

City of Austin

Evaluation of Cultural Arts Funding Process

Submitted by:

**Dabney & Associates
Lucille E. Dabney
Eduardo Diaz
Marion A. McCollam**

October 2002

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
PUBLIC POLICY	4
Source of Funding	8
Other Economic Development Implications	10
The Five Objectives and the Seven Goals	10
Conflict of Interest	12
STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF A LOCAL ARTS AGENCY	12
ARTS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	14
ARTS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	17
SUPPORT AND RESOURCES	19
EQUITY	20
COMMUNICATIONS	22
Systems and Networks	22
Timeliness	23
Protocol	23
CONCLUSION	25

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Draft Audit Report – Cultural Arts Funding Process

Appendix B: List of Activities, Documents, Meetings and Individuals

Appendix C: Austin Comprehensive Art Plans

Appendix D: Memorandum to Austin City Manager from Austin Hotel & Motel Association and Texas Hotel & Motel Association; Review of Austin’s Use of Hotel Occupancy Tax

Appendix E: 2002-03 Cultural Contract Guidelines

CITY OF AUSTIN EVALUATION OF CULTURAL ARTS FUNDING PROCESS

Dabney & Associates

INTRODUCTION

Dabney & Associates, a team composed of Marion McCollam, Eduardo Díaz and Luci Dabney, has been retained by the City of Austin to:

1. Evaluate the city's current cultural arts funding process;
2. Identify public cultural arts funding best practices and benchmarks; and
3. Identify and recommend viable cultural arts funding program model alternatives for the city, including strategies for implementing those alternatives.

This Phase One engagement began on August 19, 2002, and is scheduled for completion on November 20, 2002. Dabney & Associates is working under the supervision of the Office of the City Auditor. At the city's discretion, a Phase Two component to the project may ensue, where we will provide assistance in the implementation of the recommendations made in Phase One.

This evaluation concerns the current cultural arts funding process managed by the Cultural Arts Affairs Division (Cultural Contracts) of the City of Austin's Parks and Recreation Department. This assessment evaluates the current process against community needs and opportunities. It was the City's intent that we conduct this assessment concurrently with a performance audit conducted by the Office of the City Auditor. Unfortunately, our contract was officially executed on August 19, 2002, after the panels and the Austin Arts Commission had completed its review, rankings, funding recommendations and appeals processes. Consequently, this assessment draws from the findings in the September 24, 2002 Audit Report issued by the Office of City Auditor. We want to commend the City Auditor's staff for the thoroughness of the analysis and succinctness of the writing. It has proven indispensable in preparing this assessment and we extend our sincerest gratitude to individuals who worked arduously in conducting the analyses and preparing the document. We will refer to its findings on a frequent and necessary basis. The Audit Report is attached as Appendix A. Our evaluation builds on the Audit Report in the following ways:

- ? Policy: outlines policy areas typically addressed by cities and local arts agencies and explores areas with particular applicability to Austin;
- ? Planning: as former local arts agency directors who have led and participated in cultural planning efforts, our analysis of the 1993 Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan presents additional perspective; and
- ? Communication: comments on the aspects of frequency and timeliness.

Additionally, we address the arts link to economic and community development, themes that resonate with Austin's elected leadership, and explore issues dealing with equity and access. The Audit Report does a particularly good job of analyzing panel and Commission deliberations and process, proceedings we were unable to observe directly. We should add that our conversations with Commissioners, panel chairs and applicants did confirm the report findings and that we will make specific recommendations on how to improve the funding process. Finally, we should note that we spoke to a wider range of stakeholders and facilitated an "Open Space" meeting of some 70 stakeholders on September 28, 2002, to which over 800 people were invited. These activities provide us with a broader perspective than is reflected in the Audit Report. The results of these conversations and meeting will be reflected in each of our reports and subsequent recommendations.

With respect to methodology, the consulting team:

- ? Reviewed a variety of pertinent reports, studies and other documents from city and other sources;
- ? Attended meetings of the Austin Arts Commission and its Guidelines Committee;
- ? Viewed videotape and live cable cast of Austin City Council meetings;
- ? Listened to excerpts of audio tape recordings of Arts Commission meetings;
- ? Facilitated a day-long public meeting of arts funding stakeholders, premised on "Open Space Technology;" and
- ? Interviewed diverse stakeholders (e.g., City Council Members, City staff, Arts Commissioners, advisory panel chairs, representatives of arts organizations, business leaders, etc.).

It is important to note that we presented at a City Council work session on October 2, 2002. Additionally, a member of the consulting team did attend one Arts Commission public hearing and two meetings of the Commission's

Guidelines Committee before our official August 19th start-up. We have also had an opportunity to review audio tape recordings of two other regular Commission meetings and one Commission work session. A detailed list of activities, including document titles, meeting dates and individuals is attached. Please see Appendix B.

We have organized all of our assessment work around seven (7) topics. We settled on these seven areas based on the Audit Report findings, Austin's particular characteristics, challenges and opportunities, and our observations, findings and experience. We think that the following themes are "top of mind" with many key stakeholders. Their exploration is also key to comprehensive cultural development strategies.

1. Public Policy: what goals and objectives does the City of Austin seek to accomplish by providing arts funding and other resources?
2. Structure and Function of Local Arts Agency: Given Austin's unique opportunities and challenges, what is the best approach for providing leadership, delivering services and ensuring accountability?
3. Arts and Economic Development: Where is the link and how can the City leverage its arts investments to address community-wide economic development goals?
4. Arts and Community Development: How can the City leverage its arts investments to achieve broader applications in the areas of public infrastructure, social services, education and quality of life?
5. Support and Resources: In addition to the current funding program and its enhancement, what other forms of support can the City provide or leverage (e.g., strategic planning, technical assistance, space, etc.)?
6. Equity: Diversity is among Austin's most valuable assets; how does the City level the playing field and ensure equal access to its resources?
7. Communication: What are the best strategies for developing a system of open, timely and productive communication that permeates the arts funding process and addresses "big picture" themes and developments?

It is important to note that subsequent reports and analyses will also track these same seven theme areas.

PUBLIC POLICY

Sound public policies derive from a clear sense of vision and mission and are used to guide individual and group action, those of staff and commission, to meet

the municipality's goals and objectives. Policies impact management—planning, coordinating and directing the activities of the local arts agency. They allow for continuity of management and governance despite turnover of council members, commission members and staff. Policies help streamline decision-making and provide for more consistent decisions. Importantly, clearly delineated policies can insulate public officials and staff from political and personal pressures, especially in cases where funds are allocated. Within the context of local arts agencies, it is common, indeed expected, that staff contribute to the development of public policy.

The City of Austin contracts with arts organizations and artists for the provision of diverse arts and cultural services. Funds to support these contracts derive from a percentage of locally collected hotel and motel occupancy taxes (bed tax). Additional funding is made available by the Texas Commission on the Arts, through the Commission's decentralized funding program which makes funds available to large Texas cities for distribution through locally managed arts funding processes.

In 1986, the Austin City Council adopted an ordinance establishing an arts funding program. The ordinance contains a concise five-part mission that reads:

- ? *TO CREATE a physical and human environment which nurtures artists, arts organizations and arts producers;*
- ? *TO NURTURE AND PRESERVE cultural diversity, consistent with and reflecting Austin's population;*
- ? *TO EQUALIZE access to the arts, both participatory and professional;*
- ? *TO IMPROVE the artistic and administrative ability of Austin's arts offerings;*
- ? *TO PROMOTE the inclusion of aesthetic consideration in local decision-making through advocacy, services, financial and technical assistance and leadership in the community.*

Subsequently, the Austin Arts Commission and Cultural Affairs Division promulgated program goals and value statements, which key off elements in the above central mission. These program goals and values are listed in the current Cultural Contract Guidelines. As correctly noted in the Audit Report, while the Commission has developed these goals it has not developed specific objectives and strategies to carry them out. This was born out by our conversations with all of the Commissioners, including long-time members of the Commission. Further, the Audit Report points out that while the annual Guidelines review process tweaks the funding process, there is no other deliberative Commission-led process that addresses fundamental policy issues. Finally, the Audit Report

indicates a lack of clarity on important conflict of interest policy, and further notes that some of the current arts funding program practice may be out of synch with extant city conflict of interest policy.

In 1993, the Austin City Council commissioned the Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan (ACAP). The plan was constructed to meet the National Endowment for the Arts cultural planning requirement for application to the Locals Program. The Austin Arts Commission appointed a task force to facilitate the planning process. The plan raises fundamental questions relative to organizational structure, programs and underlying public policy. Intended as a working document, it makes three general recommendations:

1. An evaluation and reassessment of the Cultural Affairs Division as it relates to the Parks and Recreation Department;
2. Establishment of an ACAP subcommittee through the Austin Arts Commission that will oversee the implementation, update and ongoing support of the plan; and
3. Establishment of several Issues Subcommittees to assist with implementation, such as Advocacy and Public Relations, Facilities and Spaces, Minority Equity, Funding and Economic Development, and Arts Education/Artists and Arts Organizations.

The ACAP is confusing and inconclusive on the first recommendation. An analysis on the structural issues it purports to address is not presented. For unexplained reasons, the plan recommends the continuation of “strong support for the Cultural Affairs Division of the bed tax funding and continued improvement in funding allocation process within Cultural Affairs.” We see no studied evaluation or assessment of the city’s organizational structure or the performance of the Cultural Affairs staff and the process it administers. The plan document notes that the last two recommendations “will help facilitate a broader working relationships with the Austin Arts Commission and the arts community it serves.” The Austin Arts Commission did establish a subcommittee to oversee implementation of ACAP, which appears to have been active for approximately three years after the plan’s completion. During that period of time the Guidelines Committee’s purview was strengthened, funds allocated from the bed tax fund to support cultural arts funding were increased and a multi-year funding program was established (multi-year funding no longer exists). After this roughly three-year period, we see little evidence of the continuing updating or ongoing support for the plan. It appears that the recommended Issue Subcommittees morphed into Commission committees addressing special populations, facilities, marketing and public relations and funding and financial resources. Presently, there are 11 Commission committees, with varying degrees of activism. Most of the committees are tied to the funding process and are seasonably active. The Executive Committee appears to meet on a regular basis. Additionally, the

Commission has official liaisons to the Arts in Public Places Program, Convention and Visitors Bureau and Downtown Commission. In reviewing the Austin Arts Commission's committee and liaison matrix-roster, we question the effectiveness of Commissioners shouldering multiple committee and liaison assignments. Of the current Commissioners, only one has less than three assignments; most have four; one has six.

It appears that several of ACAP's specific recommendations have not been implemented. There is no advocacy program, no three-phase cultural facilities plan, no economic impact study, no marketing and public relations office, to name a few of the plan's stated recommendations. In our view, the plan is poorly written, indecisive and clearly out-dated; Austin is a much-changed community since 1993. Most of its recommendations are unsubstantiated by findings or evidence of comprehensive community dialogue. While ACAP raises some interesting and compelling questions, sadly, it has fallen far short in engendering the kind of continuing community dialogue, visioning, public policy making, strategizing and problem solving it ostensibly was conducted to initiate and continue. The Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan is attached as Addendum C.

Initiating an expansive community conversation on cultural development starts a powerful process that frequently yields tangible results even as the process moves forward. Community cultural planning is generally a process of consulting with the citizenry to ascertain cultural values and aspirations, seeking consensus on goals for cultural development and agreement on actions to achieve them, presenting a range of implementation strategies and noting responsible parties and potential resources. It is a process of:

- ? Assessing the needs and opportunities of arts service providers (their strengths and weaknesses), consumers, and the community at large;
- ? Inventorying existing arts and cultural resources and ways to build those resources;
- ? Building consensus on a shared vision and setting goals and objectives for achieving it;
- ? Dialoguing with and building support among public policy makers and private sector leaders to take action and secure resources; and
- ? Monitoring action and evaluating plan regularly.

Cultural planning is especially important in Austin because of the dynamic demographic changes the community has experienced since 1993, together with rapid growth in the arts community. In addition to the rapid population growth, approximately a 41 percent increase between 1990 and 2000, there are also some demographic shifts in ethnicity (Austin is more culturally diverse than in 1993), age, household composition and income, occupation, language spoken in

the home and other key demographic factors that must be considered during the planning process and in the development of cultural programs and services. For example, the increase in the number of households with children under 18 has major implications for arts organizations presenting and marketing family-oriented programs. The Latino community, in particular, is experiencing tremendous growth in Austin. The Latino population now constitutes 30.5 percent of the total population (up from 23 percent in 1990), with 24.5 percent of Austin's total population now speaking Spanish in the home. Language preference has major implications in developing program and marketing strategies. It will be critical for Austin's cultural leaders to keep these changes in mind throughout the planning and program implementation processes.

The issue of unclear public policy emerged during the course of several discussions with community stakeholders. In her defense of the funding process at the City Council's budget work sessions on September 9 and 10, Arts Commission Chair Andrea Bryant contended that the City Council had not been clear on what it wants to accomplish through the arts funding process and lamented the poor communication between Council and the Commission. Several Commissioners with whom we spoke also mentioned poor communication as a major problem. From the public debate, individual discussions and review of the various documents, it is obvious that city officials will need to revisit the enabling 1986 ordinance and develop, together with representatives of stakeholder groups, clear and abiding public policy relative to the provision of city funds in support of arts and cultural organizations and individual artists. What follows are points that are intended to focus this further discussion.

Source of Funding

The old adage, "Follow the Money," is useful to initiate this discussion. While the principal source of funding for Austin arts and cultural organizations and artists derives from locally collected bed tax, there is very little in the guidelines or other policy statements that allude to the use of these funds for the "encouragement, promotion, and application of the arts including presentation, execution and exhibition of various art forms." (Section 351 of the state tax code) One of the Cultural Contracts program's goals does state, "establishing a nationally recognized cultural environment which attracts Austin residents and tourists to Austin arts presentations." Clearly, the promotion of tourism constitutes a legitimate economic development strategy that can be supported by policy governing the allocation of bed tax funds in the City of Austin. Cultural and Heritage Tourism has emerged as an important component of economic development strategies in many U.S. cities, including several in Texas that utilize bed tax to support art activities. More discussion on Cultural and Heritage Tourism will follow in the forthcoming report on best practices.

In their September 25, 2002 memorandum to the Austin City Manager, the Austin Hotel and Motel Association and Texas Hotel and Motel Association claim "over

50 programs funded by the local hotel occupancy tax arguably do not meet the statutory requirement of directly promoting tourism and the hotel and convention industry.” Their memorandum suggests “the questionable funding may amount to over \$500,000 annually in local hotel occupancy tax revenues.” These visitor industry associations documented 50 programs that fell into eight categories of program activities that, according to their analysis, fall outside the intent and purpose of the state statute (tax code). Essentially, they claim that these program activities are not designed or intended to reach visitor audiences. Examples include educational presentations in area schools, workshops marketed only to local audiences and works not presented for public performance. From our review of this memorandum, it is clear that the associations’ analysis did not accurately account for program activity they view as disallowable. For example, the memorandum lists a grant of \$112,500 for the Austin Lyric Opera (FY 2001-02), and then indicates that these monies, in part, fund youth and adult education programs on opera at area elementary schools. They do not detail which part, how much, if any, of the \$112,500, was allocated in support of this arts in education program. From practical experience we do know that the applicable state statute has been the subject of differing interpretations by several Texas cities currently utilizing locally collected bed tax to support art activities. We understand that the Austin City Attorney is currently studying this memorandum and will issue a formal response on behalf of the city. We encourage the City to confer with the Texas Commission on the Arts for guidance on this matter. Regardless of the outcome of this legal deliberation, there can be no doubt that Cultural and Heritage Tourism is a legitimate economic development strategy that can be articulated as clear public policy in determining how local bed tax revenues are to be allocated in support of arts activities. The associations’ memorandum is attached as Appendix D.

What is more immediately troubling from our perspective is the lack of communication between the Austin’s visitor industry and cultural community. There is little by way of practical relationships. The Downtown Austin Alliance does provide mini-grants to support some arts activities in the downtown area, some of which can ostensibly be viewed as appealing to visitors and the Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau does include the arts in its general promotional strategies, but there is really no regular forum that brings together members of these two communities to talk strategically about Cultural and Heritage Tourism and its implications for growing the local tourism industry, increasing hotel occupancy and, as a result, augmenting the amount of available bed tax available to support appropriate activities, including the Arts. No entity convenes visitor industry and arts community leaders. Because cultural tourism is not meaningfully integrated into the funding guidelines, the arts community has received little, if any, orientation in this burgeoning travel industry and arts field niche. Similarly, from our discussions with leaders in the local visitor industry, it is clear that cultural tourism strategies make for hardly a blip on their collective radar screens. Aside from its general promotional effort, established heritage program, music, and film promotions, the Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau

does not specifically focus on cultural tourism strategies. No one in the Austin community—whether individual leader, city agency or visitor industry association—has stepped forward to play convener or liaison. It is our view that someone must do so soon. We note that the Austin Arts Commission has an official liaison to the Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau. Currently, this representative may be best positioned to initiate the conversation.

Other Economic Development Implications

During this assessment process, Richard Florida's recent book, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, has been often cited as particularly important to Austin. According to Florida, "the number of people making a living from artistic and cultural creativity also expanded dramatically over the course of the past century, and particularly since 1950." Florida asserts that professional artists, writers and performers—so-called "bohemians"—have increased some 375 percent since 1950. Austin's rank on the "Bohemian Index" is quite high. According to Florida's theory, the presence of goodly numbers of individuals in this creative class not only leads to the production of consumable artistic product, it also makes the community more popular as a place to live and visit. If you accept the basic premise that the presence of artists and their work fuel economic growth, you are then compelled to ask what the current arts funding program does to strategically encourage, promote and otherwise support the work of local artists. Aside from actual funds, should the city develop and manage programs that provide other means of practical support (e.g., marketing, additional public performance opportunities, development of affordable live-work spaces, etc.)?

The Five Objectives and the Seven Goals.

As noted above, the 1986 ordinance states, "the purpose of the City of Austin's program for the arts is to..." going on to list the five basic goals. As noted in the Audit Report, the Cultural Contracts Program has developed seven goals that key off the stated policy (found on page one of the Cultural Contracts Program Guidelines, attached as Appendix E). However, again, the funding program, itself, does not specifically or strategically address these goals. It provides general operating and project support. The program's basic criteria include standard language applying to artistic excellence, audience development and administrative ability. Below are some public policy issues to contemplate. They by no means constitute an exhaustive list of public policy considerations; rather, they are only intended to stimulate thought on how the City of Austin can think about providing support in advancing cultural development, defined broadly:

- ? If the purpose of Austin's program for the arts is "to create a physical and human environment which nurtures artists, arts organizations and arts producers" does this mean that the city should assist in facilitating the development of adequate cultural facilities and live-work spaces? Presently, this is not permissible under the guidelines, which proscribes funding of capital expenditures. The Cultural Affairs Division was involved

in efforts to include the Carver Center and the Mexican American Cultural Center in the 1998 bond elections.

- ? If the purpose of Austin's program for the arts is "to nurture and preserve cultural diversity, consistent with and reflecting Austin's population," what should the administrator of the city's arts funding program do by way of supporting marketing research and audience development strategies that enable arts organizations to identify and market to ready, culturally diverse consumers? Presently, this is may not be permissible under the guidelines, which proscribes non-artistic activities. Members of a group of Latino and African American arts administrator lamented, "The system doesn't work for us." Members of the group went on to say that their aesthetic and art forms were not always appreciated or competently reviewed by existing panelists. It is true that the panels have few people of color. As Austin's community grows more diverse (note rapid growth of local Asian community) and as artists and arts organizations of color continue to develop, cultural diversity in panel composition must be rectified.
- ? If the purpose of Austin's program for the arts is "to equalize access to the arts, both participatory and professional," does the artistic excellence criteria, applied across the board, exclude the participation of emerging artists or de-emphasize programs that encourage the participation of a broad range of constituents?
- ? If the purpose of Austin's program for the arts is "to improve the artistic and administrative quality of Austin's arts offerings," why is so little being currently offered by way of technical assistance (e.g., board development, financial management, grantwriting, volunteer management, etc.)? One applicant stakeholder asserted, "The funding process is more oriented to production and presentation, not the creative process." Another stakeholder added, "The process is not about work, it's about rules." How do you square that point with the need to be accountable for public funds through some kind of public presentation? Of concern was the assertion by several applicants that the Cultural Contracts staff is not proactive in addressing technical assistance needs and that monitoring contract compliance was uneven and, in some cases, poor. Some stakeholders talked about out the idea of an arts incubator initiative, an apprentice-like system for aspiring artists and arts organizations, as a means of bringing along and stabilizing organizations.
- ? If the purpose of Austin's program is "to promote the inclusion of aesthetic considerations in local decision-making through advocacy, services, financial and technical assistance and leadership in the community," how can the current structure (a division within the parks department) be expected to meet these high expectations? Is it not unrealistic to expect city staff to openly act as advocates? Presently, the Cultural Contracts

Program provides funds; it is a straightforward grantor-grantee relationship. There is little by way of services or technical assistance. At present, leadership does not exist in the Cultural Affairs Division to engage the arts community in effectively determining its basic and changing needs, interests and priorities. While the Austin Arts Commission's Guidelines Committee has done admirable work in improving the process, there are, as noted in the Audit Report, serious flaws in the process. Applicants and Commissioners point to the unevenness in panelists' qualification, an important "aesthetic consideration." Overall, the Committee and the Commission has done little to address the larger, underpinning public policy questions that will help resolve process issues.

Conflict of Interest

The Audit Report indicates a pattern of conflict of interest during key junctures in the funding process and that certain determinations of conflict were not in line with applicable City policy. Stakeholders also share their own observations regarding incidences of conflict of interest, although it was not possible to investigate and substantiate their allegations. It is clear that the City's policy should be clearly articulated in the arts funding program's policy, guidelines and practice and that should apply to all applicants, panelists, Commissioners and staff.

STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF A LOCAL ARTS AGENCY

The administration of a municipal arts funding program does not a local arts agency make. Presently, Austin does not have a full-service local arts agency in place that would fit a commonly accepted profile even though the functions of the Cultural Affairs Division are numerous and diverse. In addition to overseeing the arts funding process and supervising the Art in Public Places Program, the division also manages the Dougherty Arts Center, four museums, Zilker Hillside Theater, Renaissance Fair (retail operation) and the Trail of Lights, an annual special event in Zilker Park. The Division is also responsible for managing a wide range of arts education programs operating primarily out of the Dougherty School and the four museums, with educational activities occurring in recreational centers, local schools and other venues. The Division is also being asked to oversee development of the Center for Mexican American Cultural Arts, responsibility for which the City recently assumed from a local nonprofit organization. The project is currently in the construction phase. While this level of activity and responsibility is notable, there appears to be no common thread of planning and purpose that tie them together. Managing arts education programs for children in recreation centers is a significantly different program activity from funding and working with arts organizations in creating, presenting and marketing public programs. Division managers are often not at the table with city department heads discussing comprehensive economic and community development strategies, including capital improvements. The presence of a full-service local arts agency makes the following statement: The arts are a basic

city service. From this statement flows the infrastructure to support comprehensive cultural development.

While the Division has previously qualified to receive National Endowment for the Arts Funding as an officially designated local agency, it really does not function as a full-service agency. What is a local arts agency? The answer differs community to community but, essentially, it involves the management of the municipality's investments in the arts and cultural development. The local arts agency, either a department within city government structure or private, nonprofit arts council contracting with the city, typically:

- ? Administers arts funding programs;
- ? Leads planning efforts on a continuing basis (e.g., community cultural planning, public art, arts in education, cultural facilities);
- ? Provides technical assistance, including arts incubators;
- ? Manages public art or civic art and programs;
- ? Manages international cultural exchange programs;
- ? Conducts economic impact studies, marketing research and similar efforts
- ? Coordinates communications and convenes stakeholders;
- ? Interfaces with leaders and organizations representing public education, business and economic development, social services, environmental protection, religion, etc. as the acknowledged representative of the arts and cultural community;
- ? Responds affirmatively to city council goals and objectives; and
- ? Sits "at the table" for the planning and implementation of major public and private citywide initiatives.

In some cases local arts agencies manage a united arts fund (similar to a United Way campaign), coordinate festivals and other major cultural events, manage cultural facilities, run youth arts programs, manage city beautification programs, operate tourist information centers and ticketing services, etc. An ample discussion of best practices and recommendations that best fit Austin's special characteristics and needs will be forthcoming in later stages of our consulting tasks.

One applicant stakeholder asserted, "The arts need to be viewed as a basic city service." The Austin arts community is boundless in its creativity, diversity and

activism. It yearns to be included, in an integral way, into the central affairs of the city. It aches to be recognized. It wants access to the systems that guide the city's development, human and physical. It needs leadership and is looking to the City of Austin for direction and action. A stakeholder posed the following, "What is the cultural ecology of Austin? How does funding play into this? What are the other factors; who are the players? Do we leave the guidelines alone and focus a year's work on the larger policy and structural issues?"

The Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan (1993) called for an evaluation and reassessment of the Cultural Affairs Division as it relates to the Parks and Recreation Department. While we are uncertain why this recommendation is there, we have to assume that some individuals leading the planning effort were questioning the existing structure and the ability of the Division to provide leadership in accomplishing the plan's practical recommendations. To reiterate, specific recommendations on future structures, programs, staffing, etc. will be presented in subsequent reports.

ARTS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

There can be little doubt that Richard Florida's book, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, is causing quite a stir among city leaders. Florida's book lavishes Austin with praise and promise. The praise is great and certainly raises the city's self-esteem, but how does the rubber meet the road? What does economic development look like in the context of art and artists? How do city leaders work to link the activities of artists and arts organizations with economic development strategies? If you accept that the presence that a high number of artists and other "creative class" types will lure more of their kind to Austin, what kind of infrastructure (live-work spaces, cultural facilities, marketing resources, legal and accounting services, etc.) is necessary to sustain and expand the class and avoid their flight from Austin? And, importantly, how does Austin "keep Austin weird" without diminishing the importance of and support for established and more traditional artists and organizations? Equally important, how do you guard against the commodification of artists and their work and continue to value them for their own sake?

Austin is one of the leading centers of the high technology industry. According to the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce, high tech employment in the region almost doubled from year 1990 through 2000, adding close to 50,000 high tech jobs. Today, Austin ranks as the third most wired city in the nation, behind San Francisco and San José. The services and trades sectors dominate the employment picture in Metro Austin, accounting for nearly 60 percent of current jobs, followed by government (20 percent) and manufacturing (13 percent). The Chamber lists the following as key industries:

- ? Film Industry: Austin is touted for its range of locations, an established labor force of qualified film technicians and experienced actors, two nationally know film festivals (South by Southwest and Austin Film

Festival), Texas' sales tax exemptions for film and video production industry, moderate climate and welcoming hospitality industry. It should be noted that the Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau has a film office that actively pursues film production.

- ? Multimedia Industry: As described by the Chamber, "the integration of audio, video, text and graphics within an electronic interface that ultimately provides information, communication and/or entertainment." The region's key multimedia exporters are CD-ROM developers, video game software developers, Internet software firms and media/communications companies with interactive division. According to the Chamber, there are about 250 multimedia related firms employing about 5,500 local workers. The Chamber also notes the presence of local educational institutions and programs that support the industry.

- ? Music Industry: Austin is branded as "The Live Music Capital of the World." Austin's national profile as a center for musical talent has been fostered over the years by "Austin City Limits," which also just produced its first major festival. The area has five independent record labels with national distribution and more than 100 venues for live music. The Chamber asserts, "The fast-moving convergence of existing technology systems to digital video disk (DVD) shows the strength of the future market for digital entertainment. With the development of new technologies, there are growing opportunities for collaboration between the music sector and the technology sector, both in software and hardware."

The Chamber touts a report, "The Next Century Economy," prepared in 1998 by ICF Kaiser, which identifies film and music as important emerging industries in Central Texas. ICF is a leading management, technology and policy consulting firm based in Fairfax, Virginia.

The Economic Development Division of the Chamber has outlined the following key strategies:

1. Retain, expand and recruit business;
2. Diversity economy; and

3. Further entrepreneurial development.

The Chamber has set out a number of goals, programs and initiatives relating to these key strategies.

Members of City Council have expressed interest in exploring a range of opportunities and options linking the arts with economic development. We think this is a positive indication because, presently, there appears to be little exchange taking place between, for example, the visitor industry and arts community, key players in an observable economic development strategy. Additionally, it does not appear that the arts' roles in other economic development strategies (e.g., job training and development, downtown and neighborhood revitalization, business relocation, etc.) have been explored in a deliberate and concerted manner. As a result, artists and arts organizations do not know what their role is in this community enterprise and are worried that their community value is diminished and not fully appreciated. Given the keen interest in Richard Florida's theories about the "creative class" as economic engine, we think the ground is fertile for communication and strategizing involving a wide range of community stakeholders. To reiterate, it appears that Florida's theories appeal to key public policy makers and members of the local "creative class." Further discussion of Dr. Florida's work and its practical applicability to Austin will follow in a subsequent consultant report.

Austin has a number of challenges and opportunities in job creation, downtown development, entrepreneurial development, business recruitment and relocation and economic diversification in which artists and arts organizations can play a central role. While future reports will recommend specific program ideas, it is abundantly clear that Austin city leaders—from the arts, business, education, housing, government, community development and other sectors—are going to have to convene regularly with the goal of developing specific strategies and programs.

Austin must not miss the forest for the trees. Cultural and Heritage Tourism is, without a doubt, one of the fast growing segments of the visitor industry—an enterprise that has been well documented by the Travel Industry Association of America. Annually, many millions of Americans spend many billions of dollars strolling through museums, attending arts events, enjoying ethnic and special festivals and visiting historic sites. The economic impact reverberates substantially in local hotels and motels, beds and breakfasts, restaurants, galleries, gift stores, commercial attractions and other visitor industry businesses. As previously noted, very little is happening in Austin that draws the local visitor industry and arts community together. The local hotel and motel association, buttressed by its companion state association, is auditing the city's usage of the bed tax on arts. While that is certainly their prerogative, would it not be more productive for visitor industry leaders to reach out to city leaders and the arts community with an invitation to discuss and plan on how to grow cultural and heritage tourism in Austin? If arts leaders want to lobby the city for additional arts funds, does it not make sense for them to help grow an industry that will ultimately produce more bed tax revenue to which they will have access? Here is the situation: Austin relies on the drive market for most of its leisure travel business. This visitor has certain consumer characteristics, with significant

potential arts, cultural and heritage interests. How can the Convention and Visitors Bureau, the visitor industry, arts organizations and artists work collaboratively to make arts and cultural offerings accessible and affordable, thereby adding value to the visit and laying the base for return visitation? We are not sure, but the point is that visitor industry and arts leaders should strategize on how, together, the drive market can discover and enjoy the Austin arts scene. And, of course, the leisure market is only one of several in the travel industry that requires attention. Our best practices analysis will present an interesting menu of options for Austin leaders to consider. However, first things first. A relationship needs to be built. Someone has to make the first move. We are happy to report that our meeting with representatives with the Austin Hotel and Motel Association and the Convention and Visitors Bureau produced real interest on their part. Our sense is that they will respond well to a first date and will likely bring their industry cohorts with them (folks from restaurants, destination management companies, hotel sales and marketing, meeting planners, concierges, etc.). It is encouraging that the Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau has its own programs promoting historic preservation and the film and music industry, which may provide natural platforms for future programming and marketing collaborations between the bureau and the visitor industry and the arts community.

As with the previous discussion on arts and economic development, we must again caution against the over-commercialization of the arts to suit business purposes. Cultural Tourism is not for everyone. It is not for those artists and organizations that prefer to serve youth in school and neighborhood settings. Members of the arts community must be able to be given the choice to be involved in this enterprise or not. We are convinced that there are plenty of opportunities to explore cultural and heritage tourism in uniquely Austin-like ways.

ARTS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Increasingly, the arts organizations and artists are being called upon to provide services that take them beyond their traditional scopes of work—beyond the studio, the theater, the museum, the editing room, etc. Public Art is perhaps the first area where we see artists involved in truly public sphere, especially in cases where artists were working side-by-side with residents, architects and planners in the design of public infrastructure.

As local school districts began to feel the budget pinch, some of the first casualties were, sadly, arts programs—this despite irrefutable research that indicates that children with meaningful access to arts in the classroom achieve better in school across the board. As a result of these budget cuts, school districts began looking for less expensive ways to deliver arts education. Arts organizations, always in the hunt for funding opportunities, began to find a niche in educational settings. Austin's arts funding program supports numerous arts in education programs and projects. To reiterate, the funding process does not

utilize a separate category for arts in education; rather, these applications are spread over the seven disciplined-based categories. Over the years, the level of funding supporting arts in education activities has grown significantly. This strengthens the case for a separate category, with a separate set of criteria, more applicable to this kind of program activity. Further, continued funding of arts in education programs raises the need for additional planning and an analysis of arts education programs in local public schools. While we applaud efforts to deliver quality arts services to children in schools, unless these activities are better integrated into ongoing curriculum and other school activities, we fear that the true artistic and educational impact is diminished. Like public art, arts in education is a world unto itself. In a community cultural planning process, city arts leaders would have opportunities to huddle with their counterparts in public education and business to talk about arts in education and how best to utilize the services of local arts organizations and artists in ways that are mutually beneficial. A final note on arts in education. The business community, as demonstrated by the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce's education and workforce development programs, values quality education and the training of skilled workers. Given the arts' proven impact in advancing educational attainment and practical application to various trades, the possibilities for collaborative goal setting and program development are rife with potential.

As with education, health and social service providers began looking to the arts as a tool to effectively serve their constituents. When it was discovered that arts-centered programs could effectively meet the special needs of "at-risk" youth, a number of youth arts programs began popping up around the country. The arts became a tool to divert these youth from potential delinquent behavior, improve school attendance and achievement and, ultimately, keep kids from entering the juvenile justice system.

In other communities, local arts agencies have developed programs to serve the special needs of the homeless, the elderly and other special populations. As Austin's new structure and program are designed, city officials and the arts community, in concert with social and health service providers, are going to have to take stock of the need and develop programs that can effectively address the special needs of these oftentimes underserved populations.

Related to the point about changing demographics, we note that there is a growing trend to decentralize the delivery of arts services. While no one disputes the importance of revitalizing Downtown Austin, efforts with which Council Member Wynn and others are intimately involved, the fact is that people choose to live and congregate in neighborhoods far removed from Austin's core. With limited public dollars, artists, hobbyists and neighborhood associations have developed programs that provide arts activities and entertainment in neighborhood centers, schools, libraries, parks and other venues. This process has also been about discovering hidden talents and artistic expressions. What are the best strategies for providing services to Austin's far-flung neighborhoods

and suburbs? Our best practices research will yield some compelling recommendations and additional food for thought.

SUPPORT AND RESOURCES

Support and resources is about more than money. It also includes technical assistance and other services. It may include space and facilities. It is what city government determines as best strategies to address the stated public policy found in the enabling arts funding ordinance. There has been little planning, little public policy discussion. Of the many recommendations contained in the 1993 Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan the only one, besides maintenance of the Art in Public Places Program, that seems to have been fully implemented is continuing financial support for the Cultural Affairs Division from the bed tax fund to manage the funding program.

That the cultural community feels that it merits more by way of support, resources and services from the City of Austin is clear. Some also have expressed the need for:

- ? Convening and planning
- ? Technical assistance (e.g., workshops, individualized consulting, etc.)
- ? Facilities and live-work space
- ? Marketing assistance

Recommendations on specifically what kinds of support and resources the arts and cultural community needs would be identified during a future community cultural planning process.

For Fiscal Year 2002-03, the City of Austin will allocate \$3,038,834 to the Cultural Arts Fund, 11.6 percent of total anticipated hotel occupancy tax revenue (Note: state law permits municipalities to allocated up to 15 percent of hotel occupancy tax revenues on the arts). Allocations from this fund, in the amount of \$2,464,981 will be allocated to local arts organizations and individual artists, as well as an allocation to the Zachary Scott Theatre Maintenance Fund. As per city budget policy, \$305,883 will be set aside as a reserve. This 10 percent reserve is established to hedge against a possible hotel occupancy tax revenue shortfall. Additionally, the City of Austin receives \$158,226 from the Texas Commission on the Arts through the state's decentralization program. The Cultural Affairs Division applies a 15 percent administrative charge against the base grant, resulting in approximately \$134,492 being allocated to local arts organizations and artists through the Cultural Contracts Program. It is important to note that administration of the cultural arts funding program, including staff salaries, is paid for out of the City's General Fund, with the exception of one position partially funded through a grant. As we continue with our work and as the City

contemplates possible changes in the arts funding program, the relative volatility of bed tax revenue will be an important consideration in mapping out future strategies.

The Cultural Affairs Division does not seek revenue from other sources to support its program activity and we are not aware of plans to increase programming and see additional funding to support it. This is due to its narrow scope of operation. Council Member Dunkerley has suggested the need for a grants writer in the Cultural Contracts Program to assist constituent organizations with their fundraising needs and to generate additional revenues in support of expanded service delivery.

EQUITY

Equity embraces a number of considerations dealing with access, cultural diversity, continued success once in the arts funding system and dynamic demographic change. The 1986 ordinance and 1993 plan speak fairly clearly on some of these questions. For FY 2002-03, there were a total of 246 applications, a 15.5 percent increase from the previous fiscal year. A total of 230 applications competed in the process, 190 (approximately 83 percent) of which were recommended for funding. Fifty-seven were first-time applicants. Of the available contract dollars, approximately 23.4 percent were allocated to ethnic applicants, a figure that does not square with the combined percentages of Latinos, African Americans, Asians and Native Americans in the Austin community. Austin's current ethnic breakdown is: 30.6 percent Latino, 9.8 percent African American, 4.7 percent Asian, and .5 percent Other: a combined total of 45.6 percent non-White. In speaking with representatives of Eastside African American and Latino arts leaders, we were flatly told, "the system does not work for us." One Arts Commissioner added, "I am concerned with ethnic arts organizations claiming that their aesthetic is not being understood by the panels." There is little doubt that, from a public policy perspective, Austin's communities of color deserve ample and diverse opportunities to participate in cultural activities and artists and arts organizations of color deserve access to the system and a fair shake and share. We think it is incumbent upon the arts funding program to work closely with artists and organizations of color in developing funding and technical assistance programs that ensure equal access, participation and enjoyment. Presently, there is little by way of technical assistance services provided to help organizations thrive in the process and build organizational capacity, despite the demonstrated need. The Cultural Contracts Program has also done very little in assisting its constituents to respond to dynamic demographic changes impacting Metro Austin. Who is moving to town, where are they locating, what languages do they predominantly speak, what are their media preferences, what are their consumer spending behaviors, etc? These and other demographic factors have a direct impact on how people learn about and consume the arts. This information can be very helpful in assisting artists and arts organizations in learning about their potential markets and how to reach them effectively. This information is even more critical because we

suspect that Austin will be become more diverse in the immediate and long-term future.

Austin's cultural landscape has a healthy balance of large, mid-size and smaller arts and cultural organizations, as well as a large and diverse cadre of artists. The number of applications recommended for funding, 190, is remarkable for a city the size of Austin. Even the larger institutions, Austin Lyric Opera, Austin Museum of Art, Ballet Austin, Mexic-Arte Museum, Austin Symphony and Austin Children's Museum, do not receive huge city subsidies. The funds are spread out and support a relatively high number of mid-size and small organizations and individual artists. We think this is a healthy situation in ensuring access to a wide diversity of applicants. We are troubled, however, by the current application process that has:

- ? Individual artists competing against organizations;
- ? Service organizations competing against producing and presenting organizations;
- ? Small organizations competing against large organizations;
- ? New organizations competing against established organizations; and
- ? Educational and social service projects competing against more traditional, discipline-based arts projects.

Additionally, it appears that professionally managed arts organizations, with well-defined artistic product, are competing against organizations and projects that offer first access, if you will, to the arts funding system—projects that emphasize community participation over artistic excellence. This “apples versus oranges” system does not, in our view, constitute an equitable funding process. Revision of the City's funding categories may be considered in order to enhance its current level of access and level the playing field for individual artists and new organizations, particularly those serving underserved populations. Again, viable alternatives and strategies for a redesigned cultural arts funding programs, replete with suggested funding categories, will be forthcoming.

Two other related issues emerged from several stakeholder conversations, including some held with some Commissioners:

1. “The Culture of dependency:” How can the funding program emphasize the importance of matching dollars from other sources and provide technical assistance to help organization reduce their dependency of City dollars?

2. “Entitlement:” Once an organization or artist is in the funding stream, does that mean they are locked in? How does accountability (service to dollars) fit in as a stronger criteria? As one stakeholder noted, “How do we support artists and musicians in and way that moves them on and welcomes new talent?”
3. “The process can’t be all things to all people:” For a city its size, Austin accepts and funds an extraordinarily high number of applications. Some stakeholders believe that standards of “excellence” and accountability have been virtually ignored, contributing to a dilution of the underlying purpose of the arts funding program. The absence of specific program categories (e.g., arts in education, individual artists, new applicants, etc.) is a contributing factor to this dissonance.

These are politically charged considerations, but they are exactly the kind of hard policy and process questions that must be addressed head-on. Business and usual is not an option for the future.

COMMUNICATIONS

What level of communication, meaningful and consequential dialogue, currently takes place among artists, arts organizations and community stakeholders in the city of Austin around the issue of community cultural development, generally, and arts funding, specifically? Virtually none. The singular grantor-grantee framework of the funding program is not conducive to community dialogue outside of the particularities and technicalities associated with eligibility, funding criteria, panel conduct, appeals and so forth. Currently, deliberations of the Guidelines Committee appear to be the only official forum for limited community participation. The recent and, oftentimes bitter, controversies surrounding the funding process attest to limitations of this framework. The Communication Assessment completed by the University of Texas and the Audit Report, coupled with observations at the Arts Commission’s public hearing and review of the audio taped Commission hearings, clearly indicate serious communications problems. The Audit Report is also correct to point out “The Guidelines represent an important communication mechanism, but clarity of purpose is missing.” The absence of policies and the shortcomings of leadership have only served to exacerbate the situation and bring things to this point.

Systems and Networks

There are no organized systems and networks currently in place to encourage and manage community dialogue. The Cultural Contracts Program does not convene the arts community and other stakeholder groups on a frequent basis. Relevant issues and developments impacting cultural development in the field are infrequently discussed. There is little evidence of community dialogue being led by city staff administering the arts funding program. Arts organizations and artists are left to organize their own informal networks and dialogues. While the Austin Arts Commission’s Guidelines Committee meets regularly to tweak the

funding program's guidelines, the discussion centers on process, not policy, and involves a limited number of arts community representatives. Actual frequency of official communication is dictated by the Cultural Contracts Program schedule, calling for regular and special meetings of the Arts Commission, a public hearing and a series of technical presentations to orient potential grant applicants and panelists. As previously mentioned, there is very little communication occurring between the arts community and the visitor industry. There also appears to be little dialogue between the arts community and those public and private sector leaders driving economic and community development strategies.

Timeliness.

As just indicated, official communication is dictated by the Cultural Contracts Program's schedule of meetings and orientations. Conditions impacting cultural development can change swiftly and unexpectedly. For example, after 9/11 and the quickly predictable downturn in tourism, we see little evidence of discussions on how to best prepare for reduced bed tax revenues or, more importantly, of strategic dialogue between the arts community and the visitor industry on how to collaborate, capitalize on and market the city's diverse performance and exhibition opportunities, major festivals, historic sites and cultural attractions. Like all cities, Austin could have predicted that it was about to head into a "valley," as the visitor industry labels a downturn in visitation and hotel/motel occupancy. In other cities where relationships are built and active between the visitor industry and cultural community, dialogue and strategizing naturally occurs to collaboratively meet challenges and take advantages of opportunities. In the October 2, 2002, City Council work session, Council Member Dunkerley indicated her interest in quarterly briefings from the Financial and Administrative Services Department on hotel occupancy tax collections. If this practice is institutionalized it will be a good way of monitoring performance of the bed tax fund and help plan for the review and allocation process. Beyond that, regular convening and the effective use of electronic and written communication will permit the cultural community to stay connected and keep abreast of important developments in the field.

Protocol

It is clear that the arts funding program is plagued by inappropriate communications occurring throughout the process. It appears that City Council rarely hears from the Arts Commission, as a body, and usually only when problems arise concerning funding recommendations. The chair of the Arts Commission asserts that Council does not communicate what it wants to accomplish through the funding program. The pattern and culture of miscommunication and misunderstanding permeate downward through the entire arts funding process. Applicants, panelists and city staff complain of inadequate or inappropriate contacts. Comportment at public meetings is also problematic. As noted in the Audit Report, "Verbal communication among the commissioners, panelists and artist sometimes becomes emotional and mean-spirited." Observations at the Commission's Public Hearing (June 10, 2002) and review of

some of the audio also confirm this startling lack of civility. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that feelings get hurt, viewpoints become entrenched, fingers get pointed, and worse yet, that important public policy and cultural development topics remain unexplored and are not acted upon in timely fashion. The Communication Assessment and the Audit Report present sound recommendations on how to improve communication within the arts funding process, including specific training programs. We concur with the Communication Assessment's recommendation that the City invest in communications training for the Arts Commission and city staff administering the arts funding program. Communication guidelines and protocol should be clearly spelled out to applicants and there should be meaningful consequences for applicants when the protocol is breached.

During our interviews, one Arts Commissioner noted, "There is no formalized communications process or mechanism. We need something in place that is more regular and addresses a wider variety of issues. We need a method for the Commission to advise City Council." Communication is a process by which information is exchanged through a common system of behavior. It is a system of routes. It is something that is practiced on a continuing basis and is intensified when troubled waters and unique opportunities are spotted on the horizon. Communication is part of culture and, presently, it is a missing ingredient in the system that governs Austin's arts funding program. From our recent experience facilitating the Open Space meeting, we were struck by the stakeholders' eagerness to discuss a broad range of cultural development topics. We encourage you to visit our website, www.dabneyandassoc.com and click on Austin Open Space Meeting Comments. Our impression is that the arts community is hungry for meaningful, timely and regular exchange and that this exchange will be important in advancing forthcoming strategies. This was very evident in the Open Space meeting, as reflected in the following sample commentary:

"Today's seminar provided me the opportunity to listen to input from members of the arts community on what they are feeling and thinking. I plan to store this feedback in my head and use it in my future work as an arts commissioner."

"I had meaningful and substantial dialogue with colleagues across disciplines. As we move forward, I will continue the dialogue."

"Impressed with the openness and desire for cooperation – clearly there needs to be avenues of communication and cohesiveness. Be a more pro-active commissioner/whole commission, rather than just responding..."

“Good to see communication between people at all levels of the process, but I’m not still not sure anything that was discussed here today will have an impact on what is decided by Council.”

*“Chance to explore options and ideas that benefit the arts community
The process is really a continuation of a longer process of others with others that I would not regularly encounter.”*

The process is really a continuation of a longer process of others and mine toward re-visioning the arts in Austin and building sustainability of the arts in Austin. So...the process today introduced me to other players I can work with and other ways of thinking about the task ahead. I will continue meeting with those who want to go forward and continue dedicating myself and my work toward realizing these goals.”

“This process reinforces to me that there is a collective force... a diverse force that believes in the cultural presence that Austin is capable of. I intend to be engaged and be part of the solution.”

“This activity is the beginning of the healing process. It is the start of enabling a community vision.”

Fostering communication is a manifestation of sound leadership. We believe that the Arts Commission and city staff have the responsibility for developing a system of open and timely communication that permeates the arts funding process and addresses “big picture” themes and developments, in addition to improving the mechanics of the process. Such an initiative deserves the full support of City Council and should be promoted to a diverse range of community stakeholders.

CONCLUSION

With the participation of over 100 people in a brief span of time, we have assessed Austin’s arts funding with a wide-angle lens and have taken a snapshot of its current needs and special opportunities in arts and culture. We have explored existing policy, plans, funding programs and processes, support and resources, issues of equity and communication and the roles of the arts in community revitalization and economic development. Now we are scouring the nation for examples of best practices applicable to Austin’s cultural needs and model programs and processes that may in some ways be adapted to the range of opportunities that are open at this moment in time. A synthesis of such findings and how they may enhance Austin’s arts assets and, in so doing, its economy, its image and its community life, will be topics of our next report.

APPENDIX

**CITY OF AUSTIN
EVALUATION OF CULTURAL ARTS FUNDING PROCESS**

Dabney & Associates

Appendix A

Draft Audit Report – Cultural Arts Funding Process

Appendix B:

List of Activities, Documents, Meetings and Individuals

In preparing this report, the consulting team conducted the following activities:

1. Reviewed the following documents:
 - ✍ 2002-2003 Cultural Contract Guidelines (and subsequent amendments)
 - ✍ Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan (ACAP), 1993
 - ✍ Results from surveys of Austin Arts Commissioners, Panelists and Applicants (conducted by Cultural Contracts staff to assist with performance review)
 - ✍ Audit Report of Cultural Arts Funding Process, Office of City Auditor
 - ✍ Communication Assessment of the Austin Arts Commission and Cultural Contracts Program (commissioned by Office of City Auditor and conducted by University of Texas at Austin Organizational Communication Audit Team)
 - ✍ The following documents from the Austin Hotel & Motel Association and Texas Hotel & Motel Association: 1) Return on an Investment in Tourism for the City of Austin, 2) Memorandum to the Austin City Manager reviewing the Legality of City of Austin's Use of Hotel Occupancy Taxes, and 3) Review of State Laws Applicable to Arts and Historical Groups on Use of the Local Hotel Occupancy Tax
 - ✍ Economic development and trends information, Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce
 - ✍ Demographic information, City of Austin
 - ✍ Various e-mail communiques from City Council Members, Arts Commissioners, arts community members and other stakeholders

2. Attended the following meetings:
 - ✍ Austin Arts Commission (Applicant Public Hearing and Advisory Panel Chair Report), June 10, 2002 (preceded contract date)

- ✍ Guidelines Committee, Austin Arts Commission, July 29, 2002
(preceded contract date)
 - ✍ Guidelines Committee, Austin Arts Commission, August 12, 2002
(preceded contract date)
 - ✍ Austin Arts Commission, August 19, 2002
 - ✍ Executive Committee, Austin Arts Commission, September 10, 2002
3. Viewed videotape and live cable cast of Austin City Council Budget Work Sessions of September 9 and 10, 2002, respectively.
 4. Participated in the following meetings:
 - ✍ "Open Space," September 28 (see below for roster of attendees)
 - ✍ City Council Work Session, October 2, 2002
 5. Listened to excerpts from following audio tape recordings:
 - ✍ Austin Arts Commission Meeting, May 20, 2002
 - ✍ Austin Arts Commission Meeting, June 17, 2002
 - ✍ Austin Arts Commission Work Session, June 18, 2002
 5. Met with the following individuals:
 - ✍ Mayor Pro Tem Jackie Goodman
 - ✍ Council Member Raul Alvarez
 - ✍ Council Member Betty Dunkerley
 - ✍ Council Member Danny Thomas
 - ✍ Council Member Will Wynn
 - ✍ Council Member Daryl Slusher

[Note: Request in to meet with Mayor Gus García and City Manager Toby Futrell.]

 - ✍ Maria Ciccicarelli, Division Manager, Cultural Affairs, Parks and Recreation Department

[Note: scheduled meeting with Cultural Contracts staff cancelled due to City Council Budget Work Sessions]

 - ✍ Mario Garza, Manager, Cultural Contracts, Parks and Recreation Department

- ✍ Mel Ziegler, Austin Arts Commissioner
- ✍ Andrea Bryant, Austin Arts Commissioner (former Chair)
- ✍ Eduardo Benavides, Austin Arts Commissioner (former Vice Chair)
- ✍ Maxine Barkan, Austin Arts Commissioner (Parliamentarian; Chair of Guidelines Committee)

- ✍ Pamela Cunningham, Austin Arts Commissioner
- ✍ Sue Graze, Austin Arts Commissioner
- ✍ Bruce Willencek, Austin Arts Commissioner
- ✍ Gloria Mata Pennington, Austin Arts Commissioner
- ✍ Kathleen Harman, Austin Arts Commissioner
- ✍ Austin Arts Commission Panel Chairs: Lois Jebo, Dance; Annalisa Celedón, Literature; Jerry Young, Mixed Arts; Michael Bell, Music; and Kelly Arnold, Theatre

- ✍ Ricardo Hernandez, Executive Director, Texas Commission on the Arts
- ✍ Lucy Buck, Associate Director and Cilla Temple, Marketing Director, Downtown Austin Alliance

- ✍ Robert Lander, President and CEO, Austin Convention & Visitors Bureau

- ✍ Beverly Silas, Executive Director, Envision Central Texas
- ✍ Sue Edwards, Director, Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services Office, City of Austin

- ✍ Janet Seibert, Civic Art and Design Coordinator, Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services Office, City of Austin

- ✍ Martha Peters, Administrator, Art in Public Places, Cultural Affairs Division, Parks and Recreation Department

- ✍ Gail Goldman, Public Art Consultant (currently working with Austin Art in Public Places)

- ✍ Robert Faires, Arts Editor, *Austin Chronicle*
- ✍ Liz Reyna, Executive Director, Austin Hotel & Motel Association
- ✍ Roger Millar, Board President, Austin Hotel & Motel Association (Vice President of Operations, Valencia Hotels)

- ✍ Gene McMenamin, Board Member, Austin Hotel & Motel Association (General Manager, Omni Austin Hotel)
- ✍ Scott Joslove, President and CEO, Texas Hotel & Motel Association
- ✍ Group meeting with following African American and Latino artistic directors and arts administrators: Roen Salinas, Aztlán Dance Company; Mónica Caivano, Aztlán Dance Company; Rodolfo Mendez, Ballet East Dance Theatre; Boyd Vance, Pro Arts Collective; Harold McMillan, Diverse Arts Production Group Austin; and Valerie Menard, Center for Mexican American Cultural Arts.
- ✍ Andrew Long, Director, Johnson/Long Dance Company

7. Participants in the Open Space Meeting:

- ✍ Alycia Erickson, Austin Singers
- ✍ Andrea Bryant, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Barbara Grove, Downtown Austin Alliance
- ✍ Benne Rocket, IDEA
- ✍ Boyd Vance, Pro Arts Collective
- ✍ Bruce Willenzik, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Carlos Brondo, Former Panel Chair, Visual Arts
- ✍ Catherine Raesz, Cultural Affairs Division, City of Austin
- ✍ Charlene Ansley, Mixed Arts Panel
- ✍ Donald Clarke, Music Panel
- ✍ Donato Rodriguez, Theatre Panel
- ✍ Donna Wetegrove, TIPS on Art
- ✍ Janet Seibert, Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services Office, City of Austin
- ✍ Jason Neulander, Salvage Vanguard Theater and Member, Guidelines Committee
- ✍ Jill Bedgood, Artist and Chair, Art in Public Places Panel
- ✍ Karol A. Greene, SilverStar Theater Group
- ✍ Kathleen Harman, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Kay Martin, Austin Visual Arts Association
- ✍ Kelly B. Nunn, KBN Group, Inc.

- ✍ Kelly Arnold, Chair, Theatre Panel
- ✍ Latifah Taormina, Austin Circle of Theaters
- ✍ Laur Wetherholt, Ballet Austin
- ✍ Maria Ciccicarelli, Cultural Affairs Division, City of Austin
- ✍ María Castillo, Latinas Unidas Por el Arte
- ✍ Mario Garza, Cultural Affairs Division, City of Austin
- ✍ Martha Peters, Art in Public Places, City of Austin
- ✍ Maxine Barkan, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Megan Weller, Art in Public Places, City of Austin
- ✍ Mel Ziegler, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Michael, Chair, Music Panel
- ✍ Michael Melinger, Austin Jazz Workshop
- ✍ Mike Henry, Poet and Rude Mechanicals
- ✍ Pamela Cunningham, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Randy Jewart, International Sculpture Center
- ✍ Raúl Valdez, Artist
- ✍ Ray Baker, RLB Productions
- ✍ Rebecca Schwarz, SilverStart Theater Group
- ✍ Ricardo Hernandez, Texas Commission on the Arts
- ✍ Robert Faires, *The Austin Chronicle*
- ✍ Rodolfo, Ballet East Dance Theatre
- ✍ Roger M.H. Chan, City of Austin
- ✍ Sally Jacques, Jacques Productions
- ✍ San Juanita Alcalá, Division of Cultural Affairs, City of Austin
- ✍ Sue Graze, Austin Arts Commission and Texas Fine Arts Association
- ✍ Susan E. Wenck, Legacy Arts Incubator Project
- ✍ Suzie Harriman, Austin Arts Commission
- ✍ Tine Bui, Office of Councilman Daryl Slusher, City of Austin
- ✍ Tomás Salas, Texas Folklife Resources
- ✍ Yacov Sharir, Sharir+Bustamanate Dance Works
- ✍ Andres Long, Johnson/Long Dance Company

- ✍ Caitroina Lyons, Ballet East
- ✍ Gina Lalli, Artist
- ✍ Harold McMillan, Diverse Arts Production Group
- ✍ Jackie Goodman, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Austin
- ✍ Jerry Rusthoven, Office of Mayor Pro Tem, City of Austin
- ✍ Linda Guerrero, Board Member, Parks and Recreation Department, City of Austin

- ✍ Lois Jebo, Chair, Dance Panel
- ✍ Phillip Ayliffe, Artist
- ✍ Rebecca Epstein, LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas
- ✍ Ross Smith, Member, Guidelines Committee
- ✍ Sylvia Orozco, Mexic-Arts Museum
- ✍ Stephanie Beckett, Office of Councilwoman Betty Dunkerly, City of Austin

Appendix C:
Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan

Appendix D:

Memorandum to Austin City Manager from Austin Hotel & Motel Association and Texas Hotel & Motel Association; Review of Austin's Use of Hotel Occupancy Tax

Appendix E:
2002-03 Cultural Contract Guidelines