CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Advancing California through the Arts and Creativity

Craig Watson, Director

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
October 6, 2014
10:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts
701 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 978-2787

1.	Call to Order Welcome by Deborah Cullinan, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	W. Aitken D. Cullinan
2.	Roll Call and Establishment of a Quorum	D. Golling
3.	Approval of Minutes from August 28, 2014 **(TAB 14)**	W. Aitken
4.	Chair's Report	W. Aitken
5.	Director's Report **(TAB 15)**	C. Watson
6.	Public Comment (limited to two minutes per speaker)	W. Aitken
7.	Reports by California County Superintendents Educational Services Association/Turnaround Arts CA: Creativity at the Core, Turnaround Arts	S. Anderberg T. Lenihan
8.	2014-15 Program Priorities, Program Direction and Funding Allocation **(TAB 16)**	W. Aitken
9.	Applicant Process and Advisory Panels	R. Wyman
10.	Programs and Grants 2014-15	C. Jefferson
	a. Artists in Schools **(TAB 17) ACTION ITEM**	
	b. State-Local Partnership Program **(TAB 18) ACTION ITEM**	
	1) Technical assistance recommendation **(TAB 19) ACTION ITEM**	
	c. Poetry Out Loud **(TAB 20) ACTION ITEM**	
	d. Outreach & Thought Leadership Committee: Convening Implementation Proposal **(TAB 21)**	S. Steinhauser C. Coppola
11.	Public Comment (limited to two minutes per speaker)	W. Aitken
12.	CLOSED SESSION Pursuant to Government Code §11126(a), to discuss/take action on personnel matters	W. Aitken
13.	Other Business	W. Aitken
14.	Adjournment	W. Aitken

Notes:

1. *All times indicated and the orders of business are approximate and subject to change.*
2. ***Any item listed on the Agenda is subject to possible Council action.***
3. *The CAC retains the right to convene an advisory committee meeting pursuant to Government Code Sec. 11125 (d).*
4. *Council meetings are open to the public and are held in barrier-free facilities that are accessible to those with physical disabilities in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you need additional reasonable accommodations, please make your request no later than five (5) business days before the meeting. Please direct your request to the Administrative Assistant, Diane Golling, at (916) 322-6335 or diane.golling@arts.ca.gov.*
5. *Public testimony is time limited. Please make concise remarks.*
6. *A working lunch will be delivered for the Council Members and staff. No lunch break will be taken.*

Tab 14

DRAFT

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

August 28, 2014
9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Grand Central Art Center
California State University, Fullerton
125 No. Broadway, Santa Ana, CA 97201
714.567.2733

PRESENT:

Council Members

Wylie Aitken, Chair
Susan Steinhauser, Vice Chair
Michael Alexander
Donn Harris
Charmaine Jefferson
William Turner
Rosalind Wyman (arrival: 11:10 a.m.)

Arts Council Staff

Craig Watson, Director
Scott Heckes, Deputy Director
Caitlin Fitzwater, Public Information Officer
Mary Beth Barber, Special Projects Associate (arrival: 11:15 a.m.)
Diane Golling, Administrative Assistant

Other Attendees

John Spiak, Grand Central Art Center
Jim Taulli, California State University at Fullerton, College of the Arts
Rick Stein, Arts Orange County, Californians for the Arts
Patrick Brien, Riverside Arts Council
Bonnie Hall, Orange County Philharmonic Society
Terry LeMoncheck, Pasadena Arts Council
David Palmer, Soka Performing Arts Center, California Presenters
Kevin Staniel, The Muckenthaler Cultural Center
Erin Harkey, Los Angeles County Arts Commission
Laura Zucker, Los Angeles County Arts Commission
Victoria Bryan, Arts Council for Long Beach
Julia Tilley, Arts Connection

Zoot Velasco, The Muckenthaler Cultural Center
John Malpede, LA Poverty Department
Dennis Paul, arts activist
Andrew Kasdin, Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs

ABSENT:

Council Members
Christopher Coppola

MINUTES

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Chair calls the meeting to order at 10:16. Golling calls the roll and we have a quorum. Present: Aitken, Alexander, Harris, Jefferson, Steinhauser, Turner. Absent: Wyman, Coppola.

II. Welcome and Public Comment

The Chair introduces John Spiak, Director and Chief Curator of Grand Central Art Center. He welcomes the council and explains that Grand Central Art Center is an annex of California State University at Fullerton's College of the Arts. He introduces Jim Taulli, Dean of the College of the Arts, who also welcomes the arts council and says how proud he is of the work that Spiak has done.

The Chair explains the schedule for the day and notes that we will have more public comment than we normally do. He recognizes Rick Stein, Executive Director of Arts Orange County, who welcomes the council and his colleagues in the audience back to Orange County. Arts Orange County is a nonprofit independent arts agency, and is the CAC's state/local partner (SLP). Bonnie Hall is here today, and she was its founding director. There are over 600 arts organizations in Orange County and nonprofit arts contribute mightily to the Orange County economy. The local business community is very supportive of the STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts, math) focus in education. Santa Ana is one of the poorest cities in America. It is also one of the richest communities – artistically – in the state. Many interesting things are happening. The city council established its first arts and culture commission last fall, a very ambitious and talented group. Gentrification issues are arising. Stein is also president of Californians for the Arts and is very excited about the achievement that we all accomplished together, increasing the budget for the CAC this year. He states that our work is not done; the CAC budget used to be $30 million and should be again. He thanks those present who worked so hard, barraging the legislature with phone calls and faxes in support of arts funding.

The Chair recognizes Bonnie Hall, currently Vice President of Development for the Philharmonic Society, the county's oldest music organization. She gives the history of her organization and notes that the support of the CAC has been key throughout their growth. They appreciate all we have done for the growth and development of the Orange County arts field.

III. Approval of Minutes from June 17 and 18, 2014

At 10:36 a.m. the Chair moves the discussion to approval of the minutes. The minutes in the council meeting packets have been updated to contain additional information. The revised version has been distributed to council members and the public.

ACTION: Alexander moves to approve the revised minutes from June 17, 2014 and June 18, 2014 without amendment. Harris seconds. The motion is approved unanimously.

IV. Chair's Report

At 10:40 a.m. Aitken gives the Chair's report. He notes that the council held a number of public meetings where various protocols were decided upon for handing the one-time 2013-14 augmentation to the CAC's budget of two million dollars from the state assembly (the $2M). The CAC had to spend the $2M in a relatively short period of time or lose the money. The process followed by the council evolved in an open way over several meetings, so looking at only the June meetings doesn't give the entire picture. The council received approximately $11M in requests through applications to the new Creative California Communities (CCC) program. Only $750K had been set aside for CCC. When you look at what we were able to accomplish, touching 43 California counties, he thinks the council made some good decisions. He wants to make it clear that all the applications were worthy. It would have been tremendous to have the $40M the CAC once had, so we could have funded more CCC projects.

One thing very much on the council's mind was the impact the CCC projects would have on public will. The spending of the $2M was intended to make a splash, so the CAC could go back to the legislature this year and demonstrate the value of arts funding to the citizens and communities of California.

Part of this meeting will address the fact that the CAC didn't have the funds to finance every worthy project, and still does not. It does have additional money. The Chair recommends that we allocate an additional $500K over and above what we were dealing with at the last meeting, to fund a few more of the CCC applicants. The CAC will meet again in September and discuss what its priorities are. We will probably set up a similar program to CCC, hoping to address more of the projects left on the cutting room floor today. When you're dealing with limited funds, some things get cut. Even the programs that we funded at the June meeting took a cut in what they requested, because of the limited resources that we had. Heckes looked at the statistical mean and it was 67%. So the programs that the council supports here today will face a similar cut.

V. Director's Report

At 10:51 a.m. Watson gives the Director's report. He draws the council's attention to Tab 17 in their meeting packets. This is the beginning of a conversation the council intends to take up and the staff will support, looking at the CAC's peer panel process and investigating best practices. The programs committee, Alexander and Jefferson, have met in depth on this topic. Two weeks ago on a private National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) listserve a colleague in Connecticut put out a series of questions about the peer panel process, and there was a tsunami of responses about the role that peer panels play at our sister agencies.

Steinhauser says there is nothing in the recommendations under Tab 17 about modifying the criteria we use. Watson says that detail was not part of the discussion. Everyone acknowledges

that during the June meetings there was confusion experienced by our applicants and our peers. Aitken says everything is on the table. The topic will be on the agenda in September and if you have a different idea it will be welcome. This will also apply to the committee report the council will get from Alexander and Jefferson.

Watson passes around a thank you poster designed by CAC graphic designer Theresa D'Onofrio that is being framed and delivered to each legislative partner who supported us during the budget process. Watson points out that Aitken and Steinhauser paid for the framing, since the CAC can't pay for such things as a state agency. Watson turns to the Vice Chair to lead the discussion of the executive summary of the survey to the field.

At 11:00 a.m. Steinhauser reports from the Thought Leadership and Outreach Committee. She thanks Coppola and Fitzwater. The committee's first priority is convenings, to bring our grantees and partners together. They surveyed the field to determine what our constituents need. We had 933 responses from all 58 counties. She walks everyone through the key findings. Arts organizations seek help with community collaboration, leadership development, and multicultural arts. Artists want help with marketing, promotion, and networking. At the September meeting this committee will come back with some topics, preliminary speakers and dates. Jefferson adds that it was extremely helpful to have this report, so she thanks the committee and the community.

Aitken asks Watson to talk about this evening's reception in case people have to leave. The local arts and business community is hosting a reception across the plaza from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. and members of the public attending today's meeting are welcome to attend the reception.

VI. Chair's Proposal to Revisit 2013-14 Creative California Communities Applications

At 11:04 a.m. Aitken returns to his CCC proposal and asks for a motion.

Jefferson moves that the council reopen the discussion of CCC applications unfunded at its June meeting, with a limit of $500K to be allocated and an initial focus on applications that received an advisory panel ranking of 4 or higher. Turner seconds the motion. Aitken objects, saying that the motion does not reflect his intent. Harris asks for the reasoning behind the motion. Jefferson says that Aitken's letter to the applicants proposed that the council would revisit "higher ranked" applications, and to her that means the 4s and 5s. She further points out that with a limit of a half million dollars, the council cannot fund beyond the 4s and 5s.

At 11:09 a.m. Wyman arrives.

Aitken again objects to the motion on the table. Turner suggests a two-step process as a compromise. He suggests that the council start with the high ranks and then have a second motion if need be. He notes that there is consensus around reviewing the 4s and 5s, but there is a difference of opinion regarding the 3s and 2s. He is concerned that the field may question why the council only reopened the process to applications favored by individual council members. The applicants may ask, why didn't the council revisit all the unfunded applications? If the council prioritizes applications ranked highly by peer panels, that will make sense to the public. He thinks that is why the council should look at the highest-ranked proposals first.

Aitken doesn't want a predetermination in the motion that the council can't look at the lower ranked proposals. Turner says his objection to Aitken's route is that the council would be looking at applications that were specifically withdrawn after being brought forward in June. If the

council is going to reconsider unfunded applications ranked below a 4 or 5, it should look at all unfunded applications. Turner thinks a better approach for the council is to revisit only the 4s and 5s today and then throw open new guidelines.

Wyman agrees, saying she thinks the unfunded CCC applicants ought to be up against everyone else. What about the proposals before the council that had deadlines, that were ready two months ago? Does the council throw them out? Watson says one of the proposals has, in fact, withdrawn. The Arts Center of Eagle Rock cannot satisfy their original intent. But everyone else still wishes to be considered.

Harris agrees with Aitken that there are additional worthy projects, but agrees with Jefferson and Turner that the council should start with the 4s and 5s. Watson says the staff recommendation is to fund all approved proposals at 67%. Alexander says the council should hear public testimony before deciding whether to consider lower-ranked applications.

Steinhauser says that she thought the council was supposed to review all applications to prepare for the June meeting. However, although everyone read the 5s and 4s, many council members did not read the 3s and 2s. So the only lower-ranked proposals that came up in June were ones that an individual council member happened to pull from the stack and read, without necessarily reading the others. It's very important to her, and she thinks to others, that before the council starts today, it has a process in place that is above reproach. Clearly the council should look at the 5s and 4s.

Aitken reiterates that he resents and opposes the cutting of the 3s and 2s brought forward from the June meeting. Jefferson says there is a motion on the table to look at the 4s and 5s. If there is a discussion of the 2s and the 3s, the council can't fund the 4s and 5s at 67%, which is what the staff recommends. Aitken repeats that he is opposed to starting the discussion with $500K and only looking at the 4s and 5s.

Wyman asks the staff what the legal position of the council is at this point. She thinks the council can't do anything unless the public is informed in advance. The CAC is applying new money to CCC, not money from the $2M, and the public did not weigh in. Watson points out that Aitken sent a letter to the applicants with his recommendation. He affirms that the council does have the authority to do this. Alexander says it's really a proposal to expand the $51K allocated at the June meeting from the CAC's 2014-15 budget. Aitken says the council will give serious consideration to creating a similar program at the September meeting.

Jefferson calls for the question.

ACTION: Jefferson has moved to revisit the discussion of CCC applications unfunded at the council's June meeting, with a limit of $500K to be allocated, and an initial focus on applications that received an advisory panel ranking of 4 or higher. Turner has seconded. Alexander, Harris, Jefferson, Steinhauser, and Turner vote yes. Aitken and Wyman vote no. The motion passes.

At 11:37 a.m. a 10-minute break is taken.

VII. Public Comment

The Chair calls the meeting back to order at 11:48 a.m. and invites public comment. He recognizes David Palmer of Soka Performing Arts Center and California Presenters, who thanks the CAC for its support. Presenting is a vital part of what every artist does. He asks the council to

consider something akin to the touring and presenting program once run by the CAC. He supports the council in all these deliberations.

The Chair reads comments from Maria Hall Brown of PBS SoCal, thanking the CAC.

The Chair recognizes Laura Zucker of the Los Angeles County Arts Commission. She commends the council for working toward a transparent, equitable funding process. The CAC has provided leadership in this arena for decades and it's greatly appreciated.

Julia Tilley from Arts Connection thanks CAC for its SLP funding. San Bernardino County is the largest county in the country and there are a lot of arts organizations spread over a huge area. There is lots to do but they have seed money from the county and from the Irvine Foundation. Their upcoming convening on September 13 will feature Watson as keynote speaker.

Patrick Brien from Riverside Arts Council underscores the importance of the State/Local Partnership Program (SLPP). They are hoping for an increase to $1.4M. The SLPs are the CAC's "boots on the ground." SLPs enable the CAC to impact public will. They walk people through grant writing when they have terrific programs but don't know how to write a grant. Aitken assures him that at the September meeting the council will be making decisions. Steinhauser says that the SLPs helped to advocate for additional funding for the CAC.

The Chair recognizes Zoot Velasco from The Muckenthaler Cultural Center (The Muckenthaler). He gives the history of his work in the arts field in California, working with skid row, kids in foster care, and prison arts. He says he owes the CAC his life. Artists are now working in five California prisons thanks to Watson, Barber and the CAC. When their arts programs ran in immigrant centers the kids learned English twice as fast, so now they have federal money to run arts programs in detention facilities. He's not upset about not getting a CCC grant and thinks others should not be either. It sparked new ideas and The Muckenthaler received new funding. Last year they started the first STEAM program in Orange County, teaching physics through stop motion animation. They'll be serving three school districts next year. They are restarting a teen center in Placentia that has been vacant for 20 years. These developments came directly from the CCC grant even though they didn't get it. He tells the council to feel good leaving here today, because they are doing great work.

John Malpede from the LA Poverty Department says the CCC grant opportunity was a chance to get to know the CAC and that was great. He wants the council to know that the Poverty Department's NEA funding came through.

Dennis Paul speaks. He is familiar with the peer panel process and how painful it is, but thought Wyman had a valid point. He compliments the Council and Watson on receiving a budget augmentation, but thinks the criteria for using this money should not be the same as the previous money.

Andrew Kasdin, from the Department of Cultural Affairs in Los Angeles, appreciates the CAC's willingness to look at all the issues and get into the weeds. He appreciates the leadership and the commitment of the council.

Aitken asks Heckes to clarify the procedural question raised by Paul and Wyman. Why can the council dip into the new money? Heckes says he's not an attorney, but can speak to the process of it. At the meeting in June there was a public indication that the council had an interest in revisiting the applications should additional money materialize, and it did. The council is going

to consider creating a new, similar program and if that happens there will be new guidelines and a new process. Aitken says he wants to be careful that the council is proceeding in a transparent manner.

At 12:30 p.m. Watson reminds the council of the conflict of interest policy. At the June meeting the staff was directed to bring this up at the next meeting. He asks for those who have conflicts to declare them. Jefferson declares the City of Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs; she is a commission member. No other council members declare conflicts.

Steinhauser asks the staff to point out conflicts, or apparent conflicts, that council members accidentally leave out. Watson notes that Wyman has an apparent conflict of interest if the council discusses the Los Angeles County Arts Commission (LACAC). Wyman denies it. Watson reads her the definition and respectfully requests that she declare it as a conflict. Wyman declines, but agrees to leave the room during the discussion. The Chair then asks her to leave the room and she does. Alexander does as well, self declaring a potential conflict of interest due to a contentious conversation he had with someone at LACAC.

At 12:39 p.m. the Chair brings up LACAC's unfunded application, which is the only unfunded application ranked 5 by the advisory panel. Watson says that Heckes is prepared to offer bullet points from the panel. Aitken asks if applicants can access the panel notes. Heckes says yes, the staff provides them upon request. Jefferson notes that if the council had had more funds in June, this proposal would have been funded. Steinhauser asks Watson about the timeline. The first phase was July to December and if they are funded today they will not receive the funding until the end of the phase. Watson says we have to ask for a modified budget; we are doing that with everyone. The $2M had certain requirements. We are now dipping into a new pot of money. The council can leave the rules alone or change them to move the deadline out. Heckes explains that the $2M was an interagency agreement that had to be spent by June of 2015. This is money appropriated by the legislature. The dollars could be spent beyond June of 2015 as long as they are encumbered by June of 2015. Turner thinks we should change the rules as little as possible. We don't want to punish the applicants we funded in June. Jefferson agrees, they should have the same deadline as the others.

ACTION: Jefferson moves to fund the LACAC application at 70% of its initial request. Turner seconds. Aitken, Harris, Jefferson, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. No one votes no. The motion passes.

The council moves on to the applications with a panel ranking of 4. Wyman and Alexander return to the meeting.

First up for consideration is the Los Angeles Poverty Department. Heckes reads the panel comments. After discussion a straw vote is taken, to fund this proposal at 70% of its initial request. Everyone's in favor except Steinhauser, who expresses a blanket reservation about the council's consensus that all the programs funded today will be funded at 70%. Steinhauser asks that the record reflect her standing objection to assigning a dollar amount to any approved application in advance of all applications being reviewed. The record will reflect her concern and change her vote to yes, with that caveat, on both applications discussed thus far.

Next up is Eagle Rock, which has withdrawn itself from consideration.

Pasadena Playhouse's proposal is discussed at 1:17 p.m. Heckes reads the panel comments. Aitken notes that despite the name on the proposal, the project will be serving East Los Angeles

and San Gabriel Valley. After discussion, Steinhauser sums up the council's concerns by saying she likes what they're trying to do but the request is large and the application doesn't tell the story, which is problematic. Jefferson suggests a funding level of $60K. A straw vote is taken on Jefferson's recommendation. Turner, Alexander and Jefferson vote yes. Aitken, Harris, Steinhauser and Wyman vote no. The application is not funded.

The council moves on to the Pasadena Arts Council application. Heckes reads the panel comments. After discussion, a straw vote is taken. Jefferson, Alexander, Harris and Turner vote yes. Aitken, Steinhauser and Wyman vote no. $45,500 is approved for the Pasadena Arts Council's CCC proposal.

Next up is Napa Valley. Heckes reads the panel comments. Turner thinks this could be a perfect model for an area that has been recently devastated, so his opinion has changed from the previous meeting. Others agree. After discussion, the proposal is approved unanimously and funded at 70% of the initial request, with Steinhauser's caveat as noted above.

Precita Eyes Muralists is addressed at 1:43 p.m. Heckes reads the panel comments. After discussion, a straw vote is taken and the proposal is approved unanimously at 70% of the application's request, with Steinhauser's caveat as noted above.

The San Francisco Arts Commission application is taken up. Heckes reads the panel comments. After discussion, a straw vote is taken and the proposal is approved unanimously at 70% of the application's request, with Steinhauser's caveat as noted above.

At 2:00 p.m. the council discusses the Chinese Cultural Center of San Francisco's CCC application. Heckes reads the panel comments. After discussion, a straw vote is taken and the proposal is approved unanimously at 70% of the application's request, with Steinhauser's caveat as noted above.

Steinhauser notes that a recurring theme in reviewing these applications is that cities have pockets of wealth and poverty, and several proposals serve an area that is not wealthy within the borders of a wealthy city.

At 2:07 p.m. Heckes reports that the council has spent $363,033 of the proposed $500,000, if it funds the currently-approved applications at 70%.

Aitken asks if we can extend the discussion into the next meeting, to address lower-ranked proposals. Wyman says she wants a legal opinion first.

Steinhauser says she wanted to treat today's group of applications no differently than the first group. In other words, she would take the balance and return it to the CAC, to augment the pool of grant funds for other programs. Aitken wants, instead, to look now at the 3s brought forward from the June meeting. Wyman objects to the council going back over the same 2s and 3s instead of opening a new program to the field. Alexander says we need closure on the 4s and 5s, and suggests the council get that vote out of the way, then decide if it wants to talk about the 3s and 2s today, September, or not at all.

Wyman notes that the council did not apply a percentage in June, so is it fair to do this now? Jefferson said she recommended 70% to recognize that. We should either go with the 70% or go over each one individually. Fitzwater reads the votes back with the amounts. Heckes says that when the council did the initial review and vote, there was no motion; it was a straw vote. A formal action is needed.

ACTION: Alexander moves to fund all the CCC applications revisited today that were ranked 4 by the panel at 70% of their requests, with the exception of Pasadena Playhouse and Eagle Rock. Aitken seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

A short break is taken.

The Chair reconvenes the meeting at 2:48 p.m. Wyman asks that the SLPs send letters to the governor and the legislators to thank them.

Zoot Velasco is recognized by the Chair and speaks about The Muckenthaler Cultural Center's application being ranked a 3. He says the process the council just went through left money over and they should let the 3s "have a crack at it" today. Aitken says he concurs, but the reality is there is no support on the Council for doing that. He takes a vote. Aitken and Harris vote yes. Wyman, Turner, Alexander, Jefferson and Steinhauser vote no. Aitken says there is clearly no enthusiasm for his idea and he's going to let it go.

Turner notes that the application window for CCC was very tight, six weeks or so. He asks if the council could simply ask for a new CCC round, with a new application window. Aitken advocates against that. He wants to leave the door open for the existing CCC applications until the September meeting. Steinhauser objects to this, saying that when she was given instructions to read the 3s and 2s, she did it, even though she was on vacation. Now she's ready to move on. She believes the council is setting up a very unreasonable expectation. The door was supposed to close in June. We opened it again in August, and now the Chair wants to open it again in September. She thinks the council should open a different door and let everyone come through it again. We have a thoughtful proposal from Jefferson and Alexander and we ought to close the door and move on. Harris agrees. Jefferson agrees. Wyman agrees. Aitken says he is going to defer to Wyman and shelve CCC. Everyone agrees the 3s were fantastic and the CAC wishes it could fund them.

Jefferson says there is one decision that the council must make today relating to the arts license plate, and everything else on the agenda is just discussion and sending everyone away with things to think about. There are staff timelines to think about as well. Alexander points out that we lost Milich and had a few other retirements. The CAC has lost some institutional memory. To manage that, the council must be careful not to create too many new programs that have to be managed by the staff. If we are going to help the field in a timely way we need to look at the logistics and operations side of the use of this money.

Everyone is concerned about process. Steinhauser says she hopes in the future the council does not act as a panel. Aitken says whatever procedure the council goes forward with, the council must be comfortable with it.

Alexander asks staff to check best practices in states that have multiple urban centers. Wyman notes that she asked Watson to ask other states how they do it. Watson responds that Barber has done some research into the question of how a diverse state deals with sophisticated applications coming in from urban areas swamping less sophisticated applications coming from rural areas. He would be glad to set up a workshop with NASAA on best practices.

Jefferson reminds the Council how they got to this point. There was nothing wrong with the CAC's existing system. However, in the context of the $2M, the council made a decision that the members were going to read every application. We normally don't do that. Time was a factor, and the council believed that the way it handled the $2M would influence the CAC's future

funding. We do not want to be in the business of reading the applications on a regular basis. The council can improve the peer review system, but we do not want to change it.

VIII. Programs and Grants Committee Report and Recommendations

At 3:24 p.m. Jefferson turns the council's attention to the last page of Tab 20. What the council must vote on today is the arts license plate issue. Heckes has been warning the Council for years that this would need to be addressed. Now is the time. Staff recommends that we forward-fund the reserve so the dollars will be there to fund our standing programs.

Heckes clarifies. It's not exactly forward-funding the reserve. Instead of taking arts license plate money to fund Creating Places of Vitality (CPV) and Statewide Networks (SN) at the end of the year, staff recommends the council use a portion of the $5M from the general fund to support those programs. At the beginning of the fiscal year the council votes on Artists in Schools and SLPP. The council has been spending more than what it has been bringing in, because the CAC wanted to get as much money as possible out to the field. Our arts license plate marketing efforts have been postponed for a variety of reasons. If the council does not support this staff recommendation, at the end of this fiscal year there will be nothing in the reserve. We will have no money to fund Artists in Schools and SLPP at the beginning of 2015-16.

Aitken points out that the council may want to tweak those programs before then anyway. Heckes says he just wants the council to be aware. The arts license plate revenues are not increasing. A decision needs to be made before the end of this fiscal year. Heckes says ideally we'd like to get to a place where the general fund is the primary support for our programs and the arts license plate money is secondary. We're not there now. At this point we're bringing in $2.2 and spending $2.8. Watson further clarifies that we still haven't been able to launch the voucher program. Wyman asks why. Turner says the problem is delay forced by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Aitken asks if there's money the council must draw for a commitment already made. Heckes says we're fine for 2014-15 – because we support two of our programs at the end of the fiscal year. Heckes explained that years ago there was a large balance in the arts license plate account – and the council chose to spend more than it took in with license plate revenue, as a prudent move to release the funds to the field. But after years of doing this, we've spent down that balance. Marketing efforts for the plate have been unsuccessful thus far and additional arts plate funds have not materialized.

Wylie asks Jefferson to explain the programs committee recommendations. Jefferson goes through the numbers in the spreadsheet, with background on how the different recommendations kept the strategic plan in mind. Alexander adds that the increased SN recommendation is not just more money for our existing grantees but an acknowledgment that there are emerging networks we could support.

Turner congratulates Alexander and Jefferson on their work. He wonders whether the CCC and CPV programs could be combined and broken into categories. Watson says the two programs serve different types of projects; the smallest CCC grant was $30,000 and CPV's average grant is $10,000. CPV is aimed at rural communities or urban communities of need.

At 3:55 p.m. Harris asks for clarification that the spreadsheet only reviews a program budget, and not a full agency budget. Heckes confirms that is the case. Steinhauser asks that an updated programs calendar, the document created by Milich, be presented at the September council meeting. Jefferson reminds the council that it has heard from the field that SLPP needs more

support, based on their vital contributions to our statewide reach. Jefferson adds that the JUMP StArts and Arts on the Air programs need time for evaluation before additional funds are invested, possibly in the next fiscal year rather than this one. Likewise, $300K from the $2M was invested in Turnaround Schools, but there is no recommendation to provide additional funds for that program.

Steinhauser is pleased to see there are funds set aside for convenings and technical services, given the high priority for this work set forth by our Strategic Plan. She asks the council to think about what the process will be for the September decisions, given that guidance is necessary for staff to begin work on implementation.

Watson says staff will provide a "theoretical" calendar for the September meeting based on the timeline needed to construct programs. Alexander feels that the presentation from the programs committee is the start of a good process, for discussions to begin with a baseline conversation and a starting idea. He encourages the council members to communicate their feedback with Watson so the council's recommendations can be gathered and distributed for the September meeting.

Turner reminds the council that Turnaround Schools is a high visibility program that could have cause for further investment. Watson informs the council that former council member Terry Lenihan, a representative of Turnaround Arts and Creativity at the Core, plans to attend the September meeting to speak about this program.

Aitken thinks the council needs to reexamine the whole process for programs. He wants the council to think about new programs and not just the continuation of existing programs. Jefferson points out that in the scenario provided by the committee, there are unallocated funds that could be used to support new areas. Jefferson brings up general operating support as a need of the field, according to the survey results, listening tours, and what the field is saying.

Harris asks about SLPP, and what the formula will look like for the distribution to each partner. Aitken says this will be a part of future discussions. Steinhauser asks for clarification on the next steps. Watson asks that the council provide feedback on today's program committee report. Staff will analyze the council feedback and provide a report that summarizes feedback and looks for commonalties to guide the discussion.

Alexander proposes that the council provide feedback to Watson by September 10, with a summary report to be provided to the council on September 12. Aitken says no, council members should just provide feedback whenever they can.

IX. Other Business

Aitken shares that unless the council votes to confirm former council chair Malissa Shriver's ongoing relationship with the CAC, she cannot serve as the California representative on the board of NASAA.

ACTION: At 4:23 p.m. Steinhauser moves to support Shriver's position on the NASAA board. Alexander seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

ACTION: At 4:25 p.m. Alexander moves to adjourn. Harris seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

Tab 15

Gmail

Director's Report - Sept. 10, 2014

Memo

To: California Arts Council

From: Craig Watson, Director

Re: Director's Report

Date: September 10, 2014

Follow-up to our last Council meeting:

- As discussed in Santa Ana (and mentioned in a separate note sent this week), Council members are requested to pass along to Scott Heckes or me their reactions, suggestions, alternatives and questions regarding the report we heard from the Programs and Grants Committee. Then, prior to the October 6th Council meeting in San Francisco, we will package (without editing in any way) all the comments and send them all back out to the Council so you will have the benefit of each other's thinking prior to an in-depth discussion on the 6th. This will avoid any Bagley-Keene Act issue.

- The Council asked that staff provide some form of update on our JumpSTArts (juvenile justice projects) grantees. We expect to have a short report on this program and will send it out prior to the meeting.

- Staff will also provide an updated programs calendar, document the expected timelines for existing programs, and add some very preliminary timelines for potential new programs. And by "new", there is no assumption that the Council has decided anything in final form, but we want to be sure there is an understanding about the timing for any new programs and how they might be placed on a calendar for development, should the Council act to move them forward.

- Finally, staff is preparing a one-page overview of each of our existing programs (number of grants, average grant size, examples of grants, audiences served, general distribution, etc.). These will also be distributed prior to the 6th to answer some of the likeliest questions the Council may have as they discuss existing and new programs.

Strategic Plan/Committee Activities and Updates:

Programs and Services

- This Committee is expected to meet at least once more between now and the October 6th meeting. They will review the materials being prepared by staff mentioned above and help refine, modify or expand those background materials.

Arts Education

- CREATE CA: As mentioned in the Director's last report, the Hewlett Foundation has committed a $150,000 "President's Award" to CREATE CA to assist with the coordination of this collaborative effort and to also fund a statewide convening to be held next January. A copy of the Hewlett request (that led to the award) is attached. The CAC lent staff support to the crafting of this request. Our own new staff member, Shelly Gilbride, is the one who put this together with the help of CAAE Executive Director, Joe Landon. Attached you will find a copy of the proposal narrative we submitted to Hewlett. **Thanks Shelly!!!**
- Also, as mentioned in my last report, CREATE CA did submit a significant grant proposal to the National Endowment for the Arts under their "Collective Impact" category within the NEA's Arts Education unit. The California Alliance for Arts Education (CAAE) will serve as the "fiscal agent" for the grant. Like the Hewlett proposal, Shelly Gilbride had a direct hand in finalizing the grant submitted to the NEA. Attached you will find a summary of the NEA grant narrative.
- Finally, we have been asked for time on the CAC's September meeting agenda so that the principals behind the "Creativity at the Core" project can present a status report. This will showcase the work being done with one of the $300,000 grants awarded by the CAC out of Assembly funding last November. Also, one of the potential presenters is our very own former Council member, Terry Lenihan. Terry would also like to present an update on the "Turn Around" schools project. Both brief status reports might provide the Council with the background they need as they consider setting aside additional funds for these two important arts education projects.

Outreach and Thought Leadership

- Survey: The survey to the field on the topic of convenings and training was briefly presented at our last Council meeting. The Committee has asked to include on our October 6 agenda, discussion of their proposal for implementing a convening strategy for the coming year.

Resource Development

- Keep Arts in Schools
  - August results are not yet available, but through July we have raised a total of $239,072 and that puts us very close to achieving our goal (not a requirement yet...that happens in Year Two) of $250,000 by the end of this calendar year. As soon as we have an updated number we will update the Council.

- Arts Plate
    - An update and status report for the Council is coming soon. It will include details on the ongoing delays from DMV that we have experienced in our launch of the "voucher card" program. In addition, it will provide a set of timelines and marketing recommendations for the launch once the DMV removes its testing and launch restrictions. As a reminder, our launch was delayed because of heightened security requirements from the DMV after two major news stories: 1. The widely publicized Target Stores breach in December, followed by 2. The disturbing news story of a probabl e credit-card data breach at the DMV in the early spring. These breaches and others noted in the news have caused the DMV to unexpectedly expand their payment-card industry security requirements prior to approving our launch, as well as delayed the availability of their testing environment. Much more detail will be included in our report.

Legislative Affairs

- With the Legislature in recess, this is still a very quiet period in the Capitol. But we have heard from the staff in Assemblyman Bloom's (D-Santa Monica) office that he is potentially interested in sponsoring legislation to create a California State-sanctioned Arts and Culture Districts program. At their request we sent them a large notebook of materials that we had compiled documenting similar programs in several other states, including sample legislation. We will be following up with them shortly, to further gauge their interest.
- As we learned back in June, State Senator Jim Nielsen is interested in working with Senator Loni Hancock on possible legislation to extend the Arts in Corrections pilot program into County Jails. In addition, we can imagine this same duo being interested in creating legislation to extend the current two-year program for State prisons for a longer period.
- In both cases (Arts and Culture Districts and Arts in Corrections), we will confer first with our Legislative Affairs committee and come back to the Council for further review.
- Finally, we just heard from WESTAF that they will again provide $20,000 to the California Arts Advocates for their advocacy work in Sacramento and may find a way to increase that to $30,000.

International Activity

- Described as a "pending" invitation in the past, the invitation for the Director to lead a small group of municipal arts leaders to China is now official. In helping to satisfy the Governor's Memorandum of Understanding with China, the Chinese Ministry of Culture specifically requested that San Francisco and Los Angeles be represented on the trip and up to three other cities. In addition to LA and SF, San Jose, San Diego and Santa Monica will send their senior manager of cultural affairs for a total group of six traveling to China. The delegation is visiting three cities while in China...Shanghai, Xi'an and Beijing. The Chinese government will pay all expenses while the delegation is in China. Each member of the delegation must make their own travel arrangements to get to China. In my case, I will personally cover my travel expenses, there and back. We are in close coordination with the Governor's office on this trip.

- Just today, the CAC played host to a delegation of 18 visiting Chinese Ministry of Culture representatives. They were particularly interested in how the United States funds "arts and culture" and also how we (the USA and California) are supporting the use of technology to promote or experience the arts. Mary Beth Barber put together an excellent PowerPoint on both topics. And by coincidence, the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission and California State University at Sacramento are launching a very exciting use of technology by commissioning artists to create "virtual artwork" that can be viewed along the

Broadway street corridor using either a smart phone or tablet to actually "see" the artworks...fascinating! Attached is the PowerPoint presentation.

- Also today, at the request of the Governor's office, we met with representatives of the Israeli Consulate in San Francisco to build on the Governor's new MOU with Israel. Like the agreements with China and Mexico, the State desires expanded trade opportunities, including cultural exchange. Today's meeting was very preliminary, but begins the conversation. We will update the Council if anything of substance starts to occur.

Upcoming Council Meetings

October 6: Next regular meeting, to be held at the Yerba Buena Cultural Center in San Francisco.

November 19: Scheduled for a City-hosted space in Santa Monica.

Craig Watson
Director

California Arts Council
1300 I Street, Suite 930
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 322-6335
craig.watson@cac.ca.gov

LIKE us on Facebook
FOLLOW us on Twitter
VISIT us on the web
DRIVE the arts - get the Arts Plate

Bring creativity back to the classroom and make a difference through your state tax return!
Support arts education programs across California and contribute to the Keep Arts in Schools Fund in the Voluntary Contribution Section of California state tax returns.
Learn more at http://arts.ca.gov/getinvolved/kais.php.

---

3 attachments

CREATE proposal to Hewlett_FINAL_sg.pdf
554K

CREATE CA NEA Grant Summary.docx
15K

USArtsFundingAndTechnologyPresentation-9 10 14Event.pptx
2451K

CALIFORNIA ALLIANCE FOR ARTS EDUCATION

September 9, 2014

Julie Fry, Program Officer
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
2121 Sand Hill Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

RE: CREATE CA Proposal to the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Dear Julie:

On behalf of CREATE CA, the California Alliance for Arts Education requests $150,000 for one year from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. CREATE CA is a coalition of five organizations including the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Arts Council (CAC), the California PTA, the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) and the California Alliance for Arts Education (CAAE). The requested funds will support CREATE CA's continuing initiative to restore arts education to California's schools.

The coalition is grateful to the Hewlett Foundation for supporting the coalition since its inception. Your support has strengthened the organizational foundation, enabled its initial successes and helped to guide the strategic path forward. In the next year, activities will include holding a major convening, creating a public will campaign, and developing the coalition's infrastructure. CREATE CA was begun on the belief that arts education can be a key strategy to keep students in school, close the achievement gap, build 21st century skills, and inspire students to lead successful and happy lives. Current changes to curriculum and funding in California's education system have created an unprecedented opportunity to embed the arts into education policy as an essential part of the solution to the problems facing schools.

CREATE CA was launched as a result of stakeholders' participation in the NEA Educational Leaders Institute held in Chicago in May 2011. Since that time, CREATE CA has built a network of stakeholders, developed a governance structure, deepened relationships among members, created decision-making and funding strategies, and laid the groundwork for a series of policy recommendations on arts education. CREATE CA has catalyzed many initiatives including *Creativity at the Core* and the *Blueprint for Creative Schools,* both to be released in late 2014. *Creativity at the Core* is a series of instructional modules integrating arts into common core curriculum championed by CCSESA and funded by CAC. The *Blueprint for Creative Schools* is a comprehensive policy report to State Superintendent of Public instruction, Tom Torlakson, by the Joint Arts Education Task Force. This task force was an appointed state-wide coalition of organizational partners and agencies led by representatives from CREATE CA and many other arts, education and policy experts and leaders around the state.

With the support of the Hewlett Foundation, the coalition completed *A Strategic Roadmap* in May of 2014, a plan that includes a logic model (attached) by which the coalition can focus upon and track short

and long-term outcomes. The logic model builds upon and amplifies education reform work already underway across the state and connects arts education to long-term economic and educational interests. Following the recommendations of the roadmap, the coalition has established a Leadership Council (member list attached) with representatives of the five organizations as well as representatives from significant arts and education organizations and initiatives across the state.

The Leadership Council has identified three key elements from the Strategic Roadmap to focus on in the next year: organization building, convening and cultivating public will.

- **Organization Building:** CREATE CA will continue as an independent coalition but will restructure internal operations to best serve the new focus on facilitating collaborations and building public will for arts education. The Leadership Council will develop internal and external communications strategies and will contract with one or more consultants to:
    - Plan and manage the 2015 convening
    - Coordinate and support internal communications among coalition members and contribute to an ongoing state-wide advocacy network.
    - Develop and implement an external communications plan focused on building statewide public will for arts education and promoting the importance of arts education for California's schools and the future economy
- **Convening:** CREATE CA will hold a major 2-day convening in January 2015. With a projected attendance of approximately 200 artists, advocates, educators, industry leaders and policy makers, the convening will bring the community together to learn about new developments in arts education, identify new collaborative opportunities, and deepen cross-organizational relationships. This convening, tentatively scheduled at the Oakland School for the Arts, will address policy recommendations in the *Blueprint for Creative Schools*, and the priorities identified in the Strategic Roadmap.
- **Cultivating Public Will:** CREATE CA will develop an external communications strategy intended to foster public will for arts education. We will begin to build baseline data through the development of an "Arts Report Card", a public reporting system for school districts to assess their commitment to arts education. Together with the findings of the updated Otis College of Art/L.A. County Economic Development Corporation Creative Economy report, this data will serve as a basis to articulate, track and communicate success.

CREATE CA 1st Year budget: $224,000

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	NOTES
Communications and Project Management Consultant	$59,040	Included in "Other Professional Services" on Hewlett Budget Template
Event Planning Consultant	$30,000	
Communications/Public Will Campaign: materials, Arts Report Card conceptualization, design, testing and production	$47,040	
Annual Convening: venue, materials, speakers, publications, travel, scholarships	$61,040	
Direct Costs	$26,880	
TOTAL	**$224,000**	

Currently CREATE CA is applying for a $100,000 NEA Arts Education Grant and is confident that funding from The Boeing Company ($10,000) and the California Arts Council ($25,000) will continue in 2015. The coalition is also pursuing other funding opportunities.

Utilizing a non-profit organizational member of the Leadership Council as a fiscal sponsor was recommended in the Strategic Roadmap and is a successful model used by other similar groups. California Alliance for Arts Education (CAAE) is acting as the fiscal sponsor for the coalition, overseeing the administration of grants and other contracts. CAAE is the most appropriate fiscal sponsor because CAAE is not supported by state-wide funding, its mission is to broaden arts education advocacy, and it has the organizational capacity to administer funds appropriately and oversee operations at a state-wide level. Under the general direction of the Leadership Council, the Chair and Vice Chair will set the priorities and deliverables expected from the hired consultants. CREATE CA will conduct a two-year assessment of its impact and infrastructure. At that point, the coalition will decide whether to continue with CAAE as a fiscal agent, embed the work within an affiliate organization, or establish a separate 501(c)3.

CREATE CA has an unprecedented opportunity to enact profound change to our education system by championing creative, arts-rich education for all of California's kids. We are grateful to the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation for believing in the mission and the work of CREATE CA. Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely,

Joe Landon *On behalf of CREATE CA Leadership Council*
Executive Director
California Alliance for Arts Education

Sarah Anderberg – Director Statewide Arts Initiative, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Craig Cheslog – Principal Advisor to State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson, California Department of Education (CDE)
Craig Watson – Director, California Arts Council (CAC)
Donn Harris – Executive and Artistic Director, Oakland School for the Arts and Member of the California Arts Council
Paul Richman – Executive Director, California State PTA
Anne Bown-Crawford – Director/Teacher, Arcata Arts Institute, Arcata High School
Kris McClung – Founder/Former Director, Coronado School of the Arts
Francisca Sánchez – President, California Association for Bilingual Education
Bob Bullwinkel – Program Manager, Visual and Performing Arts, Fresno County Office of Education

CREATE CA: NEA Grant Application Summary
$100,000: Starting June, 2015, 1:1 Match Required

CREATE CA requests $100,000 to support the continuation of a collective impact initiative to restore arts education in California schools. Building on past success and following the recommendations of the newly adopted Strategic Roadmap, the coalition has established a Leadership Council (LC) with representatives of the CDE, CAC, CCSESA, CA PTA and CAAE plus additional members from the field and is focusing on three major efforts: organization building, cultivating public will and convening.

1) Organization Building: LC will set priorities, manage high-level activities, appoint ad hoc working groups to address critical issues like equity access to arts education, and hire staff to coordinate activities. Hired staff or consultants will then manage a major stakeholder convening (500 participants), build coalition membership and communication, create a Business Advisory Committee, and institute a public will campaign.

2) Cultivating Public Will: By reaching out to constituencies of the five organizations, CREATE CA is uniquely positioned to grow support for arts education and advance arts education advocacy. A vital part of building a public will campaign will be gathering baseline data. The "Arts Education Report Card," will be a public, self-reporting system that will identify gaps in access to arts education in schools and districts. Together with the findings in the updated the Otis College of Art and Design/L.A. County Economic Development Corporation Creative Economy Report, this data will serve as the basis to articulate, track and communicate success. CREATE CA will also build a strong web and social media presence and continue to build the network of coalition members to disseminate communications.

3) Convening: In early 2016, CREATE CA will hold a major convening of the arts, education and business communities to facilitate effective collaboration and examine trends in the field. Building upon the upcoming release of CREATE CA's Blueprint for Creative Schools (draft uploaded), a comprehensive series of policy recommendations developed by CREATE CA's Joint Education Task Force, the 2016 convening will address progress on the policy recommendations in the Blueprint, launch the "Arts Education Report Card" reporting tool for schools and districts, assess current communication and advocacy strategies and create action plans for the future, including plans to address issues of access and equity.

TIMELINE

- **Oct. 2014-Jun 2015** (prior to NEA funding period):

2015 Convening, release of the *Blueprint for Creative Schools*, coordinator hired and managed by Chair and Vice Chair of LC, ad hoc committees developed, and LC established regular communications.

- **Jun 2015 – Dec. 2015:**

Org Building: LC meeting regularly; coordinator builds stakeholder network, facilitates ad hoc committee communications and action plans, expands constituent database
Convening: Major planning for convening underway– logistics, agenda, speakers, working groups, materials, travel
Public Will: Conceptualization, design and testing for Arts Education Report Card and larger public will campaign including activation of website and social media

- **Jan 2016**:

Org Building: Business Advisory Committee formed
Convening: CREATE CA Convening occurs (500+ participants)

Public Will: Soft launch of Arts Ed Report Card, update on Otis Creative Economy Report disseminated, web and social media activity related to convening

- **Feb 2016-May 2016:**

Org Building: build upon connections made at convening, set priorities for next phase
Convening: Follow-up from convening including posting information, surveying, activating collaborations and catalyzing action items; lay groundwork for 2017.
Public Will: Data collection and analysis of Arts Ed Report Card, creation of messaging with baseline data from Otis Report and Report Card, social media and web presence to reflect new messaging.

Project Budget	
Public will campaign: print materials; "Arts Education Report Card" conceptualization, design, testing, production	$ 50,000
Annual Convening: venue, materials speakers, publications, scholarships	$40,000
Communications and project management consultant	$ 50,000
Event planning consultant (Convening production)	$ 36,000
CAAE: administrative costs	$ 24,000
Total: $200,000	

This page intentionally left blank

Memo

To: California Arts Council

From: Craig Watson, Director

Re: Director's Report

Date: September 23, 2014

Preparation for our next Council meeting on October 6:

- Director has sent a reminder notice to the Council asking for reactions, suggestions, additions to the Programs and Grants Committee report on the potential uses of the new Council funding. All responses will be sent back out to the Council in advance of our October 6th meeting in San Francisco.

- Also in your Council packets, staff will provide an updated programs calendar, documenting the timelines for existing programs. In addition we will add some very preliminary timelines for potential new programs. And by "new", there is no assumption that the Council has decided anything in a final form, but we want to be sure there is an understanding about the timing for any new programs and how they might be placed on a calendar for development, should the Council act to move them forward at our October and/or November meetings.

- Finally, staff has developed a one-page "profile" of each of our existing programs (number of grants, average grant size, examples of grants, audiences served, general distribution, etc.). These will also be included in your Council packets.

Strategic Plan/Committee Activities and Updates:

Programs and Services

- Since my last report, the Committee reviewed the "profile" materials being prepared by staff mentioned above and help refine these background materials.

- The Arts Council has been invited to join the *ENGAGE State Communities of Practice in Arts, Health, and Aging Initiative* funded by the National Endowment for the Arts. This initiative is designed to meet the needs of the growing demographic of older adults by building the capacity of state arts agencies to serve the aging population in partnership with state and local stakeholders in the arts, aging, education, and health and human services field.

  As a member in the ENGAGE Initiative Year Two, the Council will join a learning community of 26 state arts agencies. NCCA, in partnership with the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, will hold quarterly teleconferences and provide ongoing technical assistance. In addition, state arts agencies will have access to peer mentoring, capacity-building tools, and professional development designed to support their efforts to advance creative aging in their states. Initiative activities will culminate in the development of plans for the 2015 White House Conference on Aging.

- Participating agencies will agree to designate a staff member to take part in initiative activities, including group teleconferences and the completion of a state-specific action plan to be determined in collaboration with NCCA.

Outreach and Thought Leadership

- **CAC Initiating Statewide Art + Drought Student Contest**
  Staff recently discussed with the Governor's Office our interest in partnering with State Drought Task Force members to raise awareness of the drought and water conservation efforts. The Governor's office is very enthusiastic about this idea, and has connected us with the Department of Water Resources. Talks are underway for a partnership centered around an art poster and media contest for California students. Utilizing the Arts Council's local arts educator networks and other partners, the contest would lead to statewide student engagement and awareness of drought related issues. More updates will be available in the coming weeks.

- **Website Launch**
  The new website will launch on Wednesday, September 24 as scheduled. As with any new website launch or major technical upgrade, anything can happen. We are optimistic for a smooth transition, and the staff stands prepared to be nimble and responsive during the site launch.

- **Keep Arts in Schools Update**
  We've seen a swell of support from the field for the final push of our Keep Arts in Schools campaign. Organizations including Ovation, California Alliance for Arts Education, Cal Presenters, and many others have responded to our outreach and have stepped up to share the message for October's tax filers.

- **Public Will Campaigns in San Jose and LA County**
  Vice Chair Steinhauser has begun her service on an advisory panel helping to oversee the pilot Public Will project mentioned in previous reports and supported with partial funding from the Council. The Director helped the project with solicitation of additional funding from the Rosenthal Family Foundation in Los Angeles. The foundation just announced a $20,000 grant to supplement the project's budget. This pilot holds the promise of guiding our own efforts in the future to move "public will" in support of the arts.

  Related to this investment by the Rosenthal Foundation in the San Jose project, the Foundation has hired Rodriquez Strategies (the same group that assisted the Council with its strategic plan!) to manage their own, more targeted "public will" campaign in Southern California focused specifically on the value of arts education. The Director was recently interviewed to provide ideas and support for this project and will be kept in the loop as this related project proceeds.

Legislative Affairs

- While not directly related to State legislative affairs, the Director was invited to offer testimony to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors in support of an expanded funding request by Yolo Arts, our State/Local Partner in the county. Yolo Arts presented a very thorough plan to expand their Arts and Ag programs, specifically concentrating on the economic impact of their work. While Yolo Arts did not get all they asked for, the Supervisors voted to more than triple their funding and acknowledged the State's support and the Director's testimony.

Upcoming Council Meetings: October 6: Next regular meeting, to be held at the Yerba Buena Cultural Center in San Francisco. November 19: Scheduled for a City-hosted space in Santa Monica.

Peer Panels: State Arts Agency Perspectives (August 2014)

The topic of peer panels recently arose on a NASAA listserv of state arts agency directors. One state arts agency director posed some questions about their council's use of peer panels, with varying responses submitted. This document contains a brief summary of the discussion that ensued.

Conversation Starters:

- Have any of you eliminated panel review for some/all of your grant programs? If some, is it based on program type, funding threshold, or some other criteria?
- Are there other SAAs considering eliminating panels altogether?
- If you have eliminated panels for some programs, what is your sense for how that has improved or degraded the granting process? What other protections do you have in place to maintain the integrity of the process?
- Have any of you eliminated panels and subsequently reinstated them?
- Under what circumstances does your Council step in and adjust or change panel recommendations, scores, or rankings?

Responses:

Nebraska Arts Council – We have never considered eliminating panels. The "level playing field" as we refer to it resonates with legislators and even the private sector, and goes a long way to ensuring continued funding from the state. For what it's worth, I had one state senator confide to me that he hates the way our Dept. of Economic Development allocates grants without outside adjudication because he didn't think it was based on merit. Our grant review panels are chaired by a council member and we encourage all board members to serve on at least 1 panel annually. For new council members, we have them "audit" a panel before actually joining one. I have found that doing this really engages the board in the process and gives them ownership not only of the panel process, but of the applicants and the other panelists.

Idaho Commission on the Arts - Fairness and transparency are hallmarks of our review processes. Clear grant guidelines, thorough panelist instruction, good panel staffing, and cogent staff recommendations to the board all make the processes work for most people. These systems also protect board members from themselves, holding in check personal preferences. Grants serve essential roles in arts support; but they aren't suited to every policy need. If your agency is trying to accomplish certain policy objectives that, perhaps, are not suitably addressed through grants, then investigate other means to accomplish those particular objectives (e.g., contracts for specific services.)

Michigan Council for the Arts and Cultural Affairs - The peer review process we use helped to protect the agency when we were nearly eliminated. We were cut to a staff of one...and we still used peer review. The policy makers appreciated that it wasn't a bureaucrat making winner/loser decisions and that it was an open (all of our panel reviews are open to the Public and are available live on line.) They also appreciated that our agencies expertise was used to develop appropriate guidelines that were made available to everyone.

Between my 20 years in state give men and my 10 years covering it as a reporter, the peer review process used by arts agencies is by far the most fair and equitable way of returning tax dollars back to tax payers that I have ever witnessed. There would be far fewer political issues and far more public trust in government if this system were used as a model by the rest of government....especially economic developed agencies.

Delaware Division of the Arts – Because Council members serve as panel chairs, and in some cases panelists, they have first-hand experience of the peer review process. Panels are advisory only, and they don't develop funding recommendations, only ranking of applications. Staff develop funding scenarios for Council review, based on ranking, available funds, and formulae for the various grant categories. This two-tiered process (ranking and then developing funding scenarios) is reviewed by Council for their recommendation to the Division Director, who has final authority in all funding matters, according to the Delaware Code. That's right, in Delaware, the Council is an advisory body.

The Council, on occasion, recommends adjustments to funding scenarios presented, and staff take those recommendations under consideration during a public Council meeting. By the end of the Council meeting, the funding scenarios are approved (with or without adjustments). In any case, the Council's engagement in the peer review (panel) process has ensured that they have first-hand knowledge (and confidence) in the process. They are not rubber-stamping, they are affirming a process that engages the public, incorporates comprehensive review criteria, and provides a transparent process has resulted in a responsible (if not always popular with everyone) allocation of public funds.

Vermont Arts Council – Once the panel has come to agreement over the scores, then it's staff's job to convey the righteousness with which the decisions were made to Commissioners and Council-members. Most of the time that looks like rubber stamping. But to me ALL of the time, it looks like a job well done. ...For all its imperfections, the peer panel review process is as good a system for grant selection as we are ever likely to devise.

Rhode Island State Council on the Arts – I always use the term "peer review process" rather than panels because it more clearly conveys the nature of the beast. Government bureaucrats do not make decisions, they facilitate the process, and it is the needs of the field - as defined by the field itself - that prevail. I have witness many occasions where the decisions of government are questioned because people either suspect or outright know that the individuals making the decisions are influenced by financial or political motives. The reason arts funding has lasted as long as it has lies, in part, upon the impression that those influences do not play a role in the decision making process.

It is time consuming and costly, although some are employing new technologies that are reducing the costs. But I would greatly fear abandoning the peer review process.

We do a very small number of awards based on internal review, and the dollar amounts are tiny: under $500. Even that makes me nervous.

Staff expertise is essential in this process, but it is best employed helping all applicants put together the strongest, most competitive applications, and then leading the panel through a fair and open review process, without taking sides on any application or recommendation.

Missouri Arts Council – We have been conducting our grant panel review meetings via conference calls for twelve years, and they work quite successfully. In fact, we have better feedback and written panel comments than we ever had when our panel meetings were face-to-face day-long or day-and-a-half-long meetings. We are more successful at recruiting qualified panelists because they don't have to spend two or three days traveling and sitting in panel meetings. Our actual panel meetings last approximately 30 minutes to an hour, and the panels may review as few as nine or as many as 36 applications, depending on the discipline or program. All of our annual, biennial, or triennial grants are reviewed by peer panelists, whether they are project or operating support grants. Only our monthly grants ($2,500 or less) are reviewed by program staff, but by more than one, to provide more than one perspective. All grants are scored, using weighted review criteria, and a matrix, and funding is determined by a formula, based on the request amount, the average score determined by the panel, and the amount of funds available. Hardly any application is fully funded, unless they score a 10, but nearly all annual applications are funded at some level, unless they score below 6.

We conduct panel orientation conference calls shortly after the applications are available, on-line, to panelists, and this year, we made the orientation available on-line, as well, so that panelists could access it at their convenience. Applicants can attend the panel meetings at our office, or call in to listen to the meetings, so everyone around the state has equal access.

Program staff expertise is used to help every applicant submit the best, most competitive application possible. Staff provides extensive feedback if they submit their application by the draft deadline. Advisory Panel Review takes any 'favoritism' out of the equation, either by staff or a Council member, or a legislator, for that matter. The Panels' recommendations are just that, recommendations, and the Council can change them, but rarely do. Council members serve as Chairs of the panels, so they know what is happening in each of the panel meetings, and they don't like to change the panels' recommendations. They appreciate the time and expertise that the panelists provide to the fair and equitable process.

Arizona Commission on the Arts – Yes, there is a cost to managing a peer review process. However there is a benefit in the engagement of individuals in the arts industry, arts education, and artistic community in the work of the council. These individuals often become valuable connectors to the community at large, both sharing the rigorous process a review panel takes to and becoming strong advocates of your work. We have found that a number of technologies allows us to cut costs and time by having panel members engage in reviews and provide their responses prior to the panel meeting itself. This shortens the meeting, lifts up the applications that should be funded and gives the staff member a heads up to any issues that arise in the initial online review.

I believe it is always the agency's responsibility to justify where public funds are spent, especially with limited resources. That is exactly where a peer review system comes in handy. The panel, if trained well and managed tightly by staff will produce results that are justifiable. I do believe staff members play an important role in sharing their expertise and even guidance in the process. They are hired for their knowledge and use it in panel meetings as well as workshops, consultancies, and other agency work with the field.

As far as being honest with the field, I might suggest that after the panel process organizations are invited to contact with the staff who can review the notes taken during the meeting and have meaningful discussions with the applicants. The concept of "ducking behind a panel" is a new one to me.

I don't believe that is true. However, panels do provide some cover for board members who often have no experience in the arts or even the nonprofit industry in general.

In my 28 years is the biz, not counting my intern years with South Dakota Arts Council, I have seen boards overturn a total of 5 panel recommendations. In all of those cases, it was because they believed the panel was too hard on the organization. Often it was a no fund recommendation due to budget or management issues. Every one of those organizations closed their doors within a year of that board directed change.

If a panel is instructed by staff at all points and during the panel process to stick to the criteria, the ability to "write a proposal" is minimalized. Indeed there are some proposals that read better than others and that may give them a bit of an edge, I give you that. But in the end, the programmatic activity, fiscal responsibilities, and connection to your residents should will out.

We engage on board member, two if we have a senior and a new board member as chairs of each of our panels. That way they can see the process first hand, answer any questions the board has when we bring the recommendations to them for their approval and participate in a "policy review" held at the conclusion of every one of our review panel meetings.

Our board also officially appoints the panel members that are recommended by the staff. That way, their power so to speak is seen at the beginning, middle, and end of the process. This is also a great way to engage the board and connect them directly with the staff and the issues the field is facing.

Two years ago, we totally revised our grant making process. We like many in our field felt that our grants were becoming entitlement funding to many of our organizations. Indeed our largest organizations historically went through a staff review, which meant they were basically passed through and given a grant based on their size through a formula. This in my mind does neither the agency, the field, nor the citizens a service. We have gone to a complete criteria based system, where everyone applies and is reviewed by a peer panel. The panel provides a rating of high, medium, low, or no recommendations for funding. Yes, the first year, some of our largest organizations got medium or low grants. They were mad, but our board was happy because they understand the strategic investment we must all make with limited resources. The second year, the organizations focused their proposals and actual work on the criteria which when discussed with our public officials serves us well. Our elected officials in most cases are pleased to hear that organizations are reviewed by their peers and not "bureaucrats." This perception that the government is making decisions in this arena is often used by our detractors.

Peer-Review Panels and the California Arts Council

Overview

The California Arts Council, the state's arts agency, has historically used the peer-review panel process to evaluate program proposals and determine funding recommendations to the governing Council. Expert researchers have determined the peer-review process to be the best way to evaluate proposals for government funding in the arts and sciences, and the National Endowment for the Arts and virtually every other state arts agency utilize peer-review for evaluation as well. Agency staff members investigated some "best practices" on the state and national level, and provide some potential augmentations and alterations to strengthen and improve the current peer-review process used by the agency.

What is peer-review?

Peer-review – the process by which the California Arts Council evaluates its program applications – is best explained by academic Thomas O. McGarity in his article "Peer Review in Awarding Federal Grants in the Arts and Sciences," from the January 1994 issue of the *Berkeley Technology Law Journal* (reprinted for web in February 2014):

> The United States has depended to a very large degree upon "peer review" to aid the government in making the difficult scientific and artistic judgments that necessarily arise in deciding whom among a large pool of applicants will receive limited government resources. When the government relies upon peer review, it does not attempt to persuade researchers to undertake particular research projects or artists to create particular kinds of art. Instead, a granting agency allocated sums of money to entire fields and allows the researchers, artists, or performers to develop creative proposals for project that they would like to undertake. A group of "peers" with expertise in the relevant area then evaluates and ranks the proposals, leaving the ultimate funding decisions up to the government officials in charge of the relevant programs.

McGarity explains that the history of peer review started in the sciences centuries ago, and was utilized in the arts in the U.S. starting in the 1960s with the creation of the NEA. Peer review in the arts allows review from an objective viewpoint, without political pressure, governmental censorship (direct or indirect), or imposing a singular aesthetic standard.

While it's clear from McGarity's analysis that peer review is the ideal method for the allocation of government funds, he also identifies pitfalls that can befall both peer-review panels and government oversight bodies in decision-making. Bias can arise due to animus (dislike of a proposal due to factors outside the merits of the proposal), favoritism (direct favoritism or indirect and based on reputation, publicity or other factors, an effect nicknamed the "halo effect"), conflicts-of-interest (financial or personal), "tunnel vision" (unwelcoming to new concepts or methods), and ex parte lobbying and political pressure for or against an applicant. For the Council or any similar agency, it should be noted that peer-review panels significantly assist a governing and policy body from accusations of bias.

"Finally, peer review helps to shield governmental decision makers from the political pressures that usually exist when a bureaucracy has the power to dole out public dollars," said McGarity. "This is

especially important in the arts, where the pressures to impose a narrow cultural uniformity on government funded art are great."

Panelist Process Considerations

There are a number of steps the agency can take to strengthen its panel process that will give the Council increased confidence in the peer-review panel process. Considerations include:

1. Consider enlisting a "panel chair" procedure, where each panel (or series of panels) for a given program has a chair that attends the Council meeting when the panel recommendations are to be voted on by the Council. This panel representative, along with staff, can then answer any questions from the Council or provide information on the panel's review;
2. Consider including panelists that have subject-area expertise outside the arts but in the fields that the particular program relates to (e.g. juvenile justice experts for JUMP StArts, education experts for Artists in Schools, local government officials or staff for Creative California Communities, etc.);
3. Continue to follow the NEA model of not allowing panelists to serve year after year. The NEA does not allow panelists to serve for more than three consecutive years, and panel turnover rates are at least 1/3 annually, and often completely (100%) different from the previous years;
4. Consider reinstating a "panelists training" that gives potential new panelists the background necessary to be good peer-review panelists, perhaps through an inexpensive method such as online webinar;
5. Consider establishing a two-person Council committee to assist staff in the development of the potential panelist pool to draw from;
6. When resources become available, consider reinstating grantee site visits, which allow the Council to have a better understanding the field and the arts needs of our California communities. (The NEA often hires consultants to do site visits to grantees and provide information to the agency, benefiting the decision making process); and
7. Whenever their availability allows, encourage Council members themselves to serve on or attend panel meetings.

Staff Training and Exposure

State agency staff can learn from colleagues at local arts agencies, other state arts agencies, and from the regional agencies (like the Western State Arts Federation, or WESTAF) and the NEA itself. Serving as panelists for these agencies' peer-review panels can be an effective way to increase Arts Council staff's knowledge of their panel processes and impactful arts programming regionally and nationally.

Conclusion

McGarity states it best in the conclusion of his research article:

> "Despite its flaw, the peer review system is still the best model for making exceedingly complex decisions about how to allocate limited collective resources to the arts and sciences....With some modest improvements, the peer review model that has evolved in this country should provide an example to the world of how a democracy can employ expertise in the service of artistic and scientific excellence."

The Arts Council staff will continue to research and recommend improvements to the agency's peer-review process, as well as work with Council on how to be continually responsive to Council's informational needs and policy and advocacy directions.

Online Resources

McGarity, Thomas O., "Peer Review in Awarding Federal Grants in the Arts and Sciences," Berkeley Technology Law Journal, January 1994 and reprinted in February 2014: http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1115&context=btlj

State Partnership Grants Program at the NEA website description: http://arts.gov/grants-organizations/partnership-agreements/state-partnership-grant-program-description

"Ten Basic Responsibilities of Nonprofit Boards" from the National Center for Nonprofit Boards: https://www.nami.org/Content/NavigationMenu/NAMI_Center_for_Excellence/Tools_for_Excellence/TenBasicResponsibilitiesofNonprofitBoards.pdf

Lowell, Julia F., "State Arts Agencies 1965-2003: Whose Interests to Serve?": http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG121.html

Tab 16

MEMORANDUM

To: California Arts Council Members

From: Programs and Grants Committee Chair, Charmaine Jefferson

Date: August 15, 2014

Re: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROGRAMS & GRANTS COMMITTEE
Proposed Policies and Allocation of Grant Funds for FY14-15

On July 28th, the Programs and Grants Committee (Michael Alexander and Charmaine Jefferson) ("the PG Committee") met for 3 hours with Director Watson and Deputy Director Heckes to review past funding allocations and to develop and recommend for the full Council's consideration grant program funding options for FY2014-15. The PG Committee fully understands that only the full board of the Council (with staff input) can ultimately decide on the funding and programmatic direction of the funding priorities for the California Arts Council. We respectfully submit this Report with the hope that it not only serves to summarize the issues and concerns that informed the PG Committee's deliberations and ultimate recommendations but also serves as a tool to guide and inform the full Council as we begin to collectively discuss how best to utilize the routine and increased funds in our grant programming capacity for this current fiscal year and the implications that will result therefrom for future grant program offerings. To further facilitate your review and consideration, a one-page chart summarizing the PG Committee's specific grant program and funding allocations recommendations follows the narrative report summary below.

By way of background information, it is worth noting that in devising these recommendations, the PG Committee was guided by several factors:

- Input from the field and citizens of California derived from past Listening Tours and meetings;
- Past accomplishments, gaps and funding allocations for the CAC's current grant program offerings;
- the CAC's current Strategic Plan;
- past conversations of the Council regarding future interests;
- the recent experiences with the new programming made possible by the Assembly's special, one-time $2mil funding in FY2013-14;
- the special one-time funding of $5mil approved by the Legislature and the Governor for FY2014-15;
- the fiscal limitations on the reliance of funding on the Arts License Plate "reserve account"; and,
- the "boots on the ground" experiences of the Director and Deputy Director.

Arts Plate Reserve Account Limitations: Dep. Dir. Scott Heckes reviewed with the PG Committee the on-going issue of how our Arts Plate "reserve account" is being depleted and the urgency of needing to address now the impact of that reserve account being nearly depleted. As the Council will recall, years ago when the CAC's general fund budget was cut, a reserve account was created by the State with several million dollars transferred from a reserve account that had been building up in an account from the Arts License Plate fund. It is from these funds that the CAC is able to make its yearly grant program funding. Over the years, the CAC staff has been tracking and reporting to the Council on how the withdrawals would eventually outpace the income into the reserve account. With this knowledge, the License Plate campaign was initiated and the momentum is building, but the steady drop in the reserve account has not yet been abated. So long as the funding for the CAC remains primarily tied to the income levels of the Arts License Plate Fund, additional measures must be taken at the beginning of each fiscal year to insure that funds will be adequate to support funding decisions in a current and next fiscal year before funding commitments can be made on grant applications. The reason this is essential to the Council's upcoming conversation is that for the first time, the CAC will not have the normal, early-year funding from the Arts Plate reserve typically needed to fully fund the Artists in Schools and State/Local Partnership programs that are implemented early each fall....AND keep the reserve at an appropriate level going forward to keep funding these early year programs next year. The PG Committee seriously considered this issue and, as is reflected in the attached chart, recommends that the Council set aside $1million of the funding received this year to restore the reserve, and thus protect the ability of the Council to be able to make funding decisions for programs that begin early in the fiscal year and require decisions to be made about funding prior to the adoption of the State budget each year. The staff will provide the Council with a more detailed briefing on this issue at the August 28th Council meeting. It is the PG Committee's recommendation that this issue needs to be considered and addressed before any other decisions are made regarding the $5mil in funding that is available for this current fiscal year.

Maintaining Categorical Goals and Objectives Consistent with those Presented During Meetings with Legislative Leadership. The PG Committee considered the recent presentations made by the Staff and Council Members to key State Legislators regarding goals for increased funding. Throughout those presentations, the goals consistently lined up around the following categories: Economic Development; Arts Education; Justice; Infrastructure to support a creative California; and, Special Initiatives that allow for partnerships and greater outreach, recognition and service diversification.

- "Economic Development" - In this category are two long-standing programs *Creating Places of Vitality* at $1.195M and *State/Local Partnerships* at $1.050M; one new program from last year *Creative California Communities* at $1.2M; and, the revival of a previously existing and successful program to support statewide *Touring and Presenting* $300K. The PG Committee concluded that these programs presented categorical opportunities to have wide geographic and demographic impact while meeting the key economic stimulus interests of the Governor and Legislature. Hence the

recommendations for funding and funding increases for the programs in this Economic Development category.

- "Arts Education" – In this category are two long-standing programs *Poetry Out Loud* at $135K and *Artists in Schools* at $1,060M. The PG Committee recommends a modest increase in funding for *Poetry Out Loud* because of the growing interest in this program and its statewide impact on youth and literacy. Additional support for this program will be sought from the private sector in order to further support the infrastructure and extended family support aspects of this program. For the *Artists in Schools* program, the PG Committee concluded that it was important to keep funding levels steady, but did not recommend an increase given the significant proportion of the CAC budget is already dedicated to this program. However, an important new program is being proposed with a $550K funding level for *Artists in Communities.* The Council may recall many comments during our Strategic Planning process and Listening Tours about the importance of this type of public program linked directly to ccommunities. By expanding upon the Artists in Schools concept, we can allow senior centers, veterans' hospitals, downtown neighborhood associations, for example, to benefit from having an artist in residence and thus expand access and the meaning of "lifelong learning or arts learning" to include these important stakeholders and community gathering places.

- "Justice" - Has no funding directly shown in the attachment, yet it remains an important outgrowth of our efforts to incorporate the arts across all platforms of life, and to collaborate with other agencies to utilize the arts as a tool for productive, rather than destructive, expression. Specifically, the PG Committee concluded that *JumpStArts*, as a new program begun last year, is going in a very promising direction that could well serve the Council's long term goals. The attached chart also includes an itemization *Corrections* which acknowledges that the CAC is administering an 18-month, $2.5M Arts in Corrections program. The funding is not shown here since it has a different source than all of our other funding. Lastly, *County Sheriffs* is shown as a line item because there is a strong possibility that champions plan to sponsor legislation to fund a program targeting Arts in Corrections for County Sheriffs and the prisoners that have moved from the State level down to County facilities. It is recommended that the Council carefully study the outcomes of the existing currently funded pilots, to determine the direction for the Council's Justice goals going forward. Again, there is strong support for this direction, but the PG Committee determined it was best to wait and see how the outcomes are doing for this year in order to fine-tune and launch new programs based on our findings.

- "Infrastructure" – Captures two existing programs: *Statewide Networks* at $375K and the *Cultural Data Project* at $20K, as well as one new grouping of issues explained later in this paragraph. What these items have in common is that they represent support for services, technical assistance or data-related and research issues. The PG Committee surmised that an increase for *Statewide Networks* would support the important set of organizations which we rely on for extending our communications to the field and bringing together their specific constituents. Next there is reference to "convenings and technical assistance". Given the degree to which these items were mentioned as needs during our Strategic Plan and Listening tours, the recommendation of $150,000 for these items is a first step to support this oft-expressed need. Lastly, the annual cost of supporting our engagement in the national *Cultural Data Project* is shown on the chart as continuing and considered a vital tool in our arsenal to gather statistics about the constituents in California that we fund and that they serve, but no increase in that funding level is recommended.

- "Special Initiatives" – There are eight initiatives that have been conceptually agreed to for support by the Council that are set forth on the chart under this category. Many of these initiatives cross other categorical areas and the PG Committee recommends continued investment for these existing initiatives. *CREATE CA* at $25K represents CAC's signature collaboration with four other key arts education advocates (CDE, PTA, CAAE and CCSESA). *The Creative Economy* Research Study for $50K was funded with Otis College of Art and Design. Joining as one of the key partners brought great visibility to the State and the Council, and we can be proud of being a part of the effort to take this study statewide. Two long-standing programs also recommended to continue and at the same funding levels as last year are the *State Poet Laureate* at $5K level and *Arts and Accessibility* program at $20K. *Creativity at the Core* is one of the initiatives supported with last year's special funding that is expected to continue as another arts in education investment, and thus is recommend for a $100K earmark which is considerably less than what the CAC awarded last year, but continues to maximize the benefit of this national education initiative. The PG Committee also recommends setting aside $75K for *Executive Branch Initiatives* which it minimally expects to include some sort of China convening and perhaps a new Governor's initiative with Mexico. As for other new initiatives, recent conversations between CAC's Director and other State Agencies leads to the recommendation to set aside $250K for special initiatives involving *Tourism, Veterans and/or After School* programs that are favorable to occur as possible program partnerships during this next budget cycle. These are examples of special initiatives that might take the initial form of co-funding a convening or investing in joint, technical assistance to get a pilot launched. The staff will elaborate on this further during the August 28th Council meeting. Finally, the new program launched last year with special Assembly funding, *Arts on the Air*, is not currently recommended for additional funding as we need more time, as with the JUMPsTarts program, to assess

the program implemented and to study the outcomes of the pilots projects before potentially coming back to invest further and/or modify the program going forward.

Utilizing $500K From This Fiscal Year to Support More First Round *Creative California Communities* Applicants – Embedded within the budget line for the *Creative California Communities* program is also a recommendation from the PG Committee for $500K so that the Council might be able to consider and fund more of the first round applicants than was possible at our June meeting. This recommendation further supports the proposal made by our Chair in his July letter that was sent to the unfunded applicants. This $500K set aside provides resources for the Council's reconsideration process to occur at our August 28th meeting.

Expanding and Refining the CAC's Panel Process and Site Visit Systems - The PG Committee also took some time to discuss what actions might be taken to further improve our grant panel selection process, and the information gap left by not having a more expansive site visit system. While some adjustments to the panel system are being developed by the staff, it was overall determined that the grant selection approval process at the CAC works effectively and efficiently tough some tweaks need to be made. The CAC Director will prepare a separate report on this issue. We anticipate that his recommendations will also include how the CAC might begin to reboot and engage a more robust site visit system. The PG Committee is particularly concerned that in order to achieve the statewide outreach that we want from our applicant pool and service to the arts and to the citizens that we want from our grantees, we have to create the ability to better know and be familiar with the resources in our state. The PG Committee looks forward to discussing these issues with the Council further at the meeting.

The Programs and Grants Committee appreciates the Council's consideration. Should you have questions in advance of the meeting please send them only to Craig Watson and to the PG Committee Chair, and we will make sure that your issues are brought forward for discussion at the meeting. This approach should allow us to avoid any appearance of Council discussion in violation of the Bagley Keene regulations governing Council meetings.

California Arts Council
2014-15 Program Committee Meeting: July 28, 2014

CATEGORY	2014-15 Proposed Program Budget[1]	2014-15 Program Budget Increase	2014-15 Program Budget
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT			
Creating Places of Vitality (CPV)[2]	~~$695,000~~	$1,195,000	$1,195,000
Creative California Communities (CCC)		$1,200,000	$1,200,000
State-Local Partnership	$650,000	$400,000	$1,050,000
Touring and Presenting		$300,000	$300,000
ARTS EDUCATION			
Artists in Schools	$1,060,000		$1,060,000
Poetry out Loud	$85,000	$50,000	$135,000
Artists in Communities		$550,000	$550,000
JUSTICE[3]			
JumpStArts			
Corrections			
County Sheriffs			
INFRASTRUCTURE			
Statewide Networks[4]	~~$225,000~~	$375,000	$375,000
Convening, Technical Assistance		$150,000	$150,000
California Cultural Data Project	$20,000		$20,000
SPECIAL INITIATIVES			
Create CA	$25,000		$25,000
Tourism, Veterans, Afterschool, etc.		$250,000	$250,000
Creative Economy Research		$50,000	$50,000
Poet Laureate	$5,000		$5,000
Arts on the Air[5]			
Creativity at the Core		$100,000	$100,000
Arts and Accessibility	$20,000		$20,000
Executive Branch/China Initiative		$75,000	$75,000
TOTAL	$1,865,000	$4,695,000	$6,560,000
RECAP:			
2014-15 Budget Increase		$5,000,000	
2014-15 Budget Increase: Operating Expenses		-$100,000	
2014-15 Budget Increase: Allocated to 2013-14 CCC		-$51,691	
2014-15 Budget Increase: Balance of Funds		$4,848,309	
2014-15 Budget Increase: Program Committee Recommendations		-$4,695,000	
2014-15 Budget Increase: Contingency Funds/Unallocated		$153,309	
NOTES:			

1. 2014-15 Proposed Program Budget: Approved by Council, June 17, 2014, Tab 9. (Omits *Memberships/Dues*)

2. 2014-15 Program Budget Increase shifts $695,000 budgeted from the license plate to the new funds and adds an additional $500,000 to support the CPV Program. The shift is recommended to address the license plate reserve account depletion and potential impact on core program funding. This shift and the similar shift recommended for the Statewide Network Program (see note 4) will provide a reserve of approximately $1 million that will enable the Council to continue the current funding cycle for the Artists in Schools and State-Local Partnership Program which are typically funded at the start of the fiscal year.

3. Pending results of 2013-14 funded projects/activities; and new initiative development (County Sheriffs)

4. 2014-15 Program Budget Increase shifts $225,000 budgeted from the license plate to the new funds and adds an additional $150,000 to support the SN Program. The shift is recommended to address the license plate reserve account depletion and potential impact on core program funding. This shift and the similar shift recommended for the Creating Places of Vitality Program (see note 2) will provide a reserve of approximately $1 million that will enable the Council to continue the current funding cycle for the Artists in Schools and State-Local Partnership Program which are typically funded at the start of the fiscal year.

5. Pending results of 2013-14 funded projects/activities

Program Profile: Artists in Schools

Program Description
Artists in Schools (AIS) is a signature grant program supporting the valuable link between community arts resources and local schools/school districts. Residency activities emphasize long-term, in-depth arts education during school hours or in after-school programs. K-12 students are offered comprehensive, California standards-based arts education underscoring the critical role the arts play in developing creativity, overall well-being and academic achievement.

AIS Grantee Examples

City of San Fernando *(Los Angeles County)*
Mariachi Masters Apprentice Program has received national recognition as a model for municipal investment in arts education, uniting 35 youth, ages 8-18, with master musicians to receive free music and performance instruction for 32 weeks a year. Program boasts a 100% graduation rate compared with local average of 60%.

Luna Dance Institute *(Alameda County)*
Luna Dance Institute implements K-8 standards-based dance education programs at three public schools, serving approximately 450 people annually. Dance is brought to each school through a professional development model which includes dance classes by dance teaching artists, side-by-side coaching, in-services, and family dance events.

Yolo Arts *(Yolo County)*
Introduces 3 ceramic teaching artists into 2 elementary schools to celebrate the agricultural heritage of this rural county by creating agriculturally-themed ceramics with approximately 1,200 youth.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
While AIS is supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan, AIS is most strongly supported by Pillar Two; ensuring the CAC's work is reflective of California's diverse populations and accessible to all, and Pillar Four; objective to maintain CAC's ongoing commitment to arts education.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
AIS reaches approximately 50,000 students through 120-140 programs spread across approximately 30-35 counties.

AIS Statistics (2014-15 Cycle: February—application available to the field; March—application deadline; April/May—Peer Review Panel(s); June—Council review and approval; Grant term: October 2014-September 2015.)

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
2012-2013	137	$1,068,043	$7,796
2013-2014	118	$944,784	$8,007
2014-2015*	120	$1,055,688	$8,797

2012 NEA Survey

Individuals Directly Benefiting	Youth Participating	Artists Participating
171,277	58,925	929

*133 applications; 33 hrs. per panelist for pre-panel preparation (10 panelists); 2, 3-day panels

Panel Advisory
- Recommend program evaluation and assessment, including quantitative values for impact and numbers that reflect entire community in addition to schools.
- Would like a greater geographic distribution.
- Would like accessibility addressed more specifically.
- Informational webinar on program requested.

Staff Advisory
- Update program to reflect common core and national core arts standards.
- Develop greater connection to classroom teachers by incorporating a professional development component.
- Develop guidelines for ensuring quality of instruction and classroom management; share best practice resources.
- Increase outreach to the field for greater applicant pool and increased geographic reach.
- Evaluate program effectiveness; assess direct economic impact of CAC funding.
- Survey needs and interests of the field.

Program Profile: Creating Places of Vitality

Program Description
Creating Places of Vitality (CPV) is a signature grant program supporting rural and underserved communities through grant opportunities for small arts organizations. CPV offers opportunities to encourage creative innovation and to engage in meaningful cultural activities that can transform neighborhoods and communities to create a distinct sense of place.

CPV Grantee Examples

Amador County Arts Council *(Amador County)*
Amador County Arts Council is partnering with Amador County Recreation Agency to create opportunities for youth to participate in arts workshops at The HUB-- a recently-opened community center in Jackson.

Friends of Peralta Hacienda Historical Park *(Alameda County)*
Friends of Peralta Hacienda Historical Park will partner with Oakland's African American Museum, the Library at California College of the Arts, and United for Success Middle School to engage local residents, the public, and K-12 students in the site's new interactive art installation: "What I Hear, I Keep: Stories of Oakland's Griots."

LA Commons, a project of Community Partner *(Los Angeles County)*
LA Commons and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority will partner to produce and market "Trekking LA 2013: Dancing in Neighborhoods to a Global Beat," a series of tours highlighting each community's unique dance, music, culinary, and historic features.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
While supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan, CPV is most strongly supported by Pillar Two; ensuring the CAC's work is reflective of California's diverse populations and accessible to all.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
CPV strives to reach rural and underserved populations. CPV currently reaches 23 counties, 13 which are designated rural.

CPV Statistics (2013-14 Cycle: January—application available to the field; March—application deadline; April—Peer Review Panel(s); June—Council review and approval; Grant term: June 2014-May 2015.)

Average grant size accounts for regional council awards, based on number of counties served.

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
2011-2012	77	$658,895	$8,557
2012-2013	84	$996,740	$11,866
2013-2014*	85	$810,442	$9,535

2012 NEA Survey

Individuals Directly Benefiting	Youth Participating	Artists Participating
417,166	70,092	4,477

*92 applications; 23 hrs. per panelist for pre-panel preparation (7 panelists); 2, 3-day panels

Panel Advisory

- A sense of place for and through the arts gives a community identity and outlet, and often assists in economic development

Staff Advisory

- Program is the only one that focuses on the needs of rural and underserved communities

Program Profile: Poetry Out Loud

Program Description
Poetry Out Loud (POL) is an initiative of the National Endowment for the Arts celebrating its 10th anniversary year. In partnership with the National Endowment for the Arts and The Poetry Foundation, the California Arts Council coordinates the largest state-wide POL program in the nation. POL helps students master public speaking skills, build self-confidence, learn about their literary heritage and compete for college scholarship funding.

Working with partners at local arts agencies, county offices of education, California Poets in the Schools and local non-profit organizations, POL competitions first happen in the classroom and the school-wide level. Winners then progress to county competitions and then onto the state final, historically taking place within Senate Chambers at the State Capitol.

POL Grantee Examples
Los Angeles County Office of Education *(Los Angeles County)*
With one of the largest POL programs, Los Angeles is the only county that holds district as well as county competitions. Students from 27 high schools throughout Los Angeles participated in 2014.

ARTS Obispo *(San Luis Obispo County)*
In San Luis Obispo, a strong school program driven by an exceptional teacher catalyzes county-wide participation. English Teacher Nathan Shields at Nipomo High School in San Luis Obispo has recruited 7 English teachers for 2015 and has been recognized in his district with a distinguished teacher award.

Yuba Sutter Arts *(Yuba and Sutter Counties)*
In rural Yuba and Sutter Counties, POL 2015 is an element of a literacy campaign in conjunction with the NEA's Big Read in 3 local high schools.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
POL is a key component of CAC's portfolio of arts education programs, underscoring the commitment to arts education in Pillar Four. POL also serves Pillar One objectives of activating the public and building visibility for the arts.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
Approximately 15,000 high school students and their teachers are reached annually in 35 counties.

POL Statistics (2013-14 Cycle: September—Council approves program allocation and confirms county participation; January—list of participating schools sent to the NEA; February—all county competitions complete; March—State Competition; April—National Competition.)

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
2011-2012	31	$34,500	$1,113
2012-2013	31	$35,500	$1,145
2013-2014	31	$35,000	$1,129

**Total Amount* does not include funds granted to California Poets in the Schools (CPITS) for local coordination and travel.

2012 NEA Survey

Individuals Directly Benefiting	Youth Participating	Artists Participating
20,126	17,754	242

Staff Advisory
- Increase geographic reach; leverage relationships with State-Local Partners
- Outreach to underserved populations and increase accessibility to court and community schools, Native populations, English Language Learners, and people with disabilities
- Increase financial contribution to Poet Teachers and increase recognition of teachers and county coordinators
- Enhance State Final experience for youth, chaperones, teachers, parents, and legislators

Program Profile: State-Local Partnership Program

Program Description
State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) is a signature grant program which fosters community development through the arts on the county level through a partnership between the California Arts Council and a local arts agency. Partners benefit from funding, technical assistance and coordinated activities which support their efforts that enrich the lives of the members of their communities through the arts.

SLPP provides an essential connection to the "eyes and ears" of the Arts Council. Support to our State-Local Partners ensures that the work of CAC remains relevant at all levels throughout the state.

SLPP Grantee Examples
Arts Council Santa Cruz County *(Santa Cruz County)*
Celebrating their 35th year supporting artists, arts organizations, and communities in the region. Through strategies to "promote, connect, and invest", have served to establish Santa Cruz as a cultural arts destination.

Arts Orange County *(Orange County)*
Lead arts agency in a county serving more than 3 million individuals. Programs focus on building appreciation, participation and support for the arts and arts education; key programs include marketing and resource support, multicultural programs, education, and support for emerging arts leaders.

Plumas Arts *(Plumas County)*
Offers exemplary, cross-cultural programs with strong geographic reach in a blue-collar, economically challenged rural county; owns and operates an art gallery and a film house/performing arts center in two historic buildings.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
While SLPP is supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan, SLPP strongly underscores the Arts Council's commitment to Pillar One; building public will and resources for the arts by ensuring strong support for the arts statewide among the public, elected officials and decision makers. In addition, SLPP is strongly supported by Pillar Two; ensuring the CAC's work is reflective of California's diverse populations and accessible to all.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
SLPP reaches nearly 1.5 million Californians through programs in approximately 50 of California's 58 counties.

SLPP Statistics (2013-14 Cycle: May—application available to the field; June—application deadline; July—Peer Review Panel; September—Council review and approval; Grant term: October 2013-September 2014.)

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
2011-12	45	$639,216	$14,205
2012-2013	51	$648,225	$12,710
2013-2014*	50	$579,943	$11,599

2012 NEA Survey

Individuals Directly Benefiting	Youth Participating	Artists Participating
1,479,284	11,443	376,067

*51 applications; 26 hrs. per panelist for pre-panel preparation (5 panelists); 3 panel days

Panel Advisory
- Increase opportunities for peer-to-peer networking through convenings and expanded communications.
- Conduct assessment of SLPP and the impact that it has had on the field; progress towards goals, advocacy efforts, capacity-building, logic-model.

Staff Advisory
- Provide opportunities for peer-to-peer networking, communication, and mentorship.
- Catalyze support to the next generation of arts administration leadership.
- Expand efforts to increase program reach within each county and throughout the state.
- Evaluate program effectiveness; assess direct economic impact of CAC funding.
- Survey needs and interests of the field.

Program Profile: Statewide Networks

Program Description
Statewide Networks (SN) is a signature grant program supporting culturally specific, multicultural, and discipline-based statewide and regional arts networks and service organizations. Its goal is to strengthen an organization's capacity and delivery of services to its constituents through communications, professional development opportunities, networking and arts advocacy.

SN enables CAC to provide leveraged funding to key agencies that in turn offer broad impact and influence throughout the state.

SN Grantee Examples
Alliance for California Traditional Arts (ACTA)
ACTA promotes and supports ways for cultural traditions to thrive now and into the future by providing advocacy, resources, and connections for folk and traditional artists. ACTA connects artists, communities, and funders to each other, information, and resources through grants and contracts, convenings, research, and technical assistance. Additionally, ACTA provides advocacy through local and national field-building.

The California Association of Museums (CAM)
CAM is a professional and dynamic community of individuals and organizations seeking to create a brighter future for museums and their communities. CAM connects museum professionals and volunteers with timely information and practical resources, which fosters museums that are relevant and effective organizations that make a positive impact on California and its citizens.

California Alliance for Arts Education (CAAE)
CAAE seeks to advance arts education in California by focusing efforts in three key areas: state policy, local coalition building and public advocacy. With so many important initiatives underway to improve curriculum and instruction, CAAE ensures that advocates for the arts are at the table in the discussions about implementation.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
While SN is supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan, SN underscores the Arts Council's commitment to Pillar One; building public will and resources for the arts by ensuring strong support for the arts statewide among the public, elected officials and decision makers.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
Funded arts service organizations are based in 7 counties and provide robust services to a diverse, statewide constituency.

SN Statistics (2013-14 Cycle: January—application available to the field; February—application deadline; April—Peer Review Panel; June—Council review and approval; Grant term: June 2014-May 2015.)

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
2011-2012	16	$200,050	$12,531
2012-2013	15	$292,000	$19,466
2013-2014*	16	$249,200	$15,575

2012 NEA Survey

Individuals Directly Benefiting	Youth Participating	Artists Participating
2,220,849	30,820	9,630

*16 applications; 8 hrs. per panelist for pre-panel preparation (3 panelists); 1 panel day

Panel Advisory
- Field disciplines and services need evaluation in relationship to changes in demographics of our state and the use of technology and social media.

Staff Advisory
- Continue to engage arts service organizations; clearing houses for information, opportunities and collaborations.
- Emphasize their role in education and advocacy.
- Catalyze support to the next generation of arts administration leadership.
- Expand efforts to increase program reach throughout the state.

Program Profile: Creative California Communities

Program Description
Thanks to a special allocation arranged through Assembly Speaker John A. Perez, the California Arts Council received one-time funding totaling $2 million for support of grant activities to be completed by June 30, 2015. Grant programs using these funds were intended to reflect a number of new initiatives in the arts as identified through the Creative California Communities (CCC) grant program.

CCC supports exceptional demonstration/replicable projects that harness arts and culture as a key economic development or arts service strategy for large and small communities.

Projects funded by CCC represent a wide range of arts disciplines, and aim to revitalize neighborhoods through the arts, foster new arts engagement, stimulate tourism, create jobs for artists, invest in young people, and build relationships between local arts, business, and government entities.

CCC Grantee Examples

PlacerArts *(Placer County)*
PlacerArts will create "Watershed Reflections" to help the public conserve and value water through free, artist-led public activities including storytelling, painting, trash-inspired music- and art-making, the creation of public art trail markers and a series of articles and messages for print and electronic media.

San Benito County Arts Council *(San Benito County)*
"Activate Downtown," in partnership with the Hollister Downtown Association, will harness the arts as a catalyst for economic growth, neighborhood revitalization and community engagement in Hollister, through coordinated events and site-specific projects.

Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego *(San Diego County)*
The Museum of Contemporary Art and Combat Arts San Diego will engage three local artists to serve 100 troops in military residential post-traumatic stress disorder treatment programs, to support the healing of combat trauma through in-depth, high-quality artistic experiences.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
While CCC is supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan, CCC strongly underscores the Arts Council's commitment to Pillar One; building public will and resources for the arts by ensuring strong support for the arts statewide among the public, elected officials and decision makers. In addition, CCC is strongly supported by Pillar Two; ensuring the CAC's work is reflective of California's diverse populations and accessible to all.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
CCC funding supports 24 projects in 19 counties across the state.

CCC Statistics (2013-14 Cycle: January—guidelines approved by Council, application available to the field; March—application deadline; May—Peer Review Panel(s); June—Council review and approval; Grant term: June 2014-June 2015.)

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
2013-2014*	24	$1,042,477	$43,437

*157 applications received; 39 hrs. per panelist for pre-panel preparation (10 panelists); 2, 3-day panels

Panel Advisory
- Review application materials for alignment with project requirements and criteria.
- Clarify distinction between intent of CPV and CCC.

Staff Advisory
- Expand efforts to increase program reach within each county and throughout the state.
- Evaluate program effectiveness; assess direct economic impact of CAC funding.
- Survey needs and interests of the field.
- Guidelines and application review.

Program Profile: Artists in Communities
(Proposal)

Program Description
An iconic program of the California Arts Council from its inception through 2003, Artists in Communities (AIC) has historically supported community artist residencies through nonprofit community organizations and public agencies. [This program profile highlights only the organizations that participated in the program; there were more than a hundred artists that received individual artist residency grants in each of the years highlighted below.]

Programs have taken place in a variety of settings, including arts and cultural centers, parks and recreation facilities, schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, housing agencies, homeless shelters, correctional centers, convalescent or children homes, alcohol or chemical dependency treatment centers, mental health support facilities, veterans homes, and tribal reservations.

AIC Program Examples

Goldman Institute on Aging *(San Francisco County)*
Residency paired a diverse group of 8 multi-disciplinary visual and performing artists with 9 diverse community centers serving the elderly for 46 weekly activity sessions at each site. Concluded with 9 community performances or exhibitions.

Los Cenzontles *(Contra Costa County)*
Residency supported six instructor's classes, workshops and rehearsals with children and teens. Activities included intermediate to advanced technique and repertory in popular and traditional Latin music and dance taught in a group context.

Young Musicians Foundation *(Los Angeles County)*
Youth Mentor Artists Program selected professional instrumentalists to travel to 22 underserved elementary and middle schools to rehearse with orchestras, lead sectional rehearsals, provide tutoring and conduct music appreciation programs for entire student body assemblies.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
AIC would be supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan and would most strongly underscore the Arts Council's commitment to Pillar Two; ensuring the CAC's work is reflective of California's diverse populations and accessible to all.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution
Residencies have served a diversity of especially underserved populations, bringing working artists directly into non-traditional environments to offer creative expression throughout the state.

AIC Statistics (2014-15 Cycle [proposed]: November/December 2014—guidelines and application development; January 2015—guidelines and application approved by the Council; February—application available to the field; March—application deadline; April/May—Peer Review Panel(s); June—Council review and approval; Grant term: June 2015-May 2016.)

Year	Number of Grants	Total Amount	Average Grant Size
1999-2000	18	$247,946	$13,775
2000-2001	22	$587,740	$26,715
2001-2002	29	$696,962	$24,033

Panel Advisory – not available

Staff Advisory
- Continue research and past program evaluation
  - Integrate contemporary trends in community arts implementation and participatory arts practice
- Survey needs and interests of the field
- Reinstate Artists In Communities in a refreshed model that will complete CAC offerings to:
  - Address gaps not currently filled by existing grant programs
  - Reflect demographic and geographic changes
  - Enhance career and participatory opportunities in the arts for people with disabilities

Program Profile: On the Road and Center Stage
Performing Arts Expanded Access Initiative
(Proposal)

In all 11 regions of the state, high quality California touring ensembles will perform to diverse audiences at public events that generate press coverage and garner the attention of the areas' legislators. The performing ensembles will be based more than 50 miles away from the host presenting organizations and may have larger casts and/or larger cost than would otherwise be practicable for targeted presenters. Funded engagements will not be part of the presenter's normal season, but profiled as out-of-the-ordinary high profile events. Public performances where there is no cost to the audience and/or events taking place in rural communities will be given extra consideration and premium funding. The CAC's relationships with California Presenters, Inc., other touring and presenting service organizations, and Statewide Networks (both discipline-specific and ethnic-based) will be leveraged to maximize the initiative's reach and impact.

Expected Outcomes:

- Broad and diverse community reach statewide.
- High quality arts/arts access for communities.
- Ability of larger budget and/or cast productions to go to communities normally unable to host them.
- Presentations of high artistic quality.
- Arts events with media attention and storytelling value.
- Additional work for artists, technical theater crews and arts marketing staff.

Initiative Funding: $300,000

Grant Funding:

- Presenting organizations will be the grantees.
- Grants to be spread among the 11 regions of the state with minimums per region.
- Formulaic grants, which will include priority and funding incentives for engagements in rural communities and/or the provision of free public performances. Grants may be up to 80% of the artist fee.
- Grants will be matched 1:1 with all event costs taken into account.
- Presenting organizations will show at least a modest history of presenting the performing arts.
- Artists will demonstrate high artistic quality and the ability to tour.

Relationship to Strategic Plan

The Initiative is supported by all four Pillars of the Strategic Plan and would most strongly underscore the Arts Council's commitment to Pillar Two; ensuring the CAC's work is reflective of California's diverse populations and accessible to all.

Population Served and Geographic Distribution

Grants are to be spread among the 11 regions of the state with minimums per region. Formulaic grants, which will include priority and funding incentives for engagements in rural communities and/or the provision of free public performances.

Staff Advisory

- The Presenting and Touring program was one of the most important resources for performing groups and presenting organization in our state before budget cuts.
- A pilot providing extra opportunity for greater venue presentation is an all-win for performing groups, presenters, and community audience.
- Increase in artistic participation will have significant economic impact on presenting communities related to transportation, food, and other services.

Tab 17

CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Memorandum

California Arts Council
1300 I Street, Suite 930
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.322.6555

Date: October 6, 2014

To: Council Members

From: Scott Heckes, Deputy Director
Wayne Cook, Program Specialist, Artists in Schools

Re: Artists in Schools (AIS) 2014-2015—one additional grant

Staff requests approval of grant funding in the amount of $10,080 for The Unusual Suspects Theatre Company—a 2014-15 Artists in Schools applicant. The applicant was erroneous shown in the June 17, 2014 AIS Council report as not in the fundable range; they had in fact been ranked 8 out of 10 by the peer review panel. The applicant's request amount was $12,000; the recommended award amount is consistent with other applicants similarly ranked.

Background

After the June 17, 2014 Council meeting staff began the process of preparing award letters and grant documents for the AIS applicants that the Council approved for funding. At that time, staff noticed a discrepancy with the numbering identification for The Unusual Suspects Theatre Company. After further examination it was determined there was a glitch in the online system that the Council uses in its grant submittal process and that The Unusual Suspects Theatre Company was in fact in a fundable range and should have been considered for funding consistent with other organizations similarly ranked (the organization was ranked 8 out of 10 by the peer review panel).

CAC contracts with WESTAF for its online system, "GO". The glitch in the system has been addressed and new protocols are in place to guard against future errors.

Applicant Request

The Unusual Suspects will provide a Youth Theater Residency Program in collaboration with Edison Middle School in South Los Angeles. The after-school residency will be comprised of two consecutive 10-week workshops of playwriting and character development.

Panel Comments

- The actors were strong as reflected in support documentation, and seemed well established; though one panelist thought the documentation could be better representative of the group's work.

- Writing samples were good.

- The panel liked that the project was bilingual.
- The students were engaged and did not hesitate in delivering lines.
- The panel agreed that the company is really trained for this community.
- All the bios were good.
- VAPA standards good.
- The company really meets the needs of students with disabilities.
- Outcomes were brief, but clear.
- The panel thought the residency will reduce truancy and drop-out rates.

Recommendation from staff:

- Reflective of their rank of 8, approve grant funding in the amount of $10,080 for The Unusual Suspects Theatre Company consistent with other grantees similarly ranked and approved for funding by the Council at its June 17, 2014 meeting.

Tab 18

CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Memorandum

California Arts Council
1300 I Street, Suite 930
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.322.6555 | www.arts.ca.gov

Date: October 6, 2014

To: Council Members

From: Scott Heckes, Deputy Director
Jason Jong, Arts Program Specialist

Re: State-Local Partnership Program Panel Recommendations

Staff recommends Council approval of 2014-15 Panel Recommendations for funding 50 local arts agencies through the State-Local Partnership Program. Total funding amount: $638,269.

Background

The purpose of the State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) is to foster arts development on the local level through a partnership between the California Arts Council and the local arts agencies of California. A local arts agency is defined as a nonprofit organization, or an agency of county government, officially designated by the county's Board of Supervisors to provide financial support, services, or other programs to a variety of arts organizations, individual artists, and the community as a whole. Two city arts agencies have long ago been grandfathered into the program: Los Angeles and San Diego.

The goals of the State-Local Partnership Program are:

- to increase public awareness and participation in the arts of all cultures,
- to broaden public and private support for the arts,
- to serve the diverse cultural needs of California's local communities,
- to encourage and promote arts in education, and
- to foster local and regional partnership and collaboration.

The criteria for the State-Local Partnership Program are: local arts networking and facilitation, accessibility to artistic and cultural diversity by all community members, and managerial and fiscal competence.

Panel Recommendations

The SLPP peer review panel met July 21-23, 2014 to evaluate requests for funding. Fifty (50) applications were reviewed and all 50 organizations are being recommended for funding. The 50 organizations represent two cities (Los Angeles and San Diego) and 50 counties (Yuba and

Sutter counties are jointly served by Yuba Sutter Arts, and Los Angeles is serviced through both City of Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs and Los Angeles County Arts Commission). Recommended funding amounts are based on applicant rankings by the panel. Recommendations are for one year.

Four-year comparison of funding

Fiscal Year	Average Grant	Change in Average Grant from Prior Year	Grant Range	Number of Grantees	SLPP Funding
2014-15	$12,765	$1,168	$10,317 to $14,250	50	$638,269
2013-14	$11,597	-$1,113	$9,750 to $13,000	51	$591,422
2012-13	$12,710	-$1.495	$11,977 to $12,900	51	$648,225
2011-12	$14,205	n/a	$13,248 to $14,400	45	$639,216

Analysis

Although funds available for the program in 2013-14 had been reduced due to the decreased NEA grant to the Arts Council and the elimination of Tax Checkoff funding, the current year allocation will see a modest return approximating 2011-12 levels. As with the previous year, all budgeted funding for SLPP has been allocated to the basic SLPP grant; none has been reserved for technical assistance.

Attached are an applicant list with funding recommendations and a list of the peer review panelists with their bios.

State-Local Partnership Program
2014-15 Funding Recommendations

APP#	COUNTY	APPLICANT	RANK	REQUEST	AWARD
SL-14-0015	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Arts Commission	10	$14,250	$14,250
SL-14-0017	Santa Cruz	Cultural Council of Santa Cruz County	10	$14,250	$14,250
SL-14-0024	Alameda	Alameda County Arts Commission	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0001	El Dorado	El Dorado Arts Council	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0033	Los Angeles	City of Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0005	Orange	Arts Orange County	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0045	Placer	The Arts Council of Placer County County, DBA PlacerArts	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0016	Plumas	Plumas Arts	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0041	Sacramento	Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0006	San Diego	City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0003	San Francisco	San Francisco Arts Commission	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0042	Santa Clara	Silicon Valley Creates	9	$14,250	$13,595
SL-14-0028	Amador	Amador County Arts Council	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0009	Calaveras	Calaveras County Arts Council	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0035	Del Norte	Del Norte Association for Cultural Awareness	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0036	Inyo	Inyo Council for the Arts	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0004	Mariposa	Mariposa County Arts Council, Inc.	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0038	Mono	Mammoth Art Guild	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0025	Monterey	Arts Council for Monterey County	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0040	Riverside	Riverside County Arts Council	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0019	San Benito	San Benito County Arts Council	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0011	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo Arts Council, DBA ARTS Obispo	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0018	Santa Barbara	SB County Arts Commission	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0043	Siskiyou	Siskiyou Arts Council	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0048	Yolo	Yolo County Arts Council	8	$14,250	$12,939
SL-14-0007	Humboldt	Humboldt Arts Council	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0027	Kern	Arts Council of Kern County	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0037	Madera	Madera County Arts Council	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0032	Mendocino	Arts Council of Mendocino County	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0039	Merced	Merced County Arts Council	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0031	Napa	Arts Council Napa Valley	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0026	Nevada	Nevada County Arts	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0046	Trinity	Trinity County Arts Council	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0012	Tulare	Visalia Arts Consortium	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0020	Tuolumne	Central Sierra Arts Council	7	$14,250	$12,284
SL-14-0010	Butte	Upstate Community Enhancement Foundation	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0034	Colusa	Colusa County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0021	Fresno	Fresno Arts Council, Inc.	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0030	San Bernardino	Arts Connection, The San Bernardino County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0014	San Mateo	San Mateo County Arts Commission	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0013	Shasta	Shasta County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0002	Sierra	Sierra County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0044	Solano	Solano County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0008	Tehama	Tehama County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0047	Ventura	Ventura County Arts Council	6	$14,250	$11,628
SL-14-0049	Yuba/Sutter	Yuba-Sutter Regional Arts Council	6	$28,500	$23,256
SL-14-0050	Lake	Lake County Arts Council	5	$14,250	$10,973

State-Local Partnership Program
2014-15 Funding Recommendations

APP#	COUNTY	APPLICANT	RANK	REQUEST	AWARD
SL-14-0022	Lassen	Lassen County Arts Council	5	$14,250	$10,973
SL-14-0029	Modoc	Modoc County Arts Council	5	$14,250	$10,973
SL-14-0023	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	4	$14,250	$10,317
		TOTAL		$726,750	$638,269

STATE & LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM
2014-15 REVIEW PANEL
JULY 21, 22, 23, 2014

ALAN DISMUKE **Sacramento**

Alan Dismuke has served as Curator and Director for a number of fine art galleries and alternative exhibition spaces around northern California since 1986. In that time he has personally arranged over 400 art exhibitions. The venues include the Humboldt Cultural Center in Eureka, the Storefront Gallery in Arcata, Solomon Dubnick Gallery, Tower Gallery, the Center for Contemporary Art, Sacramento, the California State Fair, Sacramento International Airport, Sacramento City Hall, Sacramento County Library, and the SMUD Gallery. In addition, he has worked in arts administration and advocacy, including duty as Executive Director of the Yolo County Arts Council in Woodland, Artistic Director for the Humboldt Arts Council in Eureka, Director and Board President for the Center for Contemporary Art, Sacramento, and Board President for Chalk It Up to Sacramento. Dismuke is a photographer and graphic designer, an avid art collector, and has shared his enthusiasm for fine art and the artists who create it by leading a number of art travel tours for groups. These include an annual Art Glass tour of the Seattle area, and trips tracing the evolution of Modern Art through the back streets and museums of Paris, France. He lives and works in the historic Mansion Flats neighborhood of downtown Sacramento.

FELICIA W. SHAW **San Diego**

Felicia W. Shaw is Director of Arts and Creative Economy at The San Diego Foundation, the largest philanthropic organization serving the San Diego region. As director, Felicia oversees Creative Catalyst, an initiative developed to advance the careers of professional artists, living and working throughout the San Diego region and to provide opportunities for San Diego residents to become more deeply engaged with the creative process. She also manages the San Diego Gathering Place Project, which enables creative placemaking in under-served San Diego neighborhoods and is a partner in the Arts Empower San Diego regional arts education initiative. Prior to joining the Foundation, Felicia served as Program Manager for the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, where she facilitated the City's annual multi-million dollar regranting program. Additional program management duties included the folk and traditional arts program, the diversity initiative and cultural tourism campaign. She serves on the boards of Grantmakers in the Arts and CERF+, a national service organization focused on increasing the resilience of artists in the face of man-made and national disasters. A graduate of Northwestern University with a degree in Communications, Felicia completed post-graduate studies at the University of California, San Diego in Art History, Theory and Criticism.

JOSH RUSSELL **Santa Clara**

Josh Russell has worked in marketing, strategic communications and community based programming in Silicon Valley for over 16 years. He began his arts career at Arts Council Silicon Valley as the organization's Communications Manager. Before re-joining the Arts Council and now the merged Silicon Valley Creates as the Executive Vice President in August of 2012, Josh was the Director of Communications and Emerging Initiatives for 1stACT Silicon Valley, where he was involved in the organization's strategic planning and implementation efforts around children's creativity, cultural engagement and the Downtown San Jose Urban Core efforts. Josh is the founder and past chair of genARTS Silicon Valley.

PAULETTE LYNCH **Monterey**

Paulette Lynch has served as the executive director of the Arts Council for Monterey County since 2004. She was most recently named one of the top 25 game-changing local leaders of the past 25 years by the *Monterey County Weekly*. She was named one of the Outstanding Women of Monterey County 2013 by the Monterey County Commission on the Status of Women and the Monterey County Board of Supervisors. Paulette has also been honored by the City of onterey and the City of Seaside and named as a Local Hero by the Monterey County Weekly. She is a graduate of Colby College (BA, 1981), Monterey Institute of International Studies (MA, 1985). She was a Fulbright Scholar in Istanbul (1986-1987). Paulette received a certificate in Nonprofit Management from San Jose State in 1989 and recently completed the Stanford University Nonprofit Management Institute seminar in social innovation thanks to a scholarship from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. She is the founder and advisor to First Night Monterey. Paulette plays hammered dulcimer with the traditional music ensemble Heartstrings. She lives in Monterey with her husband Ken Peterson and fourteen-year-old son Gabe. And she had the chance to explain the origin and meaning of her favorite phrase: "The Arts Are the Answer" in a TedxMonterey! Talk in December 2013.

LYNN COOPER **Inyo**

Lynn Cooper is the Executive Director of the Inyo Council for the Arts (ICA.) Lynn is a native Californian and has lived in the Eastern Sierra off and on for approximately 25 years. Prior to becoming the Executive Director in 2001, Lynn was employed as a staff accountant for a local accounting firm and was instrumental in setting up and maintaining ICA's current financial systems for the previous two directors. Lynn also volunteered at Arts Council activities for three years before being selected, and was passionate about programs being offered to the public. In addition to her work as an accountant for 21 years, she has experience in the non-profit world in recruiting and managing 100+ volunteers as Director of Canine Development for Guide Dogs of the Desert. She is currently a member of LaCausa (a social services agency), a board member of the Inyo County School Board, and treasurer of the Bishop Chamber of Commerce, all as an ongoing commitment to advance collaboration for ICA within our community. Under her direction in the last nine years, ICA has become the leader in advancing the arts in the Eastern Sierra.

Tab 19

CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Memorandum

California Arts Council
1300 I Street, Suite 930
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.322.6555

Date: October 6, 2014

To: Council Members

From: Scott Heckes, Deputy Director
Wayne Cook, Program Specialist

Re: State-Local Partnership Program Technical Assistance Recommendation

Staff requests approval of a technical assistance grant in the amount of $5,000 to MarinLink, as fiscal sponsor for MarinArts.org.

Background

The Council at its June 19, 2013 meeting approved a $5,000 technical assistance grant to MarinLink, as fiscal sponsor for MarinArts.org, with a goal of establishing an "all-inclusive county-wide arts organization to connect, promote and empower all of the arts in Marin County".

With CAC support, MarinArts.org has held community meetings with various stakeholders, conducted surveys to discover and understand the needs of the community, successfully sought funding from other sources, researched the online presence of arts councils and commissions in urban, suburban and rural communities with a focus on online calendar functionality, and has begun the process of applying for 501(c)3 nonprofit status. Marin.Arts.org has been designated by the Marin County Board of Supervisors as Marin's official State-Local Partner with the CAC. As such MarinArts.org intends to apply to the CAC's SLPP program as a full partner in the next funding cycle—2015-16.

Applicant Request Summary

Technical assistance grant funding will be used to support ongoing development efforts, specifically:

- licensing fees for *Artpolis* to support a countywide arts calendar, and
- administration.

(An expanded proposal is attached.)

MarinArts.org

Proposal for California Arts Council Technical Assistance Grant

MarinArts.org is requesting a Technical Assistance Grant from the California Arts Council in the amount of $5,000. Our mission is to build an all-inclusive, countywide arts organization to connect, promote and empower all of the arts in Marin County.

Arts and Culture of Marin County

Marin County is a wonderful place to live. As quoted in the NY Times recently "...there is also beauty here of such ampleness, such vital intensity, that you want to get out of the car and hug a tree." This natural beauty is what has brought and continues to bring artists of every imaginable medium to our county. These artists and the arts related organizations and business that exists here have contributed to our communities, our way of life and our culture. The abundance of art is something that makes us all richer in our daily lives.

The arts make an immense contribution to Marin's economy as well. As of January, 2014 Marin County is home to 2,173 arts-related businesses that employ 5,717 people. These arts-centric businesses play an important role in building and sustaining our economic vibrancy. They employ a creative workforce, spend money locally, generate government revenue, and are a cornerstone of tourism and economic development. The creative industries account for 8.8 percent of total businesses located in Marin County, CA and 4 percent of the people they employ.

Brief History of Marin Arts Council

The Marin Arts Council was founded in the early 1980's as part of California's initiative to establish local arts agencies. MAC served in this capacity for 30 years, as Marin's central arts resource, advocacy and service agency. Over the years, MAC's programs included:

- A nationally recognized re-granting program in partnership with the Marin Community Foundation
- Annual involvement in the Marin County Fair

- Ongoing art exhibits at the Marin Civic Center in partnership with the County of Marin
- Marin Open Studios
- Marin Poet Laureate Program
- Teamworks Mentoring and Apprenticeship Program for at-risk youth
- Young Artist Scholarships
- Artist Dialogue literary newspaper

In 2009, MAC underwent a leadership change and lost significant funding from the Marin Community Foundation at the same time that the economy made a drastic downturn. This perfect storm of events eventually led to loss of financial stability and the dissolution of the Marin Arts Council in February 2012.

Formation and activities of MarinArts.org

As Marin Arts Council's dissolution was finalized, a small group of individuals began meeting to talk about what the lack of a countywide arts organization would mean for Marin, and how this void could be filled. We began with simple brainstorming and quickly became excited about how a new all-inclusive, countywide arts organization might serve the arts and culture of Marin.

Our first activities included reaching out to various arts nonprofits, art related businesses, individual artists of all media, and arts lovers and supporters. Encouraged by their overwhelmingly positive response and enthusiasm about forming a new arts organization, we conducted a brief survey of 61 constituents with equally positive results.

We applied for and received a donation of a Sales Force database from the Sales Force Foundation (estimated value $10,000 per year). We have begun structuring that database and compiling a comprehensive contact list of Marin's art community & constituents.

We obtained a license to use the Marin Arts Council's database and domain names from the last MAC Board of Directors with the single condition that they would be used to form a new arts organization. We "closed" the old MAC website and began posting updates on our efforts to form a new arts organization on marinarts.org.

After launching our website, we planned a series of focus groups to really hear what Marin artists and organizations want and need. The feedback from these groups gave us the clarity and direction to outline what the mission and vision of a new arts organization in Marin could and should be.

The results from our focus groups gave us a clear idea of what kind of arts agency is needed in Marin County. We carefully researched 12 different arts agencies in California and across the country to see if we could find similar models. We wanted to find out what worked best (and worst) for these other organizations in the hope that we will be able to build on their successes and avoid their pitfalls.

Simultaneously, we have been speaking with potential funders and partners about launching a new organization and our first project – Marin's first comprehensive online arts calendar.

- The CAC awarded us a Technical Assistance Grant (July 2013 – June 2014)
- The Hewlett and Irvine Foundations expressed interest in funding the launch of a new organization if the Marin Community Foundation or other agency would take the role of lead funder
- The Marin Community Foundation engaged Helicon Collaborative as an independent contractor to perform a feasibility study as a first step in considering funding a new arts organization. We were on the committee of arts organizations formed by Helicon to conduct and support their research.
- We hosted a convening of over 40 people from Marin's arts community. This event unveiled the future MarinArts.org online arts calendar for Marin, presented by Jeff Trabucco, Director of Artsopolis.
- We signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Artsopolis that secures our organization's exclusive use of the Artsopolis platform for Marin County.
- Marin County Supervisors designated MarinArts.org as Marin's official State Local Partner with the CAC in order to apply for the CAC's State Local Partnership Program grant.
- We will apply for the CAC's SLPP grant in 2015 under the mandate of the Marin County Board of Supervisors and encouragement of the CAC.
- We are in the process of applying for our 501(c)3 nonprofit status.
- We recently met with neighboring Arts Council Napa Valley Executive Director about successful strategies behind Napa's recent launch of NapaValleyNow.org – another Artsopolis powered community events calendar

Assessment of the Community's needs

The responses from our focus groups gave us a clear assessment of what is desired in a new arts organization:

- Foster collaboration, partnerships, communication and networking between all the existing arts organizations, groups and programs in Marin.
    - Build a web portal (with calendar feature) for all the arts and artists in Marin.
    - Be the "place to go" for any and all arts information in Marin.
- Be an ambassador for the arts.
    - Collect data and share information about the economic impact of the arts and the intrinsic value of the arts in our community.
- Be an advocate for the arts.
    - Make the arts part of every general plan in every city in Marin.
    - Procure ongoing, sustainable funding to support the arts in Marin.

Short and Long Term Goals

Our initial short-term goal is to build Marin's first comprehensive online arts calendar. Calendar events will include visual arts, theater, film, music, literature, festivals, exhibits, workshops, family events, free events and more.

The online calendar will serve as the foundation for building an organization that meets our long-term goals as listed above

- Foster collaboration, partnerships, communication and networking between all the existing arts organizations, groups and programs in Marin.
- Be an ambassador for the arts.
- Be an advocate for the arts.

How will we use this grant?

The money from this grant would be used to continue our work.

- Artsopolis licensing fees (grant funds will be matched)
- Administration (grant funds will be matched)

We, MarinArts.org, appreciate the opportunity to apply for a Technical Assistance Grant from the California Arts Council. It is our hope that this grant will continue the collaborative efforts for both organizations. We look forward to continuing to work together as we pursue our goal of establishing a new countywide Arts Organization in Marin.

Attachments:

Attachment A: MarinArts.org Fiscal Sponsor Information & Members' Biographies
Attachment B: Budget Addendum

Attachment A

MarinArts.org

Fiscal Sponsor Information
MarinLink
Mary O'Mara, Executive Director
5800 Northgate Mall Ste 250
San Rafael, CA 94903
Office: 415-472-0211
EIN: 20-0879422

Committee Member Biographies

Emily Dvorin is a Sausalito based visual artist. She is involved in many arts groups such as ICB Artists Association, Fiber Dimensions, California Fiber Artists and more. She is also the first and major financial supporter of MarinArts.org. Emily lives in Kentfield.

Jennifer Freese is a database and website developer and administrator. In the past 15 years she has worked with many Marin arts organizations and groups such as Marin Open Studios, Marin Society of Artists, Art Works Downtown, Universal Museum of Women Artists and (formerly) Marin Arts Council. Jennifer lives in Berkeley.

Pamela Morton is a non-profit manager. She has worked in the arts sector for over 20 years. Spending 15 years as the Program Director including financial management at the Marin Arts Council. She then went on to be the Executive Director of DrawBridge: an arts program for homeless children. Pam continues to work as a non-profit management consultant. She has served on the following boards: Brandeis Hillel Day School as Secretary and Treasurer, DrawBridge, and Congregation Kol Shofar. Pam lives in Corte Madera.

Mary O'Mara MBA is the Founder and Executive Director of MarinLink. MarinLink identifies and fills community needs by connecting resources, ideas, and expertise. MarinLink helps community minded people realize their dreams serving as an incubator, fiscal sponsor, and multi-faceted resource for real solutions. MarinLink provides homeless services, community gardens, environmental education projects, veterans programs, health and transportation

initiatives and more. MarinLink identifies and fulfills unmet community needs, strengthening Marin with nimble, solution based innovation and collaboration. Mary lives in San Rafael.

Debra Self

Deb is a contemporary Chinese calligraphy artist and a lawyer who mediates and arbitrates. She is a member of Art of Ink in America Society, International Chinese Calligraphy and Painting Society, American Artists of Chinese Brush Painting and was a Marin Arts Council Board member many years ago. Deb lives in Greenbrae.

Bruce W. Davis has been involved in Bay Area nonprofit arts, entertainment and politics for more than 30 years. He is a nationally recognized award-winning development professional having successfully raised more than $40 million for nonprofit charitable causes in Northern California. He has served as the Executive Director of Arts Council Silicon Valley, the Executive Director/Producer of the San Francisco Ethnic Dance Festival, and as Northern California Coordinator of People For the American Way. He is also a singer/songwriter/publisher with the BMI performing rights organization.

Attachment B

MarinArts.org

Budget Addendum

The funds from this grant will be used to help cover following costs:

- $3,000 will be used towards Artsopolis licensing fees.
    - We are currently pursuing matching funds totaling $3,000 from community partners, following the successful funding model recently implemented by Arts Council Napa Valley.
- $2,000 will be used for administrative costs*
    - We have already received matching funds totaling $2,000 as of 8/29/2014 from an individual donor.

* All MarinArts.org members donate their time and expertise to this project. In addition, one committee member serves as a part time contractor (average 8 paid work hours / month) to execute specific work requirements to further the progress of MarinArts.org.

Contractor scope of work:

- Database – develop and maintain a comprehensive database with information on all Marin artists, arts organizations, media organizations, funders, donors, sponsors and businesses with relationships to MarinArts.org which includes, but is not limited to the following features
    - Contact information
    - Support statements & survey responses
    - Volunteer and service commitments
    - Donations, contributions and pledges
- Website
    - Develop and maintain website to communicate the goals and progress of MarinArts.org
- Communication & social media
    - Develop & grow email contact list
    - Create and maintain social media presence

    - Compile and monitor surveys and survey responses as needed
    - Communicate with MarinArts.org constituents as needed
- Fundraising & Development
    - Provide administrative services as needed to pursue funding for launching a new county-wide, all-inclusive Marin arts organization. Services may include, but are not limited to funder / donor meetings, grant writing, donor cultivation, record keeping, donation acknowledgement and grant reporting.
- Manage 501(c)3 application process
    - Complete all required applications, forms and filings as needed

Tab 20

CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Memorandum

California Arts Council
1300 I Street, Suite 930
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.322.6555 | www.arts.ca.gov

Date: October 6, 2014

To: Council Members

From: Scott Heckes, Deputy Director

Shelly Gilbride and Jason Jong, Arts Program Specialists, CA POL Coordinators

Re: CA Poetry Out Loud 2015

Staff requests approval for 2015 California Poetry Out Loud (CA POL) grant awards totaling $85,000: $45,000 to California Poets in the Schools (CPITS) to help administer the program, and $40,000 for CA POL partners to coordinate county competitions. Partners include State-Local Partners, county offices of education, nonprofit arts organizations and local school districts. County participation may include, but is not limited to: Alameda, Amador, Butte, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Fresno, Humboldt, Inyo, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Los Angeles, Madera, Marin, Mendocino, Merced, Modoc, Mono, Monterey, Napa, Nevada, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tuolumne, Ventura, Yolo and Yuba. Grants to county partners range from $500 to $3,000 with the majority of partners receiving $1,000 to coordinate county POL participation.

The California Arts Council will participate in the 10th anniversary of the National Endowment for the Arts' Poetry Out Loud Program (POL) in 2015. POL is a free program that helps students master public speaking skills, build self-confidence and learn about their literary heritage by memorizing and performing great poems. Students first compete at the classroom and school level. Winners then advance to the county competition and then to the state final in Sacramento. The State Champion will then represent California at the National Finals in Washington D.C.

In the past decade, CA POL has grown from a local competition in the capitol region to a state-wide event. An estimated 40,000+ students in 35 counties participated in CA POL in 2014. For the 10th anniversary season, we hope to increase participation to include at least 40 of CA's 58 counties.

The Arts Council will facilitate the project and work with partners who identify and work with teachers, poets, students and parents. The state final competition will be on March 15th and 16th, 2015 in the State Capitol. The Arts Council will also partner with CPITS, a statewide literary arts organization, to place poet-teachers in the classroom and work directly with teachers and students in preparation for competitions.

Tab 21

Memorandum

California Arts Council
1300 I Street, Suite 930
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.322.6555 | www.arts.ca.gov

Date: September 29, 2014

To: Council Members

From: Susan Steinhauser & Christopher Coppola
Outreach and Thought Leadership Committee

Re: Convening Implementation Proposal

Introduction

As you recall, acting on the Strategic Plan, the Outreach and Though Leadership Committee surveyed the field from July 8 - August 5, 2014 – seeking the input on convenings, conversations and trainings from arts organizations, artists, board members, volunteers, and other constituents who would benefit from future CAC offerings. We received 933 responses with all 58 California counties represented.

The results of this survey and other engagement with the field inform our recommendations. This committee proposes the CAC implement two forms of convening, online convenings via professional web platforms, and an in-person convening. The recommendations below provide an introduction to these concepts.

Online Convening Series

We recommend the formation of an online convening series, to launch in early 2015. The proposed structure is as follows:

- Concept: Four online convenings during the 2015 calendar year, with a schedule avoiding the summer months when participation is traditionally low. Convenings will be professionally administered and evaluated using technology best practices.
- Engagement: Series will be developed with a comprehensive strategy for pre and post-convening engagement with participants, following best practices for online convenings/training.
- Audience and Topics: Target audiences and topics respond to needs of the field.
    - Convening #1: Audience – CAC Grantees, Topic – Maximizing your CAC grant (fundraising, networking, storytelling, etc.)
    - Convening #2: Audience – Arts and Community Organizations, Topic – Leadership Development (maximizing human capital, emerging leaders, succession planning, professional development)

- Convening #3: Audience – Arts and Community Organizations, Topic – Resource Development (fundraising, grantwriting, corporate and foundation support, partnerships)
- Convening #4: Audience – Artists, Topic – Marketing and Promotion

- Thought Leadership: Convenings will be archived on the CAC website, contributing to our library of thought leadership resources.

In-Person Convening

We recognize that significant challenges exist when conceiving an in-person convening for a state as large as California, including access, cost, and structure. We carefully discussed the various considerations for proposing the CAC's first in-person convening in many years, and recommend the following:

- Concept: One statewide arts convening during the first quarter of 2016, utilizing State-Local Partners (SLP) to gather delegations from every corner of the state, with a thematic focus on community collaboration and partnerships. This was the #1 area of need/interest from our survey of the field (for both artists and organizations).
- Location: Sacramento is our proposed location based on legislative considerations and the Council's interest in reinstating complementary "Arts Day" type activities.
- Attendees: Suggested structure for attendees involves utilizing our State-Local Partnership Network. We propose empowering each SLP—and partners in counties with no official SLP—to identify a local delegation to attend the convening. Somewhere from 3 to 5 attendees could be selected from each county, depending on the overall conference budget.
- Goals: By utilizing a local delegation model for attendance, the convening could be structured to maximize productive engagement and follow-up that results in real community collaboration and local action. The convening could be structured with a blend of "traditional" convening experiences (keynote speakers, presentation sessions, etc.) and delegation focused work-sessions which could pair facilitators with multiple delegations to encourage collaboration, problem-solving, and goal setting for local follow-up.
- Travel: Our survey results definitely showed that travel assistance will be required to facilitate a statewide convening. This support could be conducted through the SLP augmentations currently recommend by the Programs Committee.

Next Steps

Agency staff is prepared to implement these recommendations. Preparations for the online convening series will need to begin immediately to meet recommended timeline. Development of the in-person convening will require significant lead time. It is recommended the Council discuss this concept in detail at our meeting, so staff may begin work on the budget and structural development as soon as possible.