

Summary Minutes for the

**CALIFORNIA CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL ENDOWMENT (CCHE) BOARD MEETING**

Held Monday, January 24, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. via Zoom  
(virtual attendance only due to COVID-19)

Welcome and virtual meeting procedures by Bryan Cash, Chair.

**Agenda Item 1:** Roll Call and Introductions. Board Members Present: Chair Cash, Gayle Miller, Amie Hayes, Catherine Gudis, Don Waldie, Ennette Morton, Juan Devis, Senator Scott Wiener and Assemblymember Isaac Bryan.

**Agenda Item 2:** Approval of November 2, 2021, Meeting Minutes.

**Action Taken:** Motion made by Gayle Miller, seconded by Amie Hayes, and carried. Ayes (7): Chair Cash, Gayle Miller, Amie Hayes, Catherine Gudis, Don Waldie, Ennette Morton and Juan Devis.

**Agenda Item 3:** Chairperson's Report given by Bryan Cash. Reported some good news on the revenue front regarding the Snoopy Plate, we are seeing consistent growth over the last 12 months, and we have had a year-to-year growth rate of about 2.5% which is pretty significant given that we're still in the middle of a pandemic. We are happy to report that we are currently up to 11,225 plates sold generating additional revenue from where we were this time last year. Thanks, given to the California Association of Museums for the help it is providing in promoting the plate. We are seeing some additional sales; this will provide good additional revenue after the current 50 million appropriation is awarded.

**Agenda Item 4:** Manager's Report given by Carol Carter. Reported the updates to the museum guidelines today resulting from board member input and public comments.

Thanks, given to board member Juan Devis for meeting with our staff including Andrea Scharffer, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Bonds and Grants.

Thanks, given to board member Don Waldie for the suggested agenda meeting items for discussion in the meeting today. The meeting with board member Devis provided a great opportunity for discussion and I look forward to additional discussions later in this meeting today.

Thanks, given to Celeste Dewald for her continued support to our team.

Reported that Diane Sousa who is currently the lead for the museum grant program has accepted a position as a program manager in the unit, and Evelyn Maginnity who also works for the bonds and grants unit will be taking over as the lead for the program. Part of Diane's capacity as a program manager will be to lead the management of the museum grant program so she will remain very involved and will work closely with Evelyn.

Reported that 23 of the 25 projects that the board awarded in June are now in grant agreement and two of those projects are at least 50% complete. The majority of the remaining projects are in early stages of implementation.

Reported that the review committee recruitment is going well. Since we last met in November, we have added three additional members to the committee for a new total of 13. Diane can share the updated list with the board. Are there any questions before we move on to the next agenda item?

Comment from Juan Devis:

Board member Devis asked for clarification on the management changes and how those changes impact the management and administration of the endowment.

Carol responded:

My role stays the same as the chief of the bonds and grants unit. I will remain the person providing oversight for the unit as a whole. Diane, who was the lead for the program will now be taking on additional manager responsibilities for the program. There are three program managers in the unit, and they manage various programs. Diane is filling a vacancy for a program manager that left the unit. In future board meetings presentations that used to be presented by Diane will now be led by Evelyn, but Diane will still be very involved in the program as the manager of the program. Does that help clarify?

Comment from Juan Devis:

Board member Devis asked for further clarification of Diane's new role as the manager. In addition to the responsibilities for the program what other things will Diane be managing, are they outside of the endowment?

Carol responded:

Yes, outside of the endowment some of the other various programs we administer under the bonds and grants unit; various competitive grant programs.

Comment from Juan Devis:

Thank you, that clarifies it.

Comment from Becki Abrams:

Advised Chair Cash that Donelle Dadigan has joined the meeting at 9:45.

**Agenda Item 5:** Presentation of Updates to Museum Grant Program Draft Guidelines for CCHE Board Discussion and Approval presented by Diane Sousa.

The updated guidelines and meeting materials were emailed to the board and posted to the CCHE Webpage January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2022. The presentation will briefly go over the CCHE background and will recap the museum program, I will discuss the public comment process and highlight the important updates generated by the public comments and then I will wrap up with the projected program timeline.

**Presentation background:**

In 2002, the California Cultural and Historical Endowment (CCHE) board was established by Assembly Bill 716 for the purpose of preserving and protecting California's cultural resources

through a competitive grant process that resulted in CCHE awarding 182 historical and cultural preservation grants.

In 2013, Assembly Bill 482 by then speaker Atkins created a competitive Museum grant program for the CCHE to administer that would support and enhance small capital projects in museums a total of 35 small capital project grants were awarded by the board.

In 2018, SB 1493 expanded the program's project types to include programming in addition to small capital projects.

In 2020, In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Budget Act of 2020 included a provision to prioritize funding for museums that were severely affected by COVID-19 and that serve historically underserved communities and/or students subject to Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In June 2021, the CCHE awarded 25 projects to museums that were severely affected by COVID and that served underserved communities or Title 1 students. Also in the summer of 2021, the budget act appropriated FIFTY MILLION in general fund dollars to continue prioritizing the funding to museums severely affected by COVID-19 and that serve underserved communities or Title 1 students. In the fall of 2021, the draft guidelines for the museum grant program funded by specified general fund dollars, were released for public comment.

This brings us to today's board meeting, where the updated draft guidelines, informed by those public comments, are being presented to the board for approval.

The CCHE is tasked to "assist and enhance the services of California's museums and of other groups and institutions that undertake cultural projects that are deeply rooted in and reflective of previously underserved communities." AB 716

The purpose of the Museum Grant Program (MGP) is intended to solicit projects that assist the CCHE in supporting and enhancing museum services that recognize the importance of making art, science, history and culture available to ALL California residents, particularly to previously underserved communities in the state.

Applicant eligibility; to be eligible applicants must be either a non-profit organization or be a public agency.

Project eligibility; the types of eligible projects include programs, small capital projects, or a combination of both program and related capital elements.

Match requirements; Proposals submitted by nonprofits are not required to provide any matching funds. Public agencies must demonstrate at least 5% of the total grant request in matching funds. If the Public agency is serving an underserved community and has compelling circumstances, they may request a lower than required match.

Next, I will highlight some of the program's funding priorities: per the budget act, funds for this program must be prioritized for museums that have been severely affected by COVID-19 AND that serve underserved communities OR Title 1 students.

**Legislative Priorities:**

Applicants will also select at least one of the 4 legislative priorities (Superior Museums, Services to Pupils, Services to Public or Increased Access) that best suits their proposed project.

**CCHE Priorities:**

Additional consideration will be given to projects that preserve, interpret, and enhance the understanding and appreciation of the state's cultural, social and economic evolution.

Additional considerations will be given to projects located within a disadvantaged community and geographic distribution will be taken into account for the broadest statewide reach of funds.

**Public Comments:**

The draft guidelines for the first round of funding, per the budget act's 50 million appropriation, were released for public comment on October 12, 2021, using ListServ email blast and via a posting on the Museum Grant Program webpage. In addition, a CCHE board meeting was held on November 2nd of 2021, to solicit comments from the board and the public. The public comment period closed on November 12th. Targeted outreach to Native American Tribes located within California was conducted through a mass mail out to solicit comments and offer of formal consultation regarding the Museum Grant Program. This outreach effort began November 10th and closed on December 10th of 2021.

In total we received 18 public comments; One of which was an inquiry from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requesting ongoing program solicitation updates. All comments were reviewed for consideration and were incorporated into the updated draft guidelines before you.

Next, I will go over the highlights of major guideline updates that were primarily informed by those comments from the board and the public. I won't be going over are the clerical and formatting updates such as revising typographical errors, punctuation etc.

Added definition for "public agencies", "nonprofit organizations" and "museum" for clarity so that an interested applicant will be able to easily determine their eligibility.

We added examples of museum categories and expanded those categories to include art centers, cultural centers and historic houses and sites.

We added additional information to provide clarity to the minimum years of establishment and the required minimum number of days open each year.

We added improvements / renovations to interiors of mobile museum vehicles to the eligible projects capital project examples column.

The number of application questions was reduced, deleting duplicative responses.

We included additional discipline categories to question #3.

Definition for "Museum" was updated to mirror the definition provided in the enacting legislation AB 716.

A hyperlink to the Core Standards for Museums webpage was provided under the "Superior Museum" definition to provide additional guidance for applicants interested in selecting the superior museums legislative objective category.

Definition of "Underserved Community" was expanded by providing a series of examples of underserved communities such as communities of color, LGBTQIA communities, foster youth, seniors, veterans, etc.

All of these updates are also included in more detail in the staff report.

If the board approves the draft guidelines as presented, we anticipate releasing the guidelines to the public on Jan 28, 2022. We will conduct five technical assistance workshops virtually for interested applicants during the month of February. Project proposals will be due on March 11, 2022. The Museum review committee will then evaluate eligible proposals during the months of May through June 2022.

Competitive projects will receive a field visit during the months of June July and August 2022. The most competitive projects from the field visits will be invited to submit supporting documentation in September 2022. Which will lead us to a November board meeting where projects will be presented to the board for approval. Upon approval, awards will be announced. This concludes my presentation. I thank you for your time and attention.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Thanks to Diane and the staff for all the work and time you put into this, I appreciate the board and the public for making comments and providing insights into the guidelines. I want to open it up to comments from board members right now on the guidelines before we move to a vote. Or if any public comments.

Comment from Becki Abrams:

Advised Chair Cash that Greg Lucas has joined the meeting at 9:56

Comment from Chair Cash:

If there are no comments from the public or the board, we can move on.

Comment from Juan Devis:

Question about the timeline, when did we know when this money was allocated to the endowment?

Chair Cash responded:

It became available in July 2021

Comment from Juan Devis:

As part of that allocation was this sort of idea that this money could be seen as relief from all the impact that COVID has had to a certain degree, is this way too long to be releasing that money after having heard we received the influx in July it is going to be almost a year and a half since the announcement? Just a question, a year and a half is a long time.

Chair Cash responded:

Yes, but the bond unit had other programs it was finishing up when it was moving on, unfortunately it is not just dedicated to the CCHE, there are other programs.

When the guidelines came out, we had comments that we wanted to make sure we put those into the process so that is why it took a little bit longer to actually do the solicitation. Going from January to November is pretty quick for the process especially if you want to take into consideration technical assistance workshops and outreach and things like that.

It's a balance, getting out as quick as possible but also making sure that we do the outreach so you can reach those museums that are affected and that need the help to actually apply to the program.

Comment from Juan Devis:

Just a theoretical question so if there was a dedicated staff that did not have to work on other grants and things of that sort, this could potentially have gone, we would be delivering the money maybe mid 2022? Is that a correct assessment or not really?

Carol responded:

I can add a little bit Juan, generally the competitive process takes about a year for all of our programs, when you have a new program where you are adding public input, public comments.

Of course, we first have to amend or do any updates to those guidelines based on either new legislation or budget priorities and then advertise those out to the public, do public hearings and then incorporate those changes that adds a little bit of time that Bryan mentioned to get us to this point today.

Then the review process takes some time, we have folks that are volunteering to participate on these review committees and sometimes we can get a large influx of proposals for them to review so we allow sufficient time based on experience for the committee members to complete those reviews.

Documentation is submitted in phases, and we do the evaluation in phases to ease the amount of work upfront from all applicants, our old process we used to have everybody submit everything we needed up front, but we found that there is not enough funding to award everybody, and it put everybody at a lot of work upfront.

Our new process now eliminates that, it makes the submission process much simpler and less burdensome on everybody in that we only require those that are the most competitive to submit additional documents, so it does have approximately a year process but based on our experience it works well.

Comment from Juan Devis:

I know that you guys have been thorough and going through the process, my question was more along if there were dedicated staff that was 100% concentrated on CCHE would this process gone faster?

Carol responded:

I don't think so because of the timeline for public hearing and public comment process, reviews so I do not necessarily believe it would have changed the timeline.

Comment from Juan Devis:

OK, thank you.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

I do have a question about process that really derives from the timeline as well, I would also like to call out a couple of details in the revised guidelines for internal consistency.

One of my questions relates to the field visits, I am wondering how many of the projects from the 2020 round of applications were actually capital improvements? I can see a real need for capital improvements to potentially require a field visit but having served on quite a number of organizational inquiries for COVID relief I have not really seen any that needed that kind of field visit, and I can imagine that this adds to the burden to the great extent, so I am wondering how that might be considered or reconsidered either for this round or for the future.

Carol responded:

We have another program (Youth Community Access) which is primarily programs for the most part, but like the Museum program it does allow a combination that includes program and capital. The bulk of the projects are programming, and the plan is to do the visits that are primarily programming virtually.

It is very helpful, speaking from experience even when it's just a program, it is very helpful to have those field visits even though they are virtual visits. You are meeting face to face with the applicant, sometimes information is not super clear even though the proposal may have risen to the top there are still some questions, and it is so helpful to meet face to face even via a virtual meeting on teams to have those types of discussions and give the applicant the opportunity to explain things about their program so we feel that is extremely important even for those programmatic projects to have those virtual field inspections.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

Thank you for clarifying the virtual lifts a lot of the burden I imagine for both the reviewers and the participants. One comment that a previous applicant had shared with me was that the preparation for a field visit was onerous but the actually of it was quite helpful. I hope that you will be able to discern which proposals would benefit most from a virtual field visit and perhaps property owner not be required to attend. I wanted to share the public comments that was shared from the last round, when there is a public program and a field visit it might not be as necessary when an applicant is leasing the structure that clarification would be wonderful.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

I noted an inconsistency on page 3 which includes virtual, but the question later in the document does not include virtual online.

I also noted an inconsistency on page 3 which shows eligible projects marketing and collections care and small capital projects, I believe that should be or not and if you would please look at these with an editorial eye, that would be welcomed.

Statement on Page 2 that relates to the definition and I am wondering if that is a definition that has always been used and where tangible objects relate to that defining feature particularly if we are expanding the notion to include community centers that might actually be addressing to a very large extent intangible elements of culture.

Carol responded:

Thank you for those comments, Catherine, we will be sure to take a close look at those items you have addressed.

Diane responded:

That definition is the one that has been used throughout the guidelines since AB 2018 and that is directly from legislation. The definition is directly from legislation, and it includes that word tangible, so the last set of guidelines did include the definition and categories but just to simplify the definition this time around we just included the definition verbatim as provided in the legislation and then provided the categories in the document itself instead of the definition. Catherine, I wanted to respond to the comment regarding the number of days open, we will look into that clarification. When the question is asked for the number of days open the thought is that virtual days count as well, but we will take a look at that it is really explicit.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

Thank you for clarifying.

Chair Cash responded:

Let's move on to public comments.

Comment from Celeste DeWald:

Good morning, Chair and board members, my name is Celeste DeWald, I am the executive director of the California Association of Museums, although we have other key partners in our advocacy work our organization was the lead of securing the 50 million dollars for the museum grant program, so we have a stake in how this program moves forward. This one-time investment in this program is going to play such a key role in helping hundreds of museums of all sizes and disciplines' recover from the devastating effects of the pandemic. I would like to thank the staff very much for their time in preparing the grant guidelines and listening to the comments offered by community stake holders.

The one thing that I would like to underscore that has already been brought up is the possibility of truncating the timeline and getting the much-needed funds to the field earlier.



With the surge of Omicron many museums are faced with additional closures and event cancellations and attendance rates are suffering. Having additional support for priority programs and capital projects would be extremely beneficial this year so thank you for your consideration.

Chair Cash responded:

Thank you, Celeste, are there any other public comments.

Comment from Don Waldie:

As staff's recommendation on this item is to approve the draft program guidelines, I want to feel comfortable that Senator Wiener and Juan Devis are themselves comfortable with the revised definition of museum, that does touch upon a later item on the agenda but here it would seem necessary to have a brief discussion with them to confirm they are satisfied with the definition.

Chair Cash responded:

Juan, Senator Wiener do you have any comments on that?

Comment from Juan Devis:

I think after the conversations that we've had and going through the language I think that the current language is porous enough to be able to be inclusive of what I think we were bringing up in our last meeting, so I am okay with it.

Chair Cash responded:

Thank you, Senator Wiener do you have any additional comments on that?

Comment from Senator Wiener:

No, I do not, I agree

Comment from Chair Cash:

Thank you, we really appreciate those comments Juan to and in working with our staff on that and finding a way to be more inclusive, that's great.

Comment from Juan Devis:

That was my pleasure.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Let's open it up to a motion and a second on the guidelines.

Comment from Gayle Miller:

Motion for approval, I really appreciate all of the feedback and conversation, thank you.

Comment from Ennette Morton:

I second.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Moved by Gayle Miller, second by Ennette Morton.

#### **Agenda Item 5:** Draft Guideline Approval

**Action Taken:** Motion made by Gayle Miller, seconded by Ennette Morton, and carried. Ayes (9): Chair Cash, Gayle Miller, Greg Lucas, Amie Hayes, Catherine Gudis, Don Waldie, Donelle Dadigan, Ennette Morton and Juan Devis.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Thank you, let's move on to the next item.

**Agenda Item 6:** Discussion items: Annual Workplan, Museum Definition and Outreach Campaign Strategies.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Carol, it sounds like we are good on the museum definition, so let's work on the items the annual work plan and the outreach campaign strategies.

Comment from Carol:

Thank you, Bryan. There were a couple of items that were recommended for discussion one of those being an annual work plan and so we wanted to put that out to the board to see if having an annual work plan that included proposed meeting dates as well as major milestones for grant cycles would be beneficial to the board, we'd like to open that up for board discussion.

Comment from Don Waldie:

This was a suggestion of mine to staff; I would like to show you a brief statement. It is my belief that the board members would benefit from an annual work plan that would be as described earlier a key to the milestones grant application and grant making process.

I think an annual work plan would give a big picture view of what the endowment hopes to achieve by focusing attention on impacts and results and I think in collaboration with staff a plan would give structure to the board's deliberative and oversight functions and provide opportunities to develop a mission centered approach to board member deliberations and potential board actions.

Basically, a work plan is almost in front of us from the materials provided already, but I think another couple of other elements might be helpful. If for example we had a mission or vision statement as part of our work plan, a plan that contained some measurable goals for example outreach campaign goals of course we already have key dates in the application and grant making process and workshops timelines and those things. It would be helpful to have tentative dates of board meetings for planning and it would be helpful to have a document that contains some sort of table of prior years' goals that were achieved. So, in the form of a motion to the members of the board following a second if there is one and a discussion, I would move that the staff be directed to assemble dates, timeline, table of prior goals achieved, tentative dates of board meetings for the remainder of 2022. With the assistance of staff draft a mission statement and draft work plan for circulation, discussion and approval and to schedule a meeting to receive a progress report on these recommended items related to work plan and outreach campaign, I so move these recommendations.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Thanks for that Don, just a clarification I'm not sure we need to vote on this I as it was not an action item, I want to verify with legal staff on that or with Carol. To clarify even though it was not an action item we can direct staff to do this.

Comment from Don Waldie:

I have always been a little unclear of the rules of order, so I understand the distinction, thank you.

Comment from Carol:

Thank you for this information, Don, I think it was more open it up for discussion like you have Don, to see if any of the other board members also had any input.

Comment from Don Waldie:

Yes.

Comment from Chair Cash:

I think it would be a good idea to put this together. You know there hasn't been any do you like this not since the legislation was originally passed, establishing the CCHE back in the day has there really been a discussion of the mission. I think this would be a good idea for board members to really put their heads together and figure out in addition to the museum grant program are their other things we want to focus on that are part of the enabling statute from 2002.

I like this idea for discussion, I would like to ask staff though on the February timeline with everything else going on if that's doable or if we could set another date. I really like the idea of all of us putting our heads together and figuring out how we can further the mission of the CCHE especially we're doing a good job on the museums, but it seems there's some other parts of the mission where we could use some help.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

I want to thank DJ for presenting this to us I think that probably many of us have shared a bit of uncertainty as to the best way to be able to serve. This will offer some opportunity to both think on a more macro level or a global level, so I really appreciate the way that you have put this. I would support participation in this work plan and hope that this is something staff can fit into their already busy schedules because I am sure that it poses its own challenges that might be something we might also consider, discussing and assessing the elements that are presented here.

Comment from Juan Devis:

I think that probably DJ and I recommend appointing a committee of board members to draft with the advice and assistance of staff the board's mission statement to Catharine's point, one of the things is how we can be more effective and involved in the organization of the endowment and I wonder if adding something here about the creation of discrete groups and committees that are created within the board that can help assist and vision different aspects of the endowment with the staff.

Comment from Don Waldie:

I am certainly willing to participate in that level of discussion as it seems like a natural outgrowth of making the endowment as effective as possible.

Comment from Juan Devis:

Yes, I can foresee committees that are working on multiple different things throughout the year with an understanding of the annual plan such as financial fundraising definitions etc.

Comment from Don Waldie:

Or outreach activities.

Comment from Juan Devis:

The good thing is that there is enough willingness from some of the board members to be able to commit to those things if we have been appointed by the endowment.

Comment from Chair Cash:

That's great I really appreciate that, Carol any thoughts on timeline?

First off, I want to say that I really like the idea of creating some subcommittees it would be good to think that out with staff I think initially it would be good to have just a couple board members to meet with staff to kind of think this thing through and then come back and present something to the board. How does that sound? How many board members can be on a committee without breaking Bagley Keene I think it's 3 correct?

Comment from legal counsel Heather Baugh:

If you formally appoint today two or more people, then Bagley Keene is triggered so I am going to recommend appointing one person as the lead and then that person can create an ad hoc group of two, that won't trigger the act. But if you formally appoint two people or more to do this work, then you trigger all of the open meeting requirements so my recommendation is to pick a leader and that person can create an ad hoc working group of two at a time that can get this work done.

Comment from Chair Cash:

That's great, Don would you be OK being that leader?

Comment from Don Waldie:

Sure!

Comment from Chair Cash:

That's awesome and we will leave it up to you to search out volunteers, but it sounds like we have a couple already who have been giving their ideas.

Comment from Don Waldie:

I welcome any communication, please let me know anybody who is willing to give some hours to this thank you.

Comment from Carol:

Bryan in terms of coming back with a February board meeting might be pretty tough for us right now with the competitive grant cycles we have going currently and rolling out museum and doing technical workshops for museums so the staff is going to be quite busy so I think February would be tough. So, what we will have to do just go back and take a look and come up with some potential days and of course we would send something out to see what works for the board if that's OK.

Comment from Chair Cash:

That sounds great, if you can communicate directly with Don and he can share with the other members of the ad hoc committee that would be great.

Comment from Don Waldie:

To clarify, this informal or ad hoc committee can only contain two members, or can it contain three members?

Comment from Chair Cash:

Two was my understanding from Heather.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Heather is that correct?

Comment from legal counsel Heather Baugh:

Yes.

Comment from Chair Cash:

So, we can have separate ad hoc subcommittees that are members of two, right?

Comment from legal counsel Heather Baugh:

Yes, I know it's weird, but Bagley Keene really wants all of this to be done publicly so the extent that you create the working committee after this that's fine we will just have to follow those rules.

Comment from Chair Cash:

OK.

Comment from Carol:

Don would you be willing to e-mail and share this document with me and our team (Item 6 annual work plan).

Comment from Don Waldie:

Of course, I will do that immediately after the meeting.

Comment from Carol:

Thank you that would be great.

Comment from Chair Cash:

Awesome, I really appreciate that Don it's going to be exciting to have some board members dig into these issues and just think about where the board can go outside of the museum grant program and other areas really appreciate that.

Comment from Carol:

We have one more item to discuss and that is the item of the outreach strategies for the museum program. I just want to start by saying that we are open to all suggestions by the board, and I just thought it might be helpful to explain currently what our strategies are and what we're currently doing just as a starting point. So currently we start off by releasing the solicitation once approved by the board we have two listserv lists under the bonds and grants unit under agency one is specific to the CCHE which has approximately 1700 subscribers. We also have a broader listserv for the bonds and grants unit which has approximately 4500 subscribers so that's one effort to get the word out about this particular program. We also post the solicitation on our website, and we can share via agencies various social media outlets. Another avenue we plan to utilize is to seek out other organizations that can share our solicitation and information about the program such as the Arts Council, the California Association of Museums, California State Library. One of the other ways that we really provide assistance and work with stakeholders is by doing those technical assistance workshops. We will be doing five of those where we walk potential applicants through the requirements of the

program and how to submit a proposal that's a really hands-on opportunity to give them information and to answer their questions, that's done during those technical assistance workshops via webinars so we can reach as many people as possible.

Then we also make ourselves available for questions, so an entity can call our office and ask questions and we provide support, or they can e-mail us, and we will provide support. We have a dedicated team member assisting applicants in the actual submission process, it's an online application system call SOAR. We help folks all the way up to the point of submitting their proposal answering their questions and help them out. Those are some of the ways that we currently get the word out about the program and provide technical assistance to all applicants. I am open to hearing more from the board, maybe there is networks out there that the board is aware of that perhaps they can share, or they can provide the information and we are happy to share. I just wanted to start there sharing what we currently do but I'm also open to hearing the board's suggestions and recommendations.

Comment from Diane:

One additional outreach effort is we also add the solicitation to the grants statewide portal so that folks can use the portal as a one stop shop for all things grants so we submit the solicitation to that portal as well.

Comment from Carol:

That's a huge one, all state agencies that do funding are required to do that and it's a great resource as we're doing workshops, we're hearing back from folks that the word is out on that grants.ca.gov portal. Folks can go there and search all funding opportunities including museum program. Now I'd like to turn it over to the board members to hear your thoughts for further discussion.

Comment from Don Waldie:

One thought is by expanding the definition of museum neatly dove tailed into outreach efforts of solicitation of applications. If we are going to less traditional venues that fit the expanded definition, we might have to find other ways of reaching them than formerly. I think there may need to be additional effort for another component if we are actually going to be able to reach those less traditional museum settings.

Comment from Carol:

Do you have any recommendations on how we could do that Don?

Comment from Don Waldie:

I'm not an expert in that area but a couple of thoughts are that perhaps we should contact not museums specifically but instead leaders in that community, Senator Wiener brought up one at our last meeting because it may not be possible for us to know where those nontraditional venues are located but perhaps leaders in that community might know where they are located so that might give us a place to start to do outreach to them. So instead of trying to find museums find leaders in the community and talk to them.

Comment from Carol:

Thank you, Don.

Comment from Don Waldie:

Another thought would be hiring a consultant to give us additional support in this area.

Comment from Juan Devis:

Don, I think we could potentially with Carol and the teams collaboration we can make a list of substantially influential cultural organizations across California that have their foot on the ground in their community starting a conversation and brainstorming with them to find out what we could do potentially to expand the outreach to refit and match that expanded definition of museums, just an idea.

Comment from Carol:

Juan, to make sure I understand you are suggesting that maybe you and Don provide a list of some of those cultural institutions out there in those communities that would not have access to traditional museums and then provide that information to our team to help guide some ways that we're able to outreach to them?

Comment from Juan Devis:

I was suggesting we could make a list maybe of 20 of these really important cultural organizations across California for example Plaza de la Raza, Washington Neighborhood Center, Lincoln heights etc. where deeper outreach could be provided to people you potentially know who might be benefited from this.

Comment from Carol:

Definitely that sounds like a great idea. I also want to mention the agency has an assistant secretary for equity and environmental justice who may be able to provide some assistance and recommendations on various ways that we could outreach.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

That sounds like a great idea Carol, I was actually thinking about some of those organizations working to do public education and outreach programs that relate to the significance of food and food justice and using different cultural traditions to do so. I think one of the things that Juan mentioned was about trying to tap some of those organizations that have feet on the ground it might be that we can provide suggestions for organizations and then maybe highlight a few who might be in a good position to suggest other ways to advance the outreach. I'm thinking of organizations such as Alliance for California's Traditional Arts, I know we wouldn't be in a position to regrant as part of this that would be in a position to reach out to organizations that might not see themselves as traditional museums.

Comment from Carol:

Thank you, Catherine.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

May I ask a technical question I was curious about SOAR which has a statement at the top of the document on the landing page that indicated SOAR is limited to PCs that have Internet Explorer is that still the case?

Comment from Carol:

What we have found with SOAR is that Mac users have been successful in submitting proposals the folks that originally developed the software advised it works best with PC's so we always share that information with applicants, but we have heard from several that have

been successful submitting their proposals with a Mac. We had one tribal entity that did not have the ability, so we worked with them and entered the proposal for them to get their proposal submitted. We do provide that sort of assistance if there is some limitation, or an entity is unable to submit their proposal we work with them.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

That's great thank you.

Comment from Carol:

Are there any other comments on the outreach strategy? we have a couple of follow-up items here Don and Juan will work to provide a list to us and looking at those nontraditional organizations and how to get the message out to them and make sure they are able to participate in our technical assistance workshops and also to understand the availability of our team to help with questions and anything that they may need. Even understanding if they have an eligible project or an eligible applicant to meet the definition.

Comment from Ennette Morton:

I wanted to add to the comments about the outreach strategy and reiterate what some of the other board members and just to highlight that a lot of our higher education communities and universities and colleges have programs that directly partner with some of their community museums so that may be a good entity to add to the list and ideas for outreach. From my experience where I am now, we have many of the programs with our arts department, they would be very helpful in providing outreach opportunities or giving ideas of who else could possibly benefit from some of the programs.

Comment from Carol:

A follow up question Ennette, is it possible that those educational entity programs if we share the solicitation would they possibly be able to help share the message?

Comment from Ennette Morton:

Yes absolutely.

Comment from Carol:

That's a key for us, we're trying to get contact information so that we're able to get our information out to as wide a reach as possible so any help for our team in that way is very much appreciated.

Comment from Don Waldie:

Juan would you please clarify your point; I thought part of his suggestion was that a number of leaders of cultural organizations be convened in a zoom call on a roundtable discussion and those leaders could come up with potential contacts that staff could outreach to. Was that correct Juan?

Comment from Juan Devis:

Yes, you basically do a double outreach, outreaching first to these leaders, institutions, and organizations, help them understand that they could be a stakeholder in this process and then you enlist them as participants in helping to reach out to other folks who could potentially benefit.

Comment from Carol:



So, to make sure I'm clear Juan and Don you will provide our team with the list of maybe 20 or so entities and then RT would convene a team's meeting with those 20 to talk with them about how we can outreach to similar organizations that they are aware of is that correct?

Comment from Juan Devis:

Yes, that is correct.

Comment from Carol:

OK thank you.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

One other thought is to also get in touch and circulate information with California Preservation Foundation I don't know if you have on your current subscriber list other preservation related foundations, potentially also cross posting and additional listing would be municipal and county arts and culture offices and departments would perhaps be an additional way to advance the cross posting.

Comment from Carol:

I will have to reach out to our IT folks to see if we can get a subscribers list from the listserv to cross reference, I don't know how we would reach the various municipalities.

Comment from Catherine Gudis:

I will work on thinking of some names of people who might be useful contacts to help with that.

Comment from Carol:

Another comment that I have is that we are at the point of the board approving the guidelines and plan to release them in the next couple of days so it does not give us much time we're happy to schedule the zoom call Don and Juan for those names but we would need those fairly quickly so we could get something set up. To prevent further delays we want to make sure we can move forward as quickly as possible to get the word out so that they can participate in the workshops. I want to confirm that there's no intent to delay the timeline, we want to move forward as quickly as possible and get these funds out.

### **Agenda Item 7: Public Comment**

Comment from Chair Cash:

Thanks everyone for your participation, do we have any public comments on that?

Comment from Celeste DeWald:

I think it goes without saying that we would like to see additional funding for the museum grant program in future budget cycles and we want you to know that we are working to make that happen as you know the statute that enacted the museum grant program is almost 20 years old. We will be sponsoring a bill to establish the long-term priorities for the program. We feel it is time to reevaluate and articulate how the state can support museums particularly in ways that reflect the priorities of the state of California. We are currently in the process of vetting draft language with stakeholders we have to move pretty quickly given the legislatures timeline. I want to invite you all if you want to discuss those priorities we are proposing and perhaps this intersects with your mission and vision conversation that you're going to have as board members. We are preserving the purpose to support projects that are deeply rooted in and reflective of previously underserved communities, so I feel there is a nexus here between your intent of the mission and vision and what are process is for potential

language for the museum grant program. Our goal is to make state investments in the museum program a regular occurrence and not just a onetime investment. Thank you.

Comment from Chair Cash and Juan Devis:

Thank you, Celeste.

Comment from Chair Cash:

I really appreciate everyone's input today, I really feel like we are moving things forward with the CCHE and we're taking the steps that we need to do that, appreciate all the boards participation and willingness to help out and to make the program better. With that we are adjourned until our next meeting.

**Agenda Item 8:** Adjournment at 10:50 a.m.

# # #