



# Maryland State Arts Council Grants Committee

Meeting Minutes  
May 19, 2022  
Google Meet

---

It shall be the duty of this committee to review funding recommendations made by the advisory panels; to review applications for grants as necessary, and to undertake such other duties as the Council may from time to time direct. The committee shall consist of no fewer than five members.

---

In attendance: Lily Bengfort, Julie Madden, Timothy App, Anne West, Jack Rasmussen, Zoe Charlton, Steven Skerritt-Davis, Chad Buterbaugh, Laura Weiss, Keyonna Penick

Anne West called the meeting to order at approximately 11:04 a.m.

County Arts Development Funding Recommendations (Skerritt-Davis, Buterbaugh)

- County Arts Development (CAD) grants to support county arts agencies, with the goals of providing:
  - a vital connection with artists, arts organizations, and audiences throughout the State;
  - encouragement of local arts activity of all disciplines in all of Maryland's diverse communities; and
  - equitable funding for the arts on the local level through transparent processes that are accessible to all county constituents.
- CAD Process FY23
  - New and On Year county arts agencies complete a full application review process. This includes a panel review process, which ends with a recommendation from the panel to accept or request revisions to each applicant's submitted three-year plan and qualitative recommendations for applicants to improve the implementation of their plans.
    - # of On Year Orgs reviewed: 10
- Off Year applicants submit a shorter application, which is reviewed by staff only.



- # of Off-Year Orgs: 14
- CAD Process - Funding Formula  
The funding formula includes two components:
  - A block grant that divides 90% of the allocated budget among the counties equally
  - A population grant that divides the remaining 10% of the allocated budget among the counties based on the percentage of the state's population

$(90\% \text{ of Budget}/24) + (10\% \text{ of Budget} * \% \text{ of state's population}) = \text{Grant Amount}$

Anne made a motion to approve the recommendations for full council approval. Jack seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

Grants for Organizations (GFO) Funding Recommendations (Weiss, Skerritt-Davis)

- (GFO) provide operating support that strengthens and sustains Maryland's arts infrastructure.
  - The GFO granting program provides general operating support to nonprofit and tax-exempt organizations, as well as units of government, that produce or present ongoing arts programming that is open to the public. GFO grantees not only provide access to the arts in their communities, but they create audiences for the future, uplift communities, and stimulate economic impact throughout the state.
- GFO Process- FY23 GFO Cycle
  - New and On Year applicants complete a full application review process. This includes a panel review process, which ends with a % score for the organization's application.
  - # of New Orgs reviewed: 32
  - # of On Year Orgs reviewed: 69
  - Off Year applicants submit a shorter application, which is reviewed by staff only. Off Year applicants maintain their Panel Score from their last On Year review process. # of Off-Year Orgs: 191
- GFO Process - Funding Formula
  - The funding formula includes three variables:

$(\text{Total Allowable Income } \$) \times (\text{Panel } \% \text{ Score}) \times (\text{Cap Allocation } \%) = \text{Grant Amount}$



- Due to the ongoing impact of the pandemic, all returning organizations were given the option to either “reuse” financials from the FY22 application OR update to use financials from FY21/CY20
- Note: New funding formula model does not go into effect until FY24
  
- GFO Process - FY23 Changes
  - In September 2021, the Council approved changes to the GFO process that would go into effect for the FY23 cycle:
  - New organizations will no longer need to complete 3 consecutive years of “on-year” full applications to be “phased into” the GFO cycle (receiving 40%, then 60%, then 80% of the total grant in each of the three years).
  - New organizations now complete just one year of an “on-year” full application (in their first year) and, if approved, will receive 100% of the award in Year 1. In Year 2, the organization will then fall into the discipline-specific GFO cycle.
  
- GFO Process - FY23 New Organizations
  - 32 organizations went through the full review process as New applicants; 30 have been recommended for funding.
  - Funding for New organizations: \$710,459.61 (~4% of total GFO funding)
  - New organizations recommended for funding include:
  - Dance (3), Folk/Traditional (2), Literary (2), Multi-Discipline (5), Music (3), Service (7), Theatre (1), Visual/Media (7)
  
- GFO Process - Not Recommend for Funding
  - Through the Panel Review, 2 organizations weren’t recommended for funding:
    - Arts On Stage (59% score)
    - Indian Cultural Association of Howard County (64% score)
  
- Multiple Off-Year applicants did not submit an application for FY23 funding:
  - MD National Capital Park & Planning Commission (Mont. Parks)
  - Children’s Chorus of Carroll County
  - Mount Vernon Virtuosi
  - Baltimore Shakespeare Factory
  - Brown Box Theatre Project (org. closed in winter 2022)
  - Our Town Theatre
  - The Church Hill Theatre

Councilors questioned why organizations are not being recommended for



funding. The staff shared there are different factors; difficulty communicating needs, capacity limitations, and quarterly reports highlighting concerns.

- GFO Process - Funding Recommendations by Discipline
  - Dance (15 orgs.): \$422,718.09 - 2% of total funding
  - Folk and Traditional Arts (18 orgs.): \$430,562.99 - 2% of total funding
  - Literary Arts (7 orgs.): \$111,431.44 - 1% of total funding
  - Multi-Discipline (51 orgs.): \$4,701,586.53 - 28% of total funding
  - Music (47 orgs.): \$2,310,819.52 - 14% of total funding
  - Music C (21 orgs.): \$651,289.22 - 4% of total funding
  - Service (20 orgs.): \$1,230,290.14 - 7% of total funding
  - Theatre (51 orgs.): \$2,852,157.16 - 17% of total funding
  - Visual/Media (54 orgs.): \$4,289,069.78 - 25% of total funding

Councilors asked about the criteria and staff explained that the application process and the rubric are the same. The number of organizations and size make a difference. The staff went on to mention that one of the goals of the formula is to support as many organizations as possible. Councilors asked about feedback and the staff shared that while this formula won't be implemented until FY24 there has been little feedback. Councilors noted that there seems to be a worry about a decrease in funding from larger organizations and excitement from smaller organizations for more resources.

- GFO Process - Comparison
  - FY22 - Total Grants: \$15.9M; Total Organization: 260; Average grant amount: \$61,535; Cap. allocation: 7.177%
  - FY23 - Total Grants: \$16.9M; Total Organizations: 284; Average Grant amount: \$59,859; Cap. allocation 6.699%

Lily made a motion to approve the recommendations for full council approval. Julie and Zoe seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion passed.

#### New Business

- Developing a plan for \$40M in arts relief funding
- Special Request grants pausing for public revision process
  - \$275K was allocated while only \$253K spent
  - Surplus reallocated to other programs

Timothy shared his worries and expressed interest in the revision process.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:04 p.m.