

COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting

6:30 PM, Thursday, August 8, 2019
3700 South Four Mile Run Drive
Arlington, VA 22206

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEMBERS:

	Present	Absent		Present	Absent
Maggie Boland (MB)	x		Yasmina Mansour (YM)	x	
Ava Boston (AB)	x		Amy McWilliams (AM)	x	
Carol Cadby (CC)	x		Leslie Peterson (LP)		x
Sara Duke (SD)	x		Tom Prewitt (TP)	x	
Pam Farrell (PF)		x	Matthew Randall (MR)	x	
Jane Franklin (JF)	x		Kat Williams (KW)	x	
Pryalal Karmakar (PK)	x		Steven Yates (SY)	x	
Janet Kopenhaver (JK)	x				

CHAIR: Anika Kwinana (AK)

FACILITATOR: Richard Brewster (RB)

COUNTY BOARD MEMBER: Katie Cristol (KC)

STAFF PRESENT: Jill Hunger (JH), Shannon Flanagan-Watson (SFW)

INTRODUCTIONS

- I. Welcome
 - The meeting was called to order by AK at 6:35 pm; quorum present.
- II. Introductions
 - AK introduced herself and asked committee members to introduce themselves, identifying their organization and the subcommittee they are working with.
- III. Remarks from County Board Member Katie Cristol
 - Advocacy from the arts group allowed the County Board to pause, before cuts happen within the budget, to think creatively to think about arts services within the community/region.
 - What problem is this trying to solve? It is not about cutting money from the budget rather it is how to effectively serve the arts: equitably & effectively. How do we turn the resources & commitments into alternatives that can best serve? Effective service delivery.
 - Set the tone for effective engagement for the arts. Core to the vision of the arts strategy of being embedded. Embedded in conversations about land use, education, public facilities, fiscal affairs, etc. We need talented civic advocates embedded in these processes. This is a new chapter of engagement with the arts and we have a newly adopted strategy to guide, *Enriching Lives*.
 - General discussion around the recent Arlington Magazine article. Some members of the committee are looking into the numbers.
 - After her remarks, KC asked if there were any questions. Two members, JF and SD, stated that they recently received an email from Michelle Isabelle-Stark, Director of Cultural Affairs, pertaining to summer camp space indicating that their groups will have to go

through the DPR RFP process for the space & compete with other groups. This will include a 25% surcharge which is a significant change for budgeting.

- There was concern that this action undermines the work of the committee. The position that currently manages the relationship with DPR was a proposed cut. This action indicates that CAD is planning that the position will not exist. Have decisions already been made? What is the level of transparency?
- KC was not aware. Suggested that staff can investigate this issue.
- Additional conversation ensued about this suggested change in the space & services policy administratively. Members of the committee felt this undercuts the relationship between CAD, APS, arts organizations, etc.
- AK suggested there was a silver lining... Because of the work of the community arts groups, this committee was convened, and now this is a place to have such a discussion.

LEVEL SETTING

- IV. Ground Rules, Ground Rules, Expectations & Responsibilities
 - JH reviewed and asked for any comments, edits. No changes.
- V. Review of Project Scope & Work Plan
 - JH reviewed the scope and the work plan and informed the committee of the status and the next steps.

MOVING FORWARD

- VI. Overview of Tools & Models
 - AK provided an overview of the tools and explained the importance of the work of the subcommittees. Challenges. Scenarios. Good first step in understanding.
- VII. Subcommittee Report Out (Scene Shop/Costume Lab; Joint Use; Mobile Stage) – 5 minutes each
 - a. Scenic Shop/CostumeLab: Steven Yates
 - i. Summary of discussions: Many issues span the scene shop and CostumeLab but some are unique. The problem focuses around service delivery - how to get the most bang for the buck. There is a need for consistent branding to effectively market the services. Not really shared spaces – just on middle school campus. How to promote? Challenging because now a user needs to be a grantee to access the space. Are there other options for operations? Turnkey operation – but need to understand costs/insurance/risk management. Maker space ideas – could this be a viable model?

Rubric – generally meets the needs. How do you define the terms? Big question around equity of access – arts commission grants the access not the users. Need to understand hours of access. Value proposition – how to reflect the impact. RB – would this be an add to the rubric with value proposition. Unknown. MB – certain intangibles are challenging to capture. AK – Clarified that the group is still working on creating the definitions.
 - ii. Information required: Is there any threat of space (CostumeLab or Scenic Shop) taken over by APS for instructional space? What has been done since 2014? Some workshops were held but what were the specific topics? YM – explained that students were in a workshop that developed an anti-bullying video. Need to better understand the CostumeLab and barcoding system costs.

AM – Question APS use of the lab or the scene shop. CC – not available to APS. APS can't afford to buy costumes or maintain. Access to costumes & scene shop technicians. Centralized. YM – Gunston – own costumes. Wouldn't go through centralized. CC – never system or welcoming outreach. No generosity to have young people in the shops. SY – find solutions. JH – This is where alternatives come in. CC – Need to understand who will run all these programs? Facilities require expertise to function.

MR – why hasn't there been cross-pollination between APS & CAD? Just hasn't been happening.

iii. Next meeting date: Doodle poll. Likely August 14.

b. Mobile Stage: Amy McWilliams

- i. Summary of discussions (including rubric): Info gathering & market research. Understand partnerships... Starting to quantify the effect on the community. How does this stage allow programs to happen...PLACEMAKING & COMMUNITY BUILDING.
- ii. Information required: Asking many questions. Nothing obvious and in the discovery process. New groups CAN'T access the stage this year. How do you determine the longevity of the stage? Is there life left? Cost to replace? Staffing? People using the stage: mix of groups...how many people are attending the events. MB – 5,000 people attend the open house @ Signature. What's the county's game plan? Outside of the county? All involved in market research. MR – question about location of the stage – moves all around. No fixed fairgrounds, etc.

iii. Next meeting date: Not established.

c. Joint Use Scheduling: Sara Duke

- i. Summary of discussions (including rubric): 2-part process: space & services (staff review) – lengthy process & application (high ask for access to the spaces). First year to change. Paper calendar...Hal currently works to jockey behind the scenes to figure out. APS given priority (drama, band, orchestra, etc). Calendars in April/May...set for the year. Challenges: school change (event/weather/etc); April to plan for September production (obtaining rights for shows) is VERY tight; question about ELECTRONIC submission but a PERSON must still approve.
- ii. Information required: Who is using? Percentage of time. Cost → percentage of tickets sold. There is a level of budgeting security in that process.

AB – how long before. Space & Services in January but not known until April. Understanding the season. Better at the beginning of the calendar year. Maybe with the shorter space & services...change the date. MR – APS has an issue that there are elements that they don't know. How to coordinate better...at least visually see a calendar. YM – if at the same space each year – is there a

preference? Act as a new application each year but there is knowledge with the current technical director (Hal). Not set in stone. Not aware of anyone being denied...not in Arlington CO. MR – hosted a group...found a blank month but one-off. CRITERIA.

TP – APS ever use Gunston black box space? Just CAD. Sometimes pop-up events. QUESTION.... No official policy – community. SD – custodial services at Gunston. Traditionally not used by APS due to liability issues, teaching staff, scheduling, etc.

AM – who owns the Signature former space? County.

AK – Systems are needed that bring more efficiency with a thoughtful human being that can assist with prioritizing.

iii. Next meeting date: Wednesday, August 21

VIII. Criteria Evaluation & Model Building – Richard (65 minutes)

- RB – overview of the work & template. It required some creative work... The template is designed to understand how to use the rubrics, etc. Discussion of the framework – 5 steps (slide #9). Criteria – what COUNTS? Some of this is QUITE HARD...potentially SQUISHY. Think about what is reasonable/affordable/etc.
 - a. Introduction of template – including rubric evaluation tool and model building
 - Define the service – SERVICE & NOT a PRODUCT.
 - Overarching goal – Impact for Arlington as a COMMUNITY. Not “I NEED a scene shop for....”
 - Criteria – factors to achieve the goal. Two pieces...define. How to measure. Figure out the optimal range. For example, scene shop there are currently 4 accessing the space – previously 8 or more.
 - CREATIVE piece – generate ideas/scenarios. Too often convergent thinking FIRST rather than divergent...stuck in past. Discussion of the spectrum. Consortium (other jurisdictions...Philadelphia). MB – does it assume that ALL services are going to continue? For example, the costume lab? TRANSFORM but access a certain service. KC – public partnership with APS/AC – resources are from the same source – same pot of money.
 - Evaluation – common sense sifting. Eliminate the unreasonable. KC – actionable recommendations. Detail is needed...start putting in the details of HOW the alternative WORKS. Apply the indicators of the criteria & measures. AK – if you realize you can’t fill in the detail – move on to another alternative.
 - AM – current state? Questions. JH – clarify what is the state – FY19 or FY20? AK – what has changed? Scene Shop – reduced hours; funding for scene shop FTE is one-time; CostumeLab – different. KC – the service rather than the delivery. Better to understand the GOAL the service is trying to achieve. MR – some details will come out. Understand the audience...spell it out.
 - JK – clarification. Alternatives AND recommendation? RB – final recommendation via step 6. SF – ideally one recommendation. AK – work of the subcommittees to JH – don’t preclude phases.

- RB – change in the template. Define the service in step one – current... keeps you stuck.
- SY – recommendation of how to do this? RB – over the next two months.
- THOUGHTS -
- b. Agreement on overarching goals, success criteria and measures for each service
 - Overarching goals. See presentation slide (14) for the brainstorming about the Scenic Shop & CostumeLab.
 - RB – could MORE be done with different alternatives. Public good. Hook the immediate good to a higher goal.
 - AK – overarching goal isn't CURRENT state of the benefit right now BUT the benefit of providing the services in a different form.
 - KW – Mobile stage – elevated the quality of the event...more money raised...more money put into resources.
 - RB – Needs to update the template. Define the service SEPARATE from the CURRENT STATE.
 - SD – the template and discussion helps to reframe...originally seen as budget cut with loss of service. Perhaps the outcome be better. Help to reframe. Currently scared to continue to exist. A BETTER outcome for the community. Loss is scary & hard.

WRAP-UP

- Homework
 - RB to update the templates & JH to send out.
 - JH will provide additional information to subcommittees; place notes & materials on the web page
 - Subcommittees to send dates to Jill
 - Subcommittees to meet prior to next meeting
- Next meetings
 - Full committee: August 29, 2019 @ 6:30 pm
- Other
 - Discussion around APS/AC budget – same pot of tax payer dollars but there are other resources that could be leveraged.
 - General discussion around APS/AC facilities – parking lot conversation
 - SFW – options of spectrum within the template RB developed include County & Schools – connected by joint revenue stream from same tax payer base but separate operational strategies. In analyzing any option, we need to understand the benefits.
 - RB – schools are an important piece. SD will reach out to APS participants.

ADJOURN

- The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.