

**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 used by the council to award the funds 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 perception of conflict of interest.

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 commonalities 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.