

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING**Thursday, September 22, 2016****9 a.m. to 3 p.m.**

The Monday Club

1815 Monterey St.

San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

(805) 544-2013

PRESENT:Council Members

Donn K. Harris, Chair
Nashormeh Lindo, Vice Chair
Larry Baza
Phoebe Beasley
Christopher Coppola
Juan Devis
Kathleen Gallegos
Louise McGuinness
Steve Oliver

Council members absent: Jaime Galli and Rosalind Wyman

Arts Council Staff

Craig Watson, Director
Ayanna Kiburi, Deputy Director
Caitlin Fitzwater, Communications Director
Shelly Gilbride, Programs Officer
Andrea Porras, Arts Program Specialist
Jaren Bonillo, Arts Program Specialist
Mariana Moscoso, Administrative Analyst

Invited Attendees

Angela Tahiti, ARTS Obispo
Cara Goger, Executive Director at Mariposa County

Other Attendees / Members of the Public

Wendy-Marie Martin, Clark Center for the Performing Arts
Meggie Brummett, Santa Barbara Museum of Art
Lynne Oliverius, Canzona Women's Ensemble
Watson Rosen, Ventura County Arts Council
Hugo Morales, Radio Bilingüe
Benniz House, Arts Council for Monterey County
Hannah Rubalcava, Santa Barbara County Office of Art & Culture
Ron Baca, East L.A. Resident
Taiji Miyagawa, Southern CA Artist
Gayle Rappaport-Weiland, local artist in San Luis Obispo
Kay Gore, Arroy Grande resident & artist supporter
Eliza Tudor, Executive Director from Nevada City Arts Council
Craig Rosen, Ventura Arts Council
Allen Thies, ARTS Obispo
Peggy Sonda, the President of the Board of Directors of ARTS Obispo
Betina Swigger, Executive Director of Festival Mozaic
Allen Horst, Sponsor of the Cow Parade

MINUTES

I. Welcome from Host

Peggy Sonda, the President of the Board of Directors of ARTS Obispo and Angela Tahti, Executive Director of ARTS Obispo, welcomed the Council and public. Tahti introduced two performances from the community: SLO County Poet Laureate Marguerite Costigan read two poems: *War and Whispers* and *Artists Working*. The reading was followed by a contemporary dance performance by Deyo Dances.

II. Call to Order, Roll Call and Establishment of a Quorum

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:23 a.m. Moscoso took the roll at 9:24 a.m. and a quorum is established. Beasley informed the Council she received a message from Wyman. Wyman asked her absence to be excused because of extensive travel campaigning for the 2016 Presidential Election.

III. ACTION ITEM: Minutes of meeting on June 22, 2016

The Chair requested a motion to approve the minutes. Gallegos moved to approve the minutes, Coppola seconded. Gallegos noted grammatical errors on several pages and Coppola clarified on page 15 Lindo's husband, Delroy Lindo, was not a keynote speaker, the students were. The Chair requested a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

- McGuinness moved to approve the minutes as amended
- Devis seconded
- Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Gallegos, Galli and Oliver voted to approve the minutes as amended. Baza abstained because he was not present for the June 22, 2016 meeting.

- The motion passes and the minutes are approved.

IV. Chair Report

Harris discussed aspects of the written Chair's Report provided to Council at the meeting. He began the discussion with an introduction to his new position as Executive Director for Creativity and the Arts with the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). He provided a background to his position at SFUSD, underscoring his early career as an Art's Principal at San Francisco School of the Arts High School—additionally noting it is nice to return to his roots in San Francisco and to the high school both of his daughters graduated from. Harris proceeded to compare the difference between how the arts were received early in his career and how the arts are better received now compared to the previous decade. Harris added there is a surge of interest for students that do not have access to arts education and he continued to emphasize the importance of arts education.

Harris elaborated on San Francisco's \$300 million investment on renovating a building for the school at 170 Fell Street. He said it is to become a place of creativity, innovation, and arts resource center. He added that the building will be significant not only for students but for the entire city of San Francisco. He stated that as the Council thinks and discusses Cultural Districts today at the meeting, the Center will become a hub of the arts and they expect to have visitors from all over the world by 2021 or 2022.

Harris then introduced the topic of summer teacher institutes related to the arts. He said they are important to get teachers to think about the time they spend with their students in the classroom.

Harris visited the American Conservatory Theatre's Teacher Institute. In the program he observed the teachers who were asked to take a regular classroom lesson and turn it into an artistic form. He explained this opportunity allowed the teachers to explore the arts, guided by the world-class artists at the conservatory, to become as vulnerable as students are in the classroom.

Final portion of the Chair's Report focused on an article written by Harris on the importance of arts integration in California K-12 education. He noted the effort to increase thought leadership and conceive of new ways to integrate arts into education. Some ideas have been for students to learn discrete art forms early in their education and build upon that skill throughout their education. Other ideas include integrating arts into every single subject matter.

V. Director's Report

1) Cultural Districts Update

Following the Chair's Report, Watson gave an overview of the PowerPoint created by consultants Jessica Cusick and Maria Rosario Jackson for the State Cultural Districts public meetings. Watson provided the details about the Redding public meeting he and Fitzwater attended. Fitzwater informed the Council the meeting was well attended with as many as 60 attendants and representatives from art organizations, locally elected officials, national park service, and Caltrans. She highlighted the PowerPoint is introduction to the research that has been completed up to this point. The meeting was in a workshop format where attendees were asked to break into groups of five and discuss the main survey questions, also available online.

Watson provided the future locations and dates of upcoming meetings: Fresno on September 29th, Escondido on October 3rd, Oakland on October 5th, and the final meeting in Los Angeles on October 24th. He noted the Oakland and Los Angeles meetings are expected to be very large—therefore, the format will be a presentation followed by public comment. Watson informed the Council on expected staff attendance: Baza, Harris, Lindo, and McGuiness will attend Fresno and Baza will be at Escondido and Oakland. Fitzwater clarified that other Council members have confirmed they will attend other meetings and provided background assistance to the Cultural District program research.

Addressing the issue of inclusivity, Fitzwater commented on the availability of an online survey for individuals who are not able to attend one of the public input meetings. Additionally, she commented on the scientific method of the public input process and emphasized the importance of the one-to-one interviews, performed by Cusick and Jackson. Large samples of the interviewees were professionals both within California and nationally. The interviewees were stakeholders in existing cultural districts who addressed specific areas of concern. Fitzwater encouraged the Council to look at the PowerPoint which provides the initial research results and concludes with program recommendations. The research portion is expected to conclude in November, 2016 and will be reported on and reviewed at the December meeting, with the program launching in 2017.

Gallegos asked for clarification on the existence of cultural districts in California. Fitzwater provided examples of cultural districts that may be naturally occurring, have been self-designated or acknowledged by local government, also noting that these places are likely to be the prime applicants to the program. She further acknowledged the existence of mid-level and emerging level applicants. McGuiness requested to speak to Fitzwater after the meeting to talk further on the subject.

Devis asked Oliver if he has experience with cultural districts in his profession. Oliver responded that he has but possibly not at the same level. Oliver elaborated on his efforts to stabilize arts districts that have been constrained by the Tech industry in San Francisco. Fitzwater thanked Oliver for his early participation in the one-on-one interviews and how he has gracefully recommended many of his colleagues in development be interviewed to gain insight from their professional perspective.

The Chair asked Fitzwater when the guidelines will become available. Fitzwater hoped that the recommendations will be out soon, and noted they will be the cornerstone to application guidelines. The guidelines and application process will likely include criteria to determine to determine if a Cultural District designation is right for their community. Assistance will be available to applicants, including webinars and technical assistance with their application so applicants can build the best application possible.

The Chair asked if there will be limits to the number of districts that can be designated based on capacity. Fitzwater responded that a smaller group will be better in the beginning of the program. She noted much is being learned from the research, but much will also be learned with the first group of designated cultural districts. A number has not been decided on, but it is expected there will be a recommendation of ideal size for the first cohort based on the research and findings.

Oliver joined the discussion and cautioned that too much money invested too quickly without enough organization or background support may produce unintended consequences. He referred to the Dot Com boom 10-15 years ago in San Francisco that grew too fast without creating a proper support structure. Watson added that there is tremendous interest from communities all over the state that feel they are the right fit for a State Cultural District designation.

Coppola suggested the Council read about a pilot program that is growing at the San Francisco Institute that might provide helpful background information on arts districts. The Dogpatch is a growing community in San Francisco, in a period when Tech companies are pushing many local artists out of the city. The Institute's grad program is under enrolled because of the high cost of living. In an effort to improve enrollment, the Institute has bought a building in Fort Mason. The building will give back 20 studio spaces to the landlord in an effort to save money and/or offer the space at cost to local artists that cannot afford a studio space because of gentrification. Currently, it is being tested out. To move in, artists have to prove they have been in the area and are local, and they must show their work. Coppola has suggested Tech companies' marketing firms to sponsor centers like these. He proposed the idea as a "feel good story" to a marketing firm director and art collector Tom Sebastian, so these firms like his give money back to the communities that feel displaced.

Fitzwater followed Coppola's comment. She said it is still not known what the application will look like. However, she assured two items will be a part of the application process: site visits and cultural asset mapping. Fitzwater added an in-person site experience will be indispensable to gain an understanding of the place and the community. Secondly, cultural asset mapping of the community's local resources will ensure the applicant has deep understanding of the essential nature of maintaining those resources and keeping them available.

Lindo discussed the Oakland Museum of California's Identity Project. This project documents what communities define makes them unique and authentic. She concluded that as long as the State Cultural Districts serves the community that is already there, it could be a wonderful addition to communities.

Devis asked staff if the Council will be doing outlining of the framework of the Cultural Districts so that in two or three years the program will grant funds. Watson responded that the CAC is following the Massachusetts model without promising significant funding because when the State went to the legislature and legislation passed it did not come with funding. At the time of the roll out, the CAC's role will be to provide assistance to these communities. Watson added there might be an opportunity to assist the new cohorts financially depending on future legislative sessions and the program's initial impact. The author of the bill, State Assemblyman Richard Bloom, is interested in exploring a future investment in the program.

Devis asked Watson if the Council could help by sending letters. Watson suggested it is better if the program builds in stages with the intent to build a world-class program. He added there are 13 other states that have a program like this and people are watching California because they believe that California will learn all the lessons of the other states and develop a program that uniquely serves both urban and rural interests. Watson shared with the Council Devis's five part series that

looks at gentrification in California. Watson suggested it is a preview of the potential challenges the CAC could face, particularly in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Oakland. The cities in question do not tend to perceive a State designated Arts & Cultural Districts positively. The challenge faced by the CAC is how to handle the sensitivities around displacement and gentrification, cultural authenticity, and naturally occurring arts districts. As the program evolves, it will be much easier to show the legislature what the CAC creates.

Oliver introduced the CAST (Community Arts Stabilization Trust) program in San Francisco. He commented on the negative effects the Tech industry is having upon the “toughest” areas, where communities are absorbed in huge quantities overnight. Companies want to buy space that is consolidated into one floor. In an effort to curve tail the effects of Tech, Oliver has bought several small buildings for half the price. Harris asked what CAST is doing with the small buildings and he responded that he fills them up with galleries and finances them with tax credit. McGuinness asked what he is doing this south of Market Street and Dogpatch. Oliver clarified CAST has concentrated his efforts north of Market between 6th and 19th Streets where the arts are being driven out. Now CAST is looking to do something similar in Oakland.

Gallegos suggested the Council should be mindful of all communities that are involved, not just art communities. The effects of gentrification need to be central in the initial efforts and during progress of the program. Harris stated the legislation should be seen positively, adding the CAC is starting the project from scratch with the right values which will move the project in a positive direction. McGuinness revisited Lindo’s comment on the Oakland Museum’s project as a perfect example of a geographically-centered exhibition that demonstrates the effects brought out by gentrification, concluding her comments by recommending all to visit the exhibition. Lindo said she was not talking about the exhibit but a project, however acknowledged it may be connected to the exhibition. Watson acknowledged the length of the present discussion on cultural districts indicates the importance of the program.

2) Additional Director’s Report Items

Watson briefly outlined his gratitude for the State Local Partners’ letter to the Director. The letter was signed by every single SLP. He also acknowledged the presence of a few SLPs in the audience and said that the letter reflects and reminds the CAC that SLPs are the feet on the ground and the CAC takes this relationship seriously.

Watson informed the Council he would represent the CAC at the National Arts Policy roundtable held at the Sundance Institute. The roundtable was organized by Americans for the Arts and could be attended only by invitation—with the participation of 40 leaders—including the Rockefeller Foundation, and several other family art foundations. Watson was invited to talk about Arts-in-Corrections because of the CAC’s nationally recognized work in this area. Watson said he would be on a panel with Vijay Gupta, a violinist with the LA Philharmonic and a grantee, and an Oakland Police Officer and dramatist, who has a one-man show. The officer will talk about law enforcement and reform in incarceration.

Watson briefly mentioned the Confluence Conference on Monday, September 26 and Tuesday, September 27. He informed everyone he will be speaking briefly with the Cultural Pathways

grantees. He said they will also be guided by Amy Kitchner and with Beto Gonzales from Alliance for California Traditional Arts (ACTA).

Watson concluded the Director's Report by honoring Mary Beth Barber's legacy at the CAC. He informed the Council that Barber will move to a new role at the State Library, reuniting with friend and fellow journalist Greg Lucas, a State librarian. He said she will be missed and that the team is working diligently to get all the work that needs to get done as the CAC expands the Arts-in-Corrections work. Beasley asks whether a position will be lost and Watson responded with the expansion of Arts-in-Corrections there will be two positions to hire in the near future.

VI. Introduction of Grant Allocation Recommendations from Programs Committee and Grant Programs Budget Allocation 2016-17

The Chair proceeded onto the next item on the agenda. Beasley led the discussion on the new monies received by the CAC from the Legislature. She reminded the Council of staff's effort to get the Council book on time to the Council and the Council's responsibility to read, to give thoughtful comments, criticisms, and vote on the agenda items. She reminded the Council that their role is to review and approve the overall budget and grant allocations, and then to review and approve the guidelines and policies.

Kiburi provided an initial introduction to the two budget scenarios developed by staff at the request of the Chair. Harris asked if the vote will be completed program by program. Kiburi provided clarity on the voting process and the budget discussion. Kiburi explained that the Council will vote on the total budget scenario in Tab F, and will be referring to and discussing the detailed information in Tabs D and E to inform that vote.

VII. Grant Programs Budget Allocation 2016-2017

Kiburi directed the Council to Tab F with the 2016-2017 budget allocation scenarios to be reviewed. Kiburi highlighted the budgetary impact on Cultural Pathways as the starting point of the discussion. She notified the Council that following the discussion, Gilbride will provide an overview of the program rationales and guidelines. Kiburi said once the entire budget and rationale have been discussed, the Council will be asked to vote. Harris asked if anything aside the budget was going to be approved. Gilbride responded the guidelines would be approved through a second vote.

Cultural Pathways

Beasley directed the Council's direction to the provided information on Cultural Pathways (Pathways) in Tab F noting the differences between budget Scenario 1 and 2. She asked the Council to consider the two possibilities:

Scenario 1: Provide technical support, professional development, extra CAC staff assistance, and co-learning for two years in keeping with the grants plus strategy set forth in the initial program goals, and provide a \$3,000 augmentation to the 28 current Pathways grantees.

Scenario 2: Develop an overlapping grant process resulting in two cohorts by curtailing the technical support, professional development, extra CAC staff assistance, and co-learning the professional development for the original 28 grantees by allocating the funds to an additional 28 organizations this year.

Harris asked if the \$3,000 augmentation in Scenario 1 would come out of the operations budget. Gilbride answered that it would come from the grants budget and clarified the \$100,000 for professional development and technical assistance in 2015-2016 is allocated from the operations budget.

Gilbride reminded the Council that the first time the Pathways cohort will meet together will be at the Confluence statewide arts conference later in September. She also noted that Jong will be assisted by the Alliance for California Traditional Arts (ACTA) at Confluence. Previously allocated technical assistance money paid for travel and registration. Pathways grantees will be able to determine how they spend the \$3,000 augmentation. The goal is for these organizations to grow their organizational capacity so they are able to successfully apply to other CAC grant programs in the future. Gilbride reminded the Council of the uniqueness of the program's "grants plus" strategy.

Harris asked if a need for technical assistance was already demonstrated in the cohort. Gilbride responded that the need was articulated in the grant application process and in communications with grantees. None of these grantees have ever received a CAC grant. Gilbride emphasized that the extra level of assistance they will receive is new to the CAC and distinct from other CAC grant programs.

Harris and McGuiness expressed some confusion over the allocation of the funds and who the additional grantees would be. Gilbride clarified that by adopting Scenario 1, the current cohort would get technical assistance and professional development by staff and an additional \$3,000 added to their current grant. Whereas, in Scenario 2, there would be a second cohort of grantees, requiring additional staff work, particularly during the application and panel process. Having two cohorts takes away from the attention, professional development, and technical assistance that could be provided to the original 2015-16 cohort. McGuiness inquired what would be the consequences of choosing Scenario 2 over Scenario 1. Gilbride summarized it would be difficult to provide effective and substantial assistance to either cohort in Scenario 2.

Devis reminded the Council that the \$84,000 in Scenario 1 suggests that each grantee receive an additional \$3,000 to the original \$10,000 grant they are entitled to over the course of two years (\$5,000 each year). However, with the addition of a new FY16-17 cohort, the 2015-16 cohort would not receive the additional \$3,000 allotted in Scenario 1. Baza also acknowledged the comments made by Gilbride explained that in Scenario 1, the exclusive two year "grants plus" approach is necessary in order for staff to evaluate how the program works for future iterations. Baza added by bringing another cohort so soon there will not be enough time to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Harris asked the Council to consider this program within the larger context of the \$14.5 million in grants. Scenario 1 allocates \$84,000 for Pathways, whereas Scenario 2 allocates \$280,000 from

the same total amount—ultimately taking away funding from another program, Creative California Communities (CCC). He added it is a philosophical question how the Council wishes to allocate these funds. Oliver elaborated on Harris’s comment by reminding the Council that in Scenario 2, a second cohort would cost the budget \$100,000 from the reserve (remainder) amount.

Gallegos expressed concern over the budget scenarios. She said that in the previous minutes, there was evidence of panelists who expressed problems with Pathways applications, however, also acknowledged this was not a unique problem to Pathways. Gallegos said she did not understand how or why Pathways can be pulled without evaluation. Gilbride asked Gallegos what she meant by Cultural Pathways being “pulled.” Gallegos acknowledged Pathways is an area of high demand and it is only two percent of the budget. She said the additional funding from the legislature was provided to serve low-income and underserved communities but that neither budget scenario offered a significant increase in funds to Pathways.

Watson responded to Gallegos by stating that the intention is to grow Pathways over time. In order to do this, it is important to focus on the current cohort. Watson empathized with Gallegos and said that optically it may not seem that the CAC is not committed to the program but he and staff want the program to succeed. The staff is concerned that overlapping the programs will have a negative impact on grantees. The trade off is whether the Council and staff want to compromise technical assistance and professional development to add-on another cohort. He recognized that the concern is that Pathways is already small, but added that the program is unique because it is a “grants plus program” (grant and technical assistance), something that has not been done before.

Devis made a comparison to the Arts & Media program that was suspended in order to complete evaluations with grantees and other organizations in order to find out what the field needed. He asked if something like this could be done for Pathways. Additionally, he said it is important to take these two years proposed in Scenario 1 to help this group that caters to a population in need. He suggested Scenario 1 would better serve current grantees and future cohorts.

Lindo agreed with Gallegos in terms of the need, however, she also acknowledged that if the CAC spreads itself too thin no one would benefit. She added that taking the two years with the original cohort to learn what they need, providing extra technical assistance is one of the most important aspects of the grant. Devis asked the Council if it could commit to bringing the program back after it has been thoroughly evaluated and knows how to best service this population. Harris said the Council can’t commit 100% to bringing back the program because the Council does not have confirmation of the budget beyond FY16-17. However, Harris acknowledged that careful evaluation is certainly how the Council operates and noted the Arts & Media program as an example. Harris asked Gilbride if the intent after this cohort is to bring back the program every year.

Gilbride said that, yes that is the intent. She added that as the program was originally conceived, it was designed to build the evaluation into the program over the first two years. Staff is working in partnership with ACTA, who already offers similar technical assistance and evaluation services. The recommendation at the end of the grant period may be to expand the program investment and grant size for the 2017-19 cohort. Watson added that another possibility could be to increase the size of the grantee cohort. .

Beasley reminded the Council that the organizations in the cohort are small and emerging. She added it is a pilot program, and the organizations cater to immigrant refugees, tribal groups, people of color, and the most disenfranchised. Devis asked Beasley what her recommendation would be, she responded that she recommends Scenario 1 in order to focus on one cohort for two years, to learn as much as possible, and give the current cohort all of the help it needs. McGuinness moved for a vote and Harris requested continued discussion before accepting a motion.

Gallegos added to the discussion that there is a need to grow this program because these organizations need the money. She asked the Council to consider that the current budget includes one-time funds and there may not be the possibility to continue this program in the future. Devis asked for more information on the one-time funding.

Watson outlined the \$10 million increase in the 2016-17 state budget: \$4 million is for Arts-in-Corrections and \$800,000 for re-entry pilot programs, \$6 million is the new, one-time money for CAC grant programs. Watson explained that the pathway for the \$6 million was unusual – normally if CAC funds are to be increased, the increase runs through the Government Affairs Subcommittee of either the Assembly or the Senate. However, this year, the increase came in through the Public Safety Subcommittee where the Department of Corrections and issues of social justice are addressed. As the increase was passed, a general sentiment of the legislature was that everything the CAC does in some way helps with health of community. Watson acknowledged Gallegos concerns are valid and it is important the Council carefully considers all of the CAC's programs. He added that in Scenario 1 the CAC is investing money in communities of need in many grant programs, not just Cultural Pathways. He expressed confidence that the entire grants program is serving and addresses the needs of everyone, including rural communities and communities of color, and he expressed that the CAC is meeting the intentions of the legislature. Harris reiterated that the budget will be voted in its entirety after reviewing all of the rationales and that a vote is not needed at this time.

Devis asked if it was possible to keep the proposed two-year Scenario 2 and continue funding the first 28 grantees with a larger amount of money. He suggested that if it is possible to take the budget proposal in Scenario 2 but instead of giving the \$10,000 to another cohort to give the money to the original 28, investing in them even further. Gilbride said it could be a possibility.

Gallegos added to the discussion and she wanted to make clear, for the record, that the organizations Cultural Pathways assists are the most vulnerable and there is no guarantee there will be funding in the future.

a. Existing Grant Programs Allocation Rationale

Gilbride turns the Council's attention back to the current agenda item, and suggested to take the discussion of CP into account when thinking through the budget rationale for the remaining programs in Tab D and the suggested new programs in Tab E. Gilbride began the discussion with Artists Activating Communities.

Artists Activating Communities

Gilbride summarized the recommendations included in the Council book for the second year of the AAC program. The recommendation o included an increase in the maximum grant amount for 2016-2017 from the previous year's \$12,000 to \$18,000, consistent with other project-based grant programs. She added the Programs Committee's recommendation is to restrict school-site based arts education programs from applying to AAC as these activities will be funded exclusively by the Artists in Schools grant program.

Devis asked for an explanation of the difference between Artists Activating Communities (AAC) and Creative California Communities (CCC). He asked if both programs are dedicated to funding community projects and creative placemaking. Gilbride provided clarification on CCC grants. She added that CCC addresses the needs of the community through placemaking projects, whereas AAC supports artist-driven projects that engage community members, but may not be considered creative placemaking projects. McGuiness added AAC is specifically different from CCC because it is artist-driven but the artist can be part of a nonprofit arts organization or community/social service organization.

Gilbride proceeded with an overview of the rationales and recommendations for the other existing grant programs in Tab. D including: Artists in Schools, Arts and Accessibility, Creative California Communities, JUMP StArts, Local Impact, Professional Development and Consulting, Poetry Out Loud, Statewide and Regional Networks, Veterans Initiative in the Arts, and State-Local Partnership Program. She explains the recommendation to significantly increase the allocation to the Artist in Schools program and expand the program's offerings to reach more students through after-school programs and assemblies and field trip support. She also highlighted the recommended increase in the maximum grant amount for Artists in Schools to \$18,000 consistent with AAC. Arts and Accessibility is recommended to receive a significant funding increase for the partnership with the National Arts and Disabilities Center in Los Angeles. She also summarized the recommended changes to the CCC program in an effort to be equitable to organizations of all sizes, and to make the program more effective. JUMP StArts is currently undergoing a program evaluation and therefore there is no recommended increase in the allocation until that evaluation is complete. Gilbride acknowledged that there were not as many applicants to the program in FY15-16 as expected, and the evaluation will address that. The recommendation is for JUMP StArts allocation to remain the same as FY15-16. Recommendations from the JUMP StArts evaluation will be brought to Council in December. There is a recommendation to increase Local Impact allocation and the maximum grant amount to \$18,000 to be consistent with AAC and Artists in Schools. The recommendation for Professional Development and Consulting is to increase the allocation and move to 2 deadlines a year based on demand. The recommendation for Poetry Out Loud is consistent with the decision made by Council at the June 16th meeting to revise the guidelines and implement that program through participating State Local Partners. The recommendation for Statewide and Regional Networks was to increase the grant amount to be consistent with State-Local Partners. The recommendation for Veterans Initiatives in the Arts is to maintain a consistent allocation since the CAC did not receive as many applications as expected. The programs staff is seeking feedback on the guidelines to the program and is increasing outreach, and expects applications to meet the program allocation in FY16-17. A modest increase to the State-Local Partnership Program is recommended, recognizing the significant increase that the program received in FY16-17.

b. New Pilot Grant Programs Allocation Rationale

Gilbride directed the Council's attention to Tab E. She acknowledged the legislative budgetary increase as an indication of their support and belief in the CAC's existing programs, which is why the majority of the increased funds are allocated to the programs that were just discussed.

However, The Programs Committee has recommended two new pilot grant programs: first, the reinvigoration of the Arts & Public Media program after the current evaluation and second, a new Research in the Arts program. The budget for these programs is small compared to the total budget for existing programs, less than 10%.

Arts and Public Media Grant Program

Gilbride discussed the Arts and Public Media program as a revamped version of the previous Arts on the Air program offered in 2013-14 and 2014-15. She reminded the Council that they voted to suspend the program in order to evaluate the program's effectiveness, to better serve the nonprofit media arts field. The reinstatement of the program comes from the results suggested on the evaluation and the Arts and Public Media Summit in Oakland. Leaders in the field from around the state were involved in a summit and evaluation of the program. Gilbride added that a complete report of the summit is to be published in October and early results of the report informed the Program Committee's recommend the reinstatement. The program will follow a similar structure to Arts on the Air with some distinguishing differences: the criteria will allow for both small and mid-size stations to be more competitive and a broadened eligibility allowing for non-traditional media such as podcasts to apply. The total allocation is recommended for the program is \$200,000 for approximately 15-20 grantees.

Fitzwater added that the new Arts and Media program would be better at serving the community because the previous program had its shortcomings; the community felt we were underserved as a whole. Fitzwater also acknowledged the key role the panelists from the Arts and Public Media played in developing the recommendations and that there is clearly a need for an Arts and Media program.

Gallegos asked how was engagement measured. Fitzwater responded to Gallegos question and added that the new guidelines consider the size of rural and larger communities and the need to be flexible in considering how reach is measured based on community size and needs. She added that the program evaluation even considered the inclusion of language-based communities.

Research in the Arts Grant Program

Gilbride proceeded with the discussion on the proposed Research in the Arts grant program. She provided background of the program's conception and information on the NEA's research funding category. The NEA confirmed there is demand for arts research grants in California. Gilbride added that the program concept was informed by conversations with researchers from the UC system. She also added that research institutions and universities would be able to apply. Gilbride said California would be the first state agency to provide a research grant in general, but particularly one that is open to practice and experimental research.

Devis asked if this grant was for CAC related research. Watson clarified it was not and added that CAC related research is funded through the agency's operating budget as appropriate.

Harris notified the Council that they would vote for guidelines after a break. Gilbride reminded the Council that they will be voting on six sets of guidelines. Kiburi added the vote will be for the budget Scenario 1 or 2 based on the rationale Gilbride presented. Then the Council went to break.

BREAK

c. Proposed Grants Program Budget

Harris calls the meeting back to order for the vote on the two budget scenarios. Harris requested a motion for budget Scenario 1 or 2 before continuing into a short discussion. Coppola moves to vote in support of the budget as presented in Scenario 1.

Gallegos did not agree with the budget scenarios presented because she believes that there is a pattern where funding is being provided to the “top-end” and communities of colors are being taken out. Harris asked the Council if there were any comments on Gallegos’s remarks. Devis responded that he believes that a lot of the communities of need are in fact being funded by the CAC but wondered whether the CAC will invest more in emerging organizations. Devis recognized that CAC grants are distributed equally among different regions and areas and in diverse communities. He suggested the conversation should be focused in a different direction because the list of CAC grantees illustrates that communities of need are being funded across many grant programs. Coppola followed up on Devis’s comment by offering the staff a vote of confidence and said staff demonstrates concern and considers a wide-range of grants to address a wide-range of communities. He concluded his comment by extending his support to the CAC staff. Oliver acknowledged the previous comments on the subject and concluded his remarks supporting Scenario 1 because good results in the Cultural Pathways pilot could result in a much stronger program.

Lindo empathized with Gallegos’s comment. She acknowledged the sense of urgency she felt but agreed with the previous comments. Lindo added that Scenario 1 is the first step to meeting the need of emerging organizations through an effective grants plus program. She supported Gallegos but stated spreading the money without understanding how the program works would be ineffective. Devis pointed out that \$2.2 million dollars are going to Local Impact grants that serve communities of need, specifically.

Gallegos stated the goal of the Equity Subcommittee is to address diversity not only of program participants but also to fund more equitable organizations in terms of structure, organization staff, board members, and artists. Gallegos argued that Cultural Pathways speaks directly to communities of color in ways other programs do not. She added that equity is not about only serving communities in need but also about the leadership of the organizations and suggested that many funded organizations do not have a diverse staff or leadership.

Coppola said he trusts staff’s ability to look at who is on the board and the leadership of the organizations funded. Coppola mentioned that something that has not been discussed enough is the concept of hope. He said it is important for the CAC to convey to the community that there is hope and dedication to the Pathways program. He added it is important to express the desire for positive results of the pilot program.

Lindo responded to Gallegos. She reiterated Gallegos points regarding organizational structures of the grantees and the need to distribute wealth. Lindo agreed with Gallegos's concern over leadership, but added the Council cannot discriminate against organizations based on race. Gallegos stated she has been asked on certain non-CAC grants about her ethnicity.

Kiburi responded to Gallegos's comment by stating that Scenario 1 is designed to find ways to foster diversity in leadership. Kiburi continued the discussion and strongly supported the effort for Scenario 1 with the conviction of the scenario's structure to create strong and sustainable organizations through the technical assistance component of the Pathways program.

Devis followed the discussion with a positive comment about the Local Impact program's proposed budget increase of nearly \$1 million. Devis added that the program increased by nearly fifty percent. McGuinness added it is important to always consider the mission of the CAC. She said it is important to be business-like and practical because the CAC will be accountable to the Legislature. Therefore, with a new program like Cultural Pathways, it is important to have expertise going forward with the program so that the Legislature will grant the money again the following year. Watson acknowledged that the passion of the Council for the Pathways program is shared by the staff.

ACTION ITEM: Coppola moves to vote in support of the budget as presented in Scenario 1 and Oliver seconded. The motion passed with 8-1 with yes votes from Baza, Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Harris, Lindo, McGuinness, and Oliver. Gallegos voted no.

d. Guidelines

Gilbride provided an overview of the Programs Committee's memo for the standard changes to ranking system. Gilbride recommends that the Council vote to give staff the authority to find tune and publish the guidelines included in their Council books in consultation with the Programs Committee. Harris reminded the Council that this vote is in keeping with standard practice. Oliver asked if the Council would be informed of any significant changes made after the vote. Gilbride responded the Council would be notified if significant changes must be made.

Gallegos asked why the section "Clarifying the Definition of In-Kind Contributions" was revised. Gilbride responded in order to clarify that only in-kind contributions from a 3rd party can be used for the match.

Devis asked if board and staff composition could be a determining factor in the guidelines. Gilbride said demographic information collected at the time of an application would be considered exclusionary. Kiburi added demographics cannot be used to determine eligibility because it could be considered discrimination. Watson added that if applicants are asked to provide demographic information, concerns could arise around how this information would be used as a factor for the panel's consideration. He added that in grantee final reports organizations can submit demographic information.

Baza recounted a story about his experience on asking demographics with the City of San Diego. He said they used to ask directly on the application about the ethnicity of the board and

committees. He said they were told by their legal department that it needed to be removed. He added there are different ways of asking for the same information. Devis asked about Data Arts and its function. Gilbride clarified that the demographic information is collected but the information provided to the CAC is improving but is still not very good. Beasley added many individuals do not like to disclose their demographic information or simply choose to declare “other.” Coppola said profiling is not useful, it is better to fund and support organizations that help the most people. Harris reminded Council that the panelists ultimately recommend which organizations will be funded based on the specific program goals and on the many factors outlined in the grant guidelines.

Gallegos had a question regarding the language in the guidelines for Arts Activating Communities (AAC). Gilbride provided an explanation for the change. Harris suggested Gallegos provide fine-tune corrections regarding language to Gilbride directly.

ACTION ITEM: Oliver moves to give staff and the Programs Committee the authority to fine-tune and make public the guidelines for the programs outlined in Tab G. McGuiness seconded. The motion passed with 9-0 with yes votes from Baza, Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Gallegos, Harris, Lindo, McGuiness, and Oliver.

The Council enters a closed personnel session and working lunch. Oliver leaves the meeting due to travel needs.

VIII. Grant Programs 2016-2017: Voting Items

Harris began the discussion notifying the Council that State-Local Partnership Program (SLP), Art & Accessibility Technical Assistance, and Poetry Out Loud items would be voted on separately. Kiburi asked if anyone needed to declare a Conflict of Interest. Baza declared a conflict for the SLP, City of San Diego.

Gilbride introduced Jaren Bonillo, the Arts Program Specialist for State-Local Partnership Program (SLP). Gilbride acknowledged SLP was her first panel experience and congratulated Bonillo on running an excellent panel. Bonillo introduced Cara Goger, SLP Panelist and Executive Director for Mariposa County Arts Council, serving as the SLP Panel representative at the Council Meeting.

Bonillo outlined the requested to provide funding for SLP general operation support for 2016-2017. The recommendation was for \$1,473,000 million including a \$5,000 augmentation to each grantee after their panel ranking. Under the revised budget allocation voted on earlier in the meeting, the average grant size is \$32,000 per grantee with a maximum grant size of \$35,000. Grantees will only be asked to match \$30,000 (the maximum request amount as initially outlined in the guidelines). Bonillo provided background on the SLP program.

Bonillo said the SLP organizations are local representations to communities across the state, the “boots on the ground.” She remarked on the changes made to the grant application, primarily focused on equity and inclusion, accessibility and community engagement Bonillo asked Goger to speak about her panel experience.

Goger thanked the Council for their support of the SLP program. She said she felt honored for the opportunity to serve on the SLP panel. Goger spoke about the panel's desire to build an understanding of each community with a focus on access and equity. Goger said equity is defined differently in different regions across the state. She added the panel also considered access and how programs could be improved in a community. Goger said the panel also discussed the ranking system. After Goger's discussion, Harris asked if the Council had any questions.

Devis asked where counties usually get their funding. Goger replied that funds received by SLPs vary by location, and that some SLPs are nonprofit organizations and some are units of county government. Watson continued the discussion; he said in rural counties the SLP grant is a great part of their overall funding. He explained that SLPs are designated by their board of supervisors as a state partner to the CAC. Watson also explained that sometimes counties do not receive any funding from the county and he acknowledged sources of funding vary greatly from county to county.

Devis followed the discussion by asking if it is possible to provide funding depending on the size of the SLP grantee's county or community served. Devis clarified his question was more about the size of the county budget. Watson followed with a clarification question if Devis is proposing counties with smaller budgets should get more funding. Devis answered affirmatively. Watson said the SLP funding model follows the National Endowment for the Arts model for state funding. Harris added to the discussion noting that large organizations may feel penalized with a system that benefits organizations with small budgets. Harris requests a motion.

ACTION ITEM: McGuiness moves to approve the State-Local Partnership funding as recommended except for the City of San Diego. Lindo seconded. The motion passed with 8-0 with yes votes from Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Gallegos, Harris, and McGuiness.

Harris asked for Baza to leave the room for the second vote.

ACTION ITEM: Beasley moves to approve the State-Local Partnership funding for the City of San Diego as recommended. Coppola seconded. The motion passed with 7-0 with yes votes from Devis, Gallegos, Harris, Lindo, and McGuiness. Baza was not present for the vote because of a conflict of interest with the City of San Diego.

Harris asked for Baza to return and thanked Bonillo and Goger. Coppola suggested SLPs in rural areas receive technical assistance funds. Harris said other ideas for assistance could be considered. Gilbride added each county has a different operating model. SLPs who offer direct programming apply successfully in many other CAC grant categories. McGuiness asked if webinars on how to apply for a grant are available, Gilbride answered affirmatively. Watson added after every panel organization receives extensive notes to help improve their future grant applications.

Harris directed the Council's attention to Tab I, Arts and Accessibility Technical Assistance Overview, Enhancements and Opportunities. Gilbride provided a quick overview based on the memo provided in the Council book. Harris called for a motion.

ACTION ITEM: Baza moves to approve a \$150,000 joint CAC and National Arts and Disability Center (NADC) Arts and Accessibility. Lindo seconded. The motion passed with 8-0 with yes votes from Baza, Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Gallegos, Harris, and McGuiness.

Harris directed the Council's attention to Tab J, Poetry Out Loud budget recommendations. Gilbride briefly reviewed the memo provided in the Council book. Harris remarked positively on the program. Coppola asked if the east coast spends more on the program than California because they always win. Fitzwater said California's investment in the program is one of the highest in the nation.

ACTION ITEM: Coppola moves to approve a \$150,000 allocation for Poetry Out Loud: \$25,000 for teachers, \$95,000 to support county partners, and \$30,000 for travel and event costs. Lindo seconded. The motion passed with 8-0 with yes votes from Baza, Beasley, Devis, Gallegos, Harris, and McGuiness.

IX. Grant Programs 2016-2017: Informational Update

Programs Calendar Draft

Gilbride provided an overview of the Programs Calendar Draft provided in Tab K of the Council book. She noted the calendar was provided in two formats for readability purposes. Fitzwater added that as program guidelines become available, Council would be notified. McGuiness asked how far in advance would be notified. Gilbride said the Council can begin promoting the programs immediately because guidelines will begin becoming available in November. Devis asked if Council members can observe panel discussions. Gilbride answered affirmatively and adds that it is indeed encouraged, and that several Council members observed panels this year.

Call for Panelists

Gilbride directed the Council's attention to Tab L, Call for Panelists. In the tab a copy of the call was provided to the Council. Gilbride said a recent goal has been to continue developing panels with new and diverse voices. Diversity related to artistic genre, gender, age, ethnicity, etc. She said the call is being sent earlier than usual and it is available online. Gilbride reminded that once approved by a vote of the Council, panelists are on the list for two years.

Devis asked what happens after panelists apply. Gilbride said an expertise check is done with a ranking system. In January, a panel pool will be brought to the Council for approval. Staff then chooses panels based on availability and areas of expertise of the pool, and considerations of diversity and scheduling availability. Harris asked if there are any groups that are challenging to get onto the panel. Gilbride said that last year, military veterans were underrepresented and difficult to find.

Lindo asked a question regarding a specific panelist she recommended. She also asked if a panelist served one year, but was not asked to participate the second year, needs to reapply to be a panelist. Gilbride answered affirmatively since two years have passed and the panelist would no longer be active on the list. Gilbride asked the Council to reach out to their networks to promote the open call.

Coppola asked if there is an honorarium for panelists. Gilbride said that an honorarium cannot currently be offered. She added that here is an effort to learn more about how this could be offered in the future, and if legislation may be necessary. Watson added that Scott Heckes, the previous Deputy Director, expected it would require a change in legislation. The Council acknowledged that being a panelist is a lot of work. Watson agreed. Gilbride reminded the Council the CAC does cover travel, lodging, and a per diem for food.

PERFORMANCE: Tahiti introduced Sylvia Ke’alalau’eokalani Hambly’s school of Hawaiian dance performers. She teaches dance, Hawaiian custom and tradition locally in San Luis Obispo. The dancers and musicians performed Kumu Hula, Hālau Hula Nā Mele o ke Kai.

X. Public Comment

Harris calls for Public Comment. The following individuals gave public comment:

■ Hugo Morales, Radio Bilingüe

Informed the Council of the expansions made available for Radio Bilingüe because of the Arts in the Air program. He provided a background of Radio Bilingüe’s outreach and programming. Morales said it gives a voice to local communities with Latino arts groups and fosters traditional arts. He thanked the Council for their support. He congratulated staff for the budget increase in budget. Morales also supported fostering Cultural Pathways and take the time to reconsider a multicultural advancement program, previously offered by the CAC.

■ Benniz House, Community Engagement Coordinator for Arts Council for Monterey County

House thanked the CAC and Council for their support. She added that CAC funds have helped Arts Council for Monterey County increase revenues, maximize programs and impact, expanded arts education, expanded professional artists, increased music classes’ teachers, increases artists's support, and increased mentorship in Monterey County.

■ Craig Rosen, Ventura Arts Council and Hannah Rubalcava, Santa Barbara County Office of Art & Culture

Rosen brought a photograph by a young man that works in the fields in Oxnard. The frame is made of the same material the workers use during their day. Ventura County’s Arts Council collaborated with Santa Barbara County’s Arts Council to hold an exhibition. Rubalcava also thanked the Council and she mentioned their Arts Council new name. She said they have new staff, a new Executive Director, and new curator. She reminds the Council that there are underserved rural communities in Santa Barbara County. Rubalcava talked about the collaboration with Ventura Arts Council.

■ Eliza Tudor, Executive Director from Nevada City Arts Council

Thanked the Council and the CAC staff for their support.

■ Allen Thies, Arts Obispo

Thies discussed concerns about bureaucratic issues artists face at the local level in order to complete public art projects. He asked for a simplified process for artists so that they may focus on their work.

■ Gayle Rappaport-Weiland, local artist in San Luis Obispo

Rappaport-Weiland painted *Harmony of Love*, the painted cow displayed during the Arts Council for the local “Cow Parade.” She thanked the Council for their support of the arts.

■ Taiji Miyagawa, East L.A. Resident

Baca appreciated that diversity was discussed during the meeting. He said that it is not enough talk about numbers. He mentioned he is a grassroots activist and believes the budget numbers do not match the need. Miyagawa said accountability needs to be tied to the action and that the programs are reaching the groups that need them the most. Spoke to the experiences of displacement happening in Chinatown (LA).

■ Bettina Swigger, Executive Director of Festival Mozaic

She thanked the Council and the CAC staff for their work. Swigger was a panelist in the spring. She applauded the work towards underserved communities. She asked for more assistance for rural areas. Swigger said San Luis Obispo County does contain a lot of rural surrounding areas. She also wanted to highlight age-inclusion because aging communities are often neglected in arts conversations.

■ Allen Horst, Sponsor of the Cow Parade

Provided an informational background about the Cow Parade. He was inspired by iterations of the program nationally and internationally. Horst is a dairy farmer inspired by the event and brought it to San Luis Obispo. Cow statues are painted and viewed on a tour.

■ Angela Tahiti, ARTS Obispo

Tahiti expressed deep and sincere thoughts of her team and all SLPs. She thanked the Council and staff for their support and spoke of her own long and personal journey as an SLP first in northern CA and now in San Luis Obispo. Tahiti asked for SLPs to be given information about who are the applicants of their own counties so they can provide as much local assistance and encouragement as possible.

Harris concludes public comment.

XI. Council Member Updates and Reports

Watson excused himself because he had to leave for the Sundance Institute where he was invited to participate in a panel on Arts in Corrections. Harris asked Council to provide updates of art related projects and thought leadership.

Coppola said that he would like the CAC to spotlight ideas and projects of artists. He said that in the 1970s the Council was made of artists and there was a focus on ideas. Gilbride said that the CAC is a grantmaking agency and so the agency depends on funding the ideas of organizations. Harris acknowledged that the early years of the CAC were very interesting and it would be great to bring back the spontaneity but that times have changed and so has bureaucracy.

Lindo remarked on recent experiences visiting SOMA Arts and met with the director and Jaime Galli. She spoke to the experience of the Social Justice Theater in Berkeley. Lindo also visited Oakland Museum for a symposium on public art. She discussed a specific project along the US-Mexican border. Lindo also added her experiences visiting the Holocaust Museum and preview of the African-American Museum in Washington, DC. She said she would be attending the museum's opening the following weekend.

Baza spoke on a San Diego Cultural Pathways grantee and again reiterated his support of the Council's earlier vote on budget Scenario 1 provided technical assistance and an augmentation to current grantees. He is familiar with a Pathways grantee, a small multicultural LBGT group of color. Baza spoke of inequality within the LGBT community and the importance of the group's experience in the Pathways program.

Beasley shared on two site visits in Los Angeles. One is a walking tour that explores the "marriage" of the Japanese and Black community in "Walking with Grace" film. She also visited *Engaged*, a senior arts complex. It is a multigenerational communal space opening in October.

XII. Adjournment

The Council honored the memory of Bobby Hutcherson and Juan Gabriel. Harris adjourns the meeting with closing comments.