

Nevada Arts Council

Meeting Minutes

Friday, December 13, 2019

1:30 PM

Meeting Locations:

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Nevada Arts Council	716 N. Carson Street Suite A Carson City NV 89701	Conference Room
Nevada Arts Council	4000 S. Eastern Ave. Suite 240 Las Vegas NV 89119	Conference Room

A. Opening

Ms. Gail Rappa, Vice Chair, called the December 13, 2019 Nevada Arts Council Board Meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Ms. Rappa asked if there was proper posting for the meeting, and Mr. Manfredi affirmed that to be so.

Ms. Rappa conducted a roll call. **Quorum was established (9 Council Members present)**

Council Members Present:

Edward Estipona
Jerry Schefcik
Karen Michaels
Ryrie Valdez
Gail Rappa
Andy Lott
Amanda Horn
Mark Salinas
Yale Yeandel

Others in Attendance:

Tony Manfredi, Executive Director of Nevada Arts Council
Sierra Scott, Grant Specialist, Nevada Arts Council
Grace Davis, Community Arts Development Specialist, Nevada Arts Council
Cathleen Wyatt, Administrative Assistant, Nevada Arts Council

B. Public Comment

None

C. Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

There were no changes or corrections to be made to the September 27th Minutes. Mark Salinas, Yale Yeandel and Andy Lott abstained from voting due to having not attended the previous meeting.

Motion: Approve the September 27th, 2019 Nevada Arts Council Board Meeting Minutes

By: Edward Estipona

Second: Amanda Horn

Vote: Passed unanimously

D. New Board Member Introductions (Discussion Only)

Mr. Yale Yeandel introduced himself and stated that being on the board is a way to help all artists that he knows. It's an honor and a privilege to be on the Arts Council.

Mr. Andy Lott introduced himself and stated that he is also excited to be a part of the Board.

E. Thank Departing Board Members (Discussion Only)

Ms. Rappa thanked Annie and Joe for their service to the Nevada Arts Council Board.

Mr. Manfredi thanked Annie and Joe for their service. Specifically, Joe for his work as previous Chair and Annie as an ambassador for the arts. He acknowledged that they were both fantastic Board members.

F. Review of FY20 Project Grant for Artists (Cycle B) Panel Funding Recommendations (For Possible Action)

Ms. Rappa moved on to Agenda Item F and stated that twenty-four eligible applications were received for the FY20 Fellowship Project Grant. Nevada Arts Council Board to determine funding. The panel was chaired by Nevada Arts Council Board Member Jerry Schefcik. The Project Grant for Artists (PGA) from NAC supports individual artists in the production and presentation of artistic projects. The PGA is awarded twice a year for projects that take place during a specified six-month period. Examples of eligible projects include art exhibitions, performances, reading, concerts, the creation of art, portfolio creation, and marketing/promotional activities related to the arts.

Mr. Manfredi stated that there were actually 25 applications with a total of 23 being eligible. Each applicant requested \$1,500 as was described. Total requested amount of funding received during this grant request is \$34,076.74. Total available funding in this category for Cycle B was \$22,639.60. A grant of \$3,500 was returned to the Arts Council and that became available to the agency on December 4, 2019.

The \$3,500 grant was forfeited as the organization dissolved. With that funding being returned, it was added it to the Project Grant for Artists—Cycle B because we had available funding. We felt that it was very appropriate to add the \$3,500 to this panel group. That is why the funding is at the \$22,639.

Mr. Manfredi continued, the Grant Review Panel charged with reviewing FY20 Project Grants for Artists—Cycle B, convened in a public meeting virtually December 11, 2019, to discuss and score the applications. The panelists were Denise Duarte from Las Vegas, a multidisciplinary artist, Gina Lopez Hill from Carson City, Executive Director of the Brewery Arts Center, Ted Owens from Reno, a professor of music and musical theater at Truckee Meadows Community College, and Erica Vital-Lazare from Las Vegas, professor of creative writing at the College of Southern Nevada.

In previous panels, the panelists could adjust their preliminary scores based on the panel discussion for all applications at the end of the entire panel meeting. However, many panelists gave NAC staff feedback that this process was not ideal, as it was difficult to remember the discussion and comments for all applications by the end of the meeting. In response to this feedback, the panelists were given the opportunity to adjust their preliminary scores immediately after all panelists had commented on and discussed that application. This process worked well and encouraged more discussion between panelists.

Comments during this, applications were with clear evaluation methods scored well, and panelists encouraged applicants to create a formal evaluation process for their projects whenever possible. Panelists noted that several times applicants' timelines did not seem realistic and/or achievable. Panelists responded well to budgets with clearly defined line items, diversified income sources, and demonstrated in-kind support. Panelists appreciated projects that clearly impacted defined communities, as well as projects with well-articulated artistic concepts.

This group of panelists worked very well together, they were very diligent and thoughtful in their deliberations, and it was an enjoyable discussion and meeting. Public comments that we received from Suzanne Hackett-Morgan, she submitted a public comment via email thanking the panelists for their review and comments on the applications. She submitted additional comments in the email specific to her application, and these additional comments were not read as per the information on the public meeting notice, which says, "The Committee shall not take public comment regarding any grant applications under consideration."

Now NAC staff will now facilitate the scoring review for the FY20 Project Grant for Artists-Cycle B applications.

Ms. Sierra Scott noted the following from the scoring spreadsheet:

- PGA20.2.14, Sean Russell, final recommended funding, \$1,476.74.
- PGA20.2.10, Pamela Lappen, final recommended funding, \$1,500.
- PGA20.2.24, Tia Flores, final recommended funding, \$1,500.
- PGA20.2.03, Dr. Kathleen Kristy Brooks, final recommended funding, \$1,500.
- PGA20.2.20, Dean Burton, final recommended funding, \$1,500.
- PGA20.2.08, Rosie Trump, final recommended funding, \$1,417.50.
- PGA 20.2.13, Brian Fox, final recommended funding, \$1,355.36.
- PGA 20.2.23, Shannon Dorn, final recommended funding, \$1,350.
- PGA20.2.15, Sherry Rosenthal, final recommended funding, \$1,350.
- PGA20.2.19, Morrain Bauer, final recommended funding, \$1,350.
- PGA20.2.09, Nathaniel Benjamin, final recommended funding, \$1,350.
- PGA20.2.11, Michael Forsch, final recommended funding, \$1,350.
- PGA20.2.18, Todd Green, final recommended funding, \$1,350.
- PGA20.2.16, Megan Berner, final recommended funding, \$1,200.
- PGA20.2.02, Eugene Shapiro, final recommended funding, \$1,200.
- PGA20.2.04, Martin A. David, final recommended funding, \$840.
- PGA20.2.25, Arthur Richmond, final recommended funding, \$1,050.

The following applicants had a final recommended funding of zero:

- PGA20.2.22, Nancy Foster
- PGA20.2.06, Jerry Snyder
- PGA.20.2.1, Paul Thornton
- PGA20.2.07, Suzanne Hackett-Morgan
- PGA20.2.17, Jeremy Elises
- PGA20.2.21, David Lambin.

Mr. Manfredi stated, during the panel meeting, the panelists discussed each application, provided their final score for each applicant, and scores were averaged together to find the average score. Looking at applicant, PGA20.2.1 at the top, Sean Russell, the amount that was request was \$1,476. He had an average score between the panelists of 97. Based on the scoring rubric, 95-100 constitutes 100% funding. As it goes down that scoring table, 90-94% equals 90% funding, a 85-89 score equates to 80% of funding, 80-84, 70% funding, 70-79%, 60% funding, 60-69%, 50. Anyone below 60, no funding.

Mr. Manfredi continued, after the table is applied to the scores to get the amount, we look at the Recommended Funding Amount and the amount that we have to work with. In this case, it exceeded the available amount. Obviously, that's why we weren't able to award every grant in full. We applied all of the funds based on that scoring rubric, and at the end, we had a little left over. There was an additional \$72.86 available to apply.

Mr. Manfredi continued, per our practice, and part of our past procedures, these funds were distributed to applicants who scored 94% and lower by adding those Additional Funds to the Recommended Funding Amount until the Recommended Funded Amount is reached and we use all available funds. This is what makes up the Final Recommendation that we are proposing to the Board.

Mr. Manfredi asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Amanda Horn questioned how the extra \$72.00 was divided up between the applicants. Mr. Manfredi explained, after we applied the Funding Table, we were left with \$73 and change. Since we give 100% of funding to those who score 95-100%, the distribution of any additional money on those starting at the next level. You'll see PGA20.2.08, Rosie Trump, received a score of 94.5, the recommended funding that based on the score was \$1,417. We were able to give that full recommended amount of funding that the score is based on by funding up to that level. We won't ever go over the recommend funding amount, but we're trying to get to that as close as we can and base that on hierarchy.

Ms. Amanda Horn asked whether the applicants who received no funding would be a priority in the next FY cycle. Mr. Manfredi explained that those applicants do not get any preferential treatment or any other priority. Each grant panel and each grant is individually scored. Interestingly enough, this panel and these projects scored really high. As you go through the process multiple times, they vary. Sometimes we have a panel and applicants that score relatively low, and we're left over with extra money. Sometimes they're high and we have to cut it based on the amount of available funding that we have.

Mr. Manfredi continued, it varies from panel to panel and grant to grant. What we do to those who aren't able to receive funding, we go back and work with them. We work to try to help them improve their grant writing or the narrative or any of other information that potentially the panelists cited or highlighted, that caused them to receive a lower score. We're tasked with funding excellence and artistic merit so, as we've modified these tables and rubrics to ensure that we're funding those that are writing really great grant applications and have good projects in place at the highest level that we can, as well as helping those that aren't quite at that same level. The limited funds that we have really require us to be strategic on how we apply that grant funding in addition to not leaving people completely behind.

Ms. Sierra Scott added for clarification, a specific example to support what Mr. Manfredi was talking about with the variations in scoring from cycle to cycle. I have the score sheet for Cycle A in front of me as well. And just for reference, we had 13 people in Cycle B scoring 90 or higher. And in Cycle A, we only had three people scoring 90 or higher. And we are able to fund the last cycle all the way down to 77%, which is very different just because there was a wider variation of scores.

Ms. Ryrie Valdez asked the last time 100% funding was recommended and voiced concern that the applicants who received no funding could become discouraged. Mr. Manfredi stated, as we have discussed the scoring rubric and this process with the board during the grant review process and agreed to it. If this is something that we want to look at and adjust it makes perfect sense to put that on a future Agenda Item to go through it.

Ms. Sierra Scott added, in Cycle A, even though we didn't have a lot, only one person in Cycle A received full funding. We're not able to fund four applicants in Cycle A. We reach out to them, we send them a letter detailing the panelists' comments on the strengths of the application, areas for improvement, and we build a relationship with them. So, there were four last cycle, and there will be six according to this data for this cycle if we move forward, that are not funded.

Ms. Gail Rappa added that because the grant was raised to \$1,500, it might be the reason for higher quality grant applications.

Mr. Andy Lott questioned why the Board is giving more than the recommended funding? Mr. Manfredi explained, the recommended funding that you see in that table, the recommended funding is the funding amount that's based on the funding table. So, in other words, fixing them at a 90% funding would be \$1,350. If you see that like, Rosie Trump and through all of the ones that are listed in blue, you'll see the recommended funding is \$1,350. That's based on giving them 90% of the funding because they're in that score range between 94 and 90. If you were to look at the funding based on score percentage for Rosie Trump is actually \$1,417.50. If you look at what those recommended—what the amount that we would give her if we have—if we used her full score. Basing it on 94.5% versus 90%.

Mr. Andy Lott asked, why didn't you add an extra \$5,000? Would then the \$5,000 start in at the higher 90 score, or would it be funding the next 81.8% PGA20.2.22? Mr. Manfredi stated, I think at the very bottom, 73.3%, that everyone that could receive funding would receive funding based on the panel that we have that month. Where it drops off is if we someone would receive funding less than 50%, because if we fund someone less than 50% they have to either significantly change their project or go find additional funds and that is not the intention of this particular grant. That's why we stopped where we stopped. We've had instances where we have excess funding. We continue to go down and fund all those in the blue range. And that's why we have their average score filled out to the point percentage. So, 94.5, 92.0. We have two 92.0s. Those will be funded accordingly. 91.8 then 91.3. We would fund them based on their average score, the actual amount that we would give them. We would never give more than what the recommended funding amount is from the panel. That's why we never give them more than what their recommended funding is.

Mr. Andy Lott asked, if there was an additional fund totaling \$1,050, would PGA20.2.22 get that additional funds? Mr. Manfredi explained, the reason that we're not able to go down to 20.2.22, Nancy Foster, is because we don't

add the extra \$73. We have to stop the funding there. If we had more funding, then we would continue to go down the line. You can see where this would actually at 81.5 percentages, we would go out to the next percentage point if there were one and what the difference would be.

Ms. Sierra Scott added, if we had an additional even \$525, then we would have been able to fund Nancy Foster at 50% of her request, and we would have given her that \$525. But anything less than that \$525 extra would need to go over into that Additional Funds category because we wouldn't be able to fund anyone at at least 50%.

Ms. Amanda Horn congratulated the Council's staff for all the work done and the positive changes made thus far.

Ms. Sierra Scott added, in light of the fact that there's some new Board members, it might frame up this funding table just to note that this funding table, the funding was all based on their average score. If you're looking at that funding based on score percentage, everyone was given the recommended funding based solely on their average score. And then a consistent cut of those funds was applied across the board to everyone, no matter what you scored. As long as you scored over 60, you would get some funding. But everyone was cut, say, 40% of what their funding would have been. Because of that, no one ever could receive full funding because of the limited funds, which is why this funding table was created so that if you scored 95-100, you have the possibility of getting full funding.

Ms. Rappa asked if there were further questions or comments. There were none.

Motion: Approve the FY20 Project Grants for Artists as presented by staff.

By: Mark Salinas

Second: Amanda Horn

Vote: Passed unanimously

G. Public Hearing on LCB File No. R099-18 (Discussion Only)

Tabled until a further meeting.

H. Consideration of Public Comment Received Regarding Proposed Regulation LCB File No. R099-18 (For Possible Action)

Tabled until a further meeting.

I. Adoption of LCB File No. R099-18 (For Possible Action)

Tabled until a further meeting.

J. Review Board Terms (Discussion Only)

Mr. Tony Manfredi noted the following terms for the Board members:

Edward Estipona's term ends on June 20 of '21.

Amanda Horn's term ends on June 20th of '23.

Andy Lott's term ends on September of 2023.

Karen Michaels's term ends on June of 2020.

Gail Rappa's term ends on June of 2023.

Mark Salinas' term ends on June of 2021.

Jerry Schefcik's term ends on June 2021.

Ryrie Valdez's term ends on June 2023.
Yale Yeandel's term ends on September 2023.

Mr. Manfredi noted that Ms. Karen Michaels's term is shorter because she took over portions of Julia Arger's term. Mr. Manfredi stated the process for renewing. After turning in all documentation, the governor will appoint who he wishes to appoint at that timeframe. Recommendations can be given to Boards and Commissions from the Executive Director of the agency.

Ms. Gail Rappa added that if any member is planning on renewing to make sure to start the process well in advance.

Mr. Manfredi made mention that the next teleconference will be held Friday, March 27th at 1:30 p.m. Also, June 25th will be an in-person board meeting held in Las Vegas from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., tentatively.

K. Board Elections (For Possible Action)

Mr. Manfredi noted that Ms. Gail Rappa is serving as Chair. Mr. Edward Estipona has shown interested in Vice Chair. There is currently no interest in Treasurer. The Treasurer conducts meetings in the absence of Nevada Arts Council Chairperson and Vice Chair and follows all the duties that happen with the Chair. It's a position that is defined by statute, and it's something that, as the Board moves forward, it could and should probably look at what are some other duties that the Treasurer can do for the agency.

Ms. Karen Michaels noted that while math is not her forte, she is interested in the Treasurer position. Neither Mark Salinas nor Jerry Schefcik desired to turn their names in for consideration for Treasurer.

The new positions would be Gail Rappa as Chair, Edward Estipona as Vice Chair and Karen Michaels as Treasurer.

Motion: To approve the three positions for Board Elections

By: Jerry Schefcik

Second: Mark Salinas

Vote: Passed unanimously

L. Executive Director Update (Discussion Only)

Mr. Manfredi updated the Board and stated, all kinds of amazing things happening here. First and foremost, we did submit our final report for the 2019 National Endowment for the Arts Partnership Grant. We're in the process of getting all of our results and details on that report. I can tell you preliminary run-through of the numbers. Everything has gone up in terms of amount of funds that we distributed. Our impact matched funds and the like. So, the numbers look really nice.

We're in the process right now of a job search for a new Administrative Services Officer, as well as an Accountant Tech. Jared Franco took a promotion and moved on. Angie Mathiesen from Tourism has been helping us in the interim. I've gone through a number of interviews already. I have two more on Monday. Gone through a pretty extensive list. I really hope to find someone that can be very good on the fiscal side, but also help on the administrative side and the inside of process and procedure and be a really critical number two for me.

We recently hired Krista Ficken as the administrative person in the grant program and she had hit the ground running doing a great job. She and Sierra, if you love detail, you would love to watch Krista and Sierra work. It is crazy. They are attention-to-detail hawks. It's fantastic. Very appreciative of that, and Sierra's done a great job of building a team.

We're in the process of deciding what we want to do with another position that we have. Pat Atkinson retired at the end of June. We promoted Rebecca Snetselaar to her role as the lead in the Folklife department. We are deciding where we want to move with that additional position, it could either be in Folklife or in another area in the agency. I will keep you posted once that's decided and once we fill it.

From the federal side of things, the Department of Interiors is part of the continuing evolution still that - I think it's December 21st that that expires. Depending upon what happens in Congress, that will either be extended or there may be a shutdown. What's important for us to note is it doesn't so much affect our '21 Grant, although it would long-term. More importantly, we'll know where our numbers are once this has been approved. So, that will be good.

The House has proposed a \$16.7million increase, and the Senate approved only \$2M. So, there were some big discrepancies there. Americans for the Arts feels pretty confident that we'll at least get the two [\$2M] in the increase. That will increase our amount for '21. However, of note, if the government shuts down, what that means is we can't draw down funds from the NEA as needed.

We're going to make sure we draw down what we know we need at this point, prior to that December 21 timeframe so we can get that in process. If that continues longer term than we expect, the next course of action would be to let grant applicants know that we have to hold off on their payments until we can get that money in. Hopefully, it's not an issue, and all this goes according to plan. But if it doesn't, I'll keep you posted so you are aware.

We had a fantastic IDEA through Reconciliation Conference down here in Las Vegas on November 6th and 7th. Michelle and Grace did some really great work on this topic. And it was great to be a part of because it drew on looking inwardly about our own biases that we have on inclusion, diversity, equity. The group members who were there, some struggled with it at the beginning, but then through the course of the meeting really came to grips with it. We're excited to continue this work and bring it up to northern Nevada and also bring it into the rural areas. So, great work from the team there.

From the grant side, we did a number of workshops. Sierra was a Traveling Wilbury of sorts. Getting to Elko and Winnemucca, and Fallon and Lovelock and Carson and Reno and Vegas and Pahrump. Down in the Las Vegas workshop we actually partnered with the National Endowment for the Arts and they have I believe over 80 people in attendance. It was fantastic to be able to get word out about on 2021 grants.

Our Folklife program is continuing its Friends and Neighbors initiative, working to identify and document traditional artists and communities throughout Nevada. Rebecca came up to the Italian Festival in Reno and took pictures of a baker who was cooking his own sauce from a family recipe. She's going to be heading back up there to get a picture of him in his baker attire. These lenticulars that we are producing focus on a particular person in what would be culturally traditional attire and then their everyday work attire.

In October Arts Education planned and coordinated a stakeholders meeting on arts education. We had a number of people in Las Vegas and Carson City to discuss an art education strategic plan for Nevada. We had some legislative participation in that as well, which was great. Discussions of potential bills to put forward in the next sessions around this topic are in their infancy but being discussed. We are creating some committees that will help move all of this work forward.

One of the most interesting things that I found with the group was that a number of people that are doing great work in arts education, and this work will allow us to identify all of these assets and maximize them toward their strengths, and also find out what kind of gaps we have. So, really great work that Maryjane put together in that arena.

From our Artist Services side, the NTI Traveling Exhibition Program continues to be such a bright spot for the agency. This is the program that brings professionally curated visits throughout the state. Most often, it might be the only professionally curated exhibit that a particular organization or region may get. It's a small barrier of entry of \$150 to take part in it. We come and bring the exhibit in. We set it up, we tear it down, provide resources for it as well. The team has been working on getting Home Means Nevada and Still Here Now exhibits out and about. Home Means Nevada is fully booked for two years, and Still Here Now, which was just launched, I believe we have three spaces available for that exhibit. So, great work to the team there.

Another element that that team is working on is through the use of our rural funding to provide rural communities the ability to request funds for hanging systems. Some of the environments we go into and really don't have a professional hanging system to display the work. Through this funding we are able to get them a hanging system. We help them purchase it and set it up, and then Stephen works with the organizations to instruct them on how to hang exhibits. What we found is that this creates a ripple effect. Once our exhibit comes and goes, then other exhibits are more likely to be curated and put up by the organization. So, it's a really cool program.

One last point. For those that have the opportunity to take part in or help push people to take part in the census, please do so. The census has a direct connection to federal funds that come into the state of Nevada. And we know that our population has expanded. Part of our grant is contingent upon the narrative and strategic plan that we put in place, but then also, it is based on our population. So, the more people that we have, the more money that we receive. And that's, as you know, for the state as a whole in terms of federal funds. So, please encourage people to take part in the census.

And lastly, strategic plans in September of 2020, we will be submitting our next three-year partnership to the National Endowment for the Arts. A big component of that is the strategic plan. We will be talking about that as a group together to the move that works forward. And create a new and exciting and compelling strategic plan.

M. Board Member Update (Discussion Only)

Ms. Rappa asked the Board members to share something arts-related that they're excited about. She started and noted that at GBC, they are hosting the Still Here Now NCI exhibit.

Mr. Edward Estipona noted that while he didn't have anything specifically arts-related, he did attend a Tourism Board and the Board has chosen to move forward with five names to the governor.

Ms. Amanda Horn stated it's a huge benefit to be able to work at the Nevada Museum of Art. Currently, there is a program called the Teen Open Studio that helps support the youth. Starting three months ago, 24 applicants were selected to participate in the program and have real-world lessons and applications with working artists. Through the program, the participants are able to create original artwork to their exhibition called Hooked.

Mr. Andy Lott shared that the dance and theater program from his high school, Las Vegas Academy of the Arts, come together and produce a dance and theater program every December that he is excited for.

Ms. Karen Michaels shared her experience working for the Positively Arts Foundation and how she is mentoring two young ladies.

Mr. Mark Salinas noted that he has been doing a lot of research on grant applications for a foundation in Reno and the National Association of Latino Arts and Culture in San Antonio, Texas.

Mr. Jerry Schefcik noted that he went to a concert at the Corral. It's sad that they are ending their run, but they appreciated that the Arts Council is one of the funders of the organization.

Ms. Ryrie Valdez looks forward to collaborating with the Sierra Nevada Ballet.

Mr. Yale Yeandel enjoyed this time helping his wife with the Poppy Foundation.

N. Future Agenda Items (Discussion Only)

Ms. Gail Rappa noted that at the next meeting the Board will be reviewing the Board handbook.

O. Public Comment

None

P. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

Ms. Rappa thanked everyone, wished everyone a happy holiday and said she would accept a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Adjourn the December 13th, 2019 Nevada Arts Council Board Meeting

By: Amanda Horn

Second: Edward Estipona

Vote: Passed unanimously