Q20 budget scoring statements revised (changes in bold):  Q17 - (5 points) Organization demonstrates a sustained ability to meet its annual expenses **and address its fiscal condition and stability.**  Q18 - (5 points) Organization's matching funds show a healthy mix of revenue streams and  evidence of financial support from the community. **The organization can describe its fundraising plans and efforts.**  Q19 - (5 points) Organization budgets appropriately to be able to carry out its programs, **operations** and outreach as described in the application. **Any losses, large year-to-year variances, significant budget changes or “abnormalities” are adequately explained.**  Q20 - (5 points) Organization clearly shows how it would use a Cultural Service Grant award and how the funds would benefit the organization. |
| APPLICATION | Budget FORM A – Losses don’t have to be explained on the Excel form; use the budget narrative instead (Q19) |
| ON-SITES | More training for committee members around on-sites and especially use of role-play |
| ON-SITES | Designate back-up committee member(s) willing to conduct extra on-sites if a committee member is unable to complete their work in a timely manner.  Have a deadline for pulling the trigger on back-up person so that on-site visit and evaluation report can be completed by the deadline. |
| SCORING | At least one overall written comment will be required for each application. |
| SCORING/HEARING PROCEDURE | Written comments in the preliminary score form and verbal comments at the hearings will be required for scores of 2 or 1. |
| SCORING/  ITERATION MODEL/  FUNDING ALLOCATIONS | Final average score will be rounded UP to the nearest whole number. If the score is a whole number it stays the same. |