

SCFD BOARD PLANNING SESSION

MINUTES / FEBRUARY 9, 2012

ATTENDEES

Board members present – Kathryn Spuhler (Chair) (KBS), Joseph Arcese (Vice Chair) (JA), Bob Grant (Treasurer) (BG), Kathleen Stapleton (KS) (Secretary), James Harrington (JH), Peggy Lehmann (PL), Kathy Kucsan (KK), Jim Martin (JM), David Montez (DM), Shepard Nevel (SN), and Khadija Haynes (KH)

Staff – Peg Long (Executive Director) (MJL), Jessica Clare (Program Manager), Nancy McCamey (Program Manager), and Erica Barclay (Program Assistant)

Staff absent: Sheila Mieger (Office Administrator)

Guest Speakers – Floyd Ciruli (Ciruli & Associates), Gully Stanford (College in Colorado)

Facilitator – Chris Adams (Engaged Public)

MINUTES

OPENING

At approximately 8:30 a.m. Kathryn Spuhler, Chair, welcomed the board to its annual planning session. After introductions and determining that a quorum was present, Kathryn turned the meeting over to facilitator Chris Adams. Chris stated that for the past 14 years he has been the principal owner of Engaged Public, a firm specializing in facilitating large-group, interactive dialogue to develop public policy strategies. He is also the board President of Denver Urban Gardens (DUG), a Tier III organization. He then outlined the process and ground rules for the planning session. He reiterated the two desired outcomes of the session: 1) that board members have sufficient information to determine the reauthorization date and establish a framework for stakeholder participation, and 2) that board members feel the planning session was productive and successful.

STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Peg Long, SCFD Executive Director, reviewed the board's 2011 planning session directive for her to develop a process for obtaining input from each tier, beginning with Tier III, and including county cultural council members. She identified Engaged Public's interactive process as a means to obtain input from all SCFD organizations, but especially suitable for Tier III. Outside funding was secured for the first phase of the project, which began with Tier III organizations and county cultural members.

Due to the large number of Tier III organizations, some 275, and the 60+ county cultural council members, two separate sessions were scheduled, the first on December 15, 2011 and the second on January 21, 2012. Peg reported that attendance was good at both sessions, with 43% of council members and 58% of organizations participating.

Engaged Public's compiled results of the sessions, *Tier III Report: Envision the SCFD of the Future*, was included in the board members' meeting packets. The report is also available on the SCFD website at:

Chris reviewed select slides from the report and shared some of his observations:

- Solid majority of participants view their organization as prepared for the future, changing scientific and cultural landscape. 88% agree 10% disagree
- SCFD financial support is the most valued aspect of SCFD, at about 70%
- Concerns that SCFD won't be reauthorized; issues with the Tier structure were expressed
- Need for collaborating to share costs of marketing, HR and other operational expenses was a theme
- Verbal input by participants regarding the Tier structure was expressed more strongly than input through the keypad polling responses, which reflected selections from a menu of options
- Questions were raised about the relevance of the current SCFD brand and the complexity of the name Scientific & Cultural Facilities District
- Requests to simplify the grant application process were expressed verbally and in keypad polling
- A majority of participants expressed a preference for seeking reauthorization in 2015 over 2016
- Tier III organizations want to be certain that their voices are heard and their opinions are considered
- When asked what is the primary purpose of the SCFD, 76% of respondents chose "to support the arts & science organizations; only 23% chose "to support public access to arts and science", as the Statute intends

The report and summary generated many questions and comments from the board, most of whom attended one or both of the stakeholder sessions.

Were the grant application concerns mostly from organizations applying in multiple counties or across the board? (JH) Why was 2015 favored over 2016? (KBS) While organizations felt heard at these sessions, how will the board ensure their participation going forward? (BG, JH) Do we need to consider a separate voice for each cultural category—visual arts, performing arts, science, cultural history, natural history, as the groups are so diverse? (JH) Challenge all along has been how to give Tier III a voice, they need something like the Tier II SCC—how do they get there? (JH) Why was an increase to 17% or more of the revenue listed as an option—wouldn't every tier want more money? (DM, JM) What else might affect Tier III at reauthorization besides the % of revenue? (JA) Peg Long pointed out that the goal is to create a 21st century structure for the SCFD and then determine the best way to allocate resources to support it. If the next reauthorization is for 12 years, as it was last time, it will not sunset again until 2030. Given the pace of change in technology and projected demographics, there is much to think about over the next couple of years.

Board members expressed their thoughts regarding the results and possible outcomes. A sense of entitlement means organizations may see SCFD as a piggy bank and then naturally want more, but we should refocus on the SCFD core purpose of bringing culture to the public. (DM) There are tangible things we can do to help make organizations feel heard, e.g., modifications to the grant application, helping them identify sources for board development, technology support and shared services, e.g. health insurance and operations. (SN offered to help with the latter.) The significance of Tier III's attendance numbers and how that should be reflected in the share of revenue was mentioned at the Botanic Gardens (KBS). Organizations need and want technical assistance and support for board development. (PL) Tier IIIs chose 2015 because it was viewed as a less expensive year (BG) or because the options weren't explained as thoroughly as they could have been. (KS) Both the desire for a significant increase in funds and gratitude for SCFD funds were expressed verbally during the sessions. (KK) The board would like another review of the stakeholder sessions when they have been completed for all tiers.

REAUTHORIZATION HISTORY AND FUTURE

Floyd Ciruli of Ciruli Associates presented a summary of past SCFD reauthorization votes and the lessons learned from the recent November 2011 election. He shared that previous polling indicated 60% of those polled could not place a public value on SCFD because they did not know what it was. In a memo included in the board packet, he identified a number of factors that would support selection of 2016 over 2015 for the next reauthorization vote. Those factors and several others that have been identified over the past year are summarized in *Attachment A* to these minutes.

At its 2011 annual planning session, the SCFD board developed a Reauthorization Process document, outlining six phases leading up to the public vote, and committed to deciding on the year at its 2012 planning session. Following Mr. Ciruli's presentation, the board engaged in a lively discussion of the information presented and gathered over the past year. Kathleen Stapleton moved that the board seek reauthorization in 2016. Bob Grant seconded. The board unanimously chose 2016 as the year to seek reauthorization from the voters and implement the steps outlined in the Reauthorization Process. See *Attachment B* to these minutes.

CREATIVE CAREER PATHWAYS

As a result of board discussions and public comment over the past year, the importance of arts education to creative career paths and the SCFD's role, has become a topic of board interest. Gully Stanford of College in Colorado presented information linking arts and science education, i.e., STEM (Science, Technology Engineering & Math), Visual & Performing Arts, Design, etc. to success in the post-secondary workforce. During the discussion that followed, Kathryn Spuhler noted that foundations and others have sponsored summits and similar arts education activities yet no comprehensive plan has been developed to support or preserve exposure to these programs in schools. Other board members commented that we must include the perspective of educators and administrators and what they desire (DM) and could do this through organizations such as CASE (Colorado Association of School Executives), CASB (Colorado Association of School Boards), the CEA (Colorado Education Association) (SN) and the Denver Area Superintendent's Council (JH) who should be consulted regarding their needs and how programs can fit the curriculum and structure of the school day.

For SCFD, the ultimate question is: Are our funded organizations reaching all school districts within the SCFD in an equitable manner? (KBS) We need to find creative ways to impact schools beyond the work of the SCC and the Tier I organizations. (JH) Discussions among the Scientific & Cultural Collaborative (SCC) education directors and SCC administrator, the Arvada Center's DESC education pilot program using iPad technology, Think 360 Arts and others are under way and should be helpful in moving these ideas forward. The SCC directory might be a good resource for expanding information about available programming. (PL) It is important that arts education activities supplement existing school programming rather than supplant it, giving districts permission to eliminate existing programs. (MJL) Some action items identified were: 1) contact Bruce Caughey at CASE (SN); 2) continue collecting data from SCFD organizations about students served (KK); 3) work on developing a better name than "arts education," one that clearly includes science. (MJL)

PUBLIC COMMENT

During the public comment period several individuals mentioned the importance of including science in the concept of arts education or cultural programming. Others spoke about the evolution and expansion of efforts to provide programming for students, especially following the most recent reauthorization. Technology means people are engaging with the arts and sciences through digital means—how do we count that type of attendance? How do we address the diversity in size and impact of Tier III organizations that has evolved over 20 years?

TASKS AND DECISIONS

Two board members expressed concern that the continuing low interest rate is jeopardizing SCFD's financial viability and that we might not be able to make it until 2016 when the administrative percentage could be changed when the statute is amended for reauthorization. (JA, BG) Kathy Kucsan asked what the mechanics of opening the statute are. James Harrington stated that it makes more sense to recover election costs than open the statute prior to reauthorization. Opening the statute for this purpose alone could bring unanticipated consequences. Bob Grant stated that a narrowly drafted bill could reduce the possibility of that happening. Peg clarified that the administrative percentage is not in the ballot language itself but would have to be changed in the statute in order for an increase to occur. James Harrington and Joseph Arcese agreed that the administrative percentage could be increased immediately through the 2016 bill to reauthorize.

All agreed that there changes to the statute should be incremental and that changes should recognize and address as adequately as possible the challenges of rapid changes in technology. The board agreed it is appropriate to begin thinking about statutory changes now. The group also agreed that the focus throughout should be on public access to arts and science.

The board then identified a list of tasks and timeframes going forward See *Attachment C* to these minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was passed and the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.



Secretary