

APPROVED



Nevada Arts Council

Board Meeting

Thursday, February 24, 2022 – 2:00 PM

MEETING LOCATION:

Nevada Arts Council
716 N. Carson St.
Suite A
Carson City, NV 89701

Websites:

<https://www.nvartscouncil.org/about/public-meeting-notices/>

<https://notice.nv.gov>

BOARD MEMBERS

Jerry Schefcik, Chair
Claire Munoz, Vice Chair
Andy Lott, Treasurer
Gail Rappa
Patrick Duffy
Javon Johnson
Mark Salinas
Yale Yeandel

STAFF

Tony Manfredi
Sierra Scott
Rebecca Snetselaar
Stephen Reid
Sapira Cheuk
Michelle Patrick
Cathleen Wyatt
Erica Hill

DAG

Harry Ward

MEETING MINUTES

A. Opening

1. Call to Order and Confirmation of Proper Posting – Jerry Schefcik

Chair Jerry Schefcik called the meeting to order and asked if the meeting had been properly posted.

APPROVED

Executive Director, Tony Manfredi, responded that the meeting was in compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law and had been properly noticed and posted.

2. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum – Jerry Schefcik.

Chair Schefcik conducted roll call and determined quorum was established.

Present:

Jerry Schefcik, Claire Munoz, Andy Lott, Gail Rappa, Patrick Duffy, Javon Johnson, Yale Yeandel, Mark Salinas.

Nevada Art Council staff in attendance were introduced – Tony Manfredi, Sierra Scott, Stephen Reid, Sapira Cheuk, Erica Hill, Rebecca Snetselaar, Cathleen Wyatt, Michelle Patrick.

Harry Ward was present from the Attorney General’s Office.

B. Public Comment

1. Public comment is welcomed by the Committee. Members of the public who wish to participate during a public meeting may do so by providing public comment during the two designated public comment periods. Additionally, Public comment options may include, without limitation, telephonic or email comment. A period of public comment will be allowed at the beginning and at the end of the meeting. Because of time considerations, the period for public comment by each speaker may be limited to three (3) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, and speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers.
2. Executive Director to state and read any written public comments that have been received before the meeting.

There was no public comment.

C. For Possible Action – Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Board Minutes – Jerry Schefcik

There were no questions or corrections. Chair Schefcik asked for a motion to approve. Mark Salinas made a motion to approve. Claire Munoz seconded. There was unanimous consent from all board members present. The vote passed to approve the minutes for February 19, 2021.

APPROVED

There were no questions or corrections. Chair Schefcik asked for a motion to approve. Gail Rappa made a motion to approve. Mark Salinas seconded. There was unanimous consent from all board present members. The vote passed to approve the minutes for May 21, 2021.

D. For Possible Action – FY 22 Fellowship Awards

1. Review FY22 Performing Arts Fellowship Panel Review - T. Manfredi, A. Lott, S. Scott, S. Reid, S. Cheuk

Tony Manfredi stated there were a total of 19 applications received for the fiscal year 2022 performing Arts Fellowship Grant. In fiscal year 22, there is funding available for five grants at \$5,000 each in this category. To honor the panel's thoughtful review and scoring, the Nevada Arts Council's recommendation is to fund the five highest scoring applications at this amount.

Andy Lott stated the grant review panel, charged with reviewing FY 22 Performing Arts Fellowship Grant applications, convened in a public meeting virtually on January 11th, 2022. The panel reviewed 19 applications in the following areas:

Category 1 - Dance, music, theater, storytelling, performance

Category 2 - choreography, theater direction

Category 3 - music composition.

There were nine applicants in Category 1 of dance, music, theatre, storytelling performance, six applicants in Category 2 of choreography and theatre direction, and four in Category 3 of music composition. The panelists were Johanna Lundy from Tucson, Arizona, a principal horn of the Tucson symphony and assistant professor of Horn at the Fred Fox School of Music at the University of Arizona. Nikki Weaver from Portland, Oregon, the executive director of On the Inside, co-founder of Portland Playhouse, and Tanya Wideman-Davis from Lexington County, South Carolina, co-director a Wideman-Davis Dance, associate professor at the University of South Carolina in the Department of Theatre and Dance and African American studies. The applications were scored according to the following review criteria:

Artistic excellence for 60 points, creative and inventive use of the medium, consistency, and the exceptional caliber of the work.

Artistic Merit for 40 points, evidence that the work reflects the development of the artist and mysterious aesthetic investigation.

Andy said that before the panel meeting, the panelists reviewed all 19 applications and the support material online and submitted preliminary scores and comments. All the applications were reviewed in an anonymous process with concealed applicant names and identifying information.

APPROVED

During Round 1, the panelists shared their preliminary scores, comments, and then discussed each application as a group. After each application was discussed, panelists had the opportunity to submit a Round 1 score for that application. If a panelist had a change from their preliminary score to their Round 1 score, they were asked to provide the reasoning for that change. After all Round 1 scores were confirmed, Nevada Arts Council staff reviewed the scores to determine which applications moved on to the next round based upon the average score. It was determined that 13 applications with an average score of 67 and above would move on to the next round.

Andy said that during Round 2, the panelists had a more in-depth discussion of the 13 remaining applications. After each application was discussed, the panelists had the opportunity to give a Round 2 score for that application. If the panelists had a change from Round 1 to their Round 2 score, they had to provide the reasoning for that change.

Andy continued that after Round 2, the panelists reviewed their scores one final time and collectively agreed that a Round 3 of discussion was not necessary as they were committed to their scores and the recommended application ranking. Andy read the public comment from the panel. The first was from Tony Manfredi, Executive Director, who thanked the panelists for their thoughtful approach to the review process, he thanked panel chair Andy and the Nevada Arts Council staff for their dedication to the work.

The second public comment was from Harry Ward, the Deputy Attorney General who commended everyone on their work.

Andy said that the Grants Program staff will now facilitate the scoring review for the FY22 Performing Arts Fellowship Grants.

Sierra Scott said the scoring spreadsheet was included in the materials that the board had received prior to the meeting. She said the Round 1 scores on the scoring spreadsheet that were blue were scores that were changed as part of the [review] process that Andy just went through. She said that the applications that were [in gray] were underneath the cut, Round 2 scores are for the remaining applications, and finally the top five applications are highlighted in yellow.

Sierra said that based on these scores, the panel recommended funding the top five high scoring applicants which were:

Application number AFP22-05, Jacqueline Straughan. Discipline is dance and the final score was 83.7.

Application number AFP22-19, Annamarie Cavallone, theatre direction and the final score was 78.3.

Application number AFP22-18, Raja Rahman, discipline of music, final score 76.3.

APPROVED

Application number AFP22-22, Keith Thompson, discipline of music composition, average score of 74.

Application number AFP22-16, Pierce Emata, discipline of music, final score of 71.7.

Sierra stated that in the board report, there were some comments made by the panelists for each [applicant].

Andy Lott stated this was his first time chairing a grant panel and it was a really great conversation. He stated it opened his eyes and thoughts to things that he hopes will influence the way they move forward.

Mark Salinas stated that it said that all applications are reviewed in anonymous process with concealed applicant names and identifying information. He asked staff to describe that process.

Sierra Scott stated their [grant] management system has a feature for concealed review so panelists can't see name, address, etcetera. [For this grant] staff goes through every application to make sure that there's no identifying information in the samples themselves before they get to the panelists process.

Mark Salinas asked if he was to start a sentence saying, as a second-generation Latino living in Reno, would that be content that staff would omit.

Tony Manfredi replied no, they wouldn't block that out.

Mark Salinas stated he saw for the Performing Arts, [scores] 67 and up were forwarded to the next round and Literary Arts [scores] 66 and up was forwarded to the next round, and our FY 22 grant review process says 70 or less will not be funded. He asked what the consistency was in those two, that 70 that the board voted on.

Sierra Scott stated they could probably use a little bit more specificity in what the board had approved. She said the 70 score is to award project grants and the fellowship grants have a different scoring rubric. She stated they should clarify that in the policies for the future because they [Contemporary Fellowship Grants] are the only grants that have multiple round reviews.

Mark Salinas stated he noticed that in folk arts that those three applicants were not anonymous.

Rebecca Snetselaar stated that the Folklife grants haven't been anonymous. Given the nature of the work samples and the supplemental materials that are required for [the Folklife Fellowship] Grant, it would be difficult to make them anonymous because they do present more information about the artists and their involvement with the community. She said this will be the last year they will

APPROVED

award that [Folklife Fellowship] grant and they decided to stick with what they have done before and will make changes next year.

Mark Salinas asked if a grants panelist called in on the open meeting, how would they follow the discussion of their application, if everything is anonymous.

Sierra Scott stated the applicants all have access to their grant number and a link to the agenda so that they can follow along. She said they also all received a link to this meeting as well.

Tony Manfredi stated when Rebecca states that this is a new grant and the last time we will be doing it, she is referring to the folk art category. He said, for clarity, we are actually in [discussing] the Performing Arts Fellowship now. He did not want there to be any confusion among those watching or the board that we're not moving forward with fellowship [grants] in the other categories.

Mark Salinas asked if there's a board member conflict of interest, could they abstain from that vote.

Tony Manfredi replied yes - that all board members fill out a conflict-of-interest form on areas that you have a conflict of interest, and you will identify that when we move to [approve] those grants.

Tony also stated they were being asked questions from attendees in the chat function, and he let attendees know that staff and board are unable to respond to their questions [due to open meeting law]. He said if [those viewing] have comments, they may provide them in the public comment portion at the end of this meeting.

2. **Possible vote** to accept FY22 Performing Arts Fellowship Awards – Jerry Schefcik

Chair Schefcik asked for a motion to approve the panel recommendations. Clair Munoz motioned to approve. Mark Salina seconded. There was unanimous consent from all board members present and the vote passed to approve the FY22 Performing Arts Fellowship recipients.

3. Review FY22 Literary Arts Fellowship Panel Review – T. Manfredi, G. Rappa, S. Reid, S. Cheuk

Tony Manfredi stated there were a total of 33 applications received for the fiscal year 2022 Literary Arts Fellowship Grant. In fiscal year 22, there is funding available for five grants at \$5,000 each in this category. Through the panels thoughtful review and scoring, the Nevada Arts Council recommendation is to fund the highest scoring five applications at this amount. He then turned it over to panel review chair Gail Rappa.

APPROVED

Gail Rappa stated the grant review panel, charged with the reviewing FY 22 Literary Arts Fellowship grant applications, convened in a public meeting virtually on January 12 and January 28, 2022. The panel reviewed 33 applications in the following areas:

**21 in creative prose,
three in dramatic writing,
nine in poetry.**

Gail said the panel meeting was originally scheduled for one day, however, after the conclusion of Round 1, one of the panelists was feeling ill so the panel meeting was adjourned and rescheduled on January 28. The panelists were Chad M. Christiansen, Omaha, Nebraska managing editor of the WSC Press and the director of the Plains Writer series, Indigo Moor from Sacramento California, Poet Laureate Emeritus of Sacramento and adjunct professor at Dominican University, and Shabnam Nadiya from California, Bangladeshi, writer and translator.

The applications were scored according to the following review criteria.

A Artistic Excellence, 60 points, creative and inventive use of the medium, consistency and exceptional caliber of the work.

B Artistic Merit, 40 points, evidence that artwork reflects the development of the artist and a serious aesthetic investigation.

Gail said that before the panel meeting the panelists reviewed all 33 applications and support material online and submitted preliminary scores and comments. All applications were reviewed in an anonymous process that concealed applicant names and identifying information.

During Round 1, panelists shared their preliminary scores and comments, then discussed each application as a group. After each application was discussed, panelists had the opportunity to confirm Round 1 scores for that application. If the panelists change scores from their preliminary score to the Round 1 score, they were asked to provide the reasoning for the change. After all Round 1 scores were confirmed Nevada Arts Council staff reviewed the scores to determine which applications moved on to the next round based upon average score. It was determined that the 17 applications with the average score of 66 or above would move on to the next round.

During Round 2, when the panel reconvened on January 28, panelists continued the review with a more in-depth discussion of the remaining 17 applications. After each application was discussed, panelists provide a Round 2 score for that application. If the panelists had a change from the Round 1 score to the Round 2 score, they were asked to provide the reasoning for the change.

APPROVED

After Round 2 the panelists reviewed their scores one final time and collectively agreed that a Round 3 was not necessary as they were committed to their scores and the recommended application ranking.

Gail said there were public comments provided on day two of the panel meeting and read those comments. Harry Ward, deputy Attorney General reminded everyone that the meeting was being transcribed and to be sure to state their name before they talk. Mike Ross gave public comment at both the beginning and the end of the meeting. He thanked the panel for their time and energy and asked the Nevada Arts Council to consider dividing the literary arts fellowship into separate disciplines. Regina Hansen commented that she appreciated listening into the process and asked if in the future, panelists could cite a quote from each application so the applicants would know if their application was being discussed. Gail said that as panel chair, she thought it was a robust discussion, with very thoughtful comments and feedback from all three panelists. She then concluded that Grants Program staff would facilitate the scoring review for the FY 22 Literary Arts Fellowship grant applications and asked the board to please see the included score spreadsheet.

Sierra Scott stated the scores that were changed in Round 1 were in blue and that they could see the cutoff point [in gray], the applications that were discussed for Round 2, and the top five highlighted [in yellow]. Based on the scores, the panel recommended funding the top five highest scoring applicants which were:

Application number AFL22-03 Heather Lang-Cassera, discipline of poetry with a final score of 86.7.

Application number AFL22-16 Brittany Bronson, discipline of creative prose with an average score of 86.

Application number AFL22-05, Justin Evans from discipline of poetry with an average score of 82.7.

Application number AFL22-27, Josh Webster, discipline dramatic writing, average final score of 82.

Application number AFL22-04, Ben Rogers in creative prose with an average final score of 80.7.

Tony Manfredi stated he did receive a letter of appeal on this panel review dated February 20th, 2022 from Krista Lukas, an applicant, which stated:

Dear Mr. Manfredi,

APPROVED

I am writing to appeal the decision of the FY23 Nevada Arts Council Literary Arts Fellowship panel about my application, AFL22-34, Creative Prose.

I would like to thank the Nevada Arts Council (NAC) for its commitment to art making and education. The Nevada Arts Council has supported me as a professional writer in many ways: I received a Literary Artist Fellowship in creative prose (FY07); I have been a Jackpot Grant recipient and panelist; I've received Artist Express Grants to teach in public schools and at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center; I have judged Poetry Out Loud at the school, county, and state levels, including as the poet judge in 2013, the same year as the release of my poetry collection, Fans of My Unconscious. Funding from NAC has allowed me more time to write than I would have had otherwise, and I credit the organization for helping me achieve national and international recognition. I have read for audiences and led workshops in the United States and Europe. My poems have been translated into foreign languages, including for publication in the Russian in Poluntuna magazine and the Swedish in the anthology Eclectica. Poems from Fans of My Unconscious were selected for The Best American Poetry 2006 and The Writer's Almanac.

I base my appeal on the lack of a round three. As we saw in the round two discussion on January 28, the panelists conversed and even asked the opinions of others to help them decide whether to rescore or not. A few scores stayed the same, and many increased or decreased. At the end of round two, it was left up to the panelists to confirm the top five scores or to state an application number, the new score, and a justification for that change. Further discussion would have allowed panelists to work out small differences as they worked out large differences in earlier rounds. For example, at the end of round one, application AFL22-04 ranked fifth with an average score of 75.3, my application, AFL22-34 ranked sixth with an average score of 71.3, a difference of 4 points. During round two, both of our scores increased, AFL22-04 to 80.7, and mine, AFL22-34 to 79.3, a difference of 1.4 points. Requiring round three would create a more fair and equitable process for the panelists and the applicants.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely, Krista Lukas

APPROVED

Tony then read the appeals process paragraph from the Nevada Arts Council fiscal year 2022 grant policies that were approved by the Nevada Arts Council board during its May 21, 2021 board meeting:

“An applicant who disputes a review panel's recommendation on grounds of procedural errors may request a review of that recommendation by the Nevada Arts Council board. Procedural errors might include a technical error preventing panelists from properly viewing the application or a failure of a panelist with a non-conflict of interest to abstain from the discussion. Disagreement with the judgment of the panel or the amount of the word is not grounds for an appeal. Incomplete applications are not eligible to appeal. To file an appeal the applicant must submit a letter to the Nevada Arts Council executive director within 30 days of the panel meeting stating the reason or reasons for the appeal.”

He stated Krista Lukas's letter was received within 30 days of the January 28 panel meeting. He provided the agency's response to the appeal:

“We appreciate Krista Lukas reaching out to the agency. We're grateful to have an extensive working relationship with her as a previous fellowship grant recipient, a former panelist, and as part of our teaching artist roster. We understand and admire the dedication and commitment that she has to her work, we know it's a comprehensive process to submit a fellowship application and that the panel review process is a unique and very personal experience for an applicant.

Lukas based her appeal on the lack of Round 3 review. The fellowship panels did have the option to conduct three rounds of review; however, there is no requirement in our guidelines that the panel must conduct three rounds of review.

The panelists were given the opportunity to conduct a round three review and declined. As panel chair Rappa stated earlier in review of the panel process, item four, final recommendation - After round two the panelists reviewed their scores one final time and collectively agreed that a third round of discussion was not necessary as they were committed to their scores and the recommended application ranking.

The panelists were fully engaged in the process, conducted themselves ethically and provided thoughtful comments and discussions to justify their scores.

The review process was fair and equitable for all panelists and applicants.

There were no procedural errors.

APPROVED

There can be no appeal for a disagreement with the judgment of the panel.

Tony concluded that therefore, the agency's recommendation is to deny the appeal and approve the panel recommendations for the FY 22 Literary Fellowship recipients as presented.”

Mark Salinas endorsed that response.

Chair Schefcik stated he was also in favor of the decision, having been through the process and chaired past panels for fellowships.

4. **Possible vote** to accept FY22 Literary Arts Fellowship Awards – Jerry Schefcik

Chair Schefcik asked for a motion to approve the panel recommendations. Gail Rappa motioned to approve. Andy Lott seconded. Chair Schefcik ask for discussion.

Claire Munoz stated that she appreciated that the council has an appeals process that is set up so the artists can share their response and can seek appeal if it's necessary, and she thanked Tony for the way he handled that response.

Chair Schefcik conducted a vote based upon the motion. There was unanimous consent from all board members present and the vote passed to approve the FY22 Literary Arts Fellowship recipients.

5. Review FY22 Folk Arts Fellowship Panel Review – T. Manfredi, S. Scott, R. Snetselaar

Tony Manfredi stated that there was a total of three applications received for the fiscal year 2022 Folk Arts Fellowship Grant. All applications were deemed eligible and were reviewed by the grant panel. For fiscal year 22 there is one \$5,000 grant available in this category. He said to honor the panel's thoughtful review and scoring the Nevada Arts Council's recommendation is to fund the high scoring applicant at this amount.

Tony said the grant review panel, charged with reviewing the FY 22 folk art fellowship grant applications, convened in a public meeting virtually on January 19, 2022. Yale Yeandel was slated to be the panel chair for this grant, but due to technical difficulties was unable to join the panel so he stepped in as panel chair.

Tony said the panelists were Josh Chrysler, Cheyenne, Wyoming Folklorist and Health and Wellness in the Arts specialist at the Wyoming Arts Council, Ian Halligan, Logan, Utah, Heritage and Folk Art specialist at Bear River Heritage Area, and program manager at Western Folklife Center, Jennifer Jameson, Long Beach California program manager and media director at Alliance for California

APPROVED

Traditional Arts, and Lilli Tichinin, Santa Fe, New Mexico, program coordinator for Folk Arts, Folk Arts, Art Projects and Accessibility at New Mexico Arts.

Tony said the applications were scored according to the following review criteria:

Artistic Excellence, 75 points - demonstrates mastery of traditional skills and techniques, reflects and conveys, shared community values and aesthetics,

Artistic Merit for 25 points - significance of the art form within the cultural community it represents.

Tony said that before the meeting the panels reviewed all applications and the support material online and submitted preliminary scores and comments. At the panel meeting, the panel shared their preliminary scores and comments then discussed each application as a group. After each application was discussed, the panelists had the opportunity to give a final score for that application. If a panelist had a change from their preliminary score to their final score, they were asked to provide the reasoning for that change. Panelists also had the opportunity to make any final adjustments in the score after all applications have been discussed.

Tony said that the panel discussion was very thorough, panelists were very engaged and had in-depth discussions with each other about each applicant. HE said many panelists did adjust their final scores based on further insights and context that other panelists shared in the discussion of each application. Panelists commented that all three applications were very strong and spoke to different aspects of the criteria. Panelists particularly appreciated the community engagement of the top scoring applicant which spoke to the significance of the art form within the cultural community and the shared community values.

Tony said that during the panel, there was public comment from Harold D. Akyeampong. He made a public comment at the conclusion of the panel to clarify that music, dance, and drumming are all interconnected in African traditional arts.

Sierra Scott stated the score sheet looks a little bit different as this was just one round and there were only three applicants. She said the applicants are sorted from highest to lowest average score.

Application number AFF22-04, Harold Akyeampong with an average score of 90.3.

Application number AFF22-01, Xian Na Carlson with an average score of 83.8.

Application number AFF22-02, Binnie Tate Wilkin with an average score of 82.5.

Based on the scores, the panel recommended funding the highest scoring applicant Harold D. Akyeampong.

APPROVED

Yale Yeandel stated he thought some of the scoring was influenced by the scoring of whoever scored first. He felt it may be biased because the group will always change the score according to what the person's comments were before. He stated there was randomness as far as the order of the judges giving their scoring numbers. The people who were scoring last have the strongest influence on the score changes.

Javon Johnson asked if it was safe to say that the person who has the highest score therefore was always judged last.

Tony Manfredi stated he asked each panelist [for their score] in a different order to remedy that. He stated it is in the recording for the panel review meeting. He continued that each panelist certainly has the ability to listen and modify and change their score and if the panel chair or staff sees any kind of bias or potential influence creeping in, they will step in. Tony stated that they did not experience that [bias] in this panel review.

Yale agreed that there wasn't any bias. He said it just appeared to him that scores were taken in the same order, that scores changed, and he couldn't see the randomness to it.

Rebecca Snetselaar stated this was a panel of four. She said that the Folklife applications are extremely difficult to evaluate against each other because they are so different and so strong. She said that it was not unusual in the Folklife panels that they see variation from the preliminary scores. She stated she thought that this panel brought so much to the discussion.

6. **Possible vote** to accept FY22 Folk Arts Fellowship Awards – Jerry Schefcik

Chair Schefcik asked for a motion to approve the panel recommendations. Andy Lott motioned to approve. Yale Yeandel seconded.

Chair Schefcik conducted a vote based upon the motion. There was unanimous consent from all board members present and the vote passed to approve the FY22 Folk Arts Fellowship recipients.

E. Discussion Only – Agency Updates

1. Arts Council Program Area and Staffing Updates – Tony Manfredi

Tony Manfredi gave updates on staffing and positions. He said that due to personal circumstances, Tiffany White, who came on board as Administrative Services Officer in December, has resigned her position, so they are, once again, on the search for another Administrative Services Officer.

APPROVED

Tony said the Arts Initiatives position is currently under recruitment

He said they had concluded their four creative aging training cohort sessions with approximately 100 participants who completed the training. He said they will now begin the follow-up and the grant funding portion of this program. He shared a message that participant **Joylynn Ross sent to Rebecca:**

Rebecca, I've done more training than I can count in all my years as both a literary artist and instructor, a government employee, as well as an employee in corporate America and the private sector, and never -- not once -- did I ever attend a training that felt less like training and more like an experience than I did with the Creative Aging Initiative training. Prior to the three nights before each day of training, never did I go to sleep the night before saying, "I can't wait to wake up and attend training!"

I know this might sound like an oxymoron, but I felt comfortable outside my comfort zone. Who knew this training would mean me participating in comedic improv? Would mean me, as the student, sharing my own successes and failures, allowing others to learn from them? Me learning from my fellow trainees as well? The input. The feedback. The comradery. I mean, I've had phone conversations with two other trainees already. Partnerships, relationships and bonds were formed.

I thank NAC and Lifetime Arts for equipping and empowering me with the tools, resources and confidence to change lives in a way I previously only imagined doing. And for adding purpose to my life.

Tony said that they were we're excited about moving the grant element of this forward.

Tony continued that Basin to Range Exchange is a CAD-driven professional development workshop that will take place in Tonopah on April 18th through 20th. Michelle and Erica are leading the initiative. The focus of this program is to bring our metro and rural arts leaders together to engage, collaborate and learn.

He said Broadway in the Hood and their performance of American Sun continues tomorrow and Saturday in Carson City, and next Friday and Saturday in Reno. He shared data on the previous performances and the ticket requests.

West Las Vegas

January 8th – 119 attendees

January 9th – 75 attendees

Boulder City

January 15th – 25 attendees

APPROVED

January 29th - SOLD OUT (65 attended for 75 seat show)

Carson City & Reno

February 25th - 26th - TBD (Carson City) Brewery Arts Center

March 4th - 5th - TBD (Reno) Reno Little Theater

Henderson

March 18th - TBD (**Final Performance**)

He stated Sapira and Stephen in Artist Services are conducting virtual listening sessions with artists to solicit feedback and information on the topics of artistic excellence and artistic merit. These sessions are Tuesday, March 1st at 5:30 p.m. and Wednesday, March 2nd at 10:00 a.m.

Tony said that Artists Services is also conducting a virtual professional development workshop for artists on tax preparation on Thursday, March 3rd at 12 noon.

He moved on to Nevada Poetry Out Loud and said they will virtually crown a state champion on March 8th at 5:30 p.m. The state champion will represent Nevada and compete in the national competition in May. They have representatives from five counties this year, Clark, Elko, Lyon, Storey, and Washoe Counties.

Tony concluded that Sierra and Krista from the Grants Program continue with FY 22 and FY 23 grant applications that are opening and closing in various stages.

F. Discussion Only – Future Agenda Items

1. Grant Metrics Discussion to be scheduled during future meeting.
2. Request other future agenda items.

Chair Schefcik asked if any board members had any items they would like to add to the future agenda.

Mark Salinas stated that when he reviewed the grant polices, in reference to the appeal letter, item number 3 on page 3 under panel review caught his eye which states “is employed by or volunteers for an applicant.” He said this would render someone to recuse themselves from a vote. He stated he was wondering if they should add language about a member of that organization. He thought that being a volunteer is an in-kind service with a national value of \$20.54. He said that another type of investment is an annual membership to these organizations. He stated he wanted to bring that to staff’s attention as something they may want to add. He stated he would also like to include last year's future agenda item he had made February 21 of a land acknowledgement. Not only an acknowledgement but how they can, as an agency, create measurable action, so it's not performative.

APPROVED

Chair Schefcik stated they would have those put on future agenda items.

G. Public Comment

1. Public comment is welcomed by the Committee. Members of the public who wish to participate during a public meeting may do so by providing public comment during the two designated public comment periods. Additionally, Public comment options may include, without limitation, telephonic or email comment. A period of public comment will be allowed at the beginning and at the end of the meeting. Because of time considerations, the period for public comment by each speaker may be limited to three (3) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, and speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers.
2. Executive Director to state and read any written public comments that have been received during the meeting.

Sierra Scott reminded the board members that the agency has two of their larger annual FY 23 grants open right now. The Operating Support Grant for arts organizations and the Project Grant for Organizations. She stated she would appreciate them spreading the word about these opportunities.

Gail Rappa stated she wanted to thank Tony and the staff and praised their work during such a busy time of year.

Tony Manfredi stated that they did have a question in the chat from Bernard Gaddis.

Harry Ward stated that Tony didn't have to read it. Harry said whatever is in the chat is not included in the public comment for open meeting law, but if the person in the chat wants to make a public comment, they can do that right now.

There was no response.

Chair Schefcik asked if there had been any comment by phone or e-mail.

None had been received.

Chair Schefcik thanked the staff and board for their comments. He said these grants are significant and it's great for those who have received them.

H. For Possible Action – Adjournment

Chair Schefcik adjourned the meeting.