

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

November 19, 2014

9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Santa Monica Civic Auditorium

1855 Main Street, East Wing

Santa Monica, CA 90401

(310) 458-4924

PRESENT:

Council Members

Wylie Aitken, Chair
Susan Steinhauser, Vice Chair
Michael Alexander
Christopher Coppola
Kathleen Gallegos
Jaime Galli
Donn Harris
Charmaine Jefferson
Nashormeh Lindo
William Turner
Rosalind Wyman

Arts Council Staff

Craig Watson, Director
Scott Heckes, Deputy Director
Caitlin Fitzwater, Public Information Officer
Mary Beth Barber, Special Projects Associate
Diane Golling, Administrative Assistant

Invited Attendees

Jessica Cusick, City of Santa Monica
Teresa Lenihan, Loyola Marymount University/Turnaround Arts CA
Zipporah Yamamoto, Turnaround Arts CA
Ayanna Harris, Turnaround Arts CA
Sandy Seufert, Turnaround Arts CA
Jeff Mickeal, Topps Digital Services

Other Attendees

Mary Beth Traumein, Rediscover Center
Lauren Pizer Mains, Joint Committee on the Arts
Karen Workcuff, interested member of the public
Rebecca Carson, Pepperdine University Center for the Arts/California Presenters
Craig Rosen, Ventura County Arts Council
Joe Landon, California Alliance for Arts Education
Arleen Chikami, Otis College of Art & Design
Paulina Sahagu, independent artist/educator

ABSENT:

None

MINUTES

I. Call to Order and Welcome

At 9:04 a.m. Chair Aitken calls the meeting to order and recognizes Jessica Cusick, who is the head of cultural affairs for the City of Santa Monica. She recently went to China with Craig Watson as part of a California arts and culture delegation, where she developed new cultural connections. She has just submitted a guest blog for the CAC.

Craig Watson acknowledges Jeff Mickeal from Topps Digital Services. Turner thanks him and presents him with a certificate of appreciation. The relationship between the CAC and Topps goes back to 2009 and it's great to meet Mickeal in person. He tells the story of how the "million plates for the arts" campaign began and how Topps has been involved in putting the voucher card option in place. Mickeal says Topps has been very committed and excited to do it.

At 9:14 a.m. Golling calls the roll. A quorum is present: Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Lindo, Steinhauser, Turner and Wyman. Jefferson is absent.

II. Approval of Minutes

The Chair directs the Council's attention to Tab A, the Minutes of October 6, 2014. Alexander points out a typographical error on page 7. Gallegos asks for an addition on page 4 of a question she asked regarding whether a program was bilingual (it is). Wyman asks for an addition at the end of the document saying that she asked for an explanation of the rights of grantees, as to whether people were allowed to come before the Council and request things they would like the Council to do (they are).

ACTION: Alexander moves that the Minutes be approved as amended. Turner seconds.
Approval is unanimous.

III. Chair's Report

The Chair's report is given at 9:18 a.m. Aitken goes over the pie chart he sent to the members via email. \$230,000 will be left unallocated if every recommendation is adopted at the amount recommended by the Programs Committee. The Council must ask itself if this is the appropriate way to spend its one-time 2014-15 allocation of five million dollars from the general fund (the \$5M). We're looking at a lot of similar ideas to what was proposed for the one-time 2013-14

allocation of two million dollars from the Assembly (the \$2M). We have a constituency of 38 million people to serve with our \$5M. Some of the \$5M has already been allocated, so we have \$4.8M left. Some of it went to replenish the arts license plate fund, and there are some core programs that have already been funded. He asks Heckes to take us through the situation. What funds have been committed, and to what projects? Heckes refers the Council to Tab D and goes over the programs budget that was adopted in June.

At 9:32 a.m. Jefferson and Barber arrive.

Aitken wants to go over how the CAC uses peer panels. He suggests the Council discuss the issue as it goes through the process.

IV. Director's Report

At 9:35 a.m. Craig Watson gives the director's report. Watson refers the Council to Tab B and suggests setting a meeting schedule for 2015. Normally we think about a weekday on which to always set the meetings, but the Council should agree on a day. After discussion, no consensus is reached.

Harris asks how the locations are decided on for meetings. Aitken says we try to go to areas where we have not been, and try to spread the meetings out regionally. Travel to the far north or central coast is always problematic. Aitken suggests that along with dates to send to the staff, the Council make location and venue suggestions so that the arts community and the citizens get a chance to see the Council.

Watson reports from the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. He says he received many positive comments about the national news the CAC is making on arts education re CREATE CA, Turnaround Arts CA, and arts in prisons.

At 9:46 a.m. the Chair moves to public comment.

V. Public Comment

The Chair recognizes Rebecca Carson from California Presenters. They reach residents in every county in the state. They coordinate with schools; many of the students who see the performances have no other opportunity to experience live performance. She's grateful to the CAC for its past support and encourages the Council to keep fighting until the CAC becomes what we all deserve, a national leader.

The Chair recognizes Craig Rosen from Ventura County Arts Council, who notes that the Council is considering increasing its support for State-Local Partners (SLPs) and he's in favor of that. He's been working with probation departments, and they are genuinely concerned about rehab for the kids. He sees that we are doing a lot of good work but with more funding a lot more could happen. Everybody in Ventura County is so maxed out he can't even get more schools involved in Poetry Out Loud. There are a number of people who volunteer.

The Chair recognizes Joe Landon, Executive Director of California Alliance for Arts Education (CAAE). He acknowledges and thanks Watson for his work and partnership with CAAE. He encourages the Council to support the Student Voices campaign. He attended Council member Coppola's PAHfest and was profoundly moved by what he saw there.

The Chair recognizes Paulina Sahagu, who thanks the Council for doing this difficult work. She is an independent artist born and raised in Santa Monica, and asks the Council to support the SLPs because that's how independent artist teachers are able to touch the lives of students.

VI. Report from Turnaround Arts CA

At 9:57 a.m. the Chair moves to a Turnaround Arts report by former Council Member Teresa Lenihan, who now is a consultant for Turnaround Arts. Lenihan thanks the Council for its initial support to kick off the program, which grew out of a "crazy idea" by former CAC Chair Malissa Feruzzi Shriver. The heart of the program is about the staff's relationship with the schools, schools that are broken and failing. She introduces Yamamoto and passes out staff bios while Yamamoto talks about her background and introduces Seufert who also talks about her background.

Yamamoto narrates a Powerpoint presentation about Turnaround Arts CA. Early results show increased attendance and retention, enrollment improvements, better test scores, increased parent involvement and school pride, and fewer disciplinary referrals. At every school site they are seeing renewed teacher enthusiasm as well. They underestimated the impact of the celebrity "turnaround artists." When a celebrity comes to a failing school, that school gets positive media attention.

Aitken asks about expansion. They are currently fundraising and don't know how much they will expand. Aitken asks what the overall goal is. Yamamoto says one of the obvious goals is to get the arts back in public schools. The overarching goal is to turn failing schools around, using the arts. They put significant effort into changing the culture of the school. Wyman asks if they get federal money. Yamamoto says yes, the National Endowment for the Arts is a partner as well. Lenihan says Turnaround Arts is an advocacy tool to use throughout California, demonstrating what the arts can do. Harris says a lot of schools in the bottom 5% are getting no arts at all. Lenihan says yes, and these schools have been in this position for a while now, and other strategies haven't worked. This is working. The teachers are often hesitant because they've gotten shut down when they tried to bring in art, so this is a big change. Turner asks if all the celebrities have visited the schools. Yamamoto says no, their obligation is to visit once in a two year period. So Turner asks how it helps if they haven't come out. Yamamoto says some of the artists are Skyping in. Elton John sent band members. There are a number of ways for the students to work with the artists in between actual visits. All the artists have sent videos to the schools. There's a cachet to being chosen by a celebrity as "their" school; the kids get excited and the school gets positive press. It's not just a fly-by.

Steinhauser asks how long they stay at each school. Yamamoto says each school is brought on for a 3-year period. The first year is intense, but the goal is to teach them how to do it for themselves. Aitken asks if there will be empirical data to show that it works without the celebrity component. Yamamoto says yes.

Alexander asks how much it would cost if it were a statewide program. Yamamoto says there are economies of scale, but they could run some numbers on that. Alexander says this is a pilot project the CAC has funded, but at some point we need to lead the Department of Education into the mix.

Jefferson says now the questions will get harder because the CAC viewed this as a contract for services and we have to know how, or whether, to fund it in future. How many "5% and under"

schools are there in California? Lenihan says the list they were given last spring had 85 schools on it. Harris says there are not going to be test scores over the next few years, so what criteria are they using to measure results? Jefferson says the goal is obviously to put ourselves out of business by getting all those schools off that list, so what should the Council expect for its dollars? Jefferson gives them a homework assignment to come back to the Council, as the entity they contracted with, to give us budget numbers.

Coppola asks if the schools have “little sister, little brother” schools they can share with. Yamamoto says in the four districts where they are, they are looking for a Turnaround Arts school to mentor other schools.

VII. Public Comment

The Chair recognizes Arleen Chikami from Otis College of Art & Design, who thanks the CAC for supporting the Otis Report on the Creative Economy. She’s here to answer questions if we have any. There are no questions.

VIII. Arts & Accessibility Technical Assistance

Aitken moves to the recommended Arts and Accessibility Technical Assistance Grant at 10:56 a.m. Turner asks what the National Arts and Disabilities Center total budget is. Heckes says the Center provides all the administrative money and takes none from our grant, so we don’t have a complete picture of their overall budget. Alexander believes some of the artists applied to this just because they had disabilities, when in fact they could compete on a level playing field. Heckes says he will take that comment back to them. We don’t have the information on an individual’s disability because that’s private information. Wyman says that’s another way of saying we don’t care what their disability is; it could be anything or nothing. Watson says we are relying, as we always have, on the Center’s expertise.

ACTION: At 11:01 a.m. Turner moves to approve the recommended grant of \$20,000 to The Regents of the University of California in support of the National Arts and Disability Center’s Arts & Accessibility Technical Assistance Program. Coppola seconds. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. Wyman abstains.

VIII. Programs and Initiatives

At 11:02 a.m. the Chair moves to the programs discussion.

The first program to discuss is Local Impact. Galli asks why the name change from Creating Public Value (CPV) to Local Impact. Jefferson explains that people were confusing Creating Public Value with Creative California Communities because the names sounded too much alike. Wyman wants to know how everything proposed for the \$5M relates to the \$2M. Alexander explains that the \$5M and the \$2M were allocated in two different fiscal years. The \$2M is no longer before the Council. Wyman says she doesn’t want to vote for anything that repeats what the Council did with the \$2M. Alexander says, in reply to Wyman’s statement, that he recommends the opposite. He thinks the Council should not disallow repeat awarding. For many of these communities, there aren’t a lot of options (rural areas, etc).

Steinhauser suggests that grantees be required to invite a legislator or their representative to their organization or a performance.

Aitken is concerned that we're putting too much money into Local Impact. He fears that increasing an existing program doesn't tell a great story to the legislature. He also doesn't think we should grant so much money to rural and underserved counties. Aitken says the headline should be "and/or" not "and." But regardless, he doesn't think the program should be increased.

Gallegos says she loves this program and thinks the legislature would love it too. She's glad to see that small organizations are included in the \$5M. Turner says he doubted the impact of such small grants and asked about it at the last meeting, and people who were there stood and spoke very passionately about these grants. This convinced him that the small grants are very effective and have tremendous reach and breadth. There are some great stories coming out of these grants. If we add the component that the grantees maximize their visibility as Steinhauser suggests, he thinks that will be the last component we need. In his opinion they are the least visible, but the most impactful, grants we give.

Coppola asks how we know whether awardees actually receive the matching grants. Heckes says when we had a larger staff we used to audit them, but our staff is too small now. The grantees do provide documentation. Lindo asks what happens if a grantee does not get the matching grant. Heckes says because of timing that can't happen, but our grants are so small that the organizations seem to have no trouble matching them.

Harris moves to approve the Local Impact program guidelines as amended to incorporate Council member suggestions. Turner seconds the motion. Wyman objects before a vote can be taken. She says she wants the CAC staff lawyer to write all motions on which the Council votes. She is informed that the CAC has no staff lawyer.

ACTION: At 11:54 a.m. Steinhauser moves to fund Local Impact at \$1,195,000 with a possible adjustment later. Gallegos seconds the motion. Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. Wyman abstains. Aitken votes no.

At 11:55 a.m. the Chair moves to discussion of the State-Local Partnership (SLP) program. Aitken clarifies that we're talking about an increase at this meeting; the underlying \$650,000 was agreed to in October. Wyman states for the record that she doesn't remember voting for this in October. At 11:59 a.m. Turner moves to approve the committee recommendation and Lindo seconds the motion, but Aitken refuses to allow a vote. He says it can't be decided today. He thinks the Council should consider a per capita formula in funding the SLPs. He looked at the panel ratings and believes the panels are a waste of time. Heckes points out that the gentleman from Ventura just spoke this morning that the peer review is important.

Steinhauser asks if Aitken is recommending that SLP panels be eliminated, and if so, why. He says the panel should focus on what they like or don't like and give comments, without ranking the applications. Harris says that the staff and council agree that the comments have value. If the panel is going to do comments and scoring is just part of that, they may as well share the rankings. Heckes notes that the Council has talked about having the panels select a panel chair who would come to the Council meeting to answer member questions, and that is being entertained for the future.

ACTION: At 12:10 p.m. Turner moves to fund the State Local Partnership Program at the Programs Committee's recommended amount of \$1,050,000, subject to change. Lindo seconds the motion. Approval by Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo, Steinhauser and Turner. Wyman does not vote.

The Chair moves to Statewide Networks (SN) at 12:11 p.m.

The Programs Committee recommends a \$150,000 increase, which should come out of the \$5M augmentation because the arts license plate fund has decreased. Wyman says if the money for this program is now coming from the \$5M she won't support it.

Aitken says he loves the guidelines language about building public will but wants to know if it's in the actual criteria. He thinks it would be good to have that in the panel guidelines. Gallegos likes the way the staff has related everything in the book to the strategic plan. She wonders why a list of the organizations was not included. Fitzwater reads the SN list. Galli points out that a lot of information about the SN grantees is available online.

Wyman wants language about what the CAC does not fund on every set of guidelines.

ACTION: Turner moves to support Statewide Networks at \$375,000. Coppola seconds the motion. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. Wyman does not vote.

At 12:51 p.m. the discussion moves to Poetry Out Loud. Jefferson explains that we lost our Target money and Coppola helped fund Poetry Out Loud last year, but we are including even more counties this year, so the Council is being asked to increase the allocation. Watson says we are seeking a corporate partner as well.

ACTION: At 12:54 p.m. Coppola moves to approve the staff recommendation of \$135,000 to Poetry Out Loud, which represents a \$50,000 increase over the level approved in June. Turner seconds. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo, Steinhauser, Turner vote yes. Wyman abstains.

At 12:55 p.m. discussion moves to the Otis Report. Their request is for \$75,000; last time we invested \$50,000. Otis is requesting more money this year because of a unique partnership proposed between Otis and KCET to create several short videos and an hour-long special about California's creative economy.

Jefferson says Otis is going through a transition and she would have liked a chance to discuss the project with the new folks taking the helm. Turner says it's clear how effective the report has been as a tool to educate the legislature, but does the information become obsolete so quickly? Why must it come out every year? Watson says Otis has found that it does change from year to year, and each year they do a different addendum. This year will be an addendum on the talent pipeline, including arts education. The staff hopes to do a convening around the release of the Otis Report and include the legislature.

Galli asks whether KCET will have full creative control over the video. Watson says he doesn't have an answer, but states that Otis feels very comfortable. Harris says the value to this is also bringing in people who are not necessarily arts constituents. He notices that the CAC is putting more in than Otis does, and yet Otis' name is on it. Lindo asks if the launch can include northern California. Watson says yes, he's been assured that there will be a specific northern California launch event. Coppola asks if the CAC would have the right to show the video on our website; we should make sure that's in the contract. Jefferson says because it is a contract and not a grant, we have more ability to ask for anything we think is appropriate. Steinhauser says to the extent that CAC money is used in making a film, we should have our name on it.

Jefferson wants to give them less than their request. Turner asks Watson to speak to whether that will hamper them. Watson says he doesn't know.

ACTION: At 1:17 p.m. Jefferson moves to fund the Otis Report on California's Creative Economy at \$60,000. Wyman seconds the motion. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Jefferson, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. Lindo and Wyman vote no.

Discussion moves to Creative California Communities (CCC) at 1:19 p.m. Aitken says he doesn't understand why the maximum grant amount is now \$70,000 instead of \$100,000. Steinhauser says we found when it was capped at \$100,000 we received a lot of \$100,000 proposals but funded nobody at \$100,000. Turner says the stories were just as good at \$70,000, and now there will be a match component. Steinhauser says if we require a match, we may receive a more manageable number of applications. Alexander notes that if the Council keeps the grants at \$100,000 as Aitken suggests, we have the potential of only giving nine grants.

Jefferson asks for clarification and Heckes says we spent nearly \$1,000,000 last year on CCC, not including the money the Council added from this year's budget. Harris says, after going over all the numbers, we need to put more money in the pot for a new round of CCC. All told, the Council spent \$1.4M on round one and is likely to get even more applications this year. So allocating \$800,000 won't be sufficient.

Gallegos supports the idea of getting a summary evaluation, that grantees report to us how they are measuring success and whether they're meeting it. Watson says part of what we are doing with the \$100,000 administrative portion of the \$5M is seeking an independent look, to help design a longer-term evaluation process. When the CAC had a lot more money we did site visits. There's a challenge for us in the short term with limited funds. Site visits used to be done by staff, but outside evaluators also did site visits that were basically programmatic audits. Alexander was employed to do this in those days, and explains how site visits worked. Aitken asks where the \$100,000 came from. Heckes explains that the Council has been speaking of \$5M but actually has \$4.9M for grants.

Aitken asks Harris to report to the Programs Committee and be "the numbers guy." Steinhauser thinks we should get a professional evaluator to examine what we do and what our grantees do, quantitatively and qualitatively. What are we doing, for example, to help our grantees become tech savvy? We might require a demonstration of how the grantees use technology. She asks Galli to work on that if she's interested.

Steinhauser asks what the Council wants to do about requiring a match. Turner points out that if the CAC is giving \$70,000 as a top-end grant, we don't want to be the sole source for that. He's in favor of the 1:1 match. Wyman says she serves on another board that, as a matter of policy, never gives more than half the money for any project.

ACTION: Turner moves that the staff recommendation of \$838,000 to Creative California Communities be approved, with a new round to be announced pursuant to the guidelines. Gallegos seconds. The motion is approved unanimously.

The Chair moves the discussion to JUMP StArts at 2:01 p.m. Alexander explains that the Programs Committee felt that it did not have enough feedback yet to re-up at this time. Gallegos asks if we fund juvenile justice in any other programs. Watson says yes, some of the SLPs and Local Impact grantees work in juvenile halls, at least one of our CCC grantees, some of our Artists in Schools grantees ... juvenile justice is touched by a lot of CAC programs. We wanted

to be more targeted about it because we felt the need was great. JUMP StArts was meant to be a pilot from which we could learn. We need a little more experience under our belt before we can get beyond the pilot phase. Steinhauser points out that the Council cut the evaluation component due to budget restrictions, which may be why we have insufficient feedback.

Turner comments on his experience with the Minerva project. Arts programs in a juvenile justice setting can be life-changing. Aitken says it's also one of his favorite programs, and we're moving forward on a lot of other things without waiting for evaluation. He thinks we should fund it at the same level we funded before.

ACTION: At 2:15 p.m. Harris moves to fund JUMPStArts at \$200,000. Turner seconds the motion. Aitken, Gallegos, Harris, Lindo, and Turner vote yes. Coppola, Jefferson, Steinhauser and Wyman vote no. Alexander abstains. Galli is out of the room. The motion passes.

At 2:16 p.m. the discussion moves to Arts on the Air. Jefferson says the question is whether it should be taken up at this time, or whether the Council should wait for further evaluation. Current grantees would not be eligible for a new round. Steinhauser suggests that the Council put it out again for \$100,000. She was impressed with how much was done already in such a short time. Gallegos asks why cut the amount in half? Steinhauser says just because there are so many other projects out there.

ACTION: Steinhauser moves to fund another round of Arts on the Air at \$100,000. Coppola seconds the motion. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Harris, Lindo, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. Jefferson and Wyman vote no. Gallegos votes no, with a note that she wanted to fund it at a higher level. Galli is out of the room.

The Creativity at the Core discussion begins at 2:24 p.m. The recommended amount is dropping to \$100,000. Aitken likes that recommendation because that's what Hewlett is giving. Lindo reports on the forum she attended in Sacramento and says she was impressed with how the arts were being implemented in classrooms. She thinks it's a worthy program. Turner says arts in education is one of our core goals and he worries that at the pilot stage of this program \$50,000 could make a big difference, so he isn't sure he wants to cut our contribution back to \$100,000 from \$150,000. They've already cut their request and he thinks we should give them what they ask for. Gallegos asks if we know what the teachers think. Lindo says not just teachers but principals and parents are involved. Harris also likes that it empowers folks at the county level.

ACTION: Turner moves to fund Creativity at the Core at \$150,000. Harris seconds the motion. Alexander, Gallegos, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo and Turner vote yes. Aitken, Coppola and Steinhauser vote no. Galli is absent. Wyman does not vote. The motion passes.

Turnaround Arts CA is discussed beginning at 2:35 p.m. Wyman expresses dismay that we funded this out of the \$2M. Jefferson says the thinking on this was that we wanted to get it moving but the CAC could not continue to support it at that high level. There was concern in the Programs Committee that the amount of information we had from them was sketchy. They have a very "admin-heavy" budget. Basically, they want to use the CAC grant for their operating costs, and their operating costs are high.

Steinhauser excuses herself due to a potential conflict and leaves the room.

Aitken says he was there for the presentation at the White House and he thinks this is a great way to get arts back in the schools because the results are dramatic. He thinks this is the best program

to show the legislature. He thinks this is the kind of program that moves public will. He supports funding it at \$300,000. Harris says it's exciting but we need to question the administrative spending. They are paying high salaries.

The Programs Committee does not recommend that the CAC continue to fund them at this high level. Jefferson wants to know that they would touch more than ten schools if we are going to give them this kind of money. Turner says Aitken has made an excellent case, but we are talking about a sole source contract and the Chair would not allow questions while the presentation was going on, so he asks that Lenihan be allowed to speak. The Chair consents.

Harris asks about the program director salary. Lenihan says the director is doing a great job. Harris asks if the other \$500,000 on their budget is lined up. Lenihan says she believes it is. Also she says there's more money coming in that she can't talk about. Watson says there are "funders" listed in their submitted budget with no details about what they are contributing. She says some of the individual contributors are giving \$100,000/year for several years. Turner says he wants to see more details. Lenihan asks what the Council wants to see, and states that Turnaround Arts wasn't asked for a budget until recently. Jefferson says actually they were asked to give a budget and declined to give it; the CAC had to request it more than once.

Wyman leaves the room due to a potential conflict of interest.

Jefferson and Turner ask, for example, what a "dance" budget line item means. Lenihan explains. Alexander asks if they have a public information person to get the word out. Lenihan says yes. Jefferson says there should be additional parameters of what the Council wants out of this, since it is paying for it as a service. The Council has goals it thinks need to be achieved. Lenihan suggests that they give a monthly report to Barber to show the Council what is going on. Harris notes that the normal measurements will be missing for two years. Until Common Core is implemented we won't have metrics. Turner says early indications are that measurable results are impressive. Lenihan says they are able to measure parental involvement.

Jefferson says she will move to fund at \$300,000 but with a caveat that we treat it as a contract for services and ask for more accountability. Turner asks for a Council liaison to Turnaround Arts. Harris volunteers to be the liaison.

ACTION: Jefferson moves to fund Turnaround Arts CA at \$300,000. Turner seconds. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo and Turner vote yes. Galli, Steinhauser and Wyman are absent. The motion passes.

At 3:15 p.m. the Council begins talking about possible new directions.

The first program to be discussed is Artists Activating Communities. Community partners would engage artists, similar to the schools engaging artists in CAC's Artists in Schools program. The Programs Committee recommends this program and reminds the Council that the guidelines will be tweaked to reflect Council input received here today.

Aitken says he understands a prior version of this program ran for many years as a core program of the CAC, but is troubled by it. He thinks this would be a great program if we had ten million dollars or more. He characterizes it as half a million dollars to employ 48 artists. Heckes notes that the point of the program is not the number of artists being funded, it's the number of communities being served. Gallegos asks if the artists are being asked to serve underserved communities. Watson says yes, that's the expectation. Coppola notes that the other thing the

CAC did early on was an apprenticeship program. Can that be combined with this? Alexander says we could encourage that in the guidelines. Coppola says a paid CAC apprenticeship helped him years ago; he was paired with a composer and learned a lot. Lindo says amazing work is being done in senior centers and nursing homes, using the arts to reach Alzheimer's patients. That's the kind of thing this program can fund. Harris would like to specify in the guidelines even more places that would be eligible.

Steinhauser says when we did the listening tours, we heard a lot about the arts only being available to rich folks, being elite. This is a way to bring the arts to a lot of people who don't get them. Access to the arts is a quality of life issue. Aitken says he doesn't mean to infer that this is a moneymaker for artists, but he says we have 38,000,000 people in the state and he doesn't think we should spend \$550,000 on a handful of artists. He thinks we're not at a level yet where we can do this project. Turner says what strikes him is that the Chair was in favor of spending \$300,000 on ten schools, but balks at \$500,000 to serve 27-40 communities.

Steinhauser proposes that for Local Impact and CCC we pick up the language from this program and blend it in, rather than create this separate program. Watson says the staff can do that. Steinhauser says an artist can do a small scale residency for \$12,000.

ACTION: Harris moves that language from the proposed Artists Activating Communities program be merged into the guidelines for Local Impact, to incorporate possible individual artist residencies in the Local Impact program. Steinhauser amends the motion to add Creative California Communities as a program to be adjusted to include artist residencies. Alexander seconds the amended motion. It passes unanimously.

Heckes notes that the new guidelines will have to be changed. He asks that the specific Poetry Out Loud grants recommended by the staff be voted on.

ACTION: Turner moves that the staff recommendations regarding organizations to receive Poetry Out Loud grants be approved as outlined in Tab H. Aitken seconds the motion. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo, Steinhauser and Turner vote yes. Galli is absent. Wyman abstains. The motion passes.

Aitken names Turner and Jefferson to be the nominating committee for selection of next year's officers.

At 3:58 p.m. the discussion of the Student Voices project begins. Coppola says he had the pleasure of meeting them at his PAHFest. We live in a visual world and people use film to communicate. This project empowers students to tell stories about why art is important in their schools. If we have them show the short videos at the Capitol the legislature can get the arts education story right from the horse's mouth. Fitzwater reads into the record a statement from Galli who is very much in favor of this program and is excited to see it before the Council. Turner says that this initiative will enable the CAC to reach a new constituency in Silicon Valley and Silicon Beach.

ACTION: Turner moves to support the Student Voices digital initiative with \$48,000. Alexander seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

Turner leaves to attend another meeting.

At 4:03 p.m. Alexander leads a discussion about convening and capacity building. He says there are a number of advantages to the CAC taking a leadership role in getting various art

constituencies together. There are more than a dozen state arts agencies that offer this type of support and we can use their guidelines as a starting point to craft our own. The other portion of the recommendation is setting aside funds for a convening around the creative economy, \$50,000 to contract with an organization that would put it all together. Lindo asks if it would include technical assistance. Fitzwater says yes.

Heckes reminds the Council that the timeline begins to shrink if the Council puts off a decision until the January meeting. Fitzwater says if the Council expresses interest, the staff will develop guidelines. Steinhauser talks about the convening around the Otis report. Watson says it's important for the Council to hear that the convening would be held in conjunction with Arts Day in the Capitol, an event that would be put together by arts advocates.

ACTION: Steinhauser moves that the creative economy convening be supported by the Council at \$50,000. Coppola seconds the motion. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Jefferson and Steinhauser vote yes. Galli and Turner are absent. Lindo and Wyman do not vote. The motion passes.

At 4:14 p.m. Jefferson explains the China cultural exchange recommendation. Watson remarks that he and Alexander put together the support memo based on their separate, recent cultural travels in China. The staff is seeking Council approval to find a contractor who could organize such a convening. Alexander says the opportunity to have a conference for us to learn more about how to interact appropriately would be very useful. Coppola says half his school is Chinese and they discuss different ways of looking at things – he thinks we should consider the San Francisco Art Institute as a partner or site.

ACTION: Alexander moves to approve \$50,000 to fund a contract for the proposed convening in California. Coppola seconds the motion. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Lindo, and Steinhauser vote yes. Jefferson and Wyman vote no. Galli and Turner are absent. The motion passes.

At 4:23 p.m. the discussion moves to the suggested veterans' initiative. Alexander asks for a set-aside of \$150,000. Steinhauser wants to hear the staff's idea about involving the SLPs. Jefferson says the idea is to use the SLPs to help move this project as another way to strategically use our local boots on the ground. Steinhauser asks if the Council can put off a final decision until January. Heckes says yes.

ACTION: Alexander moves to set aside \$150,000 for development of an arts program that would serve veterans. Jefferson seconds the motion. It passes on a voice vote.

At 4:28 p.m. an arts tourism proposal is discussed. Watson says VisitCalifornia has a budget of \$185 million. He wants the Council to be aware that a breakthrough on cultural tourism would be a benefit to many communities. He wants to pursue collaboration with the tourism and agriculture agencies. They dovetail because of rural art trails, things that attract tourists to get off the main highway and explore. Aitken asks what impact our \$100,000 will have on agencies with such huge budgets. Watson says we will create an 'aha' moment. Steinhauser reminds the Council that it talked about interagency work in the strategic plan. The Council expresses interest in the idea but no vote is taken at this time.

At 4:33 p.m. the Chair moves the discussion to Touring and Presenting. Jefferson says the Programs Committee wants to move forward with the idea, but it's not ready for implementation.

They are asking Council approval for funding to look into it. The \$10,000 requested will come from the administrative allocation of the \$5M.

ACTION: Harris moves to approve \$10,000 as requested by the staff and Programs Committee. Lindo seconds the motion. It passes on a voice vote.

At 4:37 p.m. the Council goes over the numbers, led by Harris. Several votes are taken to adjust various program allocations.

ACTION: Harris moves that \$100,000 be set aside for future use in a capacity building program, with guidelines to be presented at the January meeting. Jefferson seconds the motion. It passes on a voice vote.

ACTION: Jefferson moves to increase the maximum grant amount for Local Impact applicants to \$15,000 and increase the overall program allocation by \$150,000. Harris seconds the motion. It passes on a voice vote.

ACTION: Wyman moves to add \$162,000 to Creative California Communities to make the available funds for that program \$1 million. Coppola seconds the motion. It passes on a voice vote.

Jefferson moves to add \$50,000 to Arts on the Air and Gallegos seconds the motion, but the Chair does not take a vote.

The SLP Program is discussed and several related votes are taken:

ACTION: An increase for the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs, as proposed in Tab F of the meeting materials, is moved by Aitken and seconded by Coppola. It is approved by Aitken, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Lindo, Steinhauser and Wyman. Jefferson and Alexander are out of the room due to a declared conflict of interest. Galli and Turner are absent.

ACTION: An increase for the Los Angeles County Arts Commission, as proposed in Tab F of the meeting materials, is moved by Aitken and seconded by Steinhauser. It is approved by Aitken, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Lindo, Steinhauser, and Jefferson. Wyman and Alexander are out of the room due to a declared conflict of interest. Turner and Galli are absent.

ACTION: An increase for all SLPs with the exception of Los Angeles County Arts Commission and the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs, as proposed in Tab F of the meeting materials, is moved by Aitken and seconded by Coppola. It is approved by voice vote.

ACTION: Aitken moves to support Turnaround Arts CA at \$300,000. Coppola seconds the motion. It is approved on a voice vote with Steinhauser and Wyman out of the room due to a declared conflict of interest.

All members return to the room except for Galli and Turner.

Harris has tracked numbers during the discussion. Heckes checks the math. The Council agrees that all motions for which any council member has a conflict have been voted.

ACTION: Aitken moves to approve an omnibus motion approving the remaining program allocations as discussed and agreed upon. Aitken, Alexander, Coppola, Gallegos, Harris, Jefferson, Lindo and Steinhauser vote yes. Wyman votes no. Galli and Turner are absent. The motion passes.

IX. Closed Session

At 5:02 p.m. the Council begins a closed executive session, which ends at 5:56 p.m. Turner returns during the closed session. Aitken leaves. Vice Chair Steinhauser reconvenes the meeting and reports out on the executive session, in which the Personnel Committee of Alexander and Aitken was disbanded. Harris and Turner are now the Personnel Committee.

X. Adjournment

At 5:58 p.m. the meeting is adjourned in memory of Anita Pauline Hall, Juan Cervantes and Samuel Quiñones.