

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

October 6, 2014

10:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Yerba Buena Center for the Arts

701 Mission Street

San Francisco, CA 94103

(415) 978-2787

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

Sarah Anderberg, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Deborah Cullinen, Executive Director, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts
Tom DeCaigny, Cultural Affairs Director for the City of San Francisco

Other Attendees

Olivia Everett, Arts Council Napa Valley
Josefa Vaughan, ArtSeed

Miko Lee, Youth in Arts
Rachelle Axel, San Francisco Arts Commission
Deborah Karp, Luna Dance Institute
Robin Rodricks, San Mateo County Arts Commission
Bruce W. Davis, Taiko Community Alliance
Pam Morton, MarinArts
Rachel Osajima, Alameda County Arts Commission
Steven Payne, Oakland East Bay Symphony
Alma Robinson, California Lawyers for the Arts
Patricia Reedy, Luna Dance Institute
Rebecca Cervantes, Moving Beyond Productions
Jessica Mele, Performing Arts Workshop & Teaching Artists Guild
Kerry Adams Hapner, City of San Jose, Office of Cultural Affairs
Dani Whitmore, YoloArts
Angela Tahti, former Executive Director of PlacerArts
Jean Johnstone, Teaching Artists Guild

ABSENT:

Invited Attendee

Teresa Lenihan, Loyola Marymount University

MINUTES

I. Call to Order and Welcome

The Chair calls the meeting to order at 10:34 a.m. He introduces Cullinen, who welcomes the Council and gives the history of the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, a former redevelopment/urban renewal project. They exist to put art at the center of life in this community. She points out some upcoming installations and events that would be of interest to the Council.

The Chair recognizes DeCaigny, who welcomes the Council to San Francisco, one of the richest arts ecosystems in the country. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors recently allocated \$2 million to help organizations that are struggling to stay in San Francisco due to the escalating real estate market. That's on top of the \$75 million budget for all the other things they do. San Francisco's arts budget is much greater than the state's arts budget. He thinks California needs to step up more now than ever to make the case of how vital the arts are to the health of our communities and the health of our economies. He thanks Watson for his partnership and leadership, especially in arts education. He's pleased to be joining a trip to China to be led by Watson in a few weeks as part of the Governor's outreach to China.

The Chair introduces new Council Member Gallegos and reads her bio. He introduces new Council Member Lindo and reads her bio. Gallegos has been sworn in by Watson, and Lindo has been sworn in by a judge. Wyman asks if they can vote without senate approval. Aitken says they can.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the Minutes

At 10:48 a.m. Golling calls the roll. A quorum is present.

At 10:52 a.m. the minutes are approved after discussion. Steinhauser suggests two additions.

ACTION: Turner moves to approve the minutes as amended by Steinhauser. Harris seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

III. Chair's Report

The Chair gives his report. The council must accomplish a few action items today and set apart a significant block of time to talk about the future direction of the agency. He will ask Heckes to help figure out the deadlines and timelines that must be observed to achieve what the council wants to achieve, then put together a calendar. The sooner the council makes decisions, the sooner those decisions can be implemented. He reminds the members that he sent his preliminary thoughts to them via email.

IV. Director's Report

At 10:55 a.m. the Chair moves to the director's report. The director suggests that if anyone has not seen yesterday's Huffington Post, they track it down and look for Eger's column, which is devoted to the California Arts Council and says a lot of nice things about our work. Apart from that, he has nothing to add to the materials already in the meeting packet. Watson says he hopes everyone saw the launch of the website and the new blog. We are telling more and more stories all the time. Fitzwater tells the council about the media splash, that when grantees acknowledge our support it gets in the media.

V. Public Comment

At 10:57 a.m. the chair moves to public comment. Robin Rodricks, San Mateo County Arts Commission, welcomes the Council to the Bay Area. She encourages the Council to help local arts councils. San Mateo County just passed a new sales tax and they are working to get some of that tax distributed through the San Mateo County Arts Commission. The tax is to supplement services that were cut during the economic downturn. They intend to distribute it with input from the community. Alexander asks if the increase would be used for grant making. She says yes, but they have a part-time grants manager so they must increase her hours.

Bruce Davis from Taiko Community Alliance, a new nonprofit arts organization, talks about taiko. He advocates to bring back the Marin County Arts Council and technical assistance grants.

Pam Morton of MarinArts brings regards from Jeanne Bogardus. They want to be a new arts service organization, not revive the old one. They are working on articles of incorporation and bylaws. They have a fiscal sponsor in Marin. Their first project is a comprehensive arts calendar online, which Marin has never had.

Rachel Osajima speaks. She is representing three organizations today: Alameda County Arts Commission, Californians for the Arts, and California Arts Advocates. She thanks the Council for its support and states that she's happy to be working in partnership with the Council and the whole state to advocate for the arts. She also represents our state/local partners (SLPs) and remembers that the listening tour for the CAC's strategic plan did not really address what was happening at the local level. She reminded the Council that the SLPs signed 48 letters prior to the Council's August meeting encouraging the CAC to double support for the SLPs.

Steven Payne from the Oakland East Bay Symphony says the symphony is going into its 25th anniversary year with Michael Morgan, who has done tremendous work. He brings to the

Council's attention a project for potential development at the south tip of Lake Merritt, the Kaiser Center. There's a theater building, an 1800-seat hall that has been derelict for a long time. Oakland East Bay Symphony would love to go there. It would be a great space for an Oakland performing arts center. He asks that the Council see if there's anything it can do to help. Harris expresses support.

Alma Robinson from California Lawyers for the Arts (CLA) shares what they have done with their Statewide Networks (SN) grant, which they have been very grateful for during the lean times. CLA's educational programs have gone global. They've been doing anti-bullying training through the arts in Sacramento, in addition to a number of other things. She thanks Watson and Barber for getting the arts in corrections contract completed. The arts help with discipline, teamwork, so many things needed in schools as well as prisons.

Patricia Reedy from Luna Dance Institute thanks the CAC for continuing the Artists in Schools (AIS) program even when our budget was slashed. It made a big difference in the lives of many of the children she works with. She encourages the Council to consider reopening the Artists in Communities program. Libraries, shelters and incarceration facilities need the arts.

Rebecca Cervantes, Moving Beyond Productions, serves more than 1000 kids and thanks the CAC for the AIS grant. It's vital to keep the arts alive and keep the kids' cultures alive.

Jessica Mele of Performing Arts Workshop says that kids show up, learn better, and love school in an arts-rich environment. We must look at the true costs of these programs in order to do them well.

Kerry Adams Hapner of the City of San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs talks about San Jose's pilot partnership with the CAC in building public will for the arts. She thanks the CAC for the grant, which they have leveraged several times over. She thanks Steinhauser, who has agreed to serve on the advisory commission. It will be publicly kicked off this week. She is optimistic about the impact this will have. She's also thrilled about the delegation Watson is leading to China and thinks this is a great opportunity to cross-pollinate and look for opportunities for cultural exchange. She looks forward to continued partnership to ensure that the arts are funded in California. She thanks Watson for the great work he and the Council have done in the past three years to reposition the CAC. The CAC is listening to the field and responding to needs.

Aitken introduces new Council Member Galli, reads her bio, and welcomes her to the Council. Watson swears her in.

VI. Report by California County Superintendents Educational Services Association

At 11:29 a.m. the Chair recognizes Sarah Anderberg, who gives a Powerpoint presentation on the Creativity at the Core initiative. She asks for the CAC to continue to support Creativity at the Core, which has a commitment from the Hewlett Foundation to consider future funding as well, in partnership with the CAC. Gallegos asks if the program is bilingual. Anderberg says that it is.

At 11:52 a.m. Anderberg introduces Jean Johnston, Executive Director of Teaching Artists Guild, who works on professionalizing the field of teaching artists. They put together a program at a juvenile hall. She shows some photos of the work, bringing teaching artists into a juvenile justice center. They used the arts to address issues of identity and community. The teachers/artists report that the workshops were transformative experiences. This was only in Alameda County, but it is hoped the module will be adopted by others.

Steinhauser asks, how do we know when we have success? The council needs to fund what is successful. Johnston says she can only answer as to the results she witnessed in Alameda County. Anderberg says they have an evaluation component, so there will be points of impact that they can point to. Jefferson reminds the Council that it will take probably eight years of cycling before we can tell whether what we put into the schools really made a difference that is measurable. Once you put arts back in the schools, you can eventually see whether it cut back on violence, improved outcomes, etc. Aitken asks how to take that model and bring it to Orange County, for example. Is there a booklet? Anderberg says right now they have people coming from all the state to watch what's happening in Alameda, but they definitely want a way to share it out. They need funding to be able to do that intense training. Aitken says yes, you can't just train people in symposiums. Harris says the county superintendants have a lot of power to disseminate it, they are the decision makers, and they seem to be supportive. Anderberg says the state rolls out lots of programs through this regional model idea. Coppola says it would be great to have the students who have been touched by these programs take it back to their communities when they leave.

At 12:31 p.m. Turner notes that it's great to have this level of attendance and interaction in a public comment session.

VII. 2014-15 Program Priorities, Program Direction and Funding Allocation

Aitken says he wants a free-flowing discussion of what to do with our one-time \$5M budget augmentation, but is going to impose the "raise your hand rule" so he can keep control. The first thing he wants to address is CAC core programs. Do we keep them, modify them, or toss them? Aitken asks Heckes what our general budget is. Heckes replies that it's about \$5.2M. Aitken asks to what extent the Council should think of this year's money as two buckets: Its "normal" money and a one-time \$5M. He asks Alexander.

Alexander says the one-time nature of the funding is problematic. He says he understands the legislators' concerns about making a long-term commitment, but he hopes that they intend to start pushing us back to where we were at the beginning of the century. He thinks we should roll the funds together and think of it as a whole rather than separate it out.

Harris had a similar thought to Alexander's. He worries about committing to something when we're not certain of future funding, but he thinks this one-time augmentation would be hard to retreat from. In terms of public perception, it would look bad to shrink us back down again. Aitken says we will work hard to get CAC baseline increased to at least \$10M, which the legislature supported this year but was ultimately reduced to a one-time \$5M allocation. We need to come back to the Governor and the legislature and tell them what we did with last year's \$2M, to make sure they understand why they should invest in us. So do we increase our existing programs? Do we create new programs? He wants all the members to give their opinions.

Harris asks about staff capacity. Do we feel the staff is the right size and can handle the influx of work? Heckes says if the Council chooses directed funding like Turnaround Schools there is not much panel management, but a program like Creative California Communities (CCC) gets a deluge of applications and there is a lot to manage. We cannot add staff positions at this time.

Aitken asks Heckes about the work involved in drawing up program guidelines. Heckes says program guidelines are based on what the Council has approved in the past; the review criteria may change based on the end result the Council is aiming for, but there are templates the staff

can use for drafting purposes. Our core programs haven't changed their guidelines much over the years. Wyman says that if the Council increases SLP funding we need to know who the SLPs are giving grants to, to avoid double dipping. Alexander says many grants require a match, and often a state grant is matched by a county in order to get the program going.

Jefferson says what's before the Council is the \$5M and a strategic plan that indicates where our goals and directions are. Our key goals are about changing public will, and we have to be careful how we allocate this \$5M; we can't disrespect the fact that we've been told it's a one-time allocation. Is there something we should fund that we are not funding? Is there something we are funding that we should ditch? We need to decide those questions first, and then talk about process. The Council may need to boost grant amounts a bit, they are very low. Aitken notes that he thinks Jefferson is saying the Council should put the \$5M in a separate bucket because it's a one-time allocation.

Steinhauser asks Heckes to state the latest possible date that the Council can put out a grant application to the field for this money. Heckes says January. The money must be encumbered by the end of June, but things being voted on in June go out as guidelines in January. He passes out a program calendar. Wyman asks why January? She thinks the guidelines should go out in November. Steinhauser agrees, but says her point is process. She says you look at the end of June and work backward. She is concerned about working the staff over the holidays trying to get all these guidelines together if the Council doesn't vote on a direction until November. Watson says it would definitely be helpful for the staff to get some direction today, so it could start preparing potential guidelines to bring back to the November meeting. The staff would come in November and give the Council the benefit of draft guidelines. The Council could then either approve them, or give authority to a subcommittee to quickly tweak them, and the guidelines could, in fact, be out to the field in November.

Harris notes that the CAC received 157 applications for CCC this year and could get 250 next year. Watson agrees. It was said publicly at the last meeting that the Council was interested in doing another "round" of CCC and now the field is buzzing about it. Aitken says that today he just wants to start exchanging ideas and he doesn't want to adopt any new program. He's reluctant to support the idea that the Council would choose a direction and put the staff to work. He rejects Watson's suggestion that the Council give direction to the staff today.

Jefferson disagrees, saying that the Council has to make decisions now. The field needs to know much further in advance. We put off decisions on the \$2M until January, which is part of why it wasn't handled well. If we're trying to influence the budget, those discussions are already underway. The budget rolls out in January and is revised in May. Meanwhile, the Council can't have conversations unless it is together in publicly-noticed meetings. So in her view, the Council has no choice about making decisions today.

Harris asks about Artists in Communities. Aitken says he's not in favor of it but is willing to learn more. Watson refers Harris to the program profiles under tab 16. Alexander says that years ago, the CAC had a policy of supporting lifelong learning, and it supported projects like Artists in Communities as part of that. Aitken says he has serious reservations. He thinks more time should be taken to hear everybody out. He states that no one said the Council would vote today. Steinhauser and Jefferson disagree with the Chair and say that it was clear the Council planned to vote on programs at this meeting; it was publicly announced at the August meeting that decisions would be made in September. Aitken says he is not prepared today to make decisions. Turner

says the Council members have had time to review the programs committee's recommendations, which were made in August, and he doesn't see a downside to addressing them today. He'd like to look at three categories: current programs we're funding and whether we want to increase them; programs that we started, like Turnaround Schools, which may need to be nurtured; and CCC and possible other categories of grant programs. He thinks if the Council looks at these three areas it will help us move the ball forward. Now would be a good time for us to get a real sense of how we feel about these three categories.

Steinhauser says it was wise to make significant grants with the \$2M and we should repeat that with the \$5M. She liked the idea of going around the table and asks the Chair if everyone can go around and talk about the core programs. Then we can see where we end up. Aitken agrees that would be a good idea, but instead looks at the budget framework from the programs committee and suggests the Council start there. Watson suggests the Council look at the program profiles under the same tab. Aitken says he would rather look at the big picture.

Jefferson explains the items under tab 16.

Aitken says the Council should talk about Creating Places of Vitality (CPV). Last year it was funded at \$819K. There is a recommendation before the Council to increase it. So do we want to continue to support it? Do we want to increase the funds? What's the difference between CPV and CCC? Watson explains: CPV is for small, emerging, rural, communities of need. CCC is larger grants for high-impact programs. Jefferson says the community that applies for CPV needs operating grants. She thinks we should let these smaller organizations apply to us for money to do what they do, and let CCC be the program where the CAC guides the content. Aitken says he agrees with Jefferson.

Jefferson says she and Alexander think the CAC is not giving enough operational support. Alexander says the Programs Committee recommendation to put much more into operational support is a result of what was heard on the listening tour. By increasing operational support we can help a lot more organizations. Jefferson thinks more organizations will apply. We had a cap on the ceiling of the organization because we had so little to give, and we might want to raise that cap.

Turner says the Council should look at its goals. It needs to strike a balance between something that will be quickly visible to the legislature and something that will energize people on the ground. As for SLP, they've asked for a doubling of their base amount, which is close to what the programs committee has recommended. If we do something like that, we need to make sure they make the money visible, give us stories we can take to the legislature about what was done with the doubling of their grant.

Jefferson brings the discussion back to CPV. Turner says that CPV is the hardest program for him to visualize because the grants are small and spread out, but it's probably the most effective because it's on the ground. Two CPV grantees are present and stand up to address the Council. YoloArts talks about what they are doing with their CPV grant: Putting together an art walk in Woodland. A town official said to them, "For the first time, the community actually feels like a community." Arts Council Napa Valley used their CPV grant for galleries in empty storefronts and it was very successful. Now the redevelopment the project was trying to attract is moving in, and people are saying, "Where did the art go?" So it was appreciated.

Alexander recommends increasing the thresholds so more organizations will be eligible. He reminds the Council that Heckes has told them that at the moment the guidelines are limiting the grantees.

Aitken moves the discussion on to CCC without a vote. He asks whether the council is going to adopt the existing guidelines or fine-tune them. Harris says CCC is going to be extremely popular. He thought the guidelines as written last year were very wide open and simple. Gallegos applied for CCC and thought it was difficult for a small organization to be put up against huge organizations. Aitken says the intent was to increase the amount of the grant, not to make it hard for small organizations to apply. Jefferson says we are all in agreement that we want to do more with CCC but the council might simplify the partnership idea. Wyman says the council could change “shovel ready” as one of the criteria, too. Jefferson suggests the council also look at dropping the minimum ceiling amount slightly, but from the beginning we can recognize that the grant might be a lower amount than the amount requested. Aitken says he sees clear support for the program but some fine-tuning is needed.

Aitken moves the discussion to the state/local partnership program (SLPP). He says that in November the Council should discuss basing SLP allocations on population. Jefferson says as soon as you go down that road you open up a nasty can of worms; plus, there is no precedent for doing it. She says it's a bad idea. Small communities do not have access to large corporate dollars. Aitken reiterates that he wants to examine this issue. He thinks we need a base level but should give more to the more populated counties and come up with a formula. Steinhauser says it's going to be contentious because there's a clear difference of opinion, so the staff should come up with recommendations. And if the Council does not come to a decision in November, it should increase the grant amount across the board and put together a committee to look at this question. Aitken says yes, the staff should come back with a recommendation. Harris asks how committed the CAC is to funding on a percentage. Heckes says the one-time programs were handled differently, but normally we fund by the panel ranking.

The Chair moves to Poetry Out Loud. Coppola says he was blown away by Poetry Out Loud. It was very invigorating to him. Margolis thanks him for stepping up to help when we lost funding from Target. Turner asks if we've ever asked a hotel to donate rooms. Margolis says no but the Sheraton gives a lot. Steinhauser says we should acknowledge the Sheraton.

Aitken shifts the discussion to Statewide Networks (SN), which supports service networks that have a statewide impact or fit a definition. Steinhauser asks if SN has been evaluated. Heckes says the staff looked at it and made some changes to the guidelines. Jefferson says the Programs Committee recommends site visits to do the kind of analysis that is needed. Watson says the staff knows we need an outside evaluation.

The Council briefly discusses the proposed convening budget, the Poet Laureate, and tourism. Jefferson says the Programs Committee did not set aside money for JUMP StArts because everyone wanted to see how the program is going before re-committing to it, but if the council wants money in it, now is the time to talk about that. Turner says the CAC wants to make sure the program succeeds. If other funders come in the council can always rethink it, but should set some money aside in case the program needs it. Jefferson suggests \$200K. Turner says to put \$200K aside would be good. Agreement is voiced but no vote is taken.

Watson says between now and the November meeting the staff will report on JUMP StArts. He also reports that Senator Nielsen has said he wants to sponsor legislation to make the current Arts

in Corrections allocation permanent and send some support to the county sheriffs. Aitken says the Council will set aside \$200K for juvenile justice and it will go to JUMP StArts or something like it.

The next item for discussion is Turnaround Arts. Aitken says that until the Council knows what it's going to fund the members can't talk about it. He thinks the council must get clear what it wants to support and then talk about it in November. Aitken says we committed to the legislature that we were going to get arts back in the schools, but we don't know what they need. Harris says there's a "turnaround" school not far from him in Hayward; he will make an effort to visit it and report about it in November.

Turner presses for a number. Steinhauser says we put in \$200K for justice because it's what we did last time, so we should be consistent and pencil in \$300K for Turnaround Arts since that's what we did last time. Aitken asks that Lenihan submit a written report before the November meeting.

Alexander suggests that we table the discussion and take the votes. Harris asks about the veterans and tourism items. Jefferson confirms that the Council has not discussed those yet.

Jefferson asks that we move to take the votes.

VIII. Programs and Grants 2014-15

Heckes says the AIS recommendation is a cleanup item. One organization was erroneously shown as nonfundable and the council is being asked to correct that.

ACTION: At 3:05 p.m. Turner moves to accept the staff's recommendation regarding The Unusual Suspects Theater Company. Jefferson seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

Heckes asks for conflicts of interest regarding the SLPP recommendation and reads the policy aloud. Jefferson leaves the room for a vote on the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs.

ACTION: At 3:10 p.m. Turner moves to accept the staff's recommendation regarding the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. Aitken seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

Jefferson returns to the room.

ACTION: At 3:11 p.m. Alexander moves to accept the staff's recommendation regarding the State/Local Partnership Program, excluding the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. Steinhauser seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

ACTION: At 3:11 p.m. Turner moves to approve a technical assistance grant to MarinLink as fiscal sponsor for MarinArts.org. Coppola seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

ACTION: At 3:12 p.m. Turner moves to accept the staff's recommendations regarding the funding of Poetry Out Loud. Jefferson seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

At 3:12 Jefferson expresses concern that discussion needs to happen today about Touring and Presenting and Artists in Communities, so the staff knows whether there is interest from the Council on moving forward. Aitken again expresses reservations because he doesn't know anything about Artists in Communities. Alexander explains that it doesn't support individual artists; it works like AIS but for nursing homes, senior citizen centers, libraries, etc. Jefferson gives an example of a Bay Area organization that does artists in residency programs in churches, offering free master classes to citizens in the community. CAC arts program specialist Wayne

Cook speaks, saying the CAC program was one of the largest in the country and was highly regarded. Artists were put to work in prisons and delinquent homes, artists worked with AIDS patients, artists were active in their communities, and we're missing that right now. Aitken says we have no definitive goal for this program. Cook says he'd like a go-ahead so the staff can develop something for the Council to look at. Aitken says that's putting the cart before the horse. Jefferson points out that there is a proposal in the book. Aitken says that's not sufficient.

Cook describes the original program, which was typically 6 to 12 months per residency, long term, in depth. Steinhauser says that artists are not given respect or invited to the table when there's a problem to solve, and if we want that to happen, we need to give them a way to do that. Steinhauser says this program is like an artist peace corps. She says it would dovetail with what the CAC is doing with collective impact and public will in our strategic plan. She asks the staff to come back with something tangible in November. Lindo says this is how she paid her electric bills when she was a young artist starting out. This is a way for artists to be empowered in their community. She is absolutely in support of it. Aitken says he doesn't know what the guidelines are going to be but he thinks the recommendation is too much money. Jefferson says since you don't want to talk about money, why not commit to the concept and let the staff come back in November. Aitken agrees to that.

Alexander talks about touring and presenting. The CAC had a program in the 1970s and 80s, a list of approved artists that had to go to at least three locations outside their communities. It jump-started the careers of many artists. Coppola suggests a digital program, which he believes isn't before the council today because he wasn't able to attend meetings. The CAC used to be a cutting-edge place of thinking and trying things, but he proposed something cutting edge that got shot down and he believes that was a mistake. Aitken says bring it up in November. He says he will. Steinhauser tells Coppola she also thinks we should be doing something with technology and innovation and encourages him to put something together with the staff. Steinhauser also thinks we should set some money aside for opportunity grants.

Aitken asks if there's anything we haven't discussed. Watson reports that he's heard from Otis and they are requesting \$75K so they can bring media into the creative economy equation.

Everyone agrees to start the November meeting at 9:00 a.m. and run until 6:00 p.m.

VII. Public Comment

Aitken calls for public comment. Wyman asks for an explanation of the rights of grantees and whether they are allowed to directly lobby on their own behalf. She is told that the public has a right to address the council.

Deborah Karp from Luna Dance Institute speaks, thanking the Council for AIS. Teaching has allowed her to make social change while fulfilling her art. She calls on the Council to continue to support dance in communities.

Josefa Vaughan, founder of ArtSeed, speaks. ArtSeed has served thousands of children in the past ten years. Their work in the schools is really a recruiting ground to pair an artist with a child and give them skills they can use in any field. Art relates to other fields. For a small agency that has a limited capacity, how does one ask the CAC to actually help make it possible to take the leap to grow and have a bigger footprint? Please make it possible for small agencies, have something where they can partner with larger organizations to support them to make that leap.

Artists in Communities would help, inter-neighborhood initiatives would help. Chance encounters between wealthy and poor through the arts, creates upward mobility.

Dani Whitmore of YoloArts advocates for an increase in SLP funding. “We are your front-line, long-term investment.” YoloArts is creating jobs for artists including digital arts in the schools, and also works in juvenile hall as a lot of SLPs do. “It is our job to have the pulse of the county.”

The Teaching Artists Guild representative again speaks about juvenile justice and states they are working with teaching artists across the board. She loved to hear all the talk around individual artists.

Barber reads into the record a message from Rachele Axel, San Francisco Arts Commission, who supports an increase in SLP funding.

Miko Lee from Youth In Arts notes that the AIS grants are small. She says we had a great program a few years back, working with outside evaluators, and if we brought that back we’d have a store of data that would make a bigger splash.

Angela Tahti says the Council has a huge task ahead. She thinks the CAC’s multicultural entry program should be looked at again. She also mentions that CAC’s touring and presenting program was fantastic and a lot of artists lost their shirts when that program ended.

VIII. Adjournment

Jefferson asks the Council to close in memory of Geoffrey Holder. Alexander adds Nati Cano. Heckes says Clark Mitze, former CAC Director, passed away very recently at the age of 96.

ACTION: At 4:25 p.m. Wyman moves to adjourn in memory of Geoffrey Holder, Nati Cano and Clark Mitze. Jefferson seconds. The motion passes unanimously.