

**APPROVED**



**Nevada Arts Council**

**Board Meeting**

Friday, September 17, 2021 – 1:00 PM

**MEETING LOCATION:**

DUE to COVID-19 this will be a virtual meeting via ZOOM conference platform

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Gail Rappa, Chair

Andy Lott

Claire Munoz

Patrick Duffy

Yale Yeandel

Mark Salinas

**STAFF:**

Tony Manfredi

Sierra Scott

Rhonda Pena

Cathleen Wyatt

Stephen Reid

Michelle Patrick

Maryjane Dorofachuk

Harry Ward

**MEETING MINUTES**

**A. Opening** \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Call to Order and Confirmation of Proper Posting – Gail Rappa.

**Gail Rappa called the meeting to order and confirmed proper posting.**

- b. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum – Gail Rappa.

**Gail Rappa conducted roll call. Javon Johnson, Melissa Melero-Moose and Jerry Schefcik were unable to attend. Their absence was recognized as excused. A quorum was established. Staff was introduced.**

**B. Public Comment** \_\_\_\_\_

- a. 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,

## **APPROVED**

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.

- b. Executive Director to state and read any written public comments that have been received before the meeting.

**Tony Manfredi reviewed written comments from Jerry Schefcik in reference to agenda item E and a statement in reference to agenda item F.**

*In reference to Agenda Item E*

*Since the NAC has the opportunity to fully fund all the applicants, provided they have met the qualifications for funding, I think that would be a wonderful use of the funds. The council's task is to get as much money as possible into the hands of as many qualified applicants as possible, this is a great opportunity to do that. I would think that this is a one-time only situation because of the circumstances. If all applicants are to be fully funded, then a panel review and ranking is not really necessary.*

*If there are funds left over from the NAC Project Grants budget, they could possibly be made available for other grants.*

*In reference to Agenda Item F*

*A Target of Opportunity grant would open the door to a quicker response to grant applicants, which I think would be greatly appreciated. If there are funds available, I think this is a good opportunity to fund pilot programs to see if they would be beneficial.*

### **C. For Possible Action – Approval of Minutes** \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Approval of Board Minutes – Gail Rappa

**Andy Lott made a motion to approve the July 17, 2020 minutes with the scrivener errors. Mark Salinas seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Mark Salinas made a motion to approve the September 18, 2020 minutes. Yale Yeandel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

# APPROVED

## D. For Possible Action – Artist + Community Roster \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Review panel meeting and recommendations – Tony Manfredi, Gail Rappa, Maryjane Dorofachuk

**Tony Manfredi reviewed the teaching artist roster. The artists in schools and community roster aims to build a network of educators, teaching artists and cultural organizations to create diverse, innovative, and quality arts learning opportunities for all ages. The roster is divided into two tracks, an education track and a community track. The education track is for artists who conduct arts-based experiences in PreK through 12 settings and the community track is for artists who conduct arts-based learning experiences in community settings.**

**Gail Rappa was the panel chair for the roster review and went over the members of the panel and read through the applicants. She stated that there were wonderful applications. The panel went smoothly which was a testament to how well-prepared the panelists were, what a great job Maryjane had done, getting everything prepared.**

**Tony Manfredi asked if there were any questions from the board on the roster applicants.**

**Mark Salinas asked if [the roster] would be like if a nonprofit has a brick and mortar and they want to hire an artist come in and do a workshop. Maryjane Dorofachuk stated that was correct.**

**Patrick Duffy stated he thought there was one very important lacking component that always seems to be part of the arts and that is the lack of metrics, analytics, and statistics. He stated he thought that the Nevada Arts Council could put together a simplified system of metrics that might challenge recipients to be a little bit more accountable with the use of funds.**

**Gail Rappa stated that is something they could put as a future agenda item and Tony Manfredi stated he thought that was appropriate.**

**Claire Munoz wanted to clarify that what they were reviewing right now is an application for inclusion in the roster, not a grant review.**

**Gail Rappa stated that was correct and what is being approved today is the newest additions to the already well staffed artists roster.**

**Claire Munoz thanked the Nevada Arts Council for the roster and described that she has used it many times in her position, often sends people to the roster, and finds it to be a great resource for the state. She asked if there was a process where people are removed from the roster. Maryjane Dorofachuk explained how people were removed or stayed on the roster.**

## **APPROVED**

- b. Possible vote to approve new Artist + Community Roster – Gail Rappa

**Claire Munoz made a motion to approve the new artist and community roster. Patrick Duffy seconded the motion. The motion passed.**

### **E. For Possible Action – FY 22 Project Grant for Organizations \_\_\_\_\_**

- a. Discuss eliminating panel review requirements for FY22 and changing to staff review of eligibility and project approval. Discuss funding all applicants at full amount of request – Tony Manfredi, Sierra Scott

**Tony Manfredi provided a quick correction. The board will be discussing funding for all *eligible* applicants not all applicants.**

**Sierra Scott stated they received 41- Project Grant for Organization applications for FY 22 and allocated \$250,000 in funding for the grant. She continued that the agency did not get as many applications as in past years and only had requests for a 192,825. In normal times, this grant goes through a panel review where each application would be scored. Funding amounts would be lowered or raised depending on the score. This is a longer process as the panel review usually takes a month for the panelists to review applications and then conduct the actual panel itself. Scott stated that the agency (for this year) is proposing to grant 100% funding to all eligible projects. She stated that the [agency] grant assistant would review for an initial eligibility check and then Scott would verify eligibility in a secondary check. Then a third staff member reviews the application again for eligibility and adherence to the NEA guidelines.**

**Tony Manfredi stated if there are any questions or challenges with those reviews, those come to him for a final review.**

**Mark Salinas asked if the unused moneys could be used for another allocation internally in the agency. Tony Manfredi stated that funding will be utilized in other grant areas.**

**Andy Lott asked about applicants who didn't apply for the full amount of funding.**

**Tony Manfredi stated the maximum amount for this grant was \$5,000. Most everyone, does apply for the max amount but some do not, and the policy is to award applicants only up to the maximum for what they applied.**

**Andy Lott asked if there were any downsides to doing this.**

**Tony Manfredi stated a positive of a panel review is getting feedback from the panelists that could be used to make the next application better. He continued that given [the state of the field due to the pandemic] the ability to get funding out fast, outweighs the scenario of getting panel comments.**

## **APPROVED**

Andy Lott asked if an eligible applicant in this scenario could receive funding if their work wasn't excellent or things he feels the agency doesn't stand for as an organization.

Tony Manfredi stated the only way they wouldn't get funded is if they don't meet the eligibility requirements for the project grant. He stated that staff will take a hard look to making sure that the application meets the basic eligibility requirements that would allow an application to be scored but also that the project meets the requirements that are set forth in the grant itself.

Sierra Scott stated the project would require artistic and/or cultural value and that would speak to artistic excellence. She continued that many of these folks have come in for the same or very similar projects in the past and that they are all 501(c)(3), cultural organizations in good standing. They look for red flags like, those applying with a fiscal agent (who are not eligible this year), if they're not in compliance with the Secretary of State, or they're not licensed to do business in Nevada. She concluded that they work with applicants to help clear up any eligibility errors that are correctable.

Mark Salinas asked if there was any type of reporting for this grant.

Sierra Scott stated there is a final report required within 45 days of project completion or by the end of fiscal year, whichever is sooner. Mark Salinas stated that then means there's an internal way to check the work.

Gail Rappa asked Sierra if she remembered how many are returning applicants for our organizational grant. Sierra Scott stated a rough estimate is 60% to 70%.

Tony Manfredi stated they were keeping tabs on why the applications haven't come in for this grant as they have in the past.

- b. **Possible vote** to a eliminate panel review requirement, allow staff to approve projects, fund all applicants at full amount of request – Gail Rappa

Mark Salinas made a motion to approve this item. Claire Munoz seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion passed.

Tony Manfredi expressed his gratitude to the board for passing this motion.

### **F. For Possible Action – Target of Opportunity Grant \_\_\_\_\_**

- a. Review Target of Opportunity Grant Guidelines – Tony Manfredi, Gail Rappa, Sierra Scott

Tony Manfredi highlighted a proposed target of opportunity grant document and described this as a way for the agency to fund worthwhile projects and activities

## **APPROVED**

that provide targeted funding to support agency initiatives including pilot programs, to provide supplemental resources to resolve immediate and unforeseen needs, and to fund projects that may not fit within the structure and timing of an existing grant program. Target of Opportunity Grant could be opened on an as needed basis through the fiscal year. Grant funding will be established per opportunity and approved by the executive director based upon available funding. The executive director will report out all target of opportunity grant awards to the board upon approval. Specific requirements for each initiative will be included as an addendum to the general guidelines, all funded projects must be completed by a specified deadline, and grantees will have to complete their report within 45 days of that specified - deadline whichever is first. Eligibility would be the same for individuals and organizations and public institutions. The same holds true with funding restrictions and the agency general guidelines and review process. Depending upon the initiative, target of opportunity partnership grant applications may be reviewed in a competitive environment, which would mean a panel process, or a non-competitive process, which would mean staff internal review. Manfredi continued that this could be an opportunity to utilize the unused Project Grant for Organization funds discussed earlier, to move work forward in some other areas this fiscal year. He stated there are also current opportunities to launch a pilot program. The Target of Opportunity Grant could provide the opportunity to strategically, quickly, and carefully get funding out to meet the needs during both our state fiscal year and our federal grant deadline from the NEA.

Mark Salinas asked if this could take the unused portions of existing individual and organization grants and allow staff to attribute that to new grants or does this have the capability of staff, without this board's input or approval, to terminate or pull the plug on a grant that might be not in use or for whatever reasons and utilize that money for something different.

Tony Manfredi stated they certainly wouldn't terminate any grant without coming to the board. He described that every year they review grants and put forth the best possible scenarios that the agency and board feel meet the needs of constituents in the state. The pandemic hit and they [agency and board] had to cancel grants. That was brought to the board. The agency then had to go through an extensive process to get new [responsive] grants out. The intent is to find ways that the agency can strategically and responsively move forward to expend extra or more targeted grant funding out that may not be allocated. The agency does not want to be unable to expend grant funding. Manfredi continued that they want to make sure that it's targeted, meets the initiatives of the agency, and that it's responsive to what they are seeing in the field.

Mark Salinas stated, at present we as an agency have to post the grants for three months and asked if this would expedite that process. Tony Manfredi stated it did.

Mark Salinas stated that's why I read projects that do not fit within the structure or timing of this interesting. Tony Manfredi stated that is something that they

## **APPROVED**

often see. Someone will approach the agency with a project or initiative that they are unable to support because it doesn't fit within the cycle and sequence of the grants. The agency is unable to be as responsive as it could be if this grant were available.

Mark Salinas asked if we were to have this approved and ready to go, what is the award amount?

Tony Manfredi stated each grant would be specific, based on objective, need, available funding. The amount is intentionally left open so that the agency can be flexible based upon available funding. He stated that they would still honor the integrity of the well-established agency grant program by funding all approved grants first. This grant would only be utilized if there was additional or unused funding.

Mark Salinas asked if these grants would be reviewed internally by staff. Tony Manfredi stated that was correct. They would be reviewed for eligibility and, depending upon the initiative, they may decide that they want a panel review.

Mark Salinas thanked staff for the explanation and stated that the intent of this grant made sense to him. He asked if the deadline was June 30, 2022.

Tony Manfredi stated it would go until August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022. He stated that the NEA grant typically ends on August 31 each year and they need to be sure this extra time is included [so NEA funds could be used if needed].

Gail Rappa stated this a pivot grant since we are again going back into potential shutdowns and given the uncertainty, she thinks this grant is pertinent now.

Tony Manfredi stated that our agency has to be responsive and more flexible in certain instances but still accountable.

b. **Possible vote** to approve Target Opportunity Grant – Gail Rappa

Claire Munoz stated she was in full support getting money into the hands of artists and organizations who need it immediately and allowing Nevada Arts Council staff and Manfredi to have some ability to move that money freely with accountability to accomplish that goal. She then made a motion to approve the target opportunity grant. Yale Yeandel seconded the motion.

Mark Salinas asked if they could add the date of August 31<sup>st</sup> to the motion. Tony Manfredi stated that poses a problem if state funds are being used as the deadline for utilizing state funding is June 30. He stated that he understands that the state and federal deadlines are confusing and suggested they say no later than August 31<sup>st</sup>.

Gail Rappa asked Claire Munoz to restate the motion with the addition. Claire Munoz stated she did not support the addition because she thinks they are

## **APPROVED**

unnecessarily putting some restrictions on this. She stated she would like to see a review at the end of June and an update on how funds had been distributed, but she did not agree with the amendment. Gail Rappa asked Mark Salinas if he was okay with that, and he stated no. He stated his rationale is because the executive director has that date of operation that seems to work within this calendar they provided us. This is a new thing for us and I think we're giving 365 days or so for the agency to do something new. I believe putting a date on this is good.

Gail Rappa asked Mark Salinas if he would be comfortable with having a date for a board review of the funds that had been allocated. Mark Salinas stated his question then is is this a grant in perpetuity.

Tony Manfredi stated they review all of their grants every fiscal year. The board has to approve grants every year. This grant, as we're looking at it right now, is just for Fiscal Year 22.

Mark Salinas stated he wanted to extend that extra month into August, so we could also use NEA [funds]. Tony Manfredi stated it doesn't say State Fiscal Year 22, it says Fiscal Year 22 and so that's how we internally manage the difference between state and the federal timelines. Mark Salinas stated, okay, if you have a Fiscal [Year] 22 listed.

Gail Rappa stated they had a first and a second [see above]. A vote was taken and the motion passed.

### **G. For Possible Action – In-Person Board Meeting** \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Discuss October In-Person Board Meeting – Tony Manfredi, Gail Rappa
- b. **Possible vote** on In-Person Board Meeting – Gail Rappa

Tony Manfredi stated they had planned to do an in-person board meeting on October 22nd. With the continuation of the pandemic, he opened up the discussion with the board to see if they wanted to continue to have an in-person board meeting in October or look for a different date.

Gail Rappa stated one of the things she would like to present is the possibility of having both options. For folks who don't feel comfortable traveling, that they could join the actual board meeting virtually, possibly just do a hybrid.

Tony Manfredi stated if postponing it into spring would allow people the possibility to feel more comfortable with an in-person meeting, it's certainly something that we like to consider because getting together is really the key in this meeting.

Mark Salinas stated their last in-person was in Carson and they tried to accommodate both. Tony Manfredi concurred and stated it would be great to be down in Las Vegas, because Jerry was unable to travel to the last one, so being



## **APPROVED**

able to bring this down to Las Vegas and rotate it would be beneficial. Andy Lott stated he would love it if more people could be together because he thought that would help them operate as a unit, not as individuals. If people are not comfortable, then he suggested to postpone.

Claire Muñoz stated she is comfortable traveling, but she has a new conflict with work on the evening of the 23rd that would prohibit her from going. So, she would appreciate a virtual opportunity to connect.

Mark Salinas stated he would be inclined to attend in Las Vegas. I think with so many new board members I think it'd be great to meet everyone to share the same space.

Gail Rappa asked Tony Manfredi if he could individually send a message to the board members and find out if we have a majority. Tony Manfredi stated he can send out another message and get a headcount and then they can decide at that point if they will move forward. No vote was needed at this time.

### **H. Discussion Only – Agency Updates** \_\_\_\_\_

#### **a. Staffing Updates – Tony Manfredi**

Tony Manfredi gave an update on the Community Arts development position for northern Nevada. That position closed on September 9<sup>th</sup> and they are awaiting a list from agency H.R. They are doing a statewide search for the Artist Services position rather than have it be located in Carson City or Las Vegas specifically. Historically, the Artist Services positions has been located in the Carson office.

He stated that from the Administrative Services side of things, Kari Ward, has accepted a transfer to Nevada State Libraries. Her last day is today. Angie Mathiesen from Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs will be assisting the agency in this role until the position is filled. Tony then thanked Kari for her service to the agency and wished her well in her new position.

#### **b. Update on State Poet Laureate – Tony Manfredi**

Tony Manfredi said they are working with the Governor's office on an upcoming announcement that should be ready in the next few days. As soon as that is complete, they will be doing a lot of communication around the poet laureate position and role.

#### **c. Executive Committee Discussion – Tony Manfredi**

Tony Manfredi stated that it was time to elect new executive committee members. He asked if board members were interested in serving as either the chair, vice chair or treasurer, that they email him with their interest and the position, and he

## **APPROVED**

will create a slate for review, discussion, and possible voting for the upcoming board meeting in October. He reviewed what the positions entail.

The chair assures the integrity of the board's process and represents the board to outside parties in general. The chair serves a two-year term from July 1 through June 30th. The role of the chairperson is to work in close partnership with the executive director, to represent the board and staff, to prepare for and chair board meetings, review and approve minutes for full board meetings, ensure that the board remains informed in between meetings, act as a facilitator in board meetings, official liaison with the governor's office, official spokesperson for the board, appoint committee chairs and members, to stay informed of state regional and national issues of interest or concern. The chair only votes in the event of a tie. If possible, attend or send designee to the annual meeting of National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. And then accordingly, job results of the chairperson is that the board behaves consistently with its own rules and those legitimately imposed upon from outside the organization. Meeting discussion content will only be those issues which according to the Arts Council and state of Nevada policies clearly belong to the board to decide, not the executive director, and meeting deliberations will be fair, open and thorough, but also timely, orderly and keeping to the point. Authority of the chair consists in making decisions that fall within topics covered by the board policies on governance, except where the board specifically delegates portions of this authority to other. The chair is also authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of the provision of these policies. Empowered to chair board meetings with all commonly accepted powers of the position examples ruling and recognizing. The chair does not have the authority to make decisions about policies as an individual, and they may represent the board outside parties in announcing board stated positions and in stating chair decisions as interpretations within the area delegated to him or her.

The vice chair conducts meetings in the absence of the Nevada Arts Council chairperson following the above duties in general. The vice chair also serves a two-year term from July 1 through June 30th.

The Treasurer conducts meetings in absence of the Nevada Arts Council Chair and vice chair following the above duties and again two-year term July 1 through June 30th.

There are a couple of positions that are typically either the chair's duties or appointed by the chair, sitting on the Tourism Commission board and on the Cultural Commission, State Historic Preservation Office.

Gail is currently our chair. Jerry is currently our Vice Chair; our Treasurer position is open. There have been discussions in the past about ways that we could actually make the treasurer a more relevant to a fiscally related role but nothing has been established.

Manfredi then stated again that if a board member is interested in serving in a leadership role to please e-mail him that information by October 1st.

# APPROVED

## I. Discussion Only – Future Agenda Items \_\_\_\_\_

Gail Rappa stated to make a note that we will add a discussion about metrics.

Mark Salinas asked Tony if the potential October meeting in Vegas would be the last one for the year, unless something comes up. Tony Manfredi stated he wasn't sure at this time.

Sierra Scott stated their next panel review is for the artist fellowship grant and the folk arts fellowship grants in early January, so they wouldn't need a board meeting to approve those awards until after that.

Tony Manfredi stated they will see about when the next meeting may be.

## J. Public Comment \_\_\_\_\_

- a. 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.
- b. Executive Director to state and read any written public comments that have been received before the meeting.

There was no public comment.

## K. For Possible Action – Adjournment \_\_\_\_\_

Gail Rappa thanked everyone for joining and asked for a motion to adjourn. Mark Salinas moved to adjourn. Andy Lott seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed. The meeting was adjourned.