

ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

INDIANA ARTS COMMISSION  
FY2012-13-STATEWIDE ARTS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS  
PROGRAM PEER REVIEW PANEL  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2011  
10:30 -11:20 a.m. EST

REMOTE CART SERVICES PROVIDED BY:  
VOICE TO PRINT CAPTIONING  
1511 E. Valley Place  
Dyer IN 46311  
219-865-7837  
Www.captions4u.com  
Captions4u@comcast.net

\* \* \* \* \*

This is being provided in a rough-draft format.  
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided  
in Order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not  
be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \* \* \*

>> KRISTINA DAVIS: It is a reminder if you are audience on call for listening-only, for observation-only and will not be allowed to participate, either ask questions of the panel or be asked questions by the panel, so we ask you to please, once you get on the call, to mute your phone so we don't get any conflicting feedback with our panelists so that everybody can hear the commentary. And we thank you for that.

And with that, Judy, are you ready to start us off?

>> JUDY HESS: Absolutely. Good morning, everyone. This is the public meeting of the Indiana Arts Commission Statewide Art Service Organization Program Peer Review Panel. Today is Wednesday, March 30th, 2011, and we are conducting a virtual panel via teleconference. Will the panelists please introduce themselves stating their name, position and where they are from? Who would you like to start? Just start.

>> AN-MING TRUXES: Hi, this is An-Ming Truxes. I am the Arts Division Director on the Connecticut Commission on Culture and Tourism, I'm Lewis Ricci's counterpart in Connecticut. Connecticut State Arts Agency is embedded within a large organization covering culture and tourism. It also includes a Division of Historic Preservation and Tourism Division.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you. Suellen?

>> SUELLEN BURNS: I'm Suellen Burns. I am the Program Director for Collaborative Space for Sustainable Development -- that's a working title only -- a new program that's being developed by the Chicago Human Rhythm Project. I'm based here in Chicago. And I've worked for about 10, maybe 15 years in the field of arts service here in Illinois.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you. Adam?

>> ADAM PERRY: Hi, my name is Adam Perry. I am a Senior Program Director at Arts Midwest. Arts Midwest is one of six U.S. regional arts organizations. Our coverage area is the Midwest and upper Midwest, of which the Indiana Arts Commission is one of our service providers. And I'm glad to join you.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you, Adam. Mitch?

>> MITCH MENCHACA: Hi, I'm Mitch Menchaca. I'm the Director of Local Arts Advancement for Americans for the Arts. Prior to that, I was a Senior Director of Arts and Programs at the Arizona Commission on the Arts, the state art agency there, and actually was Kristina's counterpart in community development.

>> JUDY HESS: Also, a reminder to our audience to please put your phone on mute as this will diminish interference during the connection for all of the Commission and listeners.

Are there any other comments before we start with the first application?

>> KRISTINA DAVIS: Judy, this is Kristina again. I know we have some audience that joined us. Just a reminder to everyone who is listening in this audience that you are here for observation-only. So there will be no participation from you either asked by the panelists or your questions to the panelists. So we ask that you please remember to mute your phone.

And with that, if there's nothing else, I will let Judy go ahead and start.

>> JUDY HESS: Okay. Thank you very much. Our first application is from the Art Education Association of Indiana. And our first reader is An-Ming.

>> AN-MING TRUXES: Okay. So the first thing that I read about the Art Education Association of Indiana is its mission statement, which is on Page 2. And it says that AEAI's purposes are to increase public awareness, develop strategies for statewide advocacy for membership occurring issues and political action, recognize outstanding performance and program statewide and assist the state Department of Education in development and implementation of curriculum materials.

And then I read in the rest of the narrative what its activities are. And it appears the primary activities are the annual fall conference, a three-day retreat for teachers in July, and I believe this is their fifth year doing this, and then supporting the workshops held by the seven organizational districts.

So there appears to be a misalignment between this organization's mission statement and its activities because clearly the professional development and networking are their most important services that they provide to their 490 members, and yet that is not mentioned in the mission statement.

And there's also minimal or no information provided about the advocacy issues that Indiana faces, nor the advocacy strategies in which AEAI is engaging, because the first thing when I read that it's advocacy, I expect to see advocacy activities and strategies. Those are missing.

Otherwise, in terms of the quality of the organization's work, I think that they work very hard on their annual conference and all their other activities supporting art educators in the state. And it's a really important function. And I believe that all their activities are well-attended by their members.

So in terms of community impacts, again, I don't feel that

the audience is clearly defined in this application besides art educators and their students, because if advocacy is part of its mission, I would think that the public would be included as its constituency. And so we can't tell what their impact is in terms of raising public awareness. And, again, this is no indication what are their current advocacy issues and political action required.

Now, they do mention twice in this application that they are very excited about starting I believe it's a listserve and contracting the services of a web developer as a form for communication. But it isn't clear about what. Communication about what? And so I think advocacy just vaguely mentioned in this application.

And I also didn't see that they have defined their underserved populations.

Let's see. And under management, I see that it's a volunteer board, but it's not diverse. There's 35 whites, one Asian, one Hispanic or Latino and one native Hawaiian. But clearly all the members are engaged in the planning and implementation of the annual conference.

And I also think that the evaluation section points to their sincerity in making continuous improvements in the activities that they offer.

I didn't see a strategic plan.

And there's a document here, let me see, the AEAI aims and purposes is a separate attachment that was included. Again, professional development and networking for art educators are not mentioned in this.

And so my advice would be for them to really re-visit their mission statement. And if advocacy really is part of what they do, perhaps that could be folded into their activities.

And, in fact, because professional development is their primary -- it seems it's clear that's primarily what they do, that needs to be folded into their mission statement. So that's just my advice.

Let's see. Looking at their budget, I see that half of its income comes from the annual conference and half is contributed income. This is not counting the IAC grants. So I think that's a pretty good balance. But in terms of their spending, a huge amount of their budget is spent on space rental. And I was just a little surprised to see that they only spent \$2,000 on professional fees when the annual conference is really their major event. So that was sort of a puzzle to me. And so those are my comments for this organization.

>> JUDY HESS: Okay. Thank you, An-Ming. Our second reader, Suellen?

>> SUELLEN BURNS: Well, gosh, I had lots of comments. I will not repeat things that An-Ming already brought up. But overall with this application, I really wanted to be enthusiastic about it. I thought the mission was admirable. And they have lofty goals. But despite my best efforts, for the most part, I just didn't feel like I could get a tangible sense of what happens in terms of service delivery. There weren't strong examples. There was not an example of even an attachment of the conference brochure so I could see the sessions that they offered might be helpful. But I was really challenged to wrap my head around what happened.

So, for example, how many people come to the various workshops that they talked about? It's so vague. How many various workshops are there? And what does "various" mean? What are the topics of those workshops? And what specifically do teachers take away from the workshops that positively impacts their classroom teaching or even their own creativity as artists. There was very little that gave me a sense of what was happening.

Unfortunately, I had the same question about almost every program event they discussed in the application. There was one exception to that; but, honest, I found that exception disappointing. They talked about "splatter paint" as an artmaking workshop subject. And honestly, it's just not a topic that impresses me as a visual artist myself or a parent. Here in Illinois, arts education funding is so strapped, and of the arts education funding that there is, if my daughter came home from school with a splatter paint art class, I just wouldn't be that impressed by it. And certainly as a Service Grant Panel Member, that as the one example of something that happened, I think they could have made a better choice.

So more specifically, on the quality end of things, I thought the program descriptions were vague. They planned to conduct 40 events in 2012 and again in 2013, but I couldn't tell what those -- there's very little sense of what that would actually entail.

I thought the application would be considerably stronger if there were -- if they included numerous examples versus just one or a few for workshop topics, conference sessions, the mini retreat topics, newsletter article topics.

I did try and view the newsletter online, but I couldn't access it. I'm not sure if it was a problem. I tried three

different days to do it. But each time I went to download the article or -- excuse me -- the newsletter itself, I wasn't able to do so. It would have been really nice if rather than in the PDF that where everyone was supposed to have samples, they just provided an actual link if the newsletter was in the PDF because I couldn't follow it. And I think it would have made their application -- I don't know if it would have made their application stronger or not, but it wasn't an option for me.

Anyway, in addition to the vagueness and encouraging them, really, to have much more concrete examples of what was happening, there were a couple of other -- on the quality end, a couple of other concerns that I had.

In their narrative about Youth Arts Month, it says the program increases, quote, "our legislators' understanding of why a well-rounded education must include the arts," but it doesn't say how the application actually accomplishes this or what the results are. So that was a really big question.

And I was also concerned on the evaluation side, the organization says that it relies most heavily on one-on-one conversations and anecdotal comments to evaluate its programs. I think that really brings the organization's credibility and, therefore, program quality into question. It is not, in my view, a thorough and professional way to assess program evaluations. And if they had talked about other types of evaluation activities, I might have felt more confident or maybe even give an example of some of the written evaluations, but they talked about the one-on-one, instead.

So, moving on to community impact and public benefit. Let's see. The audience development responses discuss member-specific services but not marketing goals and strategies or measurements and outcomes, which is a specific criteria from the Indiana Arts Commission, so I couldn't assess against that.

I wondered what were the actual or measurable results of the listserve and their other advocacy efforts. I wasn't sure, An-Ming, whether or not the listserve was happening now or if it was going to be happening?

>> AN-MING TRUXES: It looks like it's going to happen. Actually, it's very vague.

>> SUELLEN BURNS: So that's perhaps why there isn't discussion about the actual and measurable results of that.

But it sounds like the arts advocacy efforts have been happening for quite some time, and that was not discussed, as well. So I really wanted to know what specifically the organization accomplishes with arts advocacy.

And with the Youth Arts Month, I wanted to know things like how many students are there? How many venues are there? How many visitors see the exhibits?

And then moving on to the management side, I thought the strategic plan as well as the aims and purposes attachments were disappointing. I thought, like, both documents were weak as well as too broad and not measurable.

And the financial summary for 2010 shows a loss, but the application doesn't address that. And it's a specific question that the application asks. So I was disappointed not to see a discussion. There was plenty of space to talk about it. If I recall, it wasn't a significant loss, but, still, I thought they should have addressed it.

That's it for me.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you, Suellen. Any other panelists care to make any comments?

>> MITCH MENCHACA: This is Mitch. And I think pretty much the comments that I would have said have already been stated.

I just would have really liked to have seen some examples of the other programming besides the annual conference, like their contact magazine, the regional convenings, those kind of things. So I don't want to restate everything that's been said before.

>> ADAM PERRY: I agree with the panel. I have a couple constructive comments, too.

I think that the organization would benefit from investigating social media and outreach to its constituents as a possibility. A listserve is great, but I think that we're moving in a different direction in the world, and I think that social media, Facebook pages, et cetera, are a way to go right now to reinvigorate your constituency and get things moving in a different direction and will help your advocacy.

I also, too, think that more coalitions and partnerships with other similar organizations in the field would help them to strengthen their advocacy efforts.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you very much. Last call for comments on this application?

>> AN-MING TRUXES: Yeah, actually, after I read the third application, the Indiana Coalition for the Arts Foundation, I would really like to have known what is AEAI's relationship to Indiana Coalition for the Arts. I know we're not there yet for the third application, but I didn't see that mentioned. It certainly is an advocacy organization. So if AEI is, in fact, involved with the Coalition, I would have expected them to

mention it in terms of their advocacy work.

>> JUDY HESS: Okay. I think we are ready for everyone to finalize your scores, if you would, please. And if you can let me know when you're finished, that would be terrific. Take all the time you need.

>> JUDY HESS: We'll move to our second application, the Indiana Music Educators Association Inc. And our first reader is Adam Perry. Adam?

>> ADAM PERRY: Hi. I think that I got the ringer of the bunch here. The mission statement of the Indiana Music Educators Association is to support music education in Indiana by representing the united interest of music educators and students and by providing professional leadership and service in music education to enhance the arts and schools and also to function as a federated state unit of youth educators national conference.

I thought this organization had a very strong application of the three in terms of quality. I found them to be a pretty robust, high-functioning service organization that provides quality programming and resources for music educators and students across the state.

The events from conference activities to regional workshops and music educator mentoring programs are thoughtfully conceived, I thought.

Responses to constituent feedback are supportive of the mission and goals of the organization.

The Convention Fort Wayne, along with multiple choral and band competitions, Circle the State with Song, et cetera, are very well attended with a broad base of public and private support, which I thought was good.

I thought they did a pretty good job of media coverage and business sponsorships to support their activities and their conferences, and that they provide benefit across multiple sectors because of that.

The website I thought it was informational and highlights the work that they're doing quite effectively. You can go on there and find what you need to find out, both in the membership perspective and as a public perspective.

In terms of their impact and benefits, I thought the constituent base was pretty clearly defined: Music educators and students with attention to outside stakeholders, being parents and people in the field, and people in the arts in general.

I thought the programs were shaped to respond to the

feedback of participants, including conference activity evaluation survey. And a lot of the things about the impact -- the numbers kind of speak for themselves. If you have 1,000 educators and 2500 students plus 4500 stakeholders at the annual convention, 4200 kids from across the state participate in the Circle the State with Song activities, over 140 elementary, middle and high school bands and choirs and noncompetitive statewide competitions, those are high-impact activities with a lot of involvement.

I thought that the organization reaches underserved communities through targeted contacts, special invitations and special sessions at conferences and workshops.

Targeted outreach to underserved communities is laudable, but they need to push themselves a little bit, I thought, to do the same for teachers and students with disabilities and special needs. They might do that, I just didn't see a lot of that in the application.

Accessibility assessment was based on handicap accessibility of the convention spaces. They need to push more into thinking about the universal design in their marketing materials and website design, constituent resources, that kind of thing. Accessibility isn't just making sure all the spaces in the convention are handicap-accessible. It's kind of a mentality. And I know that organization deals with a lot of different kids and people all the time; they are probably addressing that, but I'd like to see it more in the application.

The forte mentorship program is a nice addition to what they're doing, and it shows a good response to constituent needs and forward thinking, I thought. And the walkathon I thought was a nice touch. Good blending of fundraising and public relations, in my opinion.

As far as management, they've had the same dedicated staff member for over 20 years. I view that as stable, for sure, in this day and age.

Budget conscious, proactive decision making, structure flexible and adaptive to the current economic climate, I thought. A good example of that is how they creatively limited their costs and thoughtfully done it and made choices in limiting their expenses that have from what I perceived had minimal impact on the core services they provide.

So making core the magazine online publication versus print, decreasing the board meeting a year, hosting a board meeting on site rather than a hotel, sharing an assistant with the Indiana State School Music Association, moving the

convention to Fort Wayne from Indianapolis, all these kind of things were thoughtful choices, I thought, that saved them some money and helped them keeping being able to provide the services that they do very well.

They do good coalition building with the partners. And I think that's pretty smart leadership, and that results in pretty good advocacy.

The one thing about the management structure I did have a little bit of an issue was the diversity of the governing body. I know that it's probably a little difficult, but I think it should be kind of a priority in recruitment as they move forward, to reach out to some different ethnicities, races and people of different affiliations.

Those are my comments.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you very much. Second reader, An-Ming?

>> AN-MING TRUXES: Yes. I agree with Adam that Indiana has a really strong Music Educators Association. This is a very strong application. I was particularly impressed by the breadth of their activities. And it's for teachers and students at all levels. You know, and some of these are noncompetitive, which is really great for kids. And their workshops are designed to reach teachers at all professional levels, from the beginning to the more established.

And I agree they have clearly defined their underserved populations and planned activities for them. And they identified their underserved populations as rural teachers, teachers of color and those of special needs.

I agree with Adam that only one out of 49 volunteer board members are a person of color, I do think they need to work on their diversity.

Let's see. In terms of their budget, I was kind of curious that they did not figure in the IAC support in both of its 2012 and 2013 income budget. There's a zero. So I thought that was interesting.

Let's see. I found that their strategic plan, which is more like an operational plan, is really extensive and ambitious. And because advocacy, again, was -- advocacy is listed as the first goal of the strategic plan, I would have expected to see mentioned advocacy activities in the narrative, and so that seems to be missing in this application.

And they mentioned that IMEA recently joined with other music associations and groups to form the Alliance for Indiana Music Education, so I found that really interesting. I would have liked to know a little bit more about that.

And those are my many comments.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you very much. Would either of the other panelists care to comment?

>> SUELLEN BURNS: I have a couple other things to add. I agree with everything that Mitch and An-Ming have said so far. I'd like to add in the -- under the quality criteria, I thought they had a terrific scope and depth with a range of convention session topics.

I thought they were particularly creative about looking at the learning talent that some students have and how who to incorporate that as part of what the professional development that they're providing I thought was really quite interesting.

Let's see. On the community impact and public benefit criteria, I thought it was terrific that they provide beginning and developing music teacher workshops for free. What a great way to engage their constituency, especially at that level.

Like Mitch, I thought the forte program sounded wonderful. I think it has the potential to be as meaningful for the retired music educators as for those that they will be mentoring. And it was really exciting to see.

I also very much appreciated that they provided economic impact data in that, when they were talking about the convention. That was really nice.

On the management side, let's see, I was a little bit concerned that I thought it was -- all their cost cutting measures were great, but going to just two board meetings a year, I think, long term could have an effect on their management effectiveness. And so I would encourage them, if it's for cost cutting measures, to think about something like teleconferencing as an alternative because two board meetings a year for an organization of this size could present some long term challenges. They certainly seem to run a very tight ship with regard to policies and handbooks and evaluation procedures and the general effectiveness of the organization.

I thought they had a great percentage of earned income.

And, really, my only concern about the application was that other than a couple things that the other panelists have brought up, which are really quite minor, I agree this is a very strong application.

I wondered why -- or I was curious about zero percentage of in-kind support in their 2012 and 2013 budgets, particularly because in the narrative, they talked about convention partners and venues. And so I was under the impression until -- based on that that there were discounts that they were receiving, but

it's not reflected in the in-kind numbers. That's it for me.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you.

Mitch?

>> MITCH MENCHACA: I don't have anything to add.

>> JUDY HESS: All right. Thank you. I'll now ask everyone to finalize their scores and let me know when you're finished.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you so much. Panelists, we're now looking at our final application from the Indiana Coalition for the Arts Foundation. Our first reader is Mitch, thanks.

>> MITCH MENCHACA: All right. For me, this is a progressive organization that was founded in 1980. Its mission and programs are to provide capacity building professional development and advocacy to its members. Their definition of arts education is not the formal arts education but education of technical assistants and professional development, which works for its mission and its constituency. They offer trainings, online offerings and convenience to their members, and they serve every county and have data to back up that statement.

It's a board-driven organization. And each board member and officer truly step up to ensure the organization can carry out its mission.

They have a good geographic reach, which is something that the organization has worked hard on, but I would have liked to have seen maybe in their next goal is to reach out to a little bit more diverse governing body.

Their audience development efforts are progressive, and they partner to promote their activities. And they work with social media to spread the word. They have a good website and Facebook presence. Their budget is small but mighty. However, I would like to see them diversify their income as it seems heavily dependent on the IAC grant and no mention of in-kind support.

Sort of the big negative for me was the lack of their method of evaluation. It was kind of a throw-away statement for them in their application. So they could have done a little bit more than just say they will survey their workshops and presentations.

And also would have liked to have seen an updated strategic plan or some sort of statement on where they're going on path 2010. So those are my comments.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you very much. Suellen, our second reader?

>> SUELLEN BURNS: Okay. So I think I'm probably on a

different spectrum than you, Mitch. And I'm sorry in an earlier application, Adam, I said it was Mitch who was making the comments that I agreed with, but it was your comment, Adam, sorry about that.

Overall, I found the lack of thoroughness or -- excuse me -- thoughtfulness and efforts with this application quite unfortunate. So many organizations in Indiana are doing really important work in the field of the arts, and I felt if this application reflects the quality of this organization's actual programs, then it's not among those who are doing fine work. It was just very disappointing.

Specific to quality, I thought the programming overview responses were vague and weak. There was no real sense of what specifically happens.

So, for example, quote/unquote "advocacy training" just doesn't cut it for me as a description. And there was no other information that actually tells me what that entails. I wondered who comes. I wondered what its constituents take away from or learn from the events.

Also from what I could assess in terms of the quality criteria, no actual outcomes have been established for any of its four programs. So what's the point of delivering programs when you don't know what you're trying to accomplish?

And I recognize 2013 you might not get into detailed planning at this point, but this application was submitted like two months into 2012, and they still said that they are -- they will be establishing what they're trying to accomplish. That was disappointing.

On the community impact and public benefit area, the application did not address their marketing goals, measurements and outcomes, only their strategies.

And the organization stated that it encourages a broader awareness and understanding of the arts and also that it works to increase public understanding that the arts are central to society, but nothing about the impact or results of those efforts.

And then finally on the management side, I thought the strategic plan was vague and had no tangible course of action that gives me confidence in this organization's ability to be successful.

More broadly, I felt the application and its other attachments don't support the organization's credibility, but, rather, reinforced my assessment of the strategic plan, that their credibility is questionable, at best.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you very much. Would either of the other panelists like to comment?

>> Yes.

>> Go ahead.

>> ADAM PERRY: This is Adam. I concur I think a little bit more with Suellen on this. I think it might be that Mitch comes from a community development background and I don't, so he probably perceived it a different way what this organization was trying to do, but I thought that the application itself was kind of messy and lazy, to be honest. And it felt kind of like an organization that is used to getting funding and was going through the motions.

And I didn't really understand what they were about at the end of the day. I read it twice. Hard. And I read all the materials. And I sat back and thought about it and read it again, and I still couldn't figure out exactly what they do or how they do it.

I thought that they need to communicate a little bit more, too, about how they do outreach and what exactly -- how they promote their activities and who they're reaching out to.

So I thought I fall more in the Suellen boat, unfortunately.

>> AN-MING TRUXES: Hi, this is An-Ming. And I agree with both Adam and Suellen. First, there was no history or background provided of the organization. So each -- right off the bat, you didn't have a sense of who they are.

And they just didn't -- it's undeveloped, their whole application. Just didn't get a sense of how they actually work with organizations.

And I was interested, of course, you know, how would they work with IMEA and also the AEAI? And how does it work with the 12 regional arts partners, since they talk about that? And then with their major activities that they list, no details are given. And I asked the question: With whom do they work to identify their priority topics and issues to be offered at these four activities that they mention?

So overall, I agree. It was really frustrating. And I read it twice trying to figure out what it is that they do, and it was difficult.

>> ADAM PERRY: I also question an organization that has the budget of 13 or \$14,000 a year, and over half of that is dependent upon a grant from IAC, to me, I don't understand why that needs to exist. I don't understand what the purpose of an organization with that small of a budget depending on that much of a grant to get it by. And that just might be my lack of

clarity and confusion after reading the application, but to me, it's a little bit distracting to figure out exactly what the purpose of an organization with such a small budget depended upon so much of an income from one place every year.

>> AN-MING TRUXES: Right. The name of this organization is Indiana Coalition for the Arts Foundation. And I was trying to figure out: Is the Foundation, then, separate from the Indiana Coalition for the Arts? Because they talk about working with it. So what is that relationship?

And is the Indiana Coalition for the Arts, in fact, does it have a bigger budget? Of course I had the same question as what Adam just asked. What -- there were just lot of questions.

>> KRISTINA DAVIS: The only thing I'll say about that is that INCA and INCA the Foundation, are two organizations. The one is set up as a lobbying entity, and the one is set up as a Foundation. And, hence, I think she mentions in the application that that that's why this organization does not -- INCAF does not do any advocacy work, and so none of the funds will be going towards that.

Now, that being said, if there is more information that you wanted beyond that, which I know she had mentioned in the application, I think that's a very valid concern; but I just wanted to clarify that they are separate organizations set up one for -- specifically for advocacy and one specifically as a foundation to be able to receive nonprofit funds and donations.

>> MITCH MENCHACA: Kristina, I'm wondering that I sort of look at this application through a lens, and maybe I should have maybe thought of this as a conflict because the Coalition for the Arts and the Coalition for the Arts Foundation are our statewide advocacy, our Action Network members. And so we work -- Americans for the Arts works very closely. So as I read this application and to pick out pieces of this, I knew what they were talking about. But now that I see it, it's know the really directed in the application. Not really directed.

And I'm wondering as one of our larger members here as Americans for the Arts should be a conflict of interest and I shouldn't score on this one.

>> KRISTINA DAVIS: Mitch, let me ask you two questions. One is: It sounds like you were kind of filling in the blanks for them. You had an awareness of them. It sounds like, then, that they are probably -- for Americans for the Arts, they participate in different activities that you oversee and probably pay dues to you, et cetera?

>> MITCH MENCHACA: Yes.

>> KRISTINA DAVIS: I think that would be considered a conflict. So I would ask you to probably refrain from scoring this application?

>> MITCH MENCHACA: Okay. And I'll send you a new conflict form.

>> KRISTINA DAVIS: Okay, thank you. Normally when we consider conflicts, we do consider both in terms of financial and in terms of personal affiliation. So it's kind of a two-pronged way of looking at it.

>> SUELLEN BURNS: I have a followup comment. It's partly in response to Mitch's assessment and what you talked about being familiar with the organization and knowing the structure of the Indiana Coalition for the Arts versus the Indiana Coalition for the Arts Foundation?

Here in Illinois, we have a similar statewide arts service organization that is advocacy in both aspects. I mean, they're sister organizations, technically. One is a 501(C)3 that can accept contributions that are tax deductible and one is not because one is based on lobbying.

And so I bring to the table a pretty thorough knowledge of how an organization like that functions as two separate entities with some common goals, but I didn't see -- regardless how this organization functions, I felt, wasn't reflected in the application.

I tried to set aside my knowledge of the similar organization in Illinois and just base it on what I could see in the applications and materials that they sent versus reading into my understanding of how an organization like this might work and why their budget might be smaller even if they're doing programs that have a broader impact.

And I think it's an important consideration because at the end of the day, we're brought in as panelists to be objective, but also -- but to bring our general knowledge. But really we have to focus on what we see on the page and what's in the materials versus what we might -- what we want to infer and be excited about.

I wanted to be excited about this application, too, and it just didn't happen. And there was an opportunity for the organization to put a whole lot more forward than they did.

>> JUDY HESS: Okay. Any other comments from panelists? Hearing none, I'll ask you now to finalize your scores and advise me when you're finished.

>> SUELLEN BURNS: I'm finished.

>> JUDY HESS: Thank you.  
>> AN-MING TRUXES: I'm done.  
>> SUELLEN BURNS: Thank you.  
>> ADAM PERRY: [inaudible]  
>> KRISTINA DAVIS: Mitch, could you take yours out for me?  
>> MITCH MENCHACA: I did already.  
>> KRISTINA DAVIS: My computer is behind you, apparently.

Okay, there we go.

>> JUDY HESS: I'm sorry, Adam, did say you're finished?  
>> ADAM PERRY: Yes.  
>> JUDY HESS: Thank you. And Mitch is abstaining.

All right. I'm not completely scripted at this point, but it would be my understanding that we have completed our tasks. And that being the case, I do want to thank all four panelists for your commitment and your diligence in reviewing these applications. And my thanks to the IAC staff and to the mute and patient Kathy, our transcriber.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in Order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \* \* \*