



Strengthening arts, culture,  
and creative expression as the  
tools to cultivate a better  
California for all.

Gavin Newsom, **Governor**

Jonathan Moscone, **Executive Director**

2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300, Sacramento CA 95833

(916) 322-6555 | [www.arts.ca.gov](http://www.arts.ca.gov)

## MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

September 15, 2022

10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The members of the California Arts Council convened via web conference to discuss and vote on various items as listed in the minutes below. The full audio and video of the meeting can be accessed [here](#).

### PRESENT:

#### Council Members

Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Chair  
Consuelo (Chelo) Montoya, Vice-Chair  
Gerald Clarke  
Vicki Estrada  
Jodie Evans  
Ellen Gavin  
Alex Israel  
Phil Mercado, M.D.  
Roxanne Messina Captor

#### Arts Council Staff

Ayanna Kiburi, Deputy Director  
Liz Azevedo, Director of Program Services  
Kimberly Brown, Public Affairs Specialist  
Mark DeSio, Director of Public Affairs  
Kristin Margolis, Director of Legislative Affairs

### 1. Call to Order

Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez opened the meeting at 10:03 a.m.

### 2. Acknowledgement of Tribal Land

Deputy Director Kiburi stated the following: *“The California Arts Council recognizes the original caretakers of these sacred lands within the state of California and throughout the United States. As guests, we pay respect to their stewardship of the air, water, and land, and*

*uplift their legacies as they continue to build and sustain their culture and practices today, and for seven generations. As the Council does its work it will seek ways to carry out our responsibility as stewards of the land, and our responsibility to ensure that all people are strengthened and supported.”*

### **3. Roll Call and Establishment of a Quorum**

Present: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Phil Mercado and Roxanne Messina Captor.

A quorum was achieved.

### **4. Chair’s Report**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez briefly reviewed the agenda, making particular note of the following:

- There is an opportunity to talk about the next phase of the evaluation. We are going to keep building on the theory of change as we move forward.
- There is also an opportunity to think outside the box as we brainstorm new ideas for the 2023 programs. It is important for us to be thoughtful in that process, because the programs we identify could be put into place for two years in a row; we want to make sure that they are responding to the public’s need.

### **5. Acting Executive Director’s Report**

Deputy Director and Acting Executive Director Kiburi provided the report. She began by expressing gratitude to the Council and to staff for the incredible amount of work accomplished over the past year. It had been a three-year effort to ensure that the Council’s funds go out the door for grants in the same fiscal year that the funds were received. Any unspent funds will not be lost: they can be rolled into the next fiscal year or to another grant program that goes out in the same year.

In October we will have finished all of the funding for 2022, and we will be finalizing the ideas we have for grant programs contingent on the Governor’s budget in 2023.

This year we rolled out 18 grant programs and a total of 2,080 grants that will be finalized. This represents a lot of collaborative work and extra meetings.

Deputy Director Kiburi welcomed new staffers Zachary Hill, the new IT Technician Associate working with Kala Kowtha; Mari Strickland, the new Office Technician in support of the Deputy Director; and Mary Durkin, who has returned as a Human Resources Liaison to help with grants administration.

Deputy Director Kiburi reported that Kristin Margolis, who has served at the agency for 22 years, has promoted into the Manager II position and will be the other Director of Program Services. Ms. Margolis is at the helm of California Creative Corps, which is moving along well. She organized a meet-and-greet on September 9 of all the funded grantees and administering

organizations (AOs) that will be supporting the administering of those funds. At that event, staff and grantees started to ideate on how to move forward. Ms. Margolis is meeting with each of the grantees to support them in submitting the appropriate documentation.

Since the Arts in Corrections (AIC) programming Request for Proposal (RFP) 2022-01 was canceled, staff went into conversations with concerned contractors to try to get the best information possible from those who were impacted. This enables us to move forward and make some appropriate changes, and also to be expeditious with our release of the new contract. We are seeking to decrease the time interval that service is interrupted in the institutions. The CAC received information from important constituents, members of the public, and potential contractors via email, in-person sessions, and oral and written comments at the July 28 and August 18 Council meetings, as well as a webinar listening session on August 25.

CAC staff consulted with agency leadership as well as attorneys at the Office of Legal Services at the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to determine actions that could be taken in a timely manner. The following changes were made to the RFP:

- All proposers will submit their responses to the newly-released RFP electronically.
- The CAC has adjusted the limit on the total amount that can be awarded to a single contractor to \$1.5 million.
- If the CAC contacts a proposer to request clarification or completion of a required attachment and/or exhibit, the proposer shall have 48 hours to respond.
- The CAC held a bidders conference to allow for questions and answers in realtime, and clarification on any of the RFP requirements.

The cultural districts will have opportunities to engage with the Council. Staff will be bringing information to the Programs Policy Committee, who will bring updates and recommendations to the Council for the vote on the cultural districts program. Right now the focus is on working with the 14 currently designated cultural districts to determine their needs and funding.

Ms. Gavin asked if there will be an opportunity to hear the ideas from the 14 cultural districts. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that a recording had been made. Through the end of the year, staff will be engaging with the cultural districts on the following timeline:

- Through October the CAC will work with the individual cultural districts to determine specific needs.
- There will be engagement with the Programs Policy Committee in November.
- In December the Council will hear recommendations from the Programs Policy Committee.

Ms. Gavin volunteered to be a part of any of the process.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez asked about the cultural districts and the Creative Corps: do we have a timeline for open applications? Ms. Margolis responded that the first round of funding for cultural districts will be at the beginning of the year. That program will build as guidelines are developed, working with that cohort to fund new and developing districts. Contracts are already out for the Creative Corps with that paperwork due October 1. It is a state process to get those

funds out the door, and we expect that in about six to eight weeks they will have their funding, and we will start regional meetings with them. We expect that regranting will start happening at the beginning of the year.

**6. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meeting**

**MOTION:** Councilmember Estrada moved to approve the August 18, 2022 Meeting Minutes. Councilmember Messina Captor seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Roxanne Messina Captor, Phil Mercado.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

**(8.) Voting Item: Allocations Committee Recommendations for Funding Cycle B Grantees**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that the Allocations Committee, comprised of herself and Ms. Estrada, reviewed the recommendations for funding for JUMP StArts, Arts Education Exposure, Arts Integration Training, Artists in Schools, Creative Youth Development, and Arts and Accessibility grants.

They were recommending that for Arts Education, we fund the program applications as follows.

- Ranked 6: 100% of requested amount
- Ranked 5: 95% of requested amount
- Ranked 4: 90% of requested amount
- Ranked 3 or below: not recommended for funding

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez recommended taking Creative Youth Development, JUMP StArts, and Arts in Education separately.

Ms. Messina Captor requested Chair Gonzáles-Chávez to describe what the programs do as we go through them. Also, was there a document where the Council sees the numbers the different organizations received based on the Committee? Chair Gonzáles-Chávez referred her to a table starting on page 90 in the packet.

Ms. Gavin was very pleased to see that programs that had done a decent job had received substantial funding, and that the CAC had been able to give money to 80+% of those who had requested.

Ms. Azevedo gave a brief description of each of the grant programs, as follows.

- JUMP StArts: supports arts education projects for youth impacted by the justice system
- Artists in Schools: supports projects integrating community arts partners as part of the regular school day
- Arts Education Exposure: supports student attendance at arts performances and exhibit

- Arts Integration Training: supports arts integration training for educators; facilitated by teaching artists
- Creative Youth Development: supports arts projects for youth outside of traditional school hours

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that most of these organizations have websites that identify the kinds of services they provide and their alignment with the grant funding they have applied for. When the CAC used to meet in person, the groups would come and make presentations.

Ms. Messina Captor asked why Petal Press had gotten only \$2,500 although they were ranked 6. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez answered that this was the amount they had requested.

Ms. Messina Captor noted that Actors Gang was getting quite a bit although they had lots of funding on their own. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez suggested not assuming that although an organization like this has a substantial budget, it is not excessive for the work they do. Ms. Estrada added that they had received a rank of 5 amid many rankings of 6 in this category. The Council only has the applications to go by, and you cannot really penalize someone for having a higher budget. In the future maybe we can use a map to show which organizations are more rural. Deputy Director Kiburi stated that a visual display of those being recommended for funding would be doable.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that page 43 in the packet shows a huge percentage of panelists from Los Angeles. This is so obviously inflated that she would like to see a better spread of panelists across the counties. Ms. Estrada further commented that the next page shows that the vast majority of panelists were female. There are some discrepancies here; in the future we should make ourselves more diverse in terms of panelists. For next year, how can we spread this out a little better? Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that these points were being recorded in the minutes and staff could use them going forward.

Ms. Gavin commented that, regarding the rural panelists, we have few people who were rejected in this program. We could look at those who were, and perhaps devise assistance to rural groups who have not quite made the cut.

## **7. Public Comment**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez explained the purpose and prohibitions for making Public Comment at CAC meetings. Ms. Margolis explained the process and provided specific instructions.

### **Live public comment:**

Thom Dancy, Executive Director of the Rosin Box Project in San Diego, stated that they are a contemporary ballet company whose mission is to reimagine the way artists and audiences connect with and experience dance. They have two grants up for approval today in Creative Youth Development and Arts Education Exposure.

Bethany Green, Resident Artist with the Rosin Box Project, spoke about the Rosin Box's engagement in the community. Feedback from the audiences, including kids in the schools that

they visit, shows that what the Rosin Box Project does is unexpected and challenges peoples' understanding of what dance can be.

Michael Angelo Camacho, Executive Director of the VAPA Foundation, stated that this organization is authorized by the San Diego Unified Schools Board of Education to enhance the quality of and access to art education for the district. As part of the district's 10-year strategic plan, the VAPA Foundation moves them toward more inclusive programming. They are collaborating with the Center for World Music to shift VAPA instruction to be less Eurocentric. VAPA has a focus on the needs of English language learners and at-risk Latin American youth. VAPA is pleased to see the five funding scenarios under Art Education Programming. Internal issues with technical assistance and panelist payments made Mr. Camacho less likely to encourage his peers to participate as grant panelists.

Kara Q. Smith of Californians for the Arts requested the Council to commit to full transparency for their funding and decision-making process. Her organization supports the Governance Committee's recommendation to open all committee meetings to the public. They asked that the Arts in Corrections program be under the purview of the Council, not just the staff. They appreciate the Policy' Committee's review of the AO models and fee structures, and believe that each program should be considered separately. They appreciate the inclusion of the Summary of Programs by the Policy Committee, but notice that cultural districts is missing. They ask for a better understanding of how funds are being spent. They believe in an accounting of financials; how much has been appropriated and encumbered in total for the past three years should be included in every packet.

**Written public comment submissions:**

- Vai (Vy) Matautia (Mah+towl+tee+ah) (She/Her/Hers), The Young SAMOA, San Bernardino County  
RE: Agenda Item 8. Voting Item: Allocations Committee Recommendations for Funding Cycle B Grantees

How are we able to find these grants? How are the grantees selected for funding? Are there grants for the Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander (N.H.P.I.) organizations and how would they be found?

Thank you for your time.

- Sarah Garcia (She/Her/Hers), LibroMobile Arts Cooperative, Orange County  
Current or Former Grantee: Impact Projects, General Operating Relief

We have yet to receive our Impact Projects funding which is shown in Smart Simple as released on Jun. 29th and and General Operations Relief funds weren't released until Sept. 5th even though both sets of documents were submitted on June 29th.

Is there an update when this funding will be received by grantees since the grant funding periods started on September 1st? Is another delay expected this year? We would like to know in order to

plan ahead, especially since the General Operation Relief Funds are of great need to keep our doors open.

Additionally, we never received award letters via email for the aforementioned grants. Will award letters be sent out via emails for additional cycles or are we supposed to log in to check our application status from now on? This would be helpful to know in order to avoid delays in submitting documents on our end and to avoid other orgs from losing funding because they were unaware they were awarded grants.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

In light of recent events and the awareness of new information, my public comment regarding the data from August's meeting will mostly be pushed to the public comment for October's meeting.

In addition to my work as an interdisciplinary artist, I've consistently worked in the field of DE&I since 2009. It is necessary to have a third-party audit of the systems and methodologies used by the CAC and all AOs to ensure that the methodologies are equity-based with their vision set on liberation. This is especially important when stewarding any emergency/recovery funds.

The data revealed "what is" so we can adjust our processes to achieve "what should be;" clear guidance and auditing will help build the necessary capacities to achieve the creative community's equity goals and vision of liberation. The CAC and every organization that receives funds from the CAC should have distribution methods and systems in place that achieve the desired outcome of a more equitable and representative arts and culture work sector, where each creative worker is valued. New systems and methodologies will need to be designed and tested if the current ones are inadequate. Along with this would come the expansion of what "supporting artists and the arts" actually looks like in practice. When it comes to improving the landscape of California's creative economy and the lives of our workers, Impact wins over Intention every time...(as it should.)

[This builds on my October comment regarding the data.]

- Julie Baker (She/Her/Hers), Californians for the Arts, Sacramento County  
Current or Former Grantee: Impact Projects, Statewide and Regional Networks  
RE: Agenda Item 8. Voting Item: Allocations Committee Recommendations for Funding Cycle B Grantees; Agenda Item 9. Council Committee Updates; Agenda Item 12.  
Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

We ask that the council commit to full transparency for their funding & decision making process. We appreciate & support the Governance committee's recommendation to open all committee meetings to the public. We ask that the Arts in Corrections program, a critical program of the CAC be under the purview of the council not just the staff. Significant concerns have been raised by the recent RFP process that speak to the importance of council oversight and public accountability. We appreciate the policy committee's review of the AO models and fee structures

and believe each program should be considered separately. We appreciate the inclusion of the summary of programs by the policy committee but noticed cultural districts is missing. We ask for a better understanding of how funds are being spent - it is unclear from the packet if CYD funds for example, that include a \$40m appropriation from the CA budget, have been expended in total or just \$14m. We believe an accounting of financials, how much has been appropriated and encumbered in total for the past 3 years should be included in every packet so the council and the public are aware of how funds are being allocated. Finally for future programming we strongly urge a move towards general operating support, common apps & a commitment to funding all budget size orgs but with an emphasis to support & build capacity for historically marginalized, under resourced community led organizations, artists and culture bearers.

- Lily Kharrazi (She/Her/Hers), Alliance for CA Traditional Arts  
Current or Former Grantee: Folk and Traditional Arts  
RE: Agenda Item 9. Council Committee Updates

ACTA advocates for there not to be “standardization” in workloads, or in funding caps which will allow CAC to be most strategic in developing partnership goals with their intermediaries; and to be able to be responsive to the cultural, linguistic, or research expertise, including local knowledge. The Nonprofit Finance Fund is an important voice in championing TRUE COST. We offer an additional perspective: we need to encourage and attract cultural producers who are a backbone and work force in the arts. It is a social justice issue at its core – we must think of our field with a professional lens and recognize that with proper compensation for all in the ecosystem. Thank you.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Interdisciplinary Conceptual Artist, Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

I want to preface the following public comments by saying that these grant suggestions have no regard for logistics, bureaucratic red tape or the status quo; however, the data from August’s meeting was taken into consideration.

I was super excited when I saw the brainstorming session for grant ideas on the agenda for this month’s meeting! One of my Design philosophies is called “The Logic of Possibility” so this was fun for me! Hopefully these ideas will turn your short and light rain shower into a thunderstorm! I tried to be as succinct as possible but I do know that ideas will continue to rise. (I’m a bit of an idea generator...hence the conceptual artist thing...haha)

But first, six things that underpin these grant ideas will be in the next two comments. The context is important. (We’ll see how many times this form will let me submit comments...since the character count on this form won’t let me be great! Hahaha. If I can’t submit everything, then I’ll roll it over into October’s comment.)

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

## The Underpinning (1, 2, 3)

People create systems, laws and methodologies. When we know better, we do better...only if one of our goals is to continually improve our processes to move our society forward in a beneficial direction. Systems, methodologies and laws can (and will) change once the mindset, heart and character of the people shift.

Although I do appreciate non-profits, it's time to get artists out of that world...and for us to actually make a profit! Individual financial health matters...as does mental health. (I personally don't like the word association of "artists = non profit") We shouldn't be confined to the non-profit box to get support from the CAC. Supporting all aspects of being an artist is essential. It's important to remember that art is work and we should be developing business skills. The "non-profit and charity sector" should not be synonymous with the arts and culture sector. How can we expect other work sectors to view us as professionals and respect our craft if our business practices aren't reflecting those sentiments? Imagine how our sector would begin to flourish if the small enterprises created by artists were actually nurtured by the CAC. Think about what message that would send!

Keeping money in artists' pockets is just as profitable to artists as putting more money into those pockets. We need both and both are essential.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

## The Underpinnings (4, 5, 6)

Just because minimum wage is a certain amount doesn't mean our industry's standard minimum has to reflect that amount. We need to set a higher minimum wage as our industry standard. This can be established in a few ways.

Increase access to artists so we can further our actual career and craft; this includes creating opportunities. (if we wanted to become teachers, we would have willingly obtained a teaching credential...and honestly, students don't need any more bitter teachers or teachers who would rather be doing something else)

Diversify the voices we amplify. [Just like there's a difference between being a "nice" person and being a "kind" person, there's a difference between "equality" and "equity"] Uprooting false friends within the arts and culture sector (which includes false allies that deceptively hold us back by downplaying our value) will allow us to begin to blossom and through our blossoming, we will be able to meaningfully collaborate with other work sectors in a greater and more symbiotic way.

A Quick Note:

I refer to "problems" as puzzles because puzzles are more fun to work on and figure out. These underpinnings and grant suggestions are just some puzzle pieces.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

Here's a non-exhaustive list of grant ideas (These are all areas in which individual artists could benefit from tangible and direct support. There are only 9 suggestions here...one suggestion has multiple iterations)

Grants to fully fund cross-sector residencies. This is similar to what Consuelo (Chelo) suggested. [I loved the other idea too about healthcare and the 5 year pension for artists!] There's a residency that I liked most of its structure and I think it would be great for establishing an industry standard for minimum pay for residencies. The artist would receive a minimum of \$5,000 per month with a monthly art materials stipend of at least \$1,000. With \$5,000 a month, that brings the industry minimum to \$60,000 a year.

A grant for museums to fund new and emerging artists from the BIPOC community so that new work can be seen in a mainstream setting and the artist can be properly paid for showing their work (according to the minimum standard rate set in our industry)

Grants for museums and libraries to allow artists free access to and copies of their rare archives! (The grant could even cover the cost of requesting archives from museums in foreign countries.)  
<- This is what I mean by opening access to artists...

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

Suggestion 4 and 5

A grant for elementary and middle schools to create an on-campus fully funded visual artist residency so students can see that visual artists can do more than teach a class. Many of us became artists to create art and work on our craft...not teach. Some of us prefer working in studios...not being a teacher in classrooms. (Preferably the visual art would be expressed in a skill that students can see and become curious about.) This could be integrated with classrooms visits and education about the craft but direct teaching isn't the primary objective. The artist would be like a guest speaker in the classroom on certain days but the door to the studio would always be open while the artist is working so the students can see. (This is a great way to focus on BIPOC artists...and cultural deserts.)

Grant funding to supplement projects that artists contract with businesses from other work sectors. These are companies that want to contribute to the creative economy but don't have the means to fully fund art projects. The scale of said projects can range from small to very large. For example, if a mom and pop shop wants to hire a muralist but doesn't have the funds to meet the muralist's rate; rather than asking the artist to take a pay cut or the shop owner having to find someone else, there's funding to make up the difference.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County  
RE: Agenda Item 12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants

Ideas 6 through 9

Grants to building owners and companies (like WeWork) that cover the cost of artists using their office spaces as a studio space. So rather than an Artist Residency where the artist is paid and it culminates in an exhibition, it'll just be a work space free of charge for the artist. (Two more iterations of this grant would be a live/work situation between residential building owners and artists and a grant that expands the capacity of organizations that already offer these types of situations but the grant would make it completely free for the artists.)

Grants for small businesses and enterprises created by Artists. Some artists may want to run their own company as a teaching artist or do arts administrative work in our sector. Grants could be given to artists wanting to contribute directly to the arts and culture sector and/or there may be artists that have far reaching interests and may want to make a company in a different sector...like the medical field. (Encouraging creative thinking in all fields is beneficial to everyone.)

Grants that support the opening of new museums, galleries and theatres in cultural deserts (specifically for people who want to be gallery owners, theatre owners and curators!) This grant could support at least one exhibition or performance a year for up to 5 years.

A grant program that supports cultural exchange and development between rural areas of California and California's cultural hubs.

**(8. continued) Voting Item: [Allocations Committee Recommendations for Funding Cycle B Grantees](#)**

The Council proceeded to vote on the recommendations.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Estrada moved to approve the allocation of \$1,708,249 to JUMP StArts. Councilmember Messina Captor seconded the motion.

Ms. Estrada commented that along with the graph provided for the panelists, she would like to see a graph showing the geography of where the applications are coming from, as well as a map of where the allocations are being awarded, to look for correlation. She also asked about the issue of the single applicant for Arts and Accessibility.

Ms. Margolis reviewed the Conflict of Interest rules for the Council members.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Phil Mercado, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Montoya moved to approve the allocation of \$14,494,228 to Creative Youth Development. Councilmember Gavin seconded the motion.

Deputy Director Kiburi reminded the Council that all of the Arts Ed portfolio is paid out of our Creative Youth Development funds.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Phil Mercado, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez pointed out that Creative Youth Development was the largest organization and had the most applications. It also had the largest number of lower-scoring applicants. It is an area that we have not presented in this way previously.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Estrada moved to approve the allocation of \$9,325,199 to Artists in Schools. Councilmember Gavin seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Phil Mercado, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Evans moved to approve the allocation of \$483,233 to Arts Integration Training. Vice-Chair Montoya seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Phil Mercado, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Messina Captor moved to approve the allocation of \$8,957,659 to Arts Education Exposure. Councilmember Israel seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Phil Mercado, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that Arts and Accessibility used to be managed by one organization. Over time, it became apparent that it needed to be put out to an open call. It is an AO position, meaning that the Council is asking an administering organization to cover the entire state and provide services to this population. Because we received so few applications, the committee decided to put this call out again. We are also looking at what recommendations come

from the Governance Committee about the administrative overhead costs – an issue related to this project as well.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Estrada moved to approve the recommendation by the Committee for Arts and Accessibility. Councilmember Evans seconded the motion.

Ms. Gavin requested a review of the granting program, and asked if the person who originally had this contract is excluded from applying. Deputy Director Kiburi explained that the Arts and Accessibility program has been around for a long time. The National Arts and Disability Center (NADC) was the holder of the grant for 20 or so years, but it was not done through a competitive process. The original contract was for \$150,000 and a few years ago the Council approved it at \$500,000. NADC communicated that they were not going to apply – they had concerns about the percentage for administrative costs. Ms. Azevedo explained that the program is intended to support enhanced opportunities for arts participation by those with access or functional needs.

Ms. Gavin asked if the AO is tasked with taking care of practical accessibility requests. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that staff had chosen to put into the guidelines that there would be a regranting process by the AO, who would determine how they were going to let the grants out. The grants are to individual artists with disabilities and the disabled community of artists. There is probably some opportunity for practical services as well. At this point the Council could also consider having more than one AO to do this program.

Ms. Gavin asked if it could be direct grants from the CAC. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez answered that to adjudicate appropriately a granting program of this type would require additional professional consultation; that is one of the reasons for going out to an AO. This is a specialized field and knowledge of the needs of the population as they relate to the arts is best responded to by someone who has that professional expertise. Deputy Director Kiburi concurred that it required a level of expertise to reach the disabled community that we do not have at the CAC.

Ms. Gavin felt that the CAC's core competency is that we are serving arts organizations which are artist-driven. She would like to see \$500,000 be available directly to disabled artists. If we are finding that we are not getting an AO statewide that can handle this, maybe the idea would be to consult with disabled artists and create an artist-driven program. Ms. Estrada agreed.

Deputy Director Kiburi added that the committee has recommended some ideas for what to do with the unallocated \$4 million. There is also an opportunity for the Council to consider the percentage for administration and whether to increase the amount of funding.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice Chair Chelo Montoya, Gerald Clarke, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Alex Israel, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez emphasized that the last item is an important one. There are multiple opportunities for how we move forward. One possibility is to reinvest in the programs that we have already just funded; we could extend their grant period from one year to two years. We could also consider reopening the call, specifically for projects that were not funded in this round. There is always the question of why they did not get funded: lack of technical knowledge to process the application, or lack of understanding about some aspect of the application. We

could provide a workshop on how to prepare a general application to ensure that more people can be successful.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez asked if the \$500,000 for the disability project is rolled into the \$4,631,379. Ms. Azevedo answered that it is not. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez commented that these were additional funds that we had allocated, so we want to make sure that we spend them.

Ms. Messina Captor felt that we should not be extending grants that were already awarded. We should open it up to others who can take advantage of this extra money.

Ms. Gavin asked for clarification. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that because of the amount of money we allocated for each of the programming areas, and when we align that with the allocation recommendations we just approved, we have an excess of \$4,631,379 that we would like to spend. Our decision now is to determine the best way to use it. Because the funds came from the Legislature in a specific way, they can only be used for these existing programs. We do lose it if we do not use it.

Mr. Clarke asked if there is time or capacity to re-evaluate the applications that were ranked 3. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez replied that typically, if an application is ranked 3 it means that there are significant issues with it.

Ms. Evans asked if the staff had any recommendations. Deputy Director Kiburi pointed out that the Allocations Committee had included the best way to handle the funds in their memo. They thought the best way to extend the funds was to make the JUMP StArt program two years, and to open up Creative Youth Development again. She noted that anyone who received a rank of 3, or is unfunded in any of these opportunities, can always reapply for any of the grants that reopen. We could do targeted outreach to them and support them with technical assistance.

Ms. Messina Captor asked if it is possible to allocate those funds for training to smaller organizations. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that this year, the Creative Youth Development funds were earmarked for existing programs. We do not have the flexibility right now to start anything new.

Ms. Gavin asked if there is a technical assistance capability within the CAC to provide consultation for those who want to submit applications. Deputy Director Kiburi emphasized that the recommendations had come from the Allocations Committee. She liked the idea of having a consultation grant that the Council could develop for next year. The Council could also consider a grant-making grant – support for a grantee to write better applications that will get funded.

Ms. Estrada asked what it would take to make that happen. Deputy Director Kiburi replied that it would have to be a Council decision – a Programs Committee recommendation.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez affirmed that technical assistance has been needed for a long time. The CAC used to invest in it. As we discuss how to use our next allocation of funding, we may want to set aside some funds for technical assistance.

Vice-Chair Montoya asked about the remaining balance after extending a second year to JUMP StArt. Would it go to adding a second year to Creative Youth Development? Chair Gonzáles-

Chávez answered that it was not enough for a second year for them. Deputy Director Kiburi stated that Creative Youth Development is currently two years. The Allocations Committee might consider opening up one of the other grant programs.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez made note of the concern within the Council of extending JUMP StArt for a second year. However, the majority seemed to feel that this would be acceptable. The rest of the funds could be put out for a second round of Creative Youth Development, because we have such strong interest in that area.

## 9. Council Committee Updates

### Programs Policy Committee

Ms. Evans stated that the Programs Policy Committee was seeking the Council's guidance on how to make this decision. Currently they are looking at many AOs. Some of them are simple, such as the Artist Relief Fund, where they give \$1,000 out; they look, write the check, and are done. Other AOs undertake support to raise up their art and are getting more money; it is more complicated. The committee is considering whether to standardize. Some AOs such as the Artist Relief Fund may get 7% for just sending the check out. Other AOs involve administering, following up, being available, and raising up the art, and they receive 15% – however, if they are getting a \$500,000 grant, 15% represents a lot of money. Do we put on a cap?

Ms. Evans referred to the four options in the memo the committee had presented. There are four possible frameworks:

1. **Standard percentage.** Probably not a good idea because of the differentials among what they need to deliver.
2. **Cap on a dollar amount.**
3. **Tiered scale.** Depends on what the Council is asking of them.
4. **Justification of request.** Have the AO present an amount to the Council in their request for funds.

Mr. Israel emphasized that the responsibilities of the AOs are very different across the programs; it is difficult to ascertain their real value and how much they should be compensated for that. Some of the AOs receive large numbers of applications while others receive very few. There is a wide range of differentials to consider.

Vice-Chair Montoya asked staff about the justification of a request – anything that is subjective can be quite nuanced in terms of the process. Deputy Director Kiburi responded that the amount in an application could be adjudicated by the panel. The Council could decide to add in the management criteria how the applicant justifies the percentage of admin they need.

Ms. Estrada agreed that there is a great amount of subjectivity. She agreed with Vice-Chair Montoya that the last option would be very difficult.

Ms. Azevedo stated that with that option, the applicants themselves could build their justification for what they feel they need for administrative or development/implementation costs. The second

half of the framework for this option would involve the Council building specific review criteria, and training would be given to that panel in evaluating that portion of the budget.

Ms. Estrada requested Mr. Israel to articulate the disadvantages of the four options. Mr. Israel described a lack of transparency in how many of the administrative costs that are allocated are being used. Is the CAC's goal to get money to the artists, or are we happy also to support the administrative costs of these organizations that are supporting the arts across the state? He described the disadvantages of the four options as follows.

1. **Standard percentage** would make it easier, but each program varies significantly.
2. **Cap on a total dollar amount** has the same disadvantage: it does not differentiate based on the duties of the AOs.
3. **Tiered scale.** May be the more sensible.
4. **Justification of request.** May be more sensible as well.

Ms. Gavin commented that it is very important to evaluate how we came to have AOs, what they signify, and what they do. For specific populations, such as folk art and disabled, it makes sense to have an organization with the expertise to manage it statewide. We also have the evolution of getting huge amounts of money (e.g., the Creative Corps) and having the legislative mandate to give it to AOs. Is that going to continue? Further, expecting the AOs to design the program from the ground up – to come up with the application and outreach, receive the applicants, and so on – is an incredible burden for them. Ms. Gavin felt that if the CAC develops the criteria for grants and unifies the entire state with a singular application that is then administered, outreached, and evaluated by AOs, it is smarter because we would improve our statewide sense of a cultural community and also give local control.

Ms. Gavin suggested four components for AOs: design, outreach, evaluation, and number of organizations. These components create very different workstreams and quantity. Ms. Gavin advocated for the design of the applications, sense of community, and sense of discipline-related cohorts. It starts with what we see as a Council for the future role of AOs in relation to our work.

Ms. Messina Captor asked how many AOs we have been working with since 2019, and how they are dispersed across the state. Ms. Azevedo answered that the California Creative Corps has 14 AOs; most of them are one to five individual artist fellowships. We have anywhere from one to fourteen AO grantees in each of the programs. Programs may be regional, such as the California Creative Corps, while others, such as Folk and Traditional Arts, have one AO statewide.

Ms. Messina Captor felt that the Council needs to re-evaluate the whole program. From this discussion, it sounds as if there are a lot of issues that we need to address. There should be a list from the CAC of things the AOs have to accomplish within the year. A system of checks and balances needs to be implemented. If these AOs are not really helping the staff and Council, then we do not really need them. Ms. Messina Captor also agreed with Ms. Gavin.

Ms. Estrada commented that she would like to hear from people during Public Comment on how they feel about this. How do other arts organizations feel about these four things?

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that the AO programs that have already been funded through Cycle A are considered pilot projects by staff. The requirement for collaboration, innovation, and

communication that will happen between the AOs and the CAC has been fortified greatly. The new Data Specialists will be documenting the way we engage with the AOs, looking at how they deliver what we are asking, and ensuring that they are reaching the right population. We might give this model a little more time because we do not yet have any outcome data.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez pointed out that the AO question has become very important because of the abundance of funding, which has caused the CAC to have a huge number of applicants for any one program. In the past the AO model has been a way to help CAC staff manage the programs. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez felt that this was an appropriate use of resources. There has been some thought about money going to AOs rather than artists in the field. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez would counter that we are giving money to artists in the field because, with the exception of Creative Corps, all of the AO programs in the past have been specifically made available to the arts field. Arts organizations are the ones eligible to be AOs, so the money is staying in the arts field. Some AOs know the field so well that they are best suited for processing those grants and providing those services. There is also the thought that some AOs are regional, and because of that, they know their areas better.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez continued that no matter the amount of the contract, there is still a process of setting up adjudication, identifying a platform for putting out the grant applications, and other required tasks. Perhaps the percentage is different based on the amount of funds the AO is managing, but work comes with every amount. We need to define administrative overhead and consider program costs versus administrative overhead. If we have a set percentage for it, that still allows a project with greater program costs to add that in the overall budget. We need to be very clear about overhead administrative costs that are allowed. There are some administrative costs that everyone will incur: a percentage of the accounting staff, office heating and cooling, rent space, general supplies. Having these constants will eliminate the uncertainty we have been living with.

Ms. Margolis pointed out that regranting exists in all spheres and is especially common when it comes to arts and cultural funding. Arts initiatives are often funded on very large scales. However, actual money trickles down all the way to individual artists and art projects on a very small, local level. Seeing us as the behemoth, local artists in most cases would never apply to our state funding. Using the regranting model (i.e., the AOs) is a concrete way of taking the steps to build the bridge between state funding and the individual artist. Creative Corps, for example, has a requirement that 80% of the funds go to the artists; 60% of that goes to artist salaries and 20% to administrative support for the artist.

Ms. Gavin commented that the AOs chosen for the Creative Corps did not make the same multicultural threshold that we generally do. It is only an assumption that we are going to have more participation by people of color and rural people for the AOs. Ms. Gavin felt that her earlier points of design, outreach, evaluation, and volume of applications is something to take into account. The design of the program should remain statewide with the CAC.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez asserted that the more money you manage, the more costs you will incur as you must bring on more staff who need benefits and so on.

Mr. Israel stated that a more detailed cost breakdown of the AOs' internal allocations of the money they are getting to administer these grants would be beneficial. That is what brought us to the fourth idea from the list – maybe we need to understand with more transparency how the AOs are spending the money and what their costs are. We may need to find someone to analyze this from a financial perspective. This is a large amount of money, and it is complicated.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that the AO model allows for this depth of analysis: with the number of AOs we have approved, the Data Specialists will have the capacity to dig in, and maybe we should look at a resource for financial analysis. Deputy Director Kiburi also pointed out that multicultural and race equity are challenges that all state agencies have, but community-based organizations do not have the same restrictions to meet the needs of the Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) community and to actually target certain organizations.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez emphasized that there are actually two issues on the table: the AO model itself, and the standard administrative overhead percentage allowed when the CAC puts out an RFP for any grant. She requested the Programs Policy Committee to consider them separately and to return with a solid recommendation at the next meeting. There may be opportunity for staff to arrange for the financial consultation we are seeking between now and the next meeting. We could look at the National Endowment for the Arts, which has an allowable administrative overhead in all their grant programs. There are also multiple foundations that have limitations on the allowable administrative overhead.

### Legislative Committee

Vice-Chair Montoya stated that AB 179 was broadly framed in the Legislative Committee's memo. There are also amendments in the Budget Act of 2022 with a hyperlink supplied.

For SB 543, the Department of General Services (DGS) Nonprofit Liaison, the DGS is required to designate a person to serve as a liaison whose responsibilities include responding to complaints by nonprofit organizations about the DGS, and assisting the nonprofit corporations in complying with DGS regulations and relevant statutes.

The Legislative Committee continues to track the progress of SB 628, the California Creative Workforce Act of 2021. Its purpose is to establish creative arts workforce development as a state priority and to promote employment and Earn and Learn. The bill has been approved, but the state budgets of last year and this year have not included funding in association with it.

Ms. Margolis added that SB 628 is about job creation for artists and should have happened years ago. The money for it could come through the Legislature or the Administration as a January budget item. As job development, Creative Corps feeds into something like SB 628. It provides a great opportunity for the CAC to fund a wider scope of things that will ultimately bring arts to the table.

Vice-Chair Montoya noted that SB 628 is reminiscent of the WPA era where artists were put to work. Artists need work, resources, health care, and training.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez pointed out that Creative Corps is almost a pilot project for this; there is money invested in paying artists to do the work and supporting them with benefits, housing, and

so on. Further, an unintended consequence of Arts in Corrections is that those are all teaching artists; because of AB 5, many of the providers of AIC programs have brought on those artists as employees, making them eligible for benefits.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that SB 543 could be specific to agencies. It is identified here as the DGS identifying one liaison, but it could be specific to agencies having a liaison which would directly impact the CAC. Ms. Margolis added that staff is going to be talking with the Governor's Office and the Department of Finance about this.

### Governance Committee

Ms. Gavin spoke about the committee's mandate to look at the CAC bylaws for more transparency and the appointment of members of the public to standing committees. We do have the major issue of Bagley-Keene, which stipulates that if committees have more than two members, we have to publicly notice the meeting with an agenda. This is balanced against what we would like to see: more input earlier from the public. Currently our standing committees are Equity, Executive, Governance, Innovation and Aspiration, Legislative, Nominating, Program Allocation, Program Policy, Special Liaison, and Strategic Planning.

Ms. Gavin read the general recommendations for the standing committees including members of the public.

The committee had also discussed combining some of the committees:

- Program Allocation with Program Policy
- Innovation and Aspiration with Strategic Planning
- Legislative with Special Liaison

Ms. Estrada pointed out that at CAC meetings we have Public Comment in the morning and the afternoon on any topic. She suggested revising the format to have Public Comment on non-agenda items first. For voting agenda items, Public Comment followed by Council discussion would be held on each item. That gives the Council better information on the items before they are voted upon.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that she and the Vice-Chair would discuss the Public Comment schedule item before the next meeting. The items on adding the general public to committees and revision of standard committees involved changes to the bylaws, and the Council proceeded with a discussion.

Ms. Messina Captor agreed with the committee's ideas. She felt that committee meetings should be private because it is the only time we have to work on things in a private way. If necessary, we should reach out to different organizations that might be helpful. Ms. Estrada pointed out the dilemma that if there are more than two members, the meeting must be made public.

Mr. Israel agreed with Ms. Messina Captor: the idea of committee meetings being public is scary because it is the opportunity where we can try out ideas, speak more freely, and have more experimental conversation. He did like the idea of joining committees together, although that would be difficult to accomplish if the committees are not made larger.

Mr. Clarke commented that revising the standing committees made sense to him – they do seem a bit redundant. He asked if the Bagley-Keene Act still applies if there are two Council members plus community members. Chair González-Chávez explained that Bagley-Keene has to do with being transparent and ensuring that the public knows what we are doing. Under Bagley-Keene, we must limit our committees to two members unless we publicly announce when the meetings are going to take place and there is an opportunity for the public to access the meetings. The committee meetings would require a 10-day public notice. The Bagley-Keene Act also indicates that we would be able to add people that are not members of the Council to serve on our committees. Currently, the only way we can do that is if the Chair appoints an ad hoc committee; that is allowable per our bylaws. Bringing additional people into the committees would require a change to our bylaws. Even if they are not Council members, the meetings would have to be made public.

Ms. Gavin commented that public meetings with more than two committee members could be followed up by private meetings with just two committee members. She noted that two people who are on a committee could have a meeting among themselves to process the conversation from the public meeting.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that two Council members can have a webinar, meet with the community, go to any event in the community to understand what is happening, and so on. Also, Bagley-Keene is about public awareness of when you meet. It does not mean that the public is required to interact with you or give feedback. The key to the decision now on the table is whether you want to change the bylaws so you can get certain members of the public invited to the committee meetings. In the past our attorneys advised that the better way is to open up committee discussions within the Council meeting.

Mr. Israel mentioned that in 2020, a committee had hosted a public meeting. This could be the way to go: if a committee needs feedback and wants to be public in a certain instance, they could engage through a public meeting. However, making every committee meeting public would end the opportunity to discuss things freely and have experimental conversations.

Deputy Director Kiburi noted that if there are two Council members who want to work with staff to coordinate a way to hear from the public, we can do that.

Ms. Messina Captor reiterated that committee meetings have to stay private. Deputy Director Kiburi had offered a perfect solution for reaching out to the public.

Ms. Gavin felt that subcommittees comprised of only two people are undemocratic. She was looking for more working members. Given Bagley-Keene, why don't we figure out a process where all subcommittee meetings can be viewed by people who can participate? As a Council member, she herself would like to join other committees, but at this point she cannot.

Dr. Mercado supported the current process in which you can either go with the co-chair of the subcommittee or add another person if you want to learn. He pointed out that Ms. Evans and Mr. Israel had made clear that they had questions from their subcommittee that they had brought to the Council to think through. There is an opportunity to use both options.

Deputy Director Kiburi noted that the Bagley-Keene Act is included in the Council's handbook. There is a serious liability for the appointed Council members if they do not adhere to the law. Staff works to ensure that Council members do not violate anything. There is a challenge in that conversations between more than two Council members are considered serial meetings.

Mr. DeSio commented that the Governance Committee had discussed that two committee members can have a meeting in private, and if they have an idea that needs public feedback, they can notice a public meeting and have a larger discussion before they bring it to the full Board.

Ms. Margolis pointed out that historically the CAC has not always had committees. Issues were brought to the Council as a whole. Members are appointees who were selected for a reason. When things are brought to the entire Council, they are discussed and then voted upon at a later meeting. Bagley-Keene is all about transparency, which we want.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez commented that although Bagley-Keene is restrictive, it is there for a reason. When you have people present in a meeting who are actually part of the committee, they can engage in dialogue as we are now. If they are just invited as observers, we do not have that dialogue. Members of the public regularly contact her; she knows that they care about the work the CAC is doing and they want to engage in dialogue with us. How do we allow people to engage more fully in our decision-making process without them being just silent observers? The committee has now heard the pros and cons from their colleagues and knows what to do moving forward. Going forward with their recommendation will require a bylaws change. If they return with the same recommendation and the Council tweaks it a bit, we will be able to vote on it at the next meeting as a bylaws change.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that the Executive Committee would discuss the issue about meetings and public comments; the next meeting might bring a change.

### **Equity Committee**

Mr. Clarke reported that the Equity Committee had been working with staff on the Equity Impact Assessment Workshop. We have reviewed a questionnaire for the State and Local Partners (SLPs) regarding the equity of their programs. The purpose is *"...to provide a self-reflective process for SLPs so that the Council has a more robust understanding of SLPs' reach throughout their regions. The Council will then have the information necessary to make community-responsive allocations to the SLP program."* The Equity Committee hopes to provide some preliminary findings to the Council in October and to have some formal recommendations in December. The guidance and the save-the-date announcement had gone out earlier this week for September 30.

Vice-Chair Montoya added that this effort had been included in the increase of resources as one of the expectations, so we want to make sure to see it through in this calendar year. Because of the shortage of Council members, we had not started the committees until midyear – thus we are getting to this later than we had hoped. We are mindful of the SLPs' capacities.

Mr. Clarke added that he was pleased to be making decisions based not on assumptions but on real data.

Deputy Director Kiburi suggested for the Council members to read the evaluation plan. It has some good information as to the justification or the role that the AO model could play. In the Conclusions section there is a regranting discussion that includes AOs. There is also a regranting strategy recommendation.

## **10. Next Phase in Evaluation and Community Engagement**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that the Strategic Framework Committee was working on the item.

Dr. Mercado stated that he and Ms. Messina Captor had begun with a brief overview of the Strategic Plan, knowing that it was constructed right before the pandemic and had not been implemented.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that one of the deliverables was to have all of the Strategic Framework aspirations and a table, so that they could distinguish Council work from staff work. They would then start to develop objectives.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that the current conversation would be related to the evaluation and the theory of change that it brings forward. It is important to consider how we engage community in this process.

Ms. Messina Captor asked about the qualifications for the stakeholders. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez responded that the SLPs are designated by their County Boards of Supervisors to act as an arm of the CAC; they are state networks of organizations that address particular parts of the arts community, for example Ballet Folklórico. Museum associations, cultural center networks, and ethnically specific networks are touched by the CAC in different ways. The leadership in Creative California addresses artists in the schools and teaching artist programs.

Ms. Messina Captor asked about the difference between what these stakeholders do and what the AOs do. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez replied that some of the stakeholders are in fact AOs. The AOs are designated “administering organizations” because they are involved in a regranting process. Not all the networks she had mentioned are engaged in regranting. Also, AOs are sometimes delivering service to a target population.

## **11. Public Comment**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez explained the purpose and prohibitions for making Public Comment at CAC meetings. Ms. Margolis explained the process and provided specific instructions.

Lily Kharrazi, Director of Special Initiatives at the Alliance for California Traditional Arts, stated that they are an AO in the Folk and Traditional Arts program. Ms. Kharrazi spoke regarding the issue of funding caps on operational costs for AOs. AOs occupy a complex niche that includes bringing to bear field expertise, program planning and outreach, and trust-building which is critical for the arts field. In order for us to maximize our efficiency, we need to consider real costs, particularly with the technology-based systems we use. Ms. Kharrazi asked the Council to look at the work of the Nonprofit Finance Fund.

Hannah Rubalcava, Grants and Contracts Manager for the Santa Barbara County Office of Arts and Culture, shared some takeaways from their participation in the Creative Corps for the Council to consider when calculating admin overhead. She mentioned the amount of the award versus the risk and liability; geographic expanse of the region; number of collaborations necessary to conduct the program; complexity of the program including pilots; and the necessity of having private contracts with local artist partners.

Maeva (no last name given), an interdisciplinary artist from Los Angeles, asked what success looks like to the Council. She was interested to see how the Council intends to implement the suggestions given during the last meeting's presentation. Artists should not be forced into the nonprofit box.

Jacquelyn Honore with the Amazing Grace Conservatory, one of the grantees for the California Creative Communities grant, shared that she was very excited to hear about SB 628. Half of their staff are alumni and they regularly train artistic directors, so having opportunities like this is right in line with what they need. Through the grant opportunity, more than 30 vendors were placed with USC's Shop Trojan Local. Ms. Honore would be very interested in being a part of any work around SB 628 implementation.

Tracy Hudak with Californians for the Arts offered an advocacy resource in relation to SB 628. Their website contains information on when and how they are going to be advocating for funding for that legislation.

## **12. Discussion Item: Brainstorm Ideas 2023 Grants**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez posed the question to the Council members: *If you could have any kind of program funded by the CAC, what might it be?* For her, it would be programs to support teaching artists across the state.

Ms. Messina Captor offered an example of a company in Salinas has a two-year theater and dance conservatory in the Theater Department of a community college. They have built the program into a summer professional program in which professional performers are combined with students. They also have a community theater outreach to the farmworkers and the owners.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez mentioned support for a touring artists program that would perform in rural communities and low-income neighborhoods. Emerging artists would have the opportunity to be seen in other parts of the state.

Vice-Chair Montoya mentioned several ideas: a program for artists who promote a cause; health insurance and retirement programs for artists; a cross-sector residency with entities in different fields; and a state partnership with different state organizations on a five-year term so that those artists receive a pension. Artists need the infrastructure of health and retirement. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that many of the teaching artists in the AIC program are now receiving benefits through their organizations.

Ms. Messina Captor commented that the company she had mentioned was based on a community college campus and the funding comes through the campus as well as the grant, so those who

come as artists to work the summers and also teach, are given pensions through CalSTRS as well as health insurance.

Ms. Estrada agreed that for many local artists, when they get sick the money comes out of their own pockets and that hurts.

Ms. Messina Captor mentioned having a professional company based on a college campus; students training in theater and dance at that campus would feed into the company.

Dr. Mercado mentioned arts in health care when people need it the most, such as pediatrics, end of life, or just routine procedures.

Ms. Gavin mentioned adequate support for the bare essentials: small, midsize, and larger institutions, particularly those of color, and those in rural and indigenous communities; and for individual artists. She felt that we have lost sight of the fundamentals of supporting artists and arts organizations, when we are not giving grants to organizations larger than \$250,000 and not trying to secure individual artist long-term fellowships. She was interested in the basics at this point. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez responded that we can revisit the question of programs over \$250,000 and how we can fund them.

Ms. Margolis added that we can develop partnerships with other state agencies or outside entities. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez mentioned that the Creative Corps has been written in such a way that we can test some of those ideas.

Deputy Director Kiburi noted that we are getting data on the Innovations and Intersections grant program – it funded arts/health and arts/technology programs. She also noted for Ms. Gavin that we are hearing from the field that general operating funding is really very important. For programming direction, the Council should take into consideration the strategic framework, our racial equity statement, and the outcomes of the evaluation.

### **13. Future Agenda Items**

Ms. Estrada asked if the next meeting might be held in person. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez answered that staff is working on that for the December meeting.

Ms. Messina Captor asked where the December meeting will be held. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that they are considering Sacramento, as staff could be a part of it. The scheduled date is December 8.

### **14. In Memoriam**

Vice-Chair Montoya acknowledged the passing of Queen Elizabeth of the United Kingdom and Commonwealth. Her reign of 70 years was the longest of any British monarch and the longest recorded reign of any female monarch in history.

### **15. Adjournment**

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez adjourned the meeting at 2:08 p.m.