Community Arts Advisory Committee

Meeting #3
August 29, 2019 | 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.
3700 South Four Mile Run Drive
agenda

INTRODUCTIONS – 5 minutes
• Welcome
• Introductions

LEVEL SETTING – 10 minutes
• Review Agenda
• Ground Rules, Expectations & Responsibilities
• Review of Project Scope & Work Plan
• Report out from County Manager’s Office

MOVING FORWARD – 90 minutes
• Subcommittee Report Out (Scenic Shop/Costume Lab; Joint Use; Mobile Stage)
  o Definition of Service(s)
  o Overarching Goal
  o Measures & Indicators
  o Initial Brilliant Ideas
  o What information is still required?
  o What are the key questions?

WRAP-UP & NEXT STEPS – 15 minutes
introductions

welcome

introductions
level setting

- ground rules, expectations & responsibilities
- review of project scope & work plan
- report out from county manager’s office
ground rules & working agreements

- Listen to each other
- Participate fully
- Respect and share air time
- Be brief – share air time
- Assume positive intent
- One person talks at a time – signal intent to speak (using name tents)
- Think creatively
- Remain positive and forward looking
- Speak for yourself, not on behalf of others
- Differences of opinion are natural and useful

expectations & responsibilities

- The process is explicit, rational, and fair.
- I was treated well and my inputs were heard.
- I can live with and commit to the outcome.

Agreements create a safe space for dialogue, critical conversation and decision-making, while aiming to create equity of voice for this work.

from consensus prime – decision making
project scope

1. catalogue public and private arts services in arlington and the region to include audio-visual services, costumes and scenery construction;

2. develop and analyze alternative management and service delivery proposals and funding sources for scenic studio, costumelab and mobile stage operations including a proposed transition for future operations;

3. evaluate and propose public-private partnerships for audio-visual services, costumes and scenery construction;

4. develop a new scheduling process for joint-use theater space in partnership with arlington public schools.
**work plan**

- **July 15**: first meeting #1 of CAAC
- **July 15**: review & discussion of research methods; establish descriptors; develop review criteria
- **July, August, September, October**: initial scenario building and evaluation
- **July, August, September, October**: initial scenario analysis; pros & cons; key questions
- **October 15**: final scenarios analysis & actionable items
- **October 15**: final draft recommendations & actionable items
- **October 31**: final recommendations to county manager

**July, August, September, October**
moving forward

subcommittee report out
## Subcommittee Report Out

### Scene Shop and CostumeLab
- Maggie Boland
- Sara Duke
- Jane Franklin
- Tom Prewitt
- Steven Yates

### Joint Use Theater Scheduling
- Pam Farrell
- Carol Cadby
- Ava Boston and Yasmina Mansour
- Janet Kopenhaver
- Leslie Peterson
- Matthew Randall

### Mobile Stage
- Pryalal Karmakar
- Amy McWilliams
- Kat Williams

### Thirty Minutes or Less...
- Definition of service(s)
- Overarching goal
- Measures & indicators
- Initial brilliant ideas
- What information is still required?
- What are the key questions?
define the service(s) | overarching goal

scenic shop & costumelab

---

**define the service(s)**

- tools
- instruction
- space (width & height)
- storage
- safety – in shop & on stage
- accessibility – ADA + hours
- expertise
- maintenance
- transportation/truck – loading bay

**overarching goal**

- facilitate better shows;
- higher production values to attract more interest by the public;
- build skills;
- build community
- soft skills (leadership, mentorship, teamwork, project management, etc);
- enabling any group/person/etc to have access to have these services for their artistic endeavors (public good);
- maker space;
- recreation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criteria</th>
<th>(examples of) measures</th>
<th>optimal indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>▪ Number of groups that get access</td>
<td>▪ Enough access to the service to produce the quality of work required for all groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Access &amp; use – number of hours available to groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Smooth administration/scheduling ease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Travel distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Cost per user group (aligned with standards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity of Access</strong></td>
<td>▪ Availability of the service is known to the potential users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ % of groups representing different parts of the community that access each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of high levels of awareness of how to access the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Various populations know of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ease of understanding HOW to access the services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria</td>
<td>(examples of) measures</td>
<td>optimal indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Facility/Service</td>
<td>- Quality of space&lt;br&gt;- Functionality of equipment&lt;br&gt;- How it compares with optimal Health and Safety standards&lt;br&gt;- Extent of match with users’ needs&lt;br&gt;- “State of the art” equipment&lt;br&gt;- Quantity &amp; quality of expertise&lt;br&gt;- Accessibility (hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
<td>- Increase in overall numbers using the service&lt;br&gt;- Satisfaction ratings of users and other key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost sharing</td>
<td>- Who pays what proportion of the costs of the service&lt;br&gt;- Real cost of the service is aligned with typical standards (arts market place)</td>
<td>- Affordable/sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Artistic Impact (NEW)</td>
<td>- Do the services meet the goals &amp; missions of the user groups? (The “wow” factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
initial brilliant ideas | scenic shop

• Marketing
• Update fees
• Update hours
• provides storage space for a fee
• open shop hours for the public
• provides scenic support to APS
• Have granted users decide schedule, needs, and hours
• contract out the running of the scene shop
• Convert to turn-key operation (funds for tool maintenance and compliance/safety?)
• Shut it down and either:
  • Find/build another
  • Cover org’s set building costs
  • Tell orgs tough luck
• Marketing
• Offer more workshops
• Offer commissioning/building of costumes for a fee
• Offer use of sewing machines/dye vat for a fee
• expanded/modify collection to include more children’s sizes
• Let APS use
• Donate collection to a local university, discount for Arlington Arts orgs
• contract out the running of the costume lab
• Convert to turn-key operation
• Convert to design, build, and advisory service (no inventory)
• Shut down the costume lab, maybe provide more funding to groups
## Information Still Needed

- County’s comfort with risk in turn-key operations

## Key Questions

- What is “sustainable” for the county?
- Access is controlled by cultural affairs, how is that influenced?
define the service(s) | overarching goal
joint use theater scheduling

**define the service(s)**
- Access to and supported use of Thomas Jefferson and Gunston to whole community for performances, rehearsals and festivals which matches the specific needs of each user group.

**overarching goal**
- To provide theatrical & festival opportunities to as many groups as possible in a simple, concise and affordable manner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>(Examples of) Measures</th>
<th>Optimal Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>• Extent to which the theater scheduling is maximized</td>
<td>• Satisfaction by users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools &amp; community is satisfied that needs are met.</td>
<td>• Conflict resolution is managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smooth operations (none or limited friction)</td>
<td>• Calendar can be viewed by all users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Matching of user group needs with best facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Access</td>
<td>▪ % of groups representing different parts of the community that access each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of high levels of awareness of how to access the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Matching needs (technical services available)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ All non-school groups to have equal access (rental v surcharge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Facility/Service</td>
<td>• Quality of service (scheduling)</td>
<td>• Example: Returned to rep. plot (lighting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical support</td>
<td>• Equipment working &amp; operable – 100 percent of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Functionality of equipment</td>
<td>• Working HVAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance &amp; repair of equipment</td>
<td>• Things work smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How it compares with optimal Health and Safety standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extent of match with users’ needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Size of the spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scheduling works smoothly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
<td>• Increase in the overall numbers of people experiencing the outcome of the use of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported group satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparent process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notification of space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arrangement sustainable over time (carry-over from year to year) – not “reinventing the wheel”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost sharing</td>
<td>▪ Who pays what proportion of the costs of the service (surcharge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Cultural affairs tech team (TD, facilities managers) continue to provide maintenance and support of joint use spaces and work with drama teachers across APS.

• Continue to use EMS for scheduling. Dates are collected by the Cultural affairs tech team (or designee). Someone from this team works as the liaison/advocate between cultural/ arts groups and APS and works to resolve conflicts in a transparent process. Key stakeholders (arts/culture groups, facilities managers, cultural affairs tech team, others) meet together on a regular basis (bi-annually?, quarterly?) to oversee the entire process.

• Notice of space assignments for cultural/arts groups in February (or earlier). Agreement between Cultural Affairs and APS to slot spaces into the calendar provisionally (good faith) and then confirm after April 15 date. Gunston 2 can be scheduled earlier since it functions independently.
  • Potential to work 2 years in advance so seasons can be planned accordingly?
  • Opportunity to include drama teachers in the scheduling process?

• Cost remains at 10% surcharge rate
### information still needed

- nothing at this time

### key questions

- Can we provisionally book dates prior to April 15?
- Non-supported groups? How is space allocated? (1st TIER OF MOU)
- Would adding other spaces to the agreement help with scheduling conflicts at TJ and Gunston? Make the program more accessible to the entire community?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>define the service(s)</th>
<th>overarching goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of a high quality functioning mobile stage</td>
<td>• Sustainable, affordable and equitable access for community groups to a high-quality mobile stage, which enhances their work in placemaking and community bridgebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria</td>
<td>(examples of) measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>▪ Usage by a target date, with increases to follow year-by-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Visibility and market penetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Access</td>
<td>▪ % of groups representing different parts of the community that access each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of high levels of awareness of how to access the service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Quality of Facility/Service | ▪ Quality of facility  
 ▪ Functionality of equipment  
 ▪ Optimal Health and Safety standards  
 ▪ Extent of match with users’ needs | ▪ Maintenance and upkeep  
 ▪ Towing – cost  
 ▪ Does stage meet needs? |
| Overall Effectiveness    | ▪ Increase in overall numbers using the service                                          |                                                                                    |
|                          | ▪ Satisfaction ratings of users and other key stakeholders                              |                                                                                    |
| Cost sharing             | ▪ Are all of the costs being covered?                                                  |                                                                                    |
|                          | ▪ Who pays what proportion of the costs of the service?                                 |                                                                                    |
• Arlington County contracts with a vendor for the 13 events that use the stage now, and users pay portion of cost
• Public Private partnership – corporate sponsorship
• Stage co-op
• Each group on their own to contract with stage vendor
**Information still needed**

- Does APS use the stage – would they?
- Assessment of current stage and suggested uses
- County’s priority and criteria of use – how is that defined
- What is the pricing criteria

**Key questions**

- Is there a regional demand for mobile stages?
- When exactly does the stage get decommissioned?
- What is the life span of the stage (years, number of uses per year)?
- How has the County promoted the availability of the stage
the next phase

- double-checking of measures and optimal indicators (step three in template)

- step five
  - (if needed/appropriate) initial “common sense” sifting out of scenarios/ideas
  - building out the remaining ideas
  - evaluation

- sub-committee work results explored by committee of whole, stage-by-stage, September 19 and October 10
the next phase

- will likely require additional type of work:
  - market research (e.g. into potential demand for scene building service)
  - feasibility checking (e.g. by talking with facility managers)
  - costing out options

- therefore, different approaches:
  - allocation of desk work
  - bilateral calls
  - written document
  - project team support
wrap up & next steps

- continued discussion

- sub-committee work
  - schedule time for work & check-in times
  - revisit step 3 & start step 5 (per “the next phase” slides)

- next meeting: September 19 @ 6:30 pm