



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the ARTS COMMISSION
Held Wednesday, March 23, 2022, in Room 488, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

EP = Electronic Participation

Present: Members: J. Loveday (Chair); D. Lajeunesse, **EP:** W. Gardner, C. Green, L. Hundleby, G. Lemon, C. Plant, K. Roessingh

Staff: Chris Gilpin, Manager, Arts Development Service; V. Jeevanandam, Community Outreach Coordinator; N. More, Senior Administrative Secretary (recorder)

Also Present:, Arts Advisory Council: R. Ditor, Funding Chair (EP)

Absent: S. Epp,

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 pm.

1 Territorial Acknowledgement

2 Approval of Agenda

MOVED by Member Lemon, **SECONDED** by Member Roessingh,
That the agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3 Adoption of Minutes

MOVED by Member Gardner, **SECONDED** by Member Green,
That the minutes of the January 25, 2023, Arts Commission meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

CARRIED

4 Chair's Remarks

Chair Loveday thanked staff and the Arts Advisory Council for the work evident in the reports. He noted that thoughtful consideration went into them. He recognized the lifting of pandemic restrictions and a return of many events not held in the last number of years, with the chance for a return to in-person formats. He also recognized the pandemic was not over. He felt it was heartening to see applications for so many events that are planning to have an in-person format, which is sure to have a beneficial impact socially and economically.

5 Presentations/Delegations There were none.

6 Commission Business

6.1 Arts Advisory Council Update

6.1.1 Arts Advisory Council Chair's Report (Verbal) There was no report.

6.1.2 Arts Advisory Council Minutes for Information

6.1.3 Arts Advisory Council *Activities by Council Summary*

MOVED by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Lajeunesse,
That the Arts Advisory Council Minutes of 1 March 2022 and *Activities by Council Summary*
of 1 March 2022 be received for information.

CARRIED

6.2 What We Heard Report: 2021 Arts Champions Summit

V. Jeevanandam provided highlights of the report.

The Commission sought clarification on the purpose of the Summit and the potential for it to be held annually.

In clarifying remarks, staff reflected on the following points:

- Summit meetings are more effective if they have a purpose. A Summit could be held in 2023 with the purpose of community input on the renewal of the strategic plan.
- Feedback at the 2021 Summit indicated an interest in seeing accountability and a call for action.
- The arts community indicated an interest in having feedback on applying the equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) lens. One way this is being addressed is with the CRD Arts Advisory Council (AAC) EDI Subcommittee, and the inclusion of community members external to the AAC. Staff will continue to look for more ways.
- The 2021 Summit had an EDI focus in response to the results of a pre-Summit survey in which the arts community indicated equity and cultural self-determination were the topics of highest interest, as well as connecting to direction from the Arts Commission on how to apply the EDI lens.
- Discussion at the Summit was not only between Arts Development Service and the arts community, but also peer to peer.

The Commission discussion included the following points:

- need for diversity among elected officials on governing bodies such as the Arts Commission
- the Summit could provide a coming-together on more than a single topic
- the Summit could have a broader range; a state-of-the-union approach could be beneficial
- EDI lens is laudable and points to the need of bringing people together to learn in a fun, non-challenging way about others

MOVED by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Green,
That the What We Heard Report: 2021 Arts Champions Summit be received for information.

CARRIED

Further discussion by the Commission included the following points:

- For the Commission to remain relevant beyond being a funder, annual or even biannual Summits might be needed; doesn't need to be an all-day event.
- Mainly, to convene and celebrate the arts.
- A clear purpose is necessary; could work with ProArt Alliance, arts councils, and other organizations to see what they want to talk about. This working group could canvass what the purpose of a Summit would be.

- Could be an annual “state-of-the-union” of the arts community, where the CRD Arts Service annual report could be released, and what is happening in the arts in the community could be promoted.
- This proposed working group could be tasked with finding out what is needed. For example, the hot topics may be different between community and professional organizations.
- After the 2018 Summit, there was discussion about making the Summit an annual event. Aligning with the 2023 strategic planning would be a good start, with the proposed working group finding the topics of importance for each year.

MOVED by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Roessingh,
That staff be directed to bring to the next meeting a report that examines the potential for annual Summits as well as a framework that would include other participant arts organizing groups to partner in planning future arts summits.

CARRIED

6.3 CreativeMornings Funding Request from Victoria Arts Council

C. Gilpin provided highlights of the report.

The Commission sought clarification on the CreativeMornings funding relationship between the CRD, the City of Victoria, and the Victoria Arts Council. The Commission requested staff find out if it were possible to add “CRD” to the name of the event, given the level of funding.

MOVED by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Green,
That \$6,000 be provided from the Arts and Culture Support Service operating budget, using the operating reserve if necessary, to Victoria Arts Council to support the CreativeMornings series to assist networking, capacity-building and professional development in the CRD arts community for a trial period ending December 2022.

CARRIED

6.4 January 2022 Project Grant Recommendations

C. Gilpin provided highlights of the report. R. Ditor was present to answer questions. Member Roessingh declared a conflict of interest concerning the Arts on View Society and the Chair declared any discussion of that funding request would be reserved until later.

The Commission sought clarification on several points, such as:

- why some organizations received the full amount applied for while others received less than that or none
- whether there was a common theme amongst those that did not get funding
- why there were so few within the top rank
- what impact being declined or receiving less than asked for has on organizations
- the application and adjudication process
- communication with applicants
- the EDI lens for future intakes
- eligibility for the April project grant intake for organizations denied funding in the January intake

- what more could be done to educate or coach organizations wanting to apply for CRD arts grants

Clarifications provided by staff included:

- The adjudicators judge the whole group of applicants in competition for funding with each other, and the awards depend on the ranking within the evaluation criteria.
- High scores in the evaluation went to applications that had a detailed way of describing their level of impact in the community in terms of community benefit, audience demographics and metrics, as well as an overall good application.
- No common theme to note about the lowest-ranked applications.
- Applicants are able to talk to staff about how the decision on their application was made.
- Before applying, organizations have many streams of information and education provided by the Arts and Culture Support Service staff about the application process and filling out the forms.
- This group of applicants did well, but given the budget, not all could be funded or fully funded.

In discussion, the Commission:

- appreciated the broad strokes of all the areas of the arts represented in the applications
- expressed concern over not having a full understanding of the reasons for the funding decisions
- requested that more detail be given on adjudications in future grant reports, such as being able to view the scoring matrix
- emphasized coaching and mentoring for new applicants

MOVED by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Roessingh,

1. That the Arts on View application be severed from the overall recommendations; and
2. That the January 2022 Project Grant recommendations, minus the Arts on View application, be approved as presented.

CARRIED

Member Roessingh recused himself from the meeting at 5:26 p.m. due to having performed for Arts on View and to having been involved as a fundraiser.

Member Hundleby left the meeting at 5:26 p.m.¹

The Commission sought clarification on the application from the Arts on View Society and the distinction between a facility and an arts organization. Staff clarified that the Arts on View Society fit the definition of being a presenter for the purposes of the programming project in the grant application.

MOVED by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Lajeunesse,

That the January 2022 Project Grant recommendation concerning the Arts on View Society be approved as presented.

¹ Member Hundleby then returned to the meeting, as corrected by the Commission in the minutes of May 3, 2022.

CARRIED

Member Roessingh returned to the meeting at 5:28 p.m.

The Commission discussed that though there are a lot of opportunities for gaining education on grant writing from the CRD, it would be great to have that summarized for the Commission, and for staff to turn their mind to continually improve the offerings and help organizations who may have barriers, and through the EDI lens, those that might be successful with a little more help.

MOVED by Plant, **SECONDED** by Geri Lemon,
That staff be directed to provide a report on potential activities to support new applications and emerging organizations in their ability to develop applications and seek input from the Arts Advisory Council as appropriate.

CARRIED

6.5 Outreach Update

V. Jeevanandam provided highlights of the report and added that there is a feedback survey that is utilized.

MOVED by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Roessingh,
That the Outreach Update be received for information.

CARRIED

7 Correspondence

MOVED by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Lemon,
That the following correspondence be received for information:

1. Pacific Opera, 31 Jan 2022, Re: Thank You, Operating Grant
2. Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, 2 Feb 2022, Re: Thank You, Operating Grant

CARRIED

8 New Business There was none until after the closed session.

9 Motion to Close the Meeting

MOVED by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Hundleby,

1. That the Finance Chair of the Arts Advisory Council be admitted to the closed session of the meeting.
2. That the meeting be closed in accordance with the *Community Charter*, Part 4, Division 3, 90(1)(a) personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the regional district or another position appointed by the regional district.

CARRIED

The Commission moved to the closed session at 5:39 p.m.

The Commission rose from the closed session at 5:46 p.m. with the following report:

That Cris Caravaca, Rachel Ditor, Will Greaves, Christina Haska, and Elizabeth Matheson each be reappointed to a term of three years ending on December 31, 2024; and that Joanna Verano be reappointed for a term of two years ending December 31, 2023.

10 New Business

The Commission discussed the timing of recruiting for the vacancies on the Arts Advisory Council.

MOVED by Plant, **SECONDED** by Hundleby,
That staff be directed to start the process of canvassing to fill out the vacant positions on the Arts Advisory Council.

CARRIED

11 Adjournment

MOVED by Member Hundleby, **SECONDED** by Member Lajeunesse,
That the meeting be adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR

RECORDER