



FY2012-2013 Organization Project Grant- Presenting

RANKING

Panel Rating	Organizaton	Grant Request	Grant Amount
115.5	Yerba Buena Gardens Festival	\$15,000	\$12,750
106.5	African & African American Performing Arts Coalition	\$15,000	\$12,750
105.8	Croatian American Cultural Center	\$15,000	\$12,750
104.3	Fresh Meat Productions	\$15,000	\$12,750
102.8	OX	\$15,000	\$12,750
102.8	PlayGround	\$15,000	\$12,750
102.8	Switchboard Music Festival	\$10,784	\$9,166
101.3	LEVYdance, Inc.	\$15,000	\$11,250
101.3	San Francisco Hip Hop DanceFest	\$15,000	\$11,250
101.3	Stepology	\$15,000	\$11,250
97.8	Crowded Fire Theatre Company	\$8,000	\$6,000
96.8	Epiphany Productions	\$15,000	\$0
96.8	San Francisco Live Arts	\$15,000	\$0
95.3	Playwrights Foundation	\$15,000	\$0
92.3	Bicycle Music Festival	\$3,000	\$0
92.3	SAFEhouse	\$15,000	\$0
90	Arab Cultural and Community Center	\$15,000	\$0
90	Women's Audio Mission	\$15,000	\$0
89.3	Queer Cultural Center	\$15,000	\$0
87.9	San Francisco Friends of Chamber Music	\$15,000	\$0
78.8	The Bay Bridged	\$10,000	\$0
75	Eth-Noh-Tec	\$15,000	\$0
66	Dance Council Movement Theater	\$5,200	\$0
60	Summer of Art / Arts Alliance of Central Market	\$12,500	\$0
50	Red Poppy Art House	\$12,000	\$0
	Total	\$331,484	\$125,416

**Cultural Equity Grants
FY2012-2013 Organization Project Grants – Performing Arts Presenting
Panelists**

Rob Bailis

Musician, writer, and performing arts curator

A native San Franciscan, Bailis was the Director of ODC Theater from 2003 – 2011. Under his leadership, the theater successfully completed a \$9 million dollar expansion of its facility, elevated its platform from regional to national and international visibility, and received numerous awards in recognition of Bailis' presenting, advocacy, and residency programs. In 2007, the San Francisco Chronicle named him "MVP" in dance presenting, describing his curation as, "...smart...instinctive, and infectious." He has commissioned over 30 new works in a variety of genres, and has served as a panelist / program consultant for foundations and arts funding organizations including MAP Fund, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, Creative Capital, SF Arts Commission, New England Foundation for the Arts, Chamber Music America, WESTAF, and the Center for Cultural Innovation, among many. A frequent public speaker on arts and culture, he has recently been heard at The Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, on KPFA's *Against the Grain*, and on NPR's *West Coast Live*, and has been a speaker and content provider at national conferences such as Dance USA and Association of Performing Arts Presenters. An acclaimed classical clarinetist, Mr. Bailis has performed with orchestra, chamber ensembles, and as a recitalist across the U.S., Canada, Asia, and the U.K. A strong proponent of contemporary music, he began his career premiering late works of Berio with the composer conducting, and has since gone on to collaborate in scored, improvised, and electro-acoustic idioms with composers such as Martin Bresnick, Jack Perla, Arlene Sierra, and Matt Ingalls among many others. On the more traditional side, in 1999 he joined the Napa Valley Symphony, and he continues to perform with numerous symphonies and chamber ensembles throughout northern California, notably the Mirage Ensemble of which he is a founding member. Mr. Bailis presently consults nationally as an independent performing arts curator and organizational development specialist. He holds degrees from Northwestern University and Yale School of Music.

Jenny Bilfield

Executive and Artistic Director, Stanford Lively Arts

Since joining Stanford Lively Arts as Artistic & Executive Director in 2006 Jenny Bilfield has stewarded the organization's transformation from university presenter to a campus-based arts producer. Hired during the early days of Stanford's arts initiative, Bilfield has collaborated extensively with faculty and program partners to develop new pathways for immersive, high-impact arts experiences for students and arts-goers in Silicon Valley and the wider Bay area. She has also been a member of the core planning team for Stanford's Bing Concert Hall, which will open in January 2013.

Prior to joining Stanford, Bilfield held numerous leadership roles in the arts throughout her 21 years in New York City. Best known for her specialized work in the strategic management, promotion, and presentation of contemporary music and cutting edge artists, Bilfield spent 12 years at music publisher Boosey & Hawkes where, as President, she was part of the international management team that led the company's public-to-private transition. While there, Bilfield had a key role in business development that was both content-oriented (catalog acquisitions, new publishing lines in band and choral music, Boosey's first foray into Jazz) and operational (a new strategy for printed music production and distribution, integrated management of composers). Bilfield also stewarded several high-impact composer focused initiatives for the company. As Executive Director of the National Orchestral Association and founder of the New Music Orchestral Project, Bilfield launched new American orchestral works through readings and premieres at Carnegie Hall and Manhattan School of Music. For this work Bilfield received an Adventuresome Programming award from ASCAP, and an orchestra leadership award from the League of American Orchestras. Bilfield is an active participant in industry convenings, foundation and presenter panels, and has held seats on boards of organizations including the American Music Center and League of American Orchestra. She holds a BA in Music from the University of Pennsylvania and is married to composer Joel Phillip Friedman.

Christine Lim

Director of Education and Artistic Administration; San Francisco Performances

Lim is in charge of the organization's education campaign, which serves over 14,000 participants through more than 150 programs. She also directs backstage operations and liaisons with the artistic managers. Before Lim started working for S.F. Performances in 2002, she was program director for the Cypress String Quartet in San Francisco, and worked for Mother Jones magazine. A UC Berkeley graduate, she has trained as a classical pianist, and is a native speaker of Korean.

Sherri Young

Executive Director; African American Shakespeare Company

An M.F.A. graduate from the American Conservatory Theatre, Sherri Young founded The African-American Shakespeare Company in 1993 and has been its Executive Director since. She has directed twelve productions, produced and executed four programs for the organization and speaks at various colleges, universities, and conferences such as the National Council of Teachers of English "Shakespeare Why 2K" Conference in Washington, DC. Ms. Young hires and manages the 30 company members and four directors every year to perform productions throughout the Bay Area. She also coordinates their arts education program, which includes a low-cost theatre program.

Ms. Young has served as a panelist for the San Francisco Arts Commission, Creative Assistance for Starving and Hungry Artists (CA\$H), and the Alameda County Art Commission. Ms. Young also served on Theatre Bay Area's Theatre Steering Committee from 2003 to 2004, and served on the Vanguard Foundation's Multicultural Diversity Committee in addition to serving on the San Francisco Arts Commission.



2013 OPG Multi-disciplinary Panel Recommendations

Yerba Buena Gardens Festival

Group Size	Mid-Size
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$12,750

Project description

To support the admission-free, public presentation of 9 outdoor performing arts programs demonstrating the diversity and artistic range of our 2013 season, featuring 131 paid artists performing all new work, including: Circus Bella on 6/28, 6/29 (2 performances), and another date TBD, Darren Johnston on 6/22 and another date TBD, CarpetBag Brigade and Teatro Nemcatocoa on 8/17, Marcus Shelby Orchestra on date TBD and Yosvany Terry on 9/14. We estimate audiences totaling 16,600.

Notes on panel's commentary

This project is an exemplary event. In fact, I see it as one of the defining events of San Francisco. From the breadth of the festival, the quality of the participants, the diversity of genres, audience participation and attendance, the participation of local, national and international artists, partnerships with high level institutions- this is a necessary part of the Bay Area cultural landscape. The work sample they sent this year was the same as we've seen before, but it still communicates why this is such a great event. Their plans are in place, and now its just a matter of sorting out the details. They control the venue, so it's perhaps not as complex as some of the other festivals but there's still a lot of work. They've put aside funds for an emergency, with commercial profits going towards this safety net. The fact that they received a Hewlett Foundation grant to do in-depth research is beneficial for the Bay Area as a whole. They've expanded their reach out into the surrounding areas. They also serve a key function in the neighborhood, which is changing. This organization does a lot of quality work, and local artists and audiences are the beneficiaries.

This application just hit it out of the park. A really exciting season has been put together with great programming. It is beautifully thought out in terms of diversity, aesthetics, and provenance of work. A lot of the planning has been done in advance and we know what they're about. The festival is clearly thought out, which demonstrates a close relationship with their artists. It's new work! To go out on such a limb, to this depth, shows that there is a lot of trust between them and their artists. You really have to know your customers and your artists to be able to put on these free public works. This could provide a new model for other festivals to follow, and I really admire that. The application was well written and well articulated. I loved the thoughtfulness of the application at almost every level. Also, I like the smart growth of the organization, which I perceive to be a slow, organic process. This application did very well in my book.

I don't know anyone who doesn't appreciate what they do. As you've said, this is what they do and they do it well. They put all of their energy into this event and the attention to detail shows. The lineup looks exciting, and I have no doubt they'll get it down. It's nice that they didn't include the administration in the budget, as it's all about the process of the project itself.

Echoing what you've said, I like the idea that it further accentuates YBCA and the area as a destination for new work. But it allows this cross pollination, outside and inside, and really underscores this neighborhood as a critical area in San Francisco for new, exciting work. This is even more true because the event is not run by YBCA, but this is smart programming.

Staff: Do you feel that the resources are sufficient for taking on the administrative work behind the festival?

I've seen the final product and the promotional materials, and everything works smoothly on the outside. So, not having that administrative line in the budget is fine by me. It's refreshing that the budget they showed us is going straight into the project itself, and not towards overhead costs.

Staff: You mean in how they're allocating our grant?

Yes, it's all for the festival.

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

African & African American Performing Arts Coalition

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The Black Choreographers Festival: Here & Now - 2014, the 10 yr celebration of a comprehensive event rooted in the traditions of African & African American art and culture. An all - community event featuring high caliber performances, Symposia, arts education and mentoring between generations of artists and encouraging arts community collaborations.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This is an annual festival. The festival features black dance choreographers, but they have a mix of other activities, including concerts, mentoring programs, and master classes featured as well. They also talk about offering dance training, such as a technique and choreography workshop for men of color. There is also a symposia and a film series. All of these community outreach activities combine for quite a few events. I've seen them perform before and they really have a great group, including notable choreographers participating in production. They talk about their line up for 2014, which was helpful. The only red flag I had was thinking that they might have too much going on, and I question how they'll manage all these things at once, particularly during the festival in February 2014. Maybe they're stretching themselves too thin. Also, reaching out to corporate sponsors, and charging their artists a nominal fee (\$125) to participate- I don't know if this is normal, but it seems to be a practice of the dance community. In the theatre community it's a 'no-no'. Also, they have musical guests such as Marcus Shelby and Omar Sosa. The budget breakdowns are nicely detailed, as we can see how much people are being paid, etc.

They have a track record of doing a lot, and the 10th anniversary is a major marker which they can leverage. I don't know if it's a reflection of the times, but they seem to be very conservative in their estimates and projections. In any case, it seems like a great opportunity to leverage their 10th anniversary event. I'm hoping for something larger, or thematic. It's very good that they share a lot of costs and key areas with co-presenters and partners. In regards to the \$125 fee, in some ways it's a very good method to build reserves, and it sort of adds an incentive for choreographers to follow through and invest in their success. The organizational capacity, especially considering the collaboration with ODC and Yerba Buena, seems to be steadily increasing in breadth and reach. I have one question- how is it that the project budget numbers went up, but the attendance was down?

There is a question of accuracy in CCDP and how numbers are entered. You just can't untangle program from institution. This is an organization essentially led by two people, so I'm sure there are questions about the data entry.

Staff: One thing we can add to our guidelines is to have applicants provide notes on the non-financial numbers of the CCDP, to ensure that they're explained.

Obviously the quality of the organization is high, as the work sample demonstrated.

I concur. They submitted really compelling samples, including a variety of voices. I made a note regarding impact on target audience. This is another thing that organizations may need clearer guidance on, because what you learn from an audience, in terms of feedback, isn't really available until weeks or months later. There is a desire to do surveys, but the data is not meaningful to me - I want to know how the work stayed with you, if you'll come back, etc. This is a more interesting metric that I think all organizations should track, i.e. how much is new audience? How well do you know your base? This is more of a general note than specific to this application- 'We want to know more about the audience'.

I know it looks like a lot of scope and activity, but this organization does do it all. All jokes aside, they get it done, it's a lot to take on but it does happen. Also those who come in to do technical training, do it for next wave and they really get a lot out of it. I want to endorse them heartily for the depth of their work during their festival period, and thank goodness for those involved it only lasts a month! I really believe in them and their work. This year, in particular, they've brought in a substantial host to MC every evening, have a great line up of performers, and it's a very well put together year. Good financial health.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Croatian American Cultural Center

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support the Croatian American Cultural Center's Cultures at the Crossroads an annual four-concert series that presents the music and dance traditions of two different Balkan cultures on each program . During the grant period, we will curate, organize and produce a series of four concerts, each featuring two master artists performing different music and dance traditions indigenous to Croatia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Bulgaria, or Hungary, along with two contemporary American performers who are pushing traditional Balkan art forms in new directions.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This organization is presenting a culture at a crossroads; they are at once master performers of Balkan traditional forms as well as contemporary American performers pushing traditional forms in new directions. This is an organization that's fostering these forms and serving a particular concentration well. We can find a cross cultural, multidisciplinary, and intergenerational synergy at play in their work. The work sample they supplied did a beautiful job of demonstrating what they're about. The quality of the artists involved is incredibly high. The joy and participation, inclusion and diversity within this community is exemplary. I learned that there is an improvisatory element to this traditional form. The way in which they made this connection to the musical context, I find really remarkable. They did it in a way that was clear and concise. They have a line up already in place for their next festival. I think this is a wonderful celebration of bringing people together. They have a clear sense of how this project fulfills and furthers the *raison d'etre* of addressing a need. It was an incredible application to review.

This application was one of my favorites as well. I wrote down in my notes, 'this is the best curated program I have reviewed out of any of the festivals'. I wrote this because I so respected the purposeful intention of how this was put together. They targeted a need, thought carefully about it, made clear decisions, crossed cultural lines that are really tough to overcome, and brought it all together in a conversation about contemporary American identity. This application meets almost every criteria in our grant review process. They came with their programming done, they have a great explanation for the significance of their work, and they were clear in setting up curatorial milestones and meeting them. My only complaint is regarding what they said about audience. They made a statement about how they want to 'migrate their audience', augment it, and I didn't think they did a great job of explaining how they intended to reach this younger community. It seems a little happenstance, as if they have faith that it will just work out. I don't know if they completely succeeded in this one area, otherwise I thought this was a nearly perfect application.

I agree. I also wrote down, 'how are you recruiting these 20/30 year olds?'. I've been to their events, and can attest that the work samples are accurate. The sense of liveliness, the energy, and the excellent work is all there. It's a bit strange, when you think of minorities in the Bay Area, the Romanians and Bulgarians are not often a community you think of, so it was surprising and informative to read this application. I found this to be a very smart and a delightful project. It doesn't seem like anyone is giving them handouts- everything they're doing, they're doing ground up.

I was also impressed with the scope and modesty of the venue. At the end of the day, these projects are about the work, and its complex to bring in artists from various parts of the world, so there's obviously there's something that drives it. There is a huge community in the Bay Area that supports this organization, and that surprised me as well. This is an organization that showcases comprehensively, and they don't just pick off the top stars.

The project budget looked feasible to me. It's small, but there's nothing about it that made me think there was an issue to bring up.

Staff: There are no CCDP budget notes.

There was nothing about the CCDP report that jumped out as wildly different.

Their financial health looked pretty steady. They had a dip in 2009-2010 fiscal year, but then again, who didn't? Overall, they look very stable to me.

There's a good amount of individual contributors for that amount of money raised. There's a level of participation here that other organizations don't necessarily enjoy.

Two things stood out to me. One, obviously they highlight a youthful contingency, as half the board is retired. The second thing is that the size of the project budget seems pretty much in line with their overall budget, so this wasn't an application that I felt I needed more notes. It was very transparent.

One mistake they made in the figure for an executive director salary, and they must have meant less, because otherwise, I'd love to take that job!

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

Fresh Meat Productions

Project description

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support the 12th Annual Fresh Meat Performance Festival at Z Space June 21-23, 2013. Curated by Artistic Director Sean Dorsey, our 3-day multidisciplinary Festival is the nation's largest annual transgender arts event, offering artistic perspectives on transgender civil rights and contemporary gender identities, particularly as expressed through the filters of race, ethnicity, class and age. Awarded funds will support the participating artists' fees and theater rental costs.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This was a strong application on a number of fronts. First, it's a three-day festival with a strong focus and curatorial eye toward transgender art, and they present a very comprehensive view. The director has canvassed across the nation to find artists to showcase. Out of this has come new works, created by both nationally sourced and emerging local artists. The latter is a focal point and very authentic outgrowth of what Fresh Meat does. So as a new art perspective, it's very important. The fees are mostly for the artists, and for renting Z space. It's a great environment to show work, socially and in terms of presentation. I appreciate that the artist fees are prioritized. The proposal is well laid out, questions are answered succinctly, and the organization has a track record of embracing and mounting this kind of work. They are well supported by multi-year grants, the documentation they provided demonstrates stability, as well as demonstrating a comprehensive approach to supporting this work beyond the actual performance. This is an important and well thought out proposal.

Fresh Meat is a very exciting group, and I like their vision for doing this three day festival. Their proposal was clear and to the point. The only thing that bothered me was that I found it hard to read such small type on a few of the lines. However, their overall mission was very clear, and they've been doing it for a while. I know they came out of the Queer Cultural Council, and I also know their leadership has very strong training. As for their breakdown, I would have liked to have known how many artists are part of this festival.

Well, they do specify ten original works. It says artist fees, \$11,000. It doesn't say how many individual performers will be on stage, but it does say ten new or original works. While the artistic allocation is \$11,000, the total budget is almost \$30,000. It looks healthy. They do claim that they pay the highest artist fees, so it would have been nice to see what that figure was.

Great partnerships with the groups they work with. They have a clear purpose, they are serving a need, and it will result in a fantastic artistic product. The commissioning of new works is great. They also have a diversity of voices represented within the festival.

I rank this application very highly. It is well put together across the board, and I'm a huge fan of the organization. Their work is as excellent as it is deep. One thing I really appreciated this time around was their move towards a deeply curated event. The depth of the location of inquiry, into histories, into the ambiguities of histories, it's all so rich. On top of that, to know there's going to be a focused group of original pieces is really impressive to me. As the event is so specific, it's going to be understood at a level which will attract all types of audiences. This is an artistic leap in a profoundly exciting direction.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

OX

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support the production of Work MORE, an evening-length curated show of multidisciplinary and drag performance artists. OX will produce two original large-ensemble performances at Z Space in August 2013 and in January 2014, each with a 4-night run. The 8 events will feature and compensate 20 local and national artists and serve approximately 1600 audience members. Awarded OPG funds will support artistic fees, OX staff compensation and production costs.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

The work sample added greatly to the whole package. This organization operates in an area I have no knowledge of, but I found the work they're doing to be spectacular, imaginative, and powerful. The video quality wasn't the best, but the work came through powerfully. The narrative made a compelling case for drag as folk art, and that they're really trying to support community over individuality. It's a complicated kind of project, and I wish the complexity of the project itself had been unpacked a bit more in the application. Since the work is time and resource heavy work, I wish they had laid out the process a little more clearly. Seeing the work on video really helped get the message across. Their growth has been natural and organic. This project serves the mission of the organization and expressed to me that the larger audience and presence of the organization came through in the proposal. Their claim of 'cross pollination of diverse communities' (theater, queer, trans) actually had legs. They have a great trajectory.

They mentioned having a successful Kickstarter campaign and I was curious to learn more details. They have increasing expenses, as a growing organization does, and they have good reasons for it. It demonstrates a really healthy ecology. I found this to be a commendable project.

I completely agree. I like everyone involved. The artist has a great perspective and brings a wonderful level of artistry to the work. This is an artist who has really been coming up in a number of different communities and has this interesting, bridging kind of a reach. I'm very much in favor of this proposal. It's well conceived, and their partnerships are going to support them in a powerful way. My only comment in terms of constructive criticism is that, while I liked the argument, it was steeped in rhetoric. It is most helpful for that kind of language to be in a mission statement, but not driving the narrative of the application. They did make a nice point about talking about video documentation. This organization is in alignment with but distinct from the rest of the queer initiatives here. All in all, they're a very powerful organization.

While I have attended a number of performances that are drawn from the queer community, I often worry that I don't have the experience or authority to be sufficiently responsive. This one absolutely stood out. They made a wonderful case for the collaborations. The art, the performance of work, all of that is beautiful. I appreciate that the artistic fees have a high priority in this budget. I probably would have figured that out looking at the samples. They're thought out, the actors move beautifully on stage, and each sample is unique. There is not a monolithic quality to the presentation-these are developed works.

I loved the work sample as well. I don't have much to add, except I really like the folk aspect of the drag and framing it in such a way.

They had free attendance in Fiscal Year 11-12, as opposed to the other years. So this resulted in high attendance numbers. It's a big draw and because it happens on a weekly basis, it's a groundswell in a specific arena and they're figuring out how to make that leap to a whole other setting. As artists are coming along and realizing, "Wow, we can do this", these strategies are tried and true. You have a following, and they will donate more to your Kickstarter than you think!

I like how they talk about the canvassing they're doing abroad, and other places in the country. They represent something special. Their expansion and growth has been logical and organic.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

PlayGround

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

PlayGround requests support for the 18th annual Best of PlayGround Festival, PlayGround's annual showcase of the Bay Area's best new playwrights and their short and full-length work. The festival will include 26 public performances of 17 short and full-length plays as well as a series of panel discussions and community dialogues on new plays and Bay Area writers, taking place at Thick House, May 1-25, 2014.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

Playground is a terrific organization. They do a short, monthly mini-festival on Monday nights. Their process begins with a pool of writers who they give a topic to. The writers crank out plays in 24 hours, which are read and vetted by a literary committee, and their selections continue on for a staged reading. There are all kinds of audience commitments and interactions. For example, the audience gets to vote on which plays advance, and it really represents an open process and deeply interactive relationship with their constituents. They are truly dedicated to this community. This proposal is for their end of the year festival, where they call up the 'best of the best' of that year. This festival is also one of the most fun theatrical highlights of the year. You can really see who's apart of the community, how they're thinking, what they do with theater aesthetics. It's really a robust investigation, and they're digging deep. They've also, in recent years, gotten into commissioning some of their writers to take these shorts further into full length plays, and I think they're trying to reach out on a national level. They've taken off in a way! There is a sensibility of real democracy within this tight knit community, of which there are always a pool of writers, dramaturges, playwrights, etc to creatively draw from. They're putting out excellent work from this process. It's a wonderful project and something a lot of folks in the Bay Area look forward to each year. The reality of the situation is that the big reputation houses will rarely take a risk on a local artist, and what PlayGround is attempting is to break this barrier by building a local following for these artists. I gave this application high marks for the caliber of their work, their knowledge of what they're doing, and for serving both artist and audience.

It does seem like they have a very established and clearly thought through process of supporting artist, giving them feedback, working collaboratively, bringing audience into the process, etc. It is all very impressive. When I read this proposal, the first thing that leapt out was the 'rapid prototyping' common to engineers. You need to get works out the door, put them out, get feedback, tweak them, put out other iterations, everything must be done quickly, etc, and this organization has embraced this model of working. This is very supportive of the workshop incubation model which is familiar in the Bay Area. There's a lot going on, and its true to the spirit of how things are done here.

I really enjoyed the proposal, but in the back of my mind I kept thinking about distinction. Working with playwrights is such a different aesthetic, and they need nurturing. I think when we read this, we all wanted to ask, 'how are you doing this differently?', and I didn't get that from this application. If you didn't say what you knew about them, I wouldn't have gotten all of that from this application. But, it sounds like a lot of fun!

In regards to finances or organizational capacity. They just got around to procuring a dedicated full-time employee. I get the feeling they're starting to really streamline the operation. I know they've looked towards expansion, but they've also been really smart about bidding their time and growing at a sustainable rate. The folks involved with them are highly experienced and very capable individuals.

Staff: Do you feel you have enough info about the new play commissions, high school projects, or other elements of the festival? The budget line didn't specify these.

The high school student projects are something they've done for a while, and it's pretty low impact, budget wise. The part about inviting new constituencies, I'm not sure if they need to be in the budget notes. The new play commissions are an expansion, but I also don't know that they need to be in the budget notes either.

Staff: There are some commissions fees and staff time dedicated to all three of those components, so they do need to be in the notes.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Switchboard Music Festival

Project description

The Switchboard Music Festival is an annual 8-hour marathon event in San Francisco that features performers, composers, and other artists who create innovative music that challenges traditional genre distinctions. By presenting and commissioning this music, Switchboard fosters a community for talented musicians otherwise underrepresented in concerts and venues around the city, and a place for audiences to discover and engage with new sounds and artists from the Bay Area.

Group Size	Tiny
Request:	\$10,784
Recommended:	\$9,166

Notes on panel's commentary

This organization has a real creative scope and sense of curiosity that I find disarming in a wonderful way. I love the variety and the open airs of the festival. Whether I look at the samples or see it in person, I learn something and feel it's always challenging for the audience. Every year will vary, and this is one of the festivals where you have to look at the curatorial vision as opposed to who is performing in a given year. It's important to support a vision that embraces the curiosity they demonstrate. A great deal is accomplished with a pretty conservative budget. The project and organization are basically one in the same. The audience is both a part of the arts community as well as staunch supporters of the individual artists. There's a kind of cross pollination going on here, and the audience is a curious audience. This organization has the ability to deliver. There's something wonderful and honest about focusing on the art as opposed to production value, etc. My instinct is to respect and support this.

I concur. That was great. I have one criticism, as there was some wobbling around in their finances that I felt was unexplained. It's a minor concern, but I was surprised because this is such a stellar application. There was a big drop in capacity, for example, in fiscal year 2011-2012 under 'attendance and paid attendance', which was unexplained. Contributed revenue appears to be on the dip as well. They're saying more and more people are coming, but the financial figures reflect the opposite, in fact. I'm just not sure what that's all about, and I would have liked for them to have spoken to it. It was enough of a red flag for me to influence my marks in regards to their financial health and competency.

Actually, they're saying their cash income went up significantly in 2012, and in the CCDP report it's 25% less. There are no notes about it, in any case, which is a question. It's not enough to cause a capacity question, but even diving deeper, I couldn't get the facts to line up. I don't think they're misrepresenting their figures, the organization is tried and true and I think they do a phenomenal job. But I also wondered about the coming and going (in this unconventional venue/audience model), and if they're selling tickets, how does one think about this in terms of oversight and revenue? How do they think about this in terms of audience experience? So I do have some minor concerns about capacity building.

Staff: Can we refer back to the budget notes? They do talk about the fluctuations a bit, but not the detail we're looking for. Looking at the CCDP on page 5, it looks like they might have switched around some figures. Perhaps they inverted fiscal year 11-12.

They could have explained this better. But they're in 'ok' shape. It was the only place they fell down. One thing about the CCDP, is that once it's done you never want to go back. However, we have to be very careful to make sure the numbers add up. There was no breakdown for project budget notes, which I noted. They were a little sloppy on the application, but I think what they're pursuing is an incredible concept.

It's hard to decipher without a breakdown. I liked how they submitted the social media details, and they had plenty of details there. The biographies they submitted only speak about their work in terms of organizational capacity, but not as artists. Biographies for administrative/key staff was not included. There was not much detail in the timeline either. I would like to see if their project is cost effective, etc. It's a high amount for a one day event, at almost \$9,000. It's an eight hour event, probably a fifteen hour set up, they're renting instruments, a huge crew, multimedia equipment, set up, etc. That number doesn't strike me as high at all. It's just one of those things, they were either sloppy or rushed and those budget breakdowns are normal.

Staff: In 2012, it seems like a slight increase, which they talk about, so it's consistent with what they're saying. We just don't have any particular standard on how the numbers are assigned.

They're probably waiting on how much they're going to be granted before doling out amounts in detail. Until they know what they have, it's a bit of a 'chicken and egg' which happens with these grant cycles.

I think this is another organization which is artist led and is evolving into a really viable entity for the experimental, 'between genre' music scene. They're enjoying a growing importance in the Bay Area music community, they're very compelling in their vision to break categories, and their programming promotes a great variety of artists. The cross pollination here is viable, incredible, and I hope it will expand. So much of their success is about where they're placing themselves aesthetically. What I like is that they've seen what else exists and found a niche – they are genre crossers and breakers, not stuck on their aesthetic but their principles. I think it's a great approach.

On organizational capacity, their growth seems very well thought through and organic. The organization is artist led, they've established a community presence, received 501(c)3 status, they enjoy an expanding board, and they are building in a logical and sustainable way.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

LEVYdance, Inc.

Project description

LEVYdance's 10th Anniversary Outdoor Home Season is a site-specific outdoor dance performance retrospective and community festival in San Francisco's South of Market district.

Group Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

Ben Levy is the director and founder of LEVYdance. It's very site specific work, and he likes to do different types of configurations. Upcoming is their 10th anniversary, and a plan for three different stages that combine to form a unique audience experience inside and out. There's an indication that he's now creating a new stage. The curatorial vision is based on revisiting past works that were successful, though I didn't get a great sense of what he was going for just yet. It seems like they've had a lot of success and established a certain notoriety, and they even have an international presence it seems. They offer master classes as well. Their board of directors is small and intimate. Looking at the past ten years, they exhibit fairly normal growth for an organization. They are based in SOMA in an alley, where much of the work is done. This all sounds very interesting. Is he out doing it on the street? Yes. Ok, I see, that's why they need the permits. Looking at their project budget, nothing has red flags. They supplied too much information about their lighting designer. I didn't get a sense of a solid plan, so maybe that's why I had a hard time remembering this proposal- it wasn't specific enough about it's plan for me. The only thing I remember significantly was the audience being positioned around and within the work.

I was very taken with the samples. I thought they demonstrated a level of detail, discipline and refinement that speaks to the company's great work. I liked the fact that the different collaborators were called out, and attention was paid to the important creative partners who make the work happen. I appreciated that. The composers, lighting, designers, and venue partners were all mentioned, and the relationships seemed very rooted, connected and partnerly. In terms of financials, there was a balance of artistic and administrative allotment, a stable timeline, and their investments have been reflected in the high quality of work. They have an interesting way of interpreting and using space, adapting to it and imposing some structure, but also looking at the architectural intersections present.

They've grown quite fast. They have really established themselves in the Bay Area and nationally in a short amount of time. This anniversary is definitely something to celebrate. It's a valid choice to look inward and revisit past performances as a company. I imagine some of the samples we saw represent work that they're revisiting, though some more details would have been helpful. I agree, it's great that they're focusing so much on their partners, the lighting designer in particular since he's playing a key role in the remounting of these works. It is really generous of them to fairly acknowledge these partners. The budget is reasonable and they themselves say, "they're in an ideal state of fiscal and administrative health". This is great to hear, as they seem to be at a stable point where they're transitioning to the next level and building the necessary leadership. The infrastructure really seems to support this big step, and I think they got it all together.

I'm in favor of this proposal. However, I'd like to bring up a few criticisms. The alley is attached to Ben's studio, and he had an event outside in the alley to get people there. He had a triangular outdoor stage and he sat people in the middle of it. To date it may have been one of his best pieces. And I think he's realizing what came together in that work was special, and he wants to revisit and recontextualize the piece with some critical distance. It's also strange for him, as a very prolific producer, to not make a new work in a year. His organization is also very supportive, and his board is tremendous. This event is so magical. It is so urban, so SOMA, and artistically it's really special. I hate to be Debbie Downer, but what was the 'festival of community event'? It was mentioned three times but never discussed. Who's it for? That's where I thought, "What are you doing? just do the show!". I'm not sure what this is for. The outdoor home season is great, and I responded positively to that, but the whole festival around it seems not to be articulated yet. So it seems a bit like hot air, as if they are trying to force a community aspect element into the piece to be more appealing, which is unnecessary. However, I agree that the event is incredible. When I witnessed it, the images I took away stayed with me for years after. It was a truly moving work.

They have a profound following. They are one of the top five dance exports from the Bay Area at the national level. They have no problem demonstrating their ability to fill a house.

Their proposal is totally flat for me. It didn't leave an impression.

They do have that in the calendar of activities. It is at that 111 Minna scene where they're building their audience, meshing with the younger dance/business demographic. This could have been spelled out better.

The notes should reflect the description of the audience. This should be a strong suit for them, and the description of what they're going to do is actually very flat and not memorable. If you look deeply enough, at the board and staff list, you would be drawn to the application. Certainly, it may not have come up if I did not have an intimate knowledge of the organization and I mentioned it. The application should be able to stand on it's own.

I think they're saying that it's a returning audience. I didn't see anything new in the marketing plan that would encourage new audience participation. I'm looking at the CCDP about admissions/ticket sales, and for the amount of activity that happened in 2012 alone, I'm surprised. \$14,000 for a dance company doing one season is actually a bit high.

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Hip Hop DanceFest

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

With gratitude for the past support of the San Francisco Arts Commission, we are respectfully requesting funding for our milestone 15th annual San Francisco Hip Hop DanceFest, coming to San Francisco's beautiful and historic Palace of Fine Arts Theatre in November 2013. We are requesting \$15,000, which will be allocated to artistic, production and marketing costs.

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

The artistic excellence of this project is very clear. The joy and celebration of this particular artistic endeavor comes through in the sample they submitted. This is another festival which basically demonstrates where this art form is, in a national context. It struck me how important this Bay Area dance community is, and the immense impact of this project. This is a festival that really demonstrates the relevance and evolution of an art form, and provides a socio-cultural context for this art form. The application had a clear sense of it's purpose. They're going into the 15th year of this festival. The one thing I wondered about was the challenging issues surrounding parking at the venue. I wish that they had shared some ideas of how they might have resolved it. Yes, it's the construction for the Exploratorium. It takes a lot of places out. In general it's challenging just getting there. I wish they had shared a timeline, or something that explored their options a bit more, etc. Otherwise, they're really well put together. All the dates are determined, so they're ahead of the game when compared to other similar projects timelines. The leadership is capable, and their track record of success shows it. They enjoy fairly diverse sources of income, and have very good plans in place.

They feature international and local artists, operating with a cross generational, inclusive outlook. They know what they do well, there is a planful approach to their budget, and the focus is where it should be- on the artists.

This is one of those proposals that I really like because they didn't add on a lot of unnecessary frills. It makes me feel calm to see them do what they're passionate about. I do wish they spelled out how the 'deeper engagement' they're seeking with their audience would come about. Also, their timeline was difficult to read. Maybe this was due to the formatting?

I agree with you all. It's a terrific festival. I really support its vision and purpose, and have been supportive of it for years. I hope it becomes the right kind of institution. Again, I agree that if it is in fact a huge problem to get the public to the venue, more details on that process would have been appreciated. However, there's no denying this organization has lasting power.

Audience was well articulated, they know who their audience is and it's a wonderful mix of people. It's a really diverse crowd if you've ever gone to the event. The only hang up is the access (i.e. getting to the venue, literally) thing.

Staff: Do we have any comments about quality, process, curatorial, or resources?

This is a lean operation that focuses on the art... and knows it cold. They're not locked into one aesthetic either. It truly is really embracing.

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

Stepology

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The 2013 Bay Area Rhythm Exchange features artists from STEPOLOGY's 11th annual Bay Area Tap Festival in a 1-night-only production at the Marines Memorial Theatre in San Francisco. Today's top tap artists celebrate the traditions of tap dance as well as contemporary innovations in the form, with live musical accompaniment and mixed-genre collaborations featuring special guest artists.

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

This event is an important repository of the tap dance legacy. It's importance lies locally and nationally in preserving and continuing this American art form. It's clear the impact is felt beyond the Bay Area. Stepology brings live music to dance, archiving and documenting this form. This is a really significant event. Their work sample is great, but I feel like I've seen it before. Was it the same as last years? I was a little disappointed in that. They just came through their 10th anniversary event, so I thought they would have had great, new work available to show. This is a festival that will be using the Herbst theatre as its main venue. I'm not sure they've really accounted for that fairly large shift in their plan, so maybe this is an area they could address further. They've been presenting at the Herbst Theatre and they will present the next festival in 2013.

The festival is the central activity of the organization. The concept of tap is severely underrepresented as an art form, locally and nationally. This organization has a huge impact towards keeping this form relevant and visible. The management has been sound and growth is steady. What they're doing is really important. It looks like they've secured significant funding from diverse sources, enjoy remarkably even budget numbers, and have a committed artistic staff with bold leadership. This is a worthy project. The shift in audience is behind the decision to go from two to one performances.

I would concur with that. This is art that combines music, movement, theatre, with soloists, partner dances, ensembles- it's a really exciting way for an audience to be immersed. It transcends age or experience, so there is a huge audience development component. The organization seems stable and adapting to changes well. The reach of non-advertising materials is pretty modest at \$1,200, a significant expense compared against admissions. I appreciate that the artists are paid.

I really liked, in the application, how they gave context to the preservation of this art form, and the difficulties they've encountered in their effort. I thought their budget projection was realistic, and there being only 1,200 people on the mailing list didn't deter me- it's a stable core. I did agree with them regarding the value of the work.

I am in favor of this project. It's well put together, powerfully presented, and I'm all for it. Doing a quick pass through their CCDP, things are matching up with what they're saying and everything makes sense.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Crowded Fire Theatre Company

Group Size Small

Project description

Request: \$8,000

We are seeking support for The Matchbox: Commissioning and Developing New Works program that champions voices of a diverse body of playwrights. The Matchbox, including three different components intended to support project development, meets playwrights' needs towards creating new production-bound plays.

Recommended: \$6,000

Notes on panel's commentary

Crowded Fire has been around for 16 years. Their process is really something unique. In the theater world, it's often difficult to take the risk of investing in new plays. They take this risk. In this series, they not only take new works, but their process is to develop them in collaboration with the directors and actors. Then they select three of those plays to be fully commissioned and develop an entire production. This is a very unique and much needed process. They have a track record which demonstrates their many successes. Many of their resident playwrights have moved on to bigger things, such as working with Cutting Ball Theater, etc. There is a thoughtful way of nurturing playwrights. It takes so much time and energy to nurture playwrights and allow them to develop. If you don't devote that time, support and feedback, it can be a horrible process for playwrights. The timeline they propose is doable. They're making an effort to target diverse and unheard voices. They've had 18 world premieres, which is an incredible number given they've been around for only 16 years. Everything looks pretty good. I would like to have breakdowns in their project budgets. They have new leadership that just came on last year, or two years ago. This is a very active group and they do incredible projects. They have art in a political arena and I wasn't sure, given the work sample, if that was true always or if it's just this sample - I didn't get a good grasp of the specificity. As playwrights, you want to know their voice is heard but I didn't get a good sense of their curatorial vision. Part of the mission that came through was producing new, emerging works. That seems like the focus of the project. They do mention the political modus operandi, but the way that manifests... I don't know if you have a curatorial vision as a playwright unless you're working with a national pool. The sample is where it shows up. Eugenie, and some of the other folks, are interested in slices of that conversation.

They did a good job of taking a complex program and articulating it to people not familiar with that world. This is one of the few applications in which data and numbers were used in a compelling way to support what they're trying to say. Things made a lot of sense. And they put things in context. The organization seems to be growing and getting a lot of new support. They've just had big internal changes. Yes. Their earned income has doubled within a year. The project really seems to support and fulfill the mission of the organization. They are in support of adventurous work, and they are supportive of young and emerging talent. They have shown an interest in sustaining their relationships over time, seeing them through the production end. The fostering of talent seems like an amazing opportunity that allows different voices to be a part of the local and national conversation. One of their strengths is how embedded they are in the Bay community. Looking at these applications, I'm struck by how tight the theater community is here. One finds the sharing of resources at every level. They gave us a very strong narrative. This was a clear presentation.

At first I marked them down a little in the project budget criteria, but then I saw that their organizational budget is so small, which means they're bare knuckles. They're still growing. I like the artists they work with. The body of work they have is conscious of their place in the community and positioning itself nationally, which many other groups are not doing. These guys are critical in that conversation. They're poised to really grow in scope and ambition. Their plan has laid out many years for us to look at. They have their money where their mouth is. They have mapped out what is on stage, matchbox or what was elsewhere. I was very happy with this application.

The project budget is small, but proportionate. If it was much bigger than that they wouldn't have the annual budget to sustain themselves. There are just a few places where they haven't parsed everything out administratively. So perhaps they aren't recognizing the true costs. One needs to be careful how the program gets articulated as a project in this kind of setting. For example, the overhead needs to be articulated here. \$3000 is going to administrative costs and there's lots of other administrative work to manage this. It's a responsible level, but the articulation is important to nail down. I would like to see them do this project with twice the money. It does seem like a low budget for their proposal. Similar incubation projects are working in the \$60,000-\$90,000 range. Due to their current size, this is the scale they can manage, but I think it could be turned into something more substantial if their growth continues over the next few years.

They certainly target emerging talent. The organization helps to develop work here and on tour, and speaks to the local theater audiences and theater making community, as well as on a larger scale. People are interested in the playwright. This organization allows them the opportunity to be seen several times over the years. Similar to the fashion in which they've developed with Eugenie. I felt the organization could have done a better job of articulating their audience. Last year, there were letters that participants could write to be seen with the samples, as I've seen applicants include personal testimonies in the past rounds of the grant. That's not a part of the grants this year, but I think it's where that particular issue can be addressed. That is, the issue of defining a target audience that is benefiting from this program.

Staff: That's not a part of the applications this year, so we need to assess what's here.

Incubator projects are focused primarily on the artists. Audiences benefit, but the industry is really the focus here. That's not in dispute here. Although, this could have been more clearly demonstrated in a testimonial. These emerging playwrights have done great things and worked with directors they haven't before. So it's a showcase in that way.

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

Epiphany Productions

Project description

EPSDT is respectfully requesting a grant in the amount of \$15,000 for support of the 2013 10th Anniversary Celebration of San Francisco Trolley Dances (SFTD) festival. A celebration of San Francisco's neighborhoods, hidden public spaces, artistic riches, and diverse residents, SFTD provides access, free of charge, to high quality, site-specific professional contemporary dance performances. This year we will travel along the F, K, L, and M Line from Embarcadero to the Castro.

Group Size

Small

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This is an organization that takes its art to places that aren't necessarily conventional 'art sites'. So one of my first questions is, how are they engaging the audience and building a community around it? I loved the video samples, as it was a real treat to see the surprise and delight of the people encountering the artists and their work. I'm wondering if people followed along, stopped and watched, etc. They really have taken ownership of their discipline, building a marketing plan that requires the involvement of the neighborhood and using volunteers as promotional vectors. From the languages used in the posters to the way they engage the communities there, they possess a very thoughtful way to connect site specific art with a sensitivity to the community. It's a playful practice which animates space in a way that's disarming. A 10th Anniversary of doing this work is an important thing to celebrate, as it is pretty tough to sustain it. Site-specific work seems very much a part of culture now, and it requires that public-private partnership to be effective. I appreciate the scope of what they have done, and it seems like they've taken a methodical approach.

I totally agree with your assessment. From the playful nature, the site specificity, the integration of the artistic product within the life of the city, it's all really amazing. One of the things they quoted was an audience comment, speaking of their work as 'a gift to the city'. That's exactly how I thought of this project. It really adds to the life of the city. The project is done in such a great spirit as it moves along and takes people throughout the city. The project engages a huge swath of the city, including tourists, by employing such creative language.

Just as a parenthetical to the previous UN plaza project- this project is also dealing with train noise, traffic noise, etc. I think the difference is that this project is dynamic, it's about the art and not a bunch of ancillary events, and feels more focused to me than the other project, which is also in a public place working with similar acoustic variables.

That's the power of successful site specific work. This is successful because they have really thought through and hand curated in a way to take into account all the other factors as part of the experience, as opposed to resisting them. On top of that, all of this is located in a place specific to this city and it's culture. Its really beautiful work.

I'm all for this project. I scored it very high, as everything that has been said is dead on. Kim is a top notch producer, and she has broken through barriers you wouldn't believe. She is tenacious, and has already barreled through so much red tape and gotten everyone on her side. This organization is always artistically outstanding, and I'm very pleased with the application.

In watching their video, I didn't see a lot of diversity. They needn't feel obligated to check certain boxes to prove they reached 'X amount of Latinos' or whatever. But I did want for them to clarify their demographic.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Live Arts

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

Roots to World is a series of 12-15 performances that features a stylistically, culturally, and ethnically diverse group of artists and ensembles given free rein to explore paths of roots music. Each concert program will look at the interplay of forms and styles by two to three different artists, as a way to highlight the intersection and divergence of such music as blues and African, bluegrass and Latin American, and Celtic and American folk music.

Notes on panel's commentary

In general, I really liked this application. When I read it I was really pleased, and this is one of my top three applications in terms of artistic intention as a curator. The mind and intellect at work here, tearing into the right idea with the right artists, bringing it before a public in a profound way, all of this was beautifully articulated. This grant writer is a pro, and this was a remarkable application. Obviously, they enjoy a profound history at Live Arts, and they're always catching onto things as they're coming along. This organization has reshaped all kinds of jazz.

I liked this project a lot because I love the 'roots to world' concept. I think what they're talking about in terms of group shows, putting these people together, it's a little heavy on the intellectual side. The wonderful things that he's talking about with these artists I think will be very illuminating. I was very pleased to see someone say exactly what they're doing in a very well thought out and articulate manner. I also like the concept of how he looks at roots.

I agree with what's been said completely. I love that it's in artists' voices and that its very thoughtfully developed. It's not just a showcase but very well thought through. They've displayed a sensitivity to artists getting paid, ensembles getting paid, which I like. Artists are the source of so much more than the performance. In a well thought out plan, they enliven the program in so many ways, both intellectually and creatively. I like the way this organization has positioned themselves in that relationship. They talk about the grants in detail, because the idea is good.

I don't know much about the group. It seems like a worthwhile program, and not just a shot in the dark. But, I detected a tinge of elitism in some parts of the application. For example, they say on one line that "this is a place for musicians/artists to have an audience who is knowledgeable and supportive of what they do". I appreciate the caliber of their presentation work, and they do go into detail about trying to reach a younger demographic. I would like to know how successful they are in this endeavor. It sounds like a plan they've had before. In their project budget, they list whole workers compensation, health insurance, etc, which I found surprising for a smaller organizations such as themselves. They've been at it for over 30 years. It might be part of their liability insurance. The venue may require it. Well, workers compensation is heavy duty. I know a lot of small organizations that pay it in order to be eligible for certain things, so they just get it done.

I second all the great things already said. I also agree that seeing some of the data would augment what they say in terms of reaching new audiences, or changing the profile of their audience. I'm curious to know more about this. It would help make the case with their curatorial statement. They have a successful track record so I have confidence in what they're doing. But as they're going through so many changes at the moment, it'd be nice to see the data that's helping them navigate.

My sense is that they're playing to their strengths. They took a major hit at that time, as many organizations did. I was very concerned with that Hewlett funding as well.

Staff: Circling back to the question of audience, are you finding their marketing outreach appropriate for the audience?

Their marketing outreach is very appropriate for programming, but I'm not sure about generating audience. If they're trying to grow, they need to implement new strategies. Again, I think that when an organization this long running goes through a sudden change as they have, they are allowed a couple years to figure it out.

I think they're doing smart things. They shouldn't alienate their base and drop something that, in my opinion, is still working. Maybe moving some resources over to their online marketing is something to consider.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Playwrights Foundation

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

PF is requesting support for the presentation of the 36th Annual Bay Area Playwrights Festival in July 2013. Founded by playwright Robert Woodruff in 1976, the BAPF serves as a forum and a showcase for local and national vanguard playwrights to experiment with new ideas, to develop and nurture creative collaborative relationships, and to push the boundaries of the form.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

The Playwrights Foundation is one of the Bay Areas premier playwrights support groups. They offer a number of programs, but what they're asking us to support is a festival, part of which would include an artist retreat. This retreat is for three days, then they spend a week and a half in the studio, etc. The 36th annual Playwrights Festival is what they're asking funding for. The incubation process and period of development to support new works has had important results in regards to mentorship and feedback. The time away from production, of all the shining lights, that's something that participant playwrights have valued.

Playwrights Foundation operates year round, but this is the end of the year festival. They present the work, take a week off, and then they present the work again. The feedback that they get via this process comes from 360 degrees around. It's a rare luxury to have the incubation time, the retreat time, and the feedback. The organization is growing, learning, and collaborating as a team, and it's their trademark process. The writers who have come through this process are among the Bay Area, and nations', best. They are probably the best incubator organization in terms of consistency and quality in the Bay Area. However, there are things about the application I find a bit perplexing.

The Playwrights Foundation has not only a local presence, but a national presence as well. Also, I'm reading here that they have a new full length musical, and I think I read they have five full length plays as well. I liked how they wrote about what they're looking for in their criteria (local artists, emerging, individuals of color, etc). I really liked this proposal. But also, the Playwrights Foundation takes risks. Perhaps I got a little lost in how they align themselves with the public in any other way than the selection of the artists. Or, how the audience can be of use to the artist in these feedback sessions. I was missing some mechanics in this discussion. Is it really just a selection of artists that drives this process each year? And if not, what is the mechanism? I felt this application did not give enough information, but it is excellent work nonetheless. They said that they're in all sorts of 'deep relationships' with this audience they don't really define. They mention really 'important partnerships' but also don't articulate how these partnerships play into this particular project. Lastly, I was struck by that fact that we've had so many festivals applications, and so many incubator programs with such well articulated steps, that this particular application does not seem so well articulated by comparison. So in a way, it's difficult for me to distinguish them [positively] from the rest.

They do offer a sort of compressed timeline. The problem is the larger framework that uses this very general incubator language. So I would liked to have heard what makes them so unique from the rest of the incubator programs out there. The Playwrights Foundation is a larger expansion, as opposed to the smaller ones such as PlayGround and Crowded Fire. Clearly the scale is much bigger, they're more established, and they've been doing it much longer. So in some ways, it's that much more complex perhaps.

Staff: Is the work sample helpful in clarifying this query?

It did not. However, I do think their process is different. And I also think it's strong, and unique from other Bay Area incubators. So, I would have liked for the work sample to represent this process, if that's what we're reviewing. Perhaps they could have submitted interviews with staff, a few pages of text, a video clip of their well documented process, etc. We don't actually need to see a few seconds of a particular work, because it's the overall process that is unique and that's what we should be judging. It's easy to forget about when you've been in the field for along time and you don't need to talk about that anymore.

I have a comment regarding the project budget notes. One must break down the breakdown of the amounts! On line 18, it says '\$30,000', but they don't break it down. Also, their notes on income for 1 and 2 are 'similar to 2011-12'. That's not enough info, and don't make us work for it! They did really lay out who their people and their staff are. There was a lot of detail there. Yes, that was excellent.

That does come a long way. The sense of being apart of a national effort to support new work is very strong as a framework for advancing this form. This process provides a model for developing new work, as well as a model in how to do residency work and work with students. They have shown the necessity of the artist to be able to work out of the spotlight, and to provide feedback in an environment where they can be vulnerable and open.

Looking at the CCDP, I wonder if this is just another inaccurate report. The numbers, like some of the other applications, simply don't match up. Looking at the paid attendance numbers, the fluctuations are so large. If these were accurate numbers, I feel they would have been reflected or addressed in the budget notes. Perhaps this is another reason they should think about investing in excellent documentation of their process. This would really shine as an application if they could have focused on that. They have a nationally recognized model, and a nationally recognized institute, so we need to take that into account.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Bicycle Music Festival

Project description

The San Francisco Bicycle Music Festival is the only 100% bicycle-powered music festival in the city. The festival is free, open to the public, and features 10-15 musical acts from around the Bay Area. Heralded in Momentum magazine as "the greenest music festival ever conceived," the San Francisco Bicycle Music Festival is produced and presented using zero generators and gasoline.

Group Size Tiny
Request: \$3,000
Recommended: \$0

Notes on panel's commentary

Staff: Unfortunately, this organization was missing the first page of their application.

This was a difficult application to read. The first page being missing did not help it. Overall, it was an interesting idea, the sample looked super fun, and it was compelling on the value side of sustainability. On the artistic side, the festival was almost by happenstance, this idea of bicycle and music. It didn't seem to me the artistic values were super compelling. Looking at the sample, I could see how the music activities were integrated into the 'green' bicycle power, which is really innovative and original. The sample served the idea of sustainability well and showed how all the components intersect. One of my big questions was, how does the venue play into it? Tied to that are questions regarding the parks department, the cost of permits, etc. Again, to return to the sample, it looks like the festival is moving from place to place, so does the venue depend upon the route they decide? The application read well enough but didn't give half of the idea I saw in the work sample. The sample itself was so well produced, but on paper, they're a shoestring operation made possible by volunteers. They submitted a really professional sample, but unfortunately the application submitted did not reflect this professionalism. It seems like they've been gathering more support, and they certainly they have a following who clearly enjoy this festival. The intent of the organization is to take the funding and pay artist fees, which is commendable. Overall I felt they could have articulated their project better. Bike culture is an interesting and important aspect of our community and they could have made a better case for it. But it was a really effective sample. This is an all volunteer organization with some capacity issues, but they are organized and capable of bringing this festival about.

So, I also found the sample really compelling. I love the idea of fusing bike culture with the arts. With their tinkering and instrument building, and DIY approach, this proposal felt like an authentic piece of the Bay Area. The music I heard included a real variety of performers. There was movement, dance, choreography, etc. I also felt that the budget and the grittiness of the organization really reflected the ethos of the bicycle community. I've seen videos of tricked out bike instruments in other places, and it's always very intriguing because everyone can relate to a bike. I found this to be a very interesting proposal. I appreciated the concept of what they're doing, and watching the samples helped a lot. They seem to have some people featured in their festival who are heavy hitters, which is great. This organization is run at a grassroots level, and I believe they are the right size and have the ability to carry out their goals. I like organizations who know who they are and what they're capable of, and I appreciate it. I also had that question of where they perform and the venue selection- in the sample, it looked to be all over. If I want to join the festival, how do I find them? I know they have an email address, but how else do we know about it? More information on their plans would have been helpful.

I was very fond of this application, and very fond of this concept. It's a moveable stage, so where they perform is everywhere. But I think the route is in question. It may be true that this application was not prepared by a grant writer who knows how to hit the marks, but I was captivated with the possibilities, the culture behind it, and the playfulness of the festival itself. From the bicycle blended smoothie to the woman who sold her car to be a part of it- I think these things are great. They've also prioritized paying artists, which is important. On the down side, a lot of the language had sweeping assumptions- for example, that there exists a homogenous community of bikers, all of whom are green, fighting for sustainability, etc. These were things that said that they didn't bother to quantify or qualify. I would say to stop generalizing and get galvanized around it, and make it internally driven. They did not win this race on a proposal level, but I'm very favorable towards idea.

Staff: So just to be clear, we're finding issue with the grant writing and language in this application?

They did say something about 'employing' volunteers, but you can't in fact employ people who are volunteers. There was some language that was a problem. Yes, agreed. Nothing was really quantified or qualified, it was just stated. You can't get away with that for very long, though I understand you have to when you're just getting of the ground.

Staff: Are there any comments regarding their project budget? Is it feasible? Or are there any concerns regarding their timeline?

I think its good they're putting so much of the funding on the artistic side. And selling smoothies! The budget is doable.. They don't yet know how to talk about how they're operating. But they're getting it done. This is looking at their third year. If I saw another application next year which still does not demonstrate an internal awareness, or level of sophistication as an organization, I would be upset. If they're identifying as representatives of the bicycle community, they need to do a better job of defining who and what this community is.

Staff: Going back to organizational growth, is this typical of an organization at this stage of their development? And trying to understand their trajectory, have they talked about their visions of continuing growth, expanding their budgets, financial health, etc?

Those are questions I would probably ask of an organization that is bigger. They are just trying to do what they're trying to do. They are new at it and young, but they seem to be doing it honestly and competently, so I'm not sure that I'm ready to ask them these questions yet and maybe slow them down. I want them to keep going first. Yeah, I don't think they're a fully functional

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Music Panel Recommendations

organization yet, and they're still working their way up to it. They all have daytime jobs, so it's hard to call them an organization if they don't have all the wheels working at the same time. This is more a project- there is no clear division of labor, just people who do what needs to get done.

Considering the growth of most organizations, the first two to three years are just getting established, but around year seven it's time to really professionalize or stop. They're clearly trying to grow and their eyes are on the prize. To me, this application really fits – they must decide if it's going to be or not be, and I think this grant might help get them to the next place. Regarding audience, it seems a lot of their outreach is word of mouth, and through the parks department. The event is mobile, so it's not yet determined what neighborhoods they'll be operating in. Again, considering their whole social media network and a community that is preexisting, I am not concerned about them getting word out. That's how a lot of big things start around here- the same kind of SF irreverence and wit and intelligence wrapped up in this vision.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

SAFEhouse

Project description

SAFEhouse produces 100 residencies at The Garage for performance artists to create new work with a special focus on UG/B/T/Queer performance and contemporary dance. The two residency programs, RAW (resident artist workshop) and AIRspace (residencies for queer performance) yield approximately 200 performances per year, not including SPF (summer performance festival) at the ODC Theater and free performances at 24 Days of Central Market Arts; nor West Wave Dance Festival performances planned for 2013.

Group Size

Small

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This is a really interesting proposal. It's remarkable how much work they support. The number of artists mentored is impassioned and well articulated in the application. When we look at the scale of activity and curatorial filter— their new work, work from LGBT artists— their goal is to support development, improve visibility, such as through open mics, which is less residency but promotes community. I don't understand what a residency means in this context. Since it's the space they perform in, what does that mean in terms of time? Given the number of performances, more definition would be helpful. As for the budget, I noted the grant request is for artistic fees—\$100 stipends for 100 artists. The \$10K ask could be used for documentation or something artists might not have access to that could help their careers. Not to be prescriptive, but they could use the money to bring in a good videographer. I don't know what a \$100 stipend does aside from creating a fair spread. I wonder what can be achieved, individually, with such a small sum. As for the financials, there are tiny and diminishing board contributions, which is challenging for any organization. This is something that takes time and cultivation. Individual contributions have diminished. They are very institutionally reliant, and also depend on admissions. Maybe admissions have taken place of contributions? Given the large community and the strong service of this organization, I hoped for a larger level of audience participation in the form of contributions. Their accounting fees jumped significantly. I didn't see an explanation as to why.

Staff: In their CCDP notes, there is an explanation.

Panel: Ok. They just became a 501(c)3, and they haven't got a board. Everything achieved has been through the commitment of the ED, who has given his life to this since the start. They've moved locations, done incredible things, etc. What they're picking up on is correct. What's happening with individuals, it was just raw creative space for a number of years. Slowly, they've built the programs that are being run, accounting for changes in the ecology and who's doing what. The ED has been coasting along, seeing and picking up on what is necessary and what has been dropped, and he's fashioning it in his own way. He's just arrived at the platform where he is. He explains the residency program. He talks about the hours in the space and technical support, the presentation at the end of the residency and the hours of rehearsal. He oversees grant writing for those people. It's raw creation but it's also feeding his presenting stream. They go into production if they're ready, and they don't if they're not. The narrative does speak about just becoming a nonprofit. The Garage has worked with other spaces to bring work out there. It's been active, but has just begun to professionalize on this new platform. Everybody was in the residency market in the dance community. The queer overtone is there, but it's there for this big community. The residency market really dried up. There are only three spaces doing this. For a 300 deep artist community, the need is there.

My concerns is that the volume is huge. I wondered how diffused the impact will be. I'm used to residency models with smaller numbers, serving a particular need, in which the logic of support is very specific. If he can do it all on this budget, more power to him. The project budget page doesn't have the allocations.

It has it in the budget notes. It says that it goes to the artists and other specifics in the notes. That was just overlooked. This project is well thought through. It's amazing what he does with so little. It comes through the application that this is a program and project that has a specific place in the Bay Area performing arts scene and is addressing a critical lack. What screams out to me is that he's been doing this for a while but this is a new structure. In the budget they have a line item for the salary. He's the only person doing this, so he needs to be compensated, but the money usually goes elsewhere. I noticed the 501(c)3 has a Concord address. That needs to be fixed. It makes it look like they're based in Concord. These are small details that need to be addressed and lined up. It takes a while to get the footing and get them working at the same time when you're doing the art and fundraising too. They've only been around for six years or so, what he is doing is gangbusters. They'll do well if he doesn't burn out.



**2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations**

They've been around eight years. It's at that seven to ten year period when you need to shift as an organization or explode. There are steps to address that dynamic. The suggestions we gave will help. There is individual giving but not foundation support. The infrastructure should be built so it's not just on his shoulders. Since they're also festival producers, there might need to be a parsing out of their agenda —he was writing about the residency project, but then started to drift into talking about the festivals. That was distracting from what this specific project was really about. It's at that critical juncture. In terms of current financial health, they shifted from calendar to fiscal year. The data is a little hard to read because of that. Is this rent for \$24K?

Yes, something like \$25K or \$27K. It's hard for me to comment on organizational health because of the changes and fluctuation. I don't want to penalize them for that. Foundation giving is so sparse out there. We always want to know how they'll manage to do the work if foundation giving goes away. There's also lots of organizations out there that will get it done no matter what. I get the sense that this is one of them. The documentation doesn't include the money he's putting into the organization himself out of pocket —which is common with founder driven organizations.

One column of the three year budget is only 6 months. That's why the next year is so large. I don't think it's as dramatic as it looks here.

Staff: The organization says they're investing in increased stability. That has been costly, and created a deficit for the first time.

Panel: I would have liked to have seen clear attendance numbers. This figure is skewed by the weird shift in the years. It looks like they've built a free attendance element over time. This has increased community.

Staff: It looks like ticket sales increased.

Panel: It's driven by the artist-in-residence program and how that's working. It's hard for organizations to do that; it's driven by who's there. It's very broad participation. The strategy is very clear. It's artist driven.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Arab Cultural and Community Center

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The Arab Cultural and Community Center (ACCC) seeks SF Arts Commission funds to support the production of our 19th Annual Arab Cultural Festival scheduled to take place the first Saturday in October 2013 at San Francisco's Union Square. Since 1995, the ACCC has produced this festival to celebrate the creativity of Arab culture through staging performances of live music and dance. Now, in its nineteenth year, the festival has grown into the largest festival of its kind in California.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

I loved this proposal. It was really terrific. I love the idea of how they are taking on the question of creative place making and ironically juxtaposing it in Union Square. This is a long running festival. They really captured in the work sample collage the spirit of the festival. The depth is outstanding. They really invest in a deep exploration into community, their values and mission. I'm drawn to this event and am thinking of going. I loved their talk about generational transition for real! That was so eloquent. The part about the process of being next to things that are different was also well articulated. In terms of constructive criticism, there was not really a fundamental discussion of the art work or selection process. I would have given a 10 across the board. Instead, those conversations are presumed but not discussed. It can be devastating to culture and I'm sure that's not what's going on. I did dock them for that, though I'm fairly sure that's not an issue. Overall, I landed in a favorable position with this application. What they are doing and how they are doing it is so important. I sensed it was an embracing, authentic event and that there was room for everybody.

I concur. It's interesting to position this event in such a very visible place. The juxtaposition is wonderful. A question that arises for me is, is the artistic more responsive than the curatorial aspects of this application? I would like to see a more deliberate process, or to have more information on their selection process. Are they choosing 10% of the applicants, or what? How is the word getting out? Or is it self-selecting? I don't feel that I know enough about the curatorial process. It's clear this event will draw people, though the high expenses and administrative costs is a monumental undertaking. I understand the weight of that.

It's very community oriented and wants to engage other cultures to learn. I appreciate that. They are cognitive with their outreach program, they're not perfect but they're there. I was also missing the curatorial piece. Maybe this is an issue of festival grant vs. presenting grant? The project is worth supporting though the arts programming needs to be a stronger component. They probably don't know how to talk about this yet, but one can still demonstrate their methodology. In the 3 year budget there was some strange calculations on the cumulative. This is another application where I am skeptical about the accuracy of the CCDP data. The organization looks stable, and they seem to have rebounded powerfully. They are managing their organization really intelligently. They are receiving increasing amounts from government funds. I think if this organization was coming to the OPG to enhance the artistic aspects of their organization, this application would have read better. However, this wasn't the case. Some things from their budget were worrisome, and it wasn't clear how the city funding would help with this. The artistic product is a big part of this festival. They said this in their proposal but they don't really go into it.

Staff: They seem much more focused on the non-artistic end. We needed more details about that. Are there any timing issues?

Their leadership change recently. It looks like they've made some good decisions. However, the timeline seems off. It could've been a tremendous proposal. Let's not forget that October is so busy, with the Bluegrass festival, etc. There's so much going on in the city, it achieves a certain kind of critical mass, to a point where people may decide to avoid the city. But, it's a great time for outdoor events. There will be a lot of foot traffic, which is part of their focus.

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Music Panel Recommendations

Women's Audio Mission

Project description

The 10th Anniversary Artist Incubator Project develops the careers of 30-40 emerging, Bay Area women musicians, songwriters and composers by providing training and mentoring in songwriting, composition, production, and performance in WAM's recording studio and on the stage. The project culminates in two performance events, including WAM's 10th Anniversary Party, and the production of a compilation CD. This project cultivates new talent, celebrates and promotes past and present WAM artists, and strengthens our growing community.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

Their mission design is based upon providing women the opportunity of being producers in the technological aspects of the audio industry. They have been fulfilling their mission for years, led by a great individual who has developed this class and workshop. They talked a lot about their 10th anniversary incubator project. What I understood from the application was that they were focusing more on the workshop series, but I just didn't get the sense that it was a developed piece. Their timeline is good, and I really liked the proposal. Their budget looks good. I noticed no plans to charge admission to their 10th anniversary party. It didn't seem that this celebration was the end result, but rather that most of the focus is on the workshop. So, I'm not sure how this fits with the OPG-presenting grant. I had a feeling we would be supporting a class or incubator for a select group, as opposed to a public performance. This organization has worked with incredible people, they are recognized in the community, and they do extremely impressive work.

Staff: So on page seven, they talk about the 10th anniversary as being an opportunity to bring back prior artists they've worked with.

I thought that they spent more time on the classes rather than the performance. They talk of a CD release party as well, and I just didn't see much in their income that indicated they were really planned for this party session. Well, one of the things they emphasize is the people that participate are usually low income, so this workshop approach, because of the anniversary, is a kind of public showcase or celebration. That's how I saw it, as a community celebration which might shed some light on a practice that's usually isolated in a studio or booth.

I am embarrassed to admit I didn't know of this organization until I read their application. However, I am incredibly impressed with them and their work, across the board. I also had exactly the same problem with the application. They do clearly state that they have narrowed the field from eight programs to this one (the incubator project). So, it seems to me they did an 'ok' job of breaking down the things that are actually new and what they're seeking funding for. However, if we look at how they're breaking the project out of the program, it is not exactly clear. The project is clear, but it's not clear where it's distinct from their typical programming, and this should be defined if we're to accept it in this 'presenting' category as an event. It is so hard to get into the communities they're apart of and serving, and this must be discussed as a part of their value. I saw this as a really meritorious project. Maybe develop a committee for the anniversary so it can become an institutional focus as opposed to just an anniversary party for celebration sake. It seems to be a high budget for an event done this way. Also, I didn't find their work sample that successful, but again, they're doing great work that is difficult to translate through a sample. Overall, I'm very impressed and in favor of what they're doing.

I share the same admiration and concerns that have been voiced. But, as there's so much that they're doing and trying to contain within this anniversary celebration, it was a little difficult for me parse everything out as well. Clearly, they're addressing a need and they've demonstrated their legitimacy in a number of ways. Also, what they're talking about really serves their mission. They have a critical mass to show. That's how I saw the 10th anniversary as a body of work. They have a history to reflect on, important stories to tell, and this could help focus resources, funding, in addition to making visible the invisible in regards to studio process. They're talking about doing a 10th anniversary compilation CD, but they didn't give us a sense of who those artists would be, did they? They have a methodology described on page six, but it looks as if nothing is confirmed yet. If they just listed a few artists, that would have helped me a lot. This lack is why I started focusing on the educational elements of the proposal as opposed to the performative, and why I questioned their placement in the OPG-presenting category. Actually, on page eight, it's certainly touched upon. There are a fair amount of details. For me, in terms of not knowing, it seems like there haven't been a ton of artists to come through their studios, but the ones that have are high caliber artists. I feel comfortable trusting their artist selection process.

Staff: To remain consistent with other applications, is there enough information about the curatorial process and the artistic quality?

We have an idea from past artists and looking at the caliber of people they've worked with. I don't think we can count it against them.

Also, I'd like to bring up, it is kind of a one shot deal for people to try and get into a grant. They probably started this grant in Fall of last year, over a year ago, and a lot of organizations simply don't have the fleshed out details for a year in advance.



2013 OPG Multi-disciplinary
Panel Recommendations

Queer Cultural Center

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support *Creating Queer Community*, a DIY (do it yourself) capacity-building professional development program that will enhance 10 emerging Bay Area LGBT artists and arts organizations' ability to conceive, create, promote, finance and produce compelling art projects as part of the June 2014 National Queer Arts Festival. Awarded SFAC funds will underwrite 10 productions at an average cost of \$1500, including artists' fees, space rental, publicity, insurance and technical production expenses.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

The Queer Cultural Council is a virtual cultural center of the City. They got this down to an art and science. Their festival is in June and consists of performances and commissioned artists. The festival also takes place at other venues, like the African American Arts and Cultural Complex, among others. The leaders have been there since the organization's inception. Their proposal is a bit tricky, because one of their specialties is helping Queer arts community to develop, learn and expand their own production or organization. They help with technical workshops for marketing, grant writing, and other kinds of support for both individual artists and organizations to grow. They are requesting funds to have a curatorial submission from artists. They want to provide a workshop series of grant writing, etc. This application was written well but there are so many moving parts. It's a panel review and they will learn how to write grant, and then a panel will review it to see if they want that particular group to be apart of the festival. I believe they're looking for 10 commissioned works for the festival. Artists will be paid a fee for participating in the festival. Also, the artist is also responsible for bringing their audience to the festival. The organization will also be sharing 75% of profits. It's interesting but, at the same time, I know it's not normal practice in the presenting world. I feel like I'd support an organization to do more training and then give them a fee to be in the festival. So, I really appreciate what they do and I think it's needed, and that think other community groups should be doing it. Looking at the project, I thought that ten dollars is an extremely nominal ticket fee. Also, under earned income, looking at the contracted service performance fees (line 6)- it talks about fiscal sponsorship, then it mentions grant writing fees for artists? Are they charging artists for this? It's a project budget and not an organizational budget, I'm assuming. I found this confusing.

Staff: It looks like it's built into that fundraising and grant development process that they describe, but perhaps they need to detail that out more.

Are they charging these groups for the service? I think the project is needed but not sure if appropriate for this format.

Staff: For consistency, I'm wondering if this is more similar to the incubator type projects, where you were asking for more details about the process. This doesn't exactly fit the model, but is that sort of framework applicable here to make this easier to think through?

No, I don't think so. I don't recall seeing any other incubator program where part of the angle of the project itself is to help them get funding, upon which they serve as a fiscal sponsor and have the fiscal relationship built-in the way this project budget does.

Staff: So is the sticky area around the structure or specific to the finances of this project?

It's both. I agree with the others, that how it's positioned now, it's hard to get inside it in that regard. They're very up front about this being a capacity building budget. They do a very important thing, because these are good skill sets that artists need to acquire. This is a very efficient and clearly thought through boot camp kind of experience. My reservation is that it's a really rigorous process for that type of work. It doesn't seem to be mirrored in an equally as rigorous artistic or curatorial way. The only thing I saw is that artists are chosen because they're compelling to the artistic director, and that's pretty much the curatorial process. They application then goes on to be very detailed when talking about capacity building. I think at the very least those two things should be given even time.

Even the capacity building part makes me feel a little uncomfortable. I see how that matches up with the mission of the organization, but whether this work fits into this project application pool, I'm not really sure. Certainly, providing all these artists tools to access public funding is necessary. It's an important statement. So yes, capacity building is great, and that was the main focus, but the artistic focus got a bit lost for me.

Staff: Did the work sample represent the artistic quality of the work?

It did a little bit, we got to hear a participant talk about the experience, but it would have been good to have to see the process itself instead of hearing a testimonial. Their quality work and process is really hard to track in a short review. I definitely give them credit for what they do and how they want to serve their community of artists.

Yes, they are great in terms of skill development, capacity building, and bringing new work to fruition. What I see is that artists early in their careers reach a point of paralysis, and question what to do with their work now. Sometimes you just need help articulating your work because you're too close to it yourself. I like that these two skills are bundled together. I was struck by it's sensibility. It's critical to supply that kind of support at this point of vulnerability.

I have a lot of regard for Pam and Jeff. I think the organization is outstanding. I had trouble unpacking this though. I agree with what was said about this support being critical, but I'm just not sure about the selection process. The other thing that was hard

2013 Organization Project Grant Summaries: Performing Arts-Presenting



2013 OPG Multi-disciplinary Panel Recommendations

was that they were talking about this emerging tier of artists, and quite frankly, if we look around at the queer organizations doing great work, so many of them owe their provenance to the Queer Cultural Center. They've done so much to enhance the local landscape, I think they should perhaps stop looking so comprehensively and look specifically at where they want to make a contribution in this community. I don't think that's what they said. I think it's what they mean perhaps, but it's not what they said. The proposal is too generic to know how to get inside of it. I was also not so hot on the \$200 fee. The services have already been there for free, and \$1500 is not a deep enough contribution to get anyone anywhere, so why start charging now?

Staff: In terms of reaching that younger generation that you wanted to see articulated better, would a description of target artists have helped?

The target artists isn't the issue. The problem is I don't know how this project functions in relationship to them. There isn't enough description of how they are serving these artists. It's just 'emergent' and 'queer', and the reality is our landscape now has a lot of organizations who can deal with that question. It was missing something for me.

Staff: Are there any comments on organizational health and stability?

They've definitely had some fluctuations on their foundation grants. I think there is a typo on attendance figures, where an extra zero was added. Looking at the three year average, one time only grants have dropped significantly. It's a big percentage. It's related to the consultant expense, no? With fiscal sponsorship, that money is a wash. A good thing is that this shows they are managing through the changes. In my mind, they are not surprised by them. It shows they are resilient.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Friends of Chamber Music

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Chamber Music Day . Live + Free is an annual day-long festival featuring the most exciting Bay Area ensembles performing baroque, classical, jazz and improvisation entirely FREE to the public. In 2013, an evening performance will precede the full day event at Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, and the entire festival with highlight Latino musicians and music. Audiences will be treated to the best of the Bay Area, in a fun, relaxed and rewarding atmosphere.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This was a very different proposal from what we've seen within the group. The focus is largely on chamber music, i.e. intimate ensembles in conventional spaces. It's strangely anomalous alongside many of the applicants we've been seeing. I was happy to see their programs are very thoughtfully curated. Chamber music is being understood and shared for the intimate art form that it is, but it seemed to me from the samples that they have a very open and inclusive approach to representing this intimate art form, featuring a lot of really fun ensembles from throughout the Bay Area. The samples were good, and it was fun to see a broad representation of their programming. They have a very sensible way of approaching their cultivation of audience and raising visibility for chamber music. Their broad reach and thoughtful curators have really embedded audience development into the scope of their programming. The artistic fees seemed too low to support the 24 ensembles involved, but there are artistic fees and that's great in itself. I wondered about the weighing of these different components. They have a high production cost, and their overhead is very high. The timeline and work plan is fine for me, as they know what they're doing and they have good people involved.

The budget very heavily weighted to the cost of the facility. I would like for more of the money to go to artist fees, but a place like YBCA brings a level of visibility they might not have in a smaller space. I understand their decision.

I want to add, on the positive side, I love how the group really understand who they are and how they are perceived by general community. They are trying to break the stuffy, elitist stereotype and promote a down to earth 'Latin theme'. However, I thought many parts of the proposal were generic, and I wanted them to flesh some things out more. It sounds as if they're relying on their one person of color (Salazar) to bring in other people of color when perhaps it should be an organizational responsibility. There were some general statements made that I found a bit sweeping, such as having a free day for 'low income people' like students, seniors, etc. They could have expressed themselves better here.

Staff: Could you clarify your comment about the pressure on the curator to bring in the Latino community?

On page four, it specifically says in the second paragraph, "...Salazars' contribution bringing Latino community". I thought that perhaps this demonstrated too much faith in one person. It doesn't necessarily qualify as a silver bullet for me.

Staff: So perhaps you'd like to see them demonstrate her connection to the community and qualify that statement?

Yes, and also it would be nice to learn what the entire organization, as opposed to this one person, is going to do to bring in a Latino audience. I agree with most things that have been said. I fully support this organization. It's an amazing day for chamber music. This organization has been on an incredible journey the last five to six years. It started by getting San Francisco a top-notch string quartet in residence, but has since evolved and taken off in a wonderful new direction. It was literally a closed community circuit, and they've opened this art form up to the city, region and nation. I heartily applaud their hard work. It was hard to sense authenticity with the Latino angle, which doesn't really add much, but they've committed to it in a big way and I think they'll pull it off. It seemed like they tacked on the Latino thing for diversity points. There is often a fear of not being culturally diverse enough. In any case, this is one of the most important days that happens for local chamber music, and this is one of the deepest communities of chamber music in the nation. The fact that they are serviced by this organization (YBCA) is profound. It is critical. In short, I didn't buy the curatorial frame (the Latino thing) and I felt that the community, and how they were defining the community, was a bit wobbly. However this group is unique and that's critical.

Staff: I think at the moment they're forging new territory, and attempting to bring in a new audience as well as remaining relevant. Maybe they're trying to branch out into new constituents.

I think also, in regards to YBCA being their host venue, it's not often that you hear chamber music there. YBCA does tend towards theatrical, conceptual, and more contemporary performance work. They're building an audience not just for chamber music, by way of this partnership for someone else, and that's what we have to respect. I think they do an amazing job.

I believe that they are going in a new direction but there is just something about the messaging that didn't seem like it was internally organic for the organization to be on board. So maybe that's a note for them, that we'd like to see a more comprehensive, institutionally embedded plan to embrace new audiences.

I am pretty sure they recently moved to a stipend. I'm very pleased to see honoraria in place. They've been growing, growing, and growing, and I'm so pleased to see it. Clearly there has been a great response to having that leadership. I'm going to give a very high score on the quality of the leadership. The organization has really taken shape over time.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

The Bay Bridged

Project description

Phono Del Sol combines the local food and music communities in one free, all-ages outdoor event, engaging audiences with live music. This family friendly event draws thousands to an under-utilized park, in an area where few or no comparable events are currently held. In addition, this food and music festival highlights two nationally recognized recording studios in the neighborhood, creating opportunities for youth and musicians to gain exposure to resources for artists close to home.

Group Size Small
Request: \$10,000
Recommended: \$0

Notes on panel's commentary

I enjoyed this application a lot. There were many wonderful aspects of it, but a few questions were raised as usual. It came across as a strong and clear curatorial vision from their statement, but somehow we didn't get into their artist selection and history. I also didn't get enough from their work sample to grasp the scope of their proposal. Everything else about the application was terrific, from building this project around recording studios to the sensibility of showing us 'this is how the whole thing happens', not just on stage with the music, but allowing us a behind the scenes look at what it takes to produce. I love that they're moving from radio waves and materializing into a park from the ether, which speaks to me in very interestingly ways of how people find music these days. They're kind of putting you in a situation in which it's not just about grabbing things from this vast array of data (digital media, online music, airwaves), but getting down to the ground and highlighting the human interaction around it. The way that they're thinking is always a way to bridge difference, and it's wonderful and interesting. The main thing that came down to this application not doing great for me was that the work sample itself (slideshow with a tune) did not compel me at all. It showed me that a lot of people come, but did not convince me the artistic or curatorial outcome of this was substantial. I love the vision they express, the application is well-written, etc, but I didn't get any historical input from the samples. I just could not substantiate it. They needed to provide this information and context and it didn't come through. Otherwise, I thought it was quite a winning proposition.

I really liked this group. However, there was something about this proposal that didn't hit the mark for me. I liked what they said about providing access, getting small groups out of small venues, raising visibility, etc. They said the park is open to the public, but then they say they're going to collect \$44,000 in admission. I wonder, how do they intend to collect fees and regulate access? Also, I didn't get a great sense of who their crowd was and felt it was very open ended. I liked their curatorial guidelines, although I wish they gave a sampling of lineups from the past. Their budget breakdown did not disclose artist fees. I would like to hear more about their community.

I wondered about the permit, items 22 and 23 under 'project budget' I believe. This figure eclipses artistic and administrative budget two times over. So I wonder about that. Also, going back to their community, how do you know you have an audience as opposed to people who are just there at the park? I thought it was a clear, well written proposal and that the points were made in a clear, visual way. It was not endless narrative, and it served the spirit of the organization. I would have liked to know more about the curatorial outcomes. Adding a soundtrack to the photos in the work sample did not give a sense of that.

I agree, the application is well written but the sample made me wonder about what made the festival distinctive. It sounds like a nice festival, but the curatorial drive didn't make itself clear or demonstrate its unique qualities. The way it's manifested into a festival doesn't really seem to have a compelling drive to it.

To that point, what they could have done was to submit a sound sample with the name of the artists/musicians, photo of group, and photo of audience listening or otherwise engaging. It would have made more sense and at least drawn the lines between the dots.

As well written as the application is, the sample didn't help it. In fact it almost killed it for me. It's kind of a shame because otherwise it seems really well organized. The overall effect just wasn't as compelling as I expected it to be. I felt that this organization, out of all the applicants, has the strongest social media marketing plan and should be an example to the rest. I only question the product.

To the feasibility of the budget and financial health of the organization, more info about production costs would have been nice. How much do they pay artists? Giving a range or general idea of that amount would have been helpful. They tell how much they charge for attendance, an estimated figure for attendance, etc.

There is a jump in the CCDP from prior years, so maybe more explanation is needed to explain audience numbers.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Eth-Noh-Tec

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

ENT proposes to produce the San Francisco Asian Storyfest. It will be a first of its kind outside of Asia. The storytelling festival will present 7 Asian storytellers of national calibre, including Eth-Noh-Tec. In addition, ENT's apprentices will be presented to the public and the storytelling community at this time, as ENT artists and founding directors train the next generation in its unique art form. The festival will also include a panel discussion on storytelling and the Asian/Asian American culture.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

I have a very healthy regard for Eth-Noh-Tec. Many of the artists involved in this process are very strong. This goes without saying, largely because they're so long-standing, and for good reason. They are fantastic storytellers, and of course storytelling is its own genre and thing unto itself. Unfortunately, when you're receiving it in this reduced form, it suffers the most at the level of work sample. It's such a powerful art form one on one and in person. These are artists that can do that. So high marks along those lines. Unfortunately, that's where the good news stops for me. It flops in the way the application is put forward, in a very generalized sort of conversation. There is nothing specific about what it is, what's it going to do, or how its conceived. It application just doesn't sparkle like the artistry of the work demands. The writing is not well thought out, and there are generalized statements that come out of left field, some of which could be interpreted as somewhat inflammatory statements. Considering the depth of work they do here, this narrative did not compel me. They have a very general marketing plan, 'aiming with email and social media to attract audiences', etc. I know the artists are fantastic, but the project is not well explained and the rhetoric is really disappointing.

I loved this proposal and I was looking at it in a different context. I love what they say about passing down their traditions and history. I understand your point regarding lack of vision and curatorial methodology. However, the people they work with, and the examples they've shown, I find all very exciting. I really appreciated the white space between the lines, it was easy to read, with bullet points. There was a big jump in audience attendance revenue from \$3,000 to \$10,000, according to the CCDP, with no mention of this change in the notes. I think it had to do with touring.

When they're doing it, they're out there doing it. These guys are wonderful. The proposal needs improvement.

Storytelling is a powerful form, and this is the only proposal of its kind in this group. This is such a powerful medium and they're taking it for the art form that it is, but it's a serious study as well. The ambition of the storytelling festival is in keeping with their growth and achieving the visibility the organization deserves.

In applying same level of rigor as with other applications, this cannot pass. Though I agree, it is the only project of its kind, and is very accessible to the public. These are extraordinary artists. That's part of my frustration with this application.

The narrative is really compelling when speaking to their history, but less compelling when speaking about this particular project. I can sort of pick out what they're getting at. I have an idea of the quality, but I agree that this application and work sample doesn't demonstrate the capability of this organization. They fall short there. Maybe it's not a fair thing to say, but it's a storytelling organization and they should be able to tell their story in a very compelling way. It's true that it's the only organization representing this form, and that should be supported. There is this sort of crossing the borders of age, through archival transmission of culture, which is so important.

I'm also a little concerned about the numbers, because they're all over the place. It's likely because of budgets being cut, as touring has shifted from a successful year to the drying up of work. It seems the stability of the organization is kind of on the table. In a sense, this proposal seems to be a larger event than they have dealt with in some time, so the scale of it could have used support or data. They don't use a lot of data that could have really supported the application. That's just it for me. I absolutely love their work and think that they're wonderful. I'm digging and digging for this to not fall short, but it clearly has in terms of identifying itself.

Staff: They talk about the financial stability in the CCDP budget notes.

Their income sources are in major flux, and it's not addressed directly. In regards to the bookings, is it through Young Audiences? Yes, they've done a lot in schools. But I think they were really dependent on that, but it has dried up a bit.

Staff: They've had some income raised from touring fees, so it seems like they're looking for other revenue streams.

Yes, just big fluctuation from one year to the other.

It's very important how different forms talk about what they do. It is true they talk about how Storyfest works- 'you get your time slot' and you do what you do. It's a sort of blind faith in the artists, and we know the artists are amazing so we can believe in them at that level. However, that is something that you need to read between the lines to get, because it's not articulated in the application. I didn't get the sense that there was an organic need they were trying to address. We didn't need so many work samples, just one or two solid ones.

I think having a festival can really focus this, but too many activities at the festival make it difficult to achieve critical mass. Perhaps this is a glimpse into an organization rethinking, logistically. The event has really important programmatic value towards community building. I'm supportive of the proposal, despite the caveats, and I think the project is worth encouraging.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Dance Council Movement Theater

Group Size	Tiny
Request:	\$5,200
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

Dance Council Movement Theater is requesting support for the WERK Collective and its second year program of "Evolutionary Development", a project designed to bring together six San Francisco choreographers and to create a model for presenting work across genres. WERK will present its second fully-produced concert at ODC Theater in November, 2013. Funds from the San Francisco Arts Commission in the amount of \$5,200 would go towards artist fees and production costs.

Notes on panel's commentary

I am very torn about this application. I love many of these people involved, their support structures are good, and they're bringing in great staff. At an artistic level, I really respect everyone involved, and they get things done. To step back a bit, there are a lot of names and people floating around in this application. Dance Council Movement Theater is the overriding organization, but distinct from this project. This project has the work of a collective and the actual project name is "evolutionary development" - so if you managed to get all that figured out, you're on your way. Just a word of advice for the record- I think that there's too much expressed through the over-naming of everything. It took me three reads just to begin understanding the structure. This application was extremely hard to unpack and that's what ultimately tanked it. The strength of the artists involved is the reason I even read it many times. One thing that came up as positive in this application was that they had identified a need in the community, as if they were speaking into a void and reaching into something- I really respect that. What I find perplexing here is that no one is a late emerging artist. Pretty much everyone involved has national reputations, done international work, and are otherwise well established. So, the questions around mentorship and what that means, none of that was articulated well. For example, there is an absence of a mid-career opportunity hurdle. It's just so much to unpack. There are many levels of discussion around mentorship for people who do not need mentorship. If it's about resource sharing, yes, I can understand that. However, organizing it in this way, you need to demonstrate a platform for bringing people together. The application was just prepared in a fashion that does not compel me to believe that their proposal could happen. I absolutely think they've named something, i.e. that in the Bay Area, you either self produce or you're going to be very occasionally presented. The reality is that as artists are aging and maturing, there is a real deficit of opportunity. Unless they decide how they're going to steer these venues towards lasting relationships, they're in jeopardy. There used to be more open space, more available space, but it's just not there anymore. Instead, there's a lot of curated space, and the self producer is in a pinch. I don't want to discourage this application, but there were a lot of general ideas that were not panned down.

I found it difficult to navigate through the maze of sections and fractions in the application. I do understand the need they've identified, this transitional stage, and I agree. What I didn't understand was the curatorial voice of the project. It seemed like this was really a performance that didn't have that curatorial voice. I wasn't sure of the difference between presenting versus a regular performance, inviting different artist, etc. I like the aspect of 'advancing the careers of dancers beyond their career'. They claim they will have a diverse audience, but who is this audience? How does the programming attract them? I have no questions about the quality of talent, nor their ability to execute. Nonetheless, many aspects of this application went unexplained. They didn't explain the fundraising, for example. There was no plan, just hope. I also noted, for advertising and marketing, they have allotted \$2500 which seems small.

In terms of the long term commitment, the plan is that this group will switch out and bring in a new group, so where is the identity of the project? How do they select new artists, and what will they bring to the table? I completely believe in this group but I don't think this proposal is fully baked yet.

It's kind of like reading between the lines in terms of qualifications. My assumption is that they've already participated in or tested this process where they're supposed to be mentored. But I need more details regarding this mentorship process.

I got the feeling that there's just not enough detail. They referred to The Garage program, which I think serves as a model, but it's not clear how they're operating and functioning with this template. It seemed to me that a peer collective model and resource sharing make sense, but I didn't get the feeling it was doing the job it hoped to do (developing emerging talent, teaching skills, etc.) and the application was missing details on how they're planning on doing this.

I felt the huge need for the mentorship and platform to be fleshed out, in general terms. I also question their logic behind acquiring a diverse audience. Just because you mix a variety of things up on a program, you can't assume you're getting an audience for each of those areas. I don't think it's a compelling way to build an audience, per se.

Regarding the health of the organization, it's hard to answer, as the relationship between organization and project is so muddled in this application. The organization itself is actually great, but the project I find very wobbly. I hope they will come back with this in the future.



2013 OPG Multi-disciplinary
Panel Recommendations

Summer of Art / Arts Alliance of Central Market

Group Size Small
Request: \$12,500
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Summer of Art proposes their 2013 season of programming which includes art programs at UN Plaza occurring weekly between 1 May and 31 October 2013, as well as initiating a Stage Subsidy Program for the community benefit. Arts programs include the "What's on Stage?" theatre and dance preview series, People in Plazas with "Tenderloin Tunes", Poetry & Paint Day, and Denia Dance's "Dance on Market" Swing Night.

Notes on panel's commentary

This is an application that I loved reading from the community impact perspective because it reminds me how much art can animate and redefine space, especially in an urban setting. Seeing art in a different context makes the viewer more aware of community, of the space around them. However, this proposal seemed more like a community based project rather than one where I had a clear sense of a curatorial voice. There was a clarity of purpose, but the samples we saw didn't give me a strong sense of how the curatorial vision was anchored. It's always a balance between the curatorial and community aspects of the project. The artist works very hard at their craft, and I wonder, is their work embraceable in that context (with the noise, traffic, crowds etc)? The project may serve the space but it might also be artistically encumbered by the space. It's not random; these conditions are optimized. One thing I couldn't draw from the samples was a good sense of the music and art. Again, because it's a reflection of the community, it draws from programming created.

I'm somewhat familiar with the programming at the UN Plaza. It's very interesting because as I was reading the proposal, I kept flashing back to particular performances in the plaza and how this one might work. The proposal confused me a bit because it spent the bulk of it's time speaking of the dance floor, as a primary venue for other artists. The central Market is an area being revitalized for neighborhoods and communities, but I was missing the curatorial quality to this proposal.

I wasn't sure when the events were actually supposed to happen, or who was in their programming line up, or how they arrived at decisions. It seemed more of a neighborhood collaboration rather than a curatorial presentation of artists. In any case, overall I find it a worthwhile project.

I sort of concur. It's a great thing to help revitalize the central Market area. It says they're helping to revitalize UN plaza as a place for dance, music, and art. In looking at the work sample, it did seem like an ancillary event to go along with 'Off the Grid', the farmers market, etc. The curatorial vision did not seem flushed out. I do see potential in that area because it's becoming the hub of so many cultural activities, but I just didn't feel this proposal was quite there yet. I didn't understand who was involved, and this idea of a stage (a central part of the application) did not gel for me.

Did anyone see the drop from Fiscal Year 11-12? It went down 50%.

I just can't wrap my head around how this project is organized in any meaningful way. They have great ideas, but there's so much to track and I can't figure out what they're actually going to do. There's an absence of leadership somewhere, or it's too collective and they won't articulate it. All I know is there are some very smart ideas here. In regards to the stage, I'm totally mystified. It cost \$50k to build it and now there's a stage subsidy thing which looks like they're advertising cost on a capital improvement. What is the actual 'cost of use'? What's even more perplexing is that the person they've just brought on as project manager is amazing! I just can't understand what this proposal actually is. I love the idea, I get what it does, the people involved are remarkably competent. I'd like to see something continue here, but I just can't wrap my head around it. I have no idea how the leadership works, how the marketing works, how the accumulation of efforts becomes public good, how anything is measured or quantified. All I know is a group of people get together and have great ideas with profound possibilities, but that's all.

We need to learn more about their systemic curatorial process. There are many organizations who present a variety of projects, year after year in public space. It would be helpful for this organization to be more specific as to how they make their decisions. What are the filters involved? They articulate the feeling and the vibe of the event, while the curatorial side is less articulated.

Their audience is going to be mostly passer-bys. So the question arises, how does one compel an audience for 10 minutes? I want to see more of a relationship between how they're planning this festival and the specific context of the site. There needs to be a producer. No producer is listed. Maybe that's what is missing. There's nothing in the center, guiding or framing the project. It's too diffused.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Red Poppy Art House

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$12,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

RPAH is asking for support of a newly launched program, the Five Dollar Series, a popular, affordable performance series, falling under the greater mission of our regular wide-reaching performance program but with its own compelling curatorial vision. Broader in terms of artistic disciplines featured and dynamic in its interdisciplinary approach, the series showcases recently developed, even experimental collaborations among local and hyper-local artists in the areas of music, literary and visual arts, film theater and dance.

Notes on panel's commentary

I felt very mixed about this project, particularly the five dollar series proposal. It seemed to me that the overall mission is well served, but I do have some questions. I'm concerned about the capacity of the space, which is a small room, and obviously their notion of access, which is a big thing driving this project. Their mission is to serve as a hub of activity, and clearly they have a very active program, with new multidisciplinary areas (film, dance, etc) to add to the music centric programming. I am just wondering about how the numbers fit together and the sustainability of it all. The sample is very instructive- I had a sense it was a small space, but upon seeing the sample images, I see that it's a really small space. I have a feeling that 50-60 people is the maximum amount of people that might fit, so if you charge \$5 per ticket and max out at 50 tickets, how is that a cost effective model? That's my biggest question about this proposal. They seem really overextended with the resources they already have. I think the idea is to turn over 40% of their performing series into \$5 series, and I question whether that's economically viable. I agree that access is very important, the impulse to do this is admirable, and it fits with their mission. However, with no board contributions and considering the high volume of events that are undertaken, I feel that their resources are a major concern.

I really had trouble with this one too. I am in complete agreement, except I also think they are running the risk of profoundly devaluing what they're doing. If this about access, that's one thing- but \$5 for 64 events a year? What's going to happen when you need to charge \$24? There's so much data from similar attempts to look at it, which perhaps was not known to them. Others have tried this strategy before, for example, Shotgun Players. They tried to have free tickets and found out if there's no value on a ticket, the work is inclined to suffer as well. Part of what happens in the monetizing part is that we are part of an economy, and the arts lose so much standing across the board. They're talking about things that I value deeply, e.g. 'let's find an equitable way to bring more people to what we love'. But there has to be another way beyond this [5\$ ticket series] to target a community that wants to join you but can't, and make it possible for them to come. I would caution them not to allow the transactive element to degrade the artistic value.

How do they pay artists? I have no idea. Though I totally agree that they are devaluing the work by doing this. It miscommunicates to the audience. On top of that, it's very difficult to raise ticket prices after that. There's this fallacy regarding low income areas in that they cannot afford ticket prices. The reality is that people will value what they put forward. Having a \$5 ticket is a good practice once in a while, as a draw, but if it's all the time, I think it's like shooting yourself in the foot. We went through the same thing. At Stanford, if you give tickets away to students, they won't come. If you charge \$10, they will come.

I didn't take my investigation of the organization as a whole. The product itself is not viable to me. I felt strongly that this initiative has exactly the right intention, and they can look carefully at what others have tried before to pursue it. But they should pursue something that doesn't involve this level of jeopardy for themselves, and frankly, I don't think it's good for the field in general.

I didn't see the data or reasoning that would convince me to take this kind of risk. I could at least buy this argument if there was a reasoning or demonstrable logic behind it.

They're creating an intimate space that really privileges the connection between artist and audience. I didn't really get the work samples. I thought the samples didn't do much to support the application. I agree. It was a few tracks of music by performers who have performed there.

Here's the thing about how they do what they do, specifically in their exploration from visual art into this multidisciplinary field- they are talking about the edgier things, and they want to build out of this very experimental platform that's looking at the intersection of visual and performing arts. I believe they could actually do this really well, as Root Division is starting to do now. That's really robust, if they could get at it, and they would also like this to be a fully subsidized opportunity for the community to engage in this experiment.

Staff: There are two things I want to remind the panel about. First, the soundness of their plan is one of the criteria, and two, is this plan tied back to the rational of why they're proposing it in this way? They're experimenting with the structure based off their history of programming. So, it's not as if there's no base with what they're working towards here.

I did see that, but it's pretty general. It's true, they're following a trend, but has it been for one year? Two years? They have all the ticketed events listed for 'sometime', so I get that they're keeping track of some data, but I'm missing the links they're putting out there. I worked there for over a decade, so I'm a little more familiar. They're talking about taking it up to a level of 54 performances in a year, or basically one every week. This just does not add up for me at all.

Staff: They also talk about the impact of the project, I believe on the third page. "It will result in greater turn outs, increased revenue, and will generate morale among staff and community".

**2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations**

I circled that because I thought it was a very interesting comment. It implies they're in a place where the staff is not happy. In terms of the project itself, I was very intrigued when they talked about this hyper mixing concept, with music, theater, painting, etc. At the same time, the work sample did not demonstrate how this hyper mixing might work. How do these elements function together? I've heard of Red Poppy before, and I know a lot of their supporters, but I get the sense that something has yet to gel in this proposal. The only difference I saw was the pricing, so my question is, how is this a project? I didn't get the sense of how it changed.

Staff: Can we speak to the artistic quality of the proposal?

I don't know if I can speak to that. They didn't give us anything to go on.

Staff: What can we say about the project potential or outcomes?

I think this project represents a big risk. It makes assumptions that are unsupported.

Staff: Can we speak to the impact on targeted audience?

I'm not sure we can speak to that. We have no idea who their audience is. I need to understand how the programming ties in with the new pricing structure ties in with the audience they're trying to engage. The people I know who like experimental stuff like \$5 tickets, so tell me how you arrived at this point. How does it guide me as a programmer to know it's a \$5 ticket versus a \$10 ticket? There are some filters needed.

To play devils advocate, let's just pretend that Red Poppy was proposing to do this at an outdoor venue. If so, I don't think we would not be squawking about the \$5 price as much. So for me, it's only a sense of the mission of the organization that I'm missing information on.

I hear what you're saying, but there's another aspect to it. They're a gallery, an art house, and now they're also getting into performance.

If you look at their CCDP under expense, they're paying \$20,000 a year for the brick and mortar they're in now.

It's tucked away in the Mission, in a very residential area. It is not on the main drag, and as it is off the beaten path, is a bit of a destination. The reality of it is, they are starting from a visual arts mindset and moving into a community organization. They need bodies coming in, I get it, but present me with a platform for achieving that as opposed to, "Come one, come all! cheap tickets!". What they're actually saying is that this is for us, but we're doing it in front of you in a public place. There's no leveraging of the outcome.

It just seems like they're kind of grabbing at everything. The curatorial vision is really broad. It seems like they're thinking, 'in order to get people here, we're going to try everything under the sun'. Yes, everyone is doing their best and throwing caution to the wind. The artists are experimenting, the curators are experimenting, everyone is experimenting.

Staff: If you look at their past programming, you do get a sense of their curatorial vision, the artists they work with, and what they're looking at. The other area I need comments on is the organizational budget and the financial health of the organization.

They looked okay in terms of their overall financial health. They're generally coming up ahead. They explained the Hewlett funding issue, so they had a cutback there. They seemed to have buoyed back up from it. I also wasn't sure how they're attracting their contributed. Does anyone know what's going on there? Their 2010/2011 foundation numbers don't reflect their stated outcomes. I see no board contributions, and only individual contributions?

Staff: Sometimes the way the CCDP does things, board contributions are counted as individual contributions.

That's right. They have some great people on the advisory board. I wonder how much they're utilizing them.

Staff: Is there an assessment on staff, volunteer, structure?

They have a small staff. Well, not that small considering their size and ambitions. Again, it's mostly stipend based pay and five dollar shows are not helping. It's just doesn't really add up for me. Even if you pay them minimally, the proposal doesn't add up.

Staff: It says that staff are all modestly paid by stipend, but they enjoy a volunteer base of 400 individuals. So based off of these numbers, do we believe they are capable of carrying out their project?

My sense is that their plan doesn't look like it will result in a sustainable practice.



FY2012-2013 Organization Project Grant- New Work

RANKING

Panel Rating	Organizaton	Grant Request	Grant Amount
115.8	Garrett + Moulton Productions	\$15,000	\$12,750
115.2	Cutting Ball Theatre Company	\$15,000	\$12,750
114	First Voice	\$15,000	\$12,750
114	Theatre of Yugen	\$15,000	\$12,750
113.4	Eye Zen Art	\$15,000	\$12,750
112.8	Circuit Network	\$15,000	\$12,750
112.2	Musical Traditions, Inc. / Paul Dresher Ensemble	\$15,000	\$12,750
112.2	Post:Ballet	\$15,000	\$12,750
111	Asian Improv aRts	\$15,000	\$12,750
111	Dance Brigade	\$15,000	\$12,750
111	Dancers' Group	\$15,000	\$12,750
110.4	Volti	\$15,000	\$11,250
109.2	inkBoat	\$15,000	\$11,250
108.6	San Francisco Chamber Orchestra	\$15,000	\$11,250
105.6	Capacitor Performance	\$15,000	\$11,250
103.8	Joe Goode Performance Group	\$15,000	\$11,250
101.2	Navarette x Kajiyama Dance Theater	\$10,800	\$0
100.8	Amy Seiwert's Imagery	\$10,000	\$0
98.6	Carpetbag Brigade Physical Theater	\$15,000	\$0
98.4	Push Dance Company	\$7,500	\$0
96.6	Dandelion Dance Theater	\$15,000	\$0
93.6	Fecund Arts	\$15,000	\$0
92.5	San Francisco Shakespeare Festival	\$15,000	\$0
92.4	Flyaway Productions	\$15,000	\$0
91.8	Bindlestiff Studio	\$15,000	\$0
88.2	Scott Wells and Dancers	\$15,000	\$0
85.8	Contraband / Mixed Bag Productions	\$14,500	\$0
85.8	Theatre Flamenco of San Francisco	\$15,000	\$0
85	ZiRu Productions	\$15,000	\$0
82.8	Mark Foehringer Dance Project	\$15,000	\$0
76.2	Guerilla Rep	\$15,000	\$0
67.8	Fictional Artists' Contemporary Theatre / San Francisco (FACT/SF)	\$10,000	\$0
67.4	Jess Curtis/Gravity	\$15,000	\$0
67.2	Not Quite Opera Productions	\$5,000	\$0
63.4	Carolina Lugo's & Carolé Acuña's Ballet Flamenco	\$15,000	\$0
63	Mugwumpin	\$15,000	\$0
57	KUNST-STOFF	\$15,000	\$0
TOTAL		\$522,800	\$196,500

**Cultural Equity Grants
FY2012-2013 Organization Project Grants – Performing Arts New Work
Panelists**

Sidney Chen

Artistic Administrator, Kronos Quartet

Sidney Chen's commitment to the creation, performance, and advocacy of contemporary music is at the core of his professional life. As artistic administrator of the pioneering Kronos Quartet, part of the non-profit Kronos Performing Arts Association, he has aided in the realization of dozens of new works for the ensemble, and has worked on more than 25 recording projects for Kronos, which collectively have garnered eight Grammy and Latin Grammy nominations and an award for Best Chamber Music Performance. In partnership with music publisher Boosey & Hawkes, he oversaw the production of the Kronos Edition, an authoritative print edition of works commissioned for the ensemble. His strong belief in the need to nurture emerging composers and performers is reflected in his management of the Kronos: Under 30 Project, a commissioning program for young composers that has yielded over 750 applicants from more than 30 countries since its inception in 2003, as well as a week-long Professional Training Workshop, led by Kronos at the Weill Institute of Carnegie Hall, which provided four emerging professional quartets with a week of intensive coachings with Kronos on contemporary repertoire. He is an alumnus of the Association of Performing Arts Presenters Emerging Leadership Institute, and has served as a juror for the APAP Young Performers Career Advancement program.

He is on the Advisory Board for and a performer with Volti, a professional chamber chorus focused exclusively on contemporary music, for which he has also served as Executive Director. His participation on the group's artistic planning committee includes judging Volti's annual Choral Arts Laboratory, a commissioning competition for American composers under the age of 35 to write a new piece for Volti, and developed through a series of workshops. His work has contributed to Volti's recognition by ASCAP/Chorus America with six Awards for Adventurous Programming, an achievement unmatched by any other chorus. He is a co-producer of the group's upcoming album Turn the Page, to be released on Innova Records in early 2010.

As a performer, he is a founding member of The M6, a vocal sextet dedicated to performing the works of the eminent multidisciplinary artist Meredith Monk, which recently performed at Symphony Space and the Whitney Museum in New York, and which will perform with Monk at the Brooklyn Academy of Music's Next Wave Festival in 2009/10. This past season he sang in Carnegie Hall's 45th-anniversary celebration of Terry Riley's minimalist masterwork In C. Last summer he performed a set of music for unaccompanied voice at Garden of Memory 2008 at Oakland's Chapel of the Chimes and live on KUSF. In 2006 he sang in Carnegie's Zankel Hall as part of the Meredith Monk Young Artists Concert, which was the culmination of a week-long Professional Training Workshop led by Monk. He has been featured throughout the San Francisco Bay Area as a bass soloist with numerous orchestras and choruses.

Since 2004 he has been the writer of TheStandingRoom.com, one of the first blogs about classical and contemporary music, and which has consistently been included in lists of the Web's 25 most influential classical music blogs. He is a graduate of Harvard University.

Lily Kharrazi

Living Cultures Grants Manager, Alliance for California Traditional Arts

Trained in Dance Ethnology at UCLA under Allegra Fuller Snyder, a pioneer in the field of dance and culture, Kharrazi currently works at the Alliance for California Traditional Arts, a statewide funder and advocate for the folk and traditional arts. Since 2005 she has managed the Living Cultures Grants Program. Kharrazi served as the program director of World Arts West, the producers of the San Francisco Ethnic Dance Festival for nine seasons, during which time through extensive outreach efforts, new and little known cultural dance had the opportunity to be presented. Prior to joining ACTA, Lily worked in the refugee resettlement field as well as arts education. She continues to write freelance on issues of dance and culture as well as serve as a consultant to national and regional funders.

Madeleine Oldham

Literary Manager and Resident Dramaturg, Berkeley Repertory Theater

Oldham also manages Berkeley Rep's commissioning program that will generate approximately 50 plays in 10 years. She has served as literary manager and associate dramaturg at Baltimore's Center Stage, which included producing their First Look reading series and heading up their young audience initiative. Before moving to Baltimore she was based in Seattle, working as the literary manager at Seattle Children's Theatre, as well as assistant and interim literary manager at Intiman Theatre. She acted as treasurer of Literary Managers and Dramaturgs of the Americas for two years, and their U.S.-based Vice-President International for another two. Favorite projects include dramaturging the world premiere of *Passing Strange* which then went on to receive a Broadway run and a Tony Award for Best Book, heading the dramaturgy section of the Kennedy Center's American College Theater Festival, collaborating on a theatre/music project with Austin Scriptworks, and participating in Portland Center Stage's JAW/West Festival. Also a sound designer, Madeleine has designed sound for Crowded Fire, Rochester's Geva Theatre, and Chicago's Neo-Futurists.

Olivia Malabuyo Tablante

Grants Manager, Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation

In addition to her work with the Gerbode Foundation, Tablante also manages the arts commissioning awards program in partnership with the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. Prior to joining as Gerbode Foundation's program assistant in 2006, Olivia served as Los Cenzontles Mexican Arts Center's administrative manager, a managing director of San Francisco's black box theater Bindlestiff Studio, and as staff at the Tenants and Owners Development Corporation, where she worked over 5 years in senior and low-income housing development.

Isabel Yrigoyen

Performing Arts Manager, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts

Yrigoyen has been a longtime member of the San Francisco Bay Area arts community, as programmer, producer, concert coordinator, and publicist. She also serves as the Music Curator of New Frequencies, a new annual music series at YBCA that showcases experimental and adventurous international non-genre specific music from around the globe; New Frequencies is committed to presenting San Francisco Bay Area emerging and world-class musicians who are innovators in their specific genres.

Prior to her joining YBCA in 2003, Ms. Yrigoyen launched Zunzún Promotions & Productions in 1999, Zunzún Promotions & Productions was an entertainment company based in Oakland, California, dedicated to producing and publicizing musical and entertainment programs, with an emphasis on jazz, Latin jazz, world music and dance. Zunzún Promotions & Productions produced and promoted festivals, concerts and events that highlighted world-renowned artists and San Francisco Bay Area acts in diverse performing venues, clubs, theaters, and outdoor venues.

For a short period, Isabel stepped in as visiting Artistic Director at the Brava Theater Center in 2002-03 while the Founding Artistic Director was on hiatus from her position, and promoted, produced and programmed a series of concerts and theatrical productions in her stead. Prior to starting her own freelance business, Ms. Yrigoyen worked as publicist and concert programmer for the San Francisco Jazz Festival from 1994 to 1999. In addition to her work as publicist for a number of institutions and individuals, Isabel has coordinated and/or curated a diverse array of musical events, concerts, and festivals for major institutions and organizations throughout the Bay Area.

Ms. Yrigoyen has a B.A. degree in Women's Studies, with a minor in music. She received a certificate from the San Francisco Renaissance Entrepreneurship program focusing on business and marketing skills. Currently, Isabel studies piano and singing at the Jazzschool in Berkeley, CA. Originally from Ciego de Avila, Cuba, she resides in Oakland, California.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Garrett + Moulton Productions

Group Size	Mid-Size
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$12,750

Project description

Garrett + Moulton Productions is seeking support for "A Show of Hands"--a free-to-the-public, site-specific work exploring the power of human touch that will take place in a series of 12 performances throughout October 2013 at San Francisco's Museum of Performance and Design. This evening length work will feature five dancers, a "movement choir" of 24 community volunteers, and an original score by composer Dan Becker that will be performed live by a string quartet.

Notes on panel's commentary

The background consists of 100 drawings of hands. Where are they getting these hands, since they're an integral part of this set? Charles Moulton is drawing them. He's a visual artist. Their goal is to bring in cancer patients. Garret is a healer and she's been providing energetic workshops. This is a personal piece. It's coming from her. The piece consists of volunteer performers and others from CPMC. She's bringing back her form of movement choir from the 2009 production. She's working with Dan Becker and he's doing an original score for the piece. They already have a grant for the music component. Because she has an ongoing direct experience with the patients, I feel better about this. There's nothing jumping out that tugged at my heart. There was something missing for me. The project is not clear to me. I'm not familiar with the Museum of Performance and Design? Does anyone else know?

This is a partnership of two people working together as collaborative partners. They are showing a great deal of strength. They've created some wonderful synergy. I was taken by the work sample. To pull off dancers and non-dancers in performance with that degree of fluidity, you have to work with great deal of intention. It speaks to the direction for such a large scale of work. I think the investigation of hands is really wonderful; a wonderful metaphor. Hands have many healing properties. It's multi-layered. Garrett has worked years as therapeutic healer in a known healing center. This proposal is filled with strength after strength. They've been working on the movement choirs and they're quite strong. Their work plan is reasonable. They have secured funding. Their target audience consists of dancers and healers. They have a following. The budget is healthy. Free admission is such a gift to the community and speaks to this piece's accessibility. The Museum of Performance and Design is formerly known as PALM, the Performing Arts Library and Museum.

I've seen both samples live. They were extremely well received, and it was moving to be there and watch them live. It's an incredible vocabulary that she's developed with the movement choir and it's amazing. The relationship between the two artists is incredible. They are dearly loved by their dancers. She's done proscenium style work and has changed to large scale, site-specific works. Charlie and Janet are life partners as well. There's a lot of love for each other's work. This is about love, touching, and wanting to give these gifts to their community. They are using Charlie's complete talent in creating these drawings. I was excited to read about it. I didn't know about her history with the cancer community: She has built trust with them and has worked with the scientific community as well. It's believable. The budgeting and timeline are reasonable and realistic. They've received significant foundation support. Even though they've been through some financial ups and downs, they've done really well with ticket sales and audience development.

I'm so happy with this application. I love it. It has heart. I love this project. I love their target audience section. They've made an effort to make new contacts with new populations, and they show it. It is lovely that there is no admission charge. It's accessible. Question on budget notes: \$18,000 for the composer and musician fee. Becker received a \$16,000 grant from New Music USA. Does that item include the composers? Are the musicians only getting \$2000 each? Maybe it will be recorded?

\$500 per musician can be done with a younger quartet. But \$16,000 for that one person seems like a lot, unless some of the musician fees are included in that grant. They've done work with a string quartet before. They have experience working with live music. It was great. It was beautiful.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Cutting Ball Theatre Company

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The Cutting Ball Theater will produce the American Premiere of Samuel Gallet's *Communique* number 10 in a world premiere translation by Rob Melrose. Gallet's politically charged and surreal writing, along with *Communique's* timely subject of a youth-led revolt set in a futuristic and ethnically divided city, perfectly encapsulates foundations of CBT's artistic mission: to advance the theater art form and to expose poetic truths as opposed to realistic ones.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

Cutting Ball is a theater company that has a lot to add to the cultural landscape of San Francisco. Even nationally, not many people are doing what they're doing. I love their mission of revealing poetic truth as opposed to realism or other forms. That's rare in theater and our culture in general. They are very focused on the art. They have a very specific angle towards the avant garde and experimental that very few people do. By its nature it is the opposite of popular, so by nature of appealing to a different segment—it's great. They have clear goals and mission. As a company that shows, they're gaining steam. They are pioneers in this work. This project is interesting. Historically, it's hard to have international partnerships in the theater. As a field we're behind in that respect. As a small theater, you simply can't afford it. And as a larger organization, equity makes it complicated. It's starting to break down, but again, this company is very forward thinking about that. That's nice to see. They are partnering with the Playwrights Foundation. The festival is happening—French folks came and wanted to work here and met up with folks. I'm thrilled to see Cutting Ball taking them up on it. That's fantastic. Rob Melrose has done translation work. He's known for it. I don't know know the other's work, but he sounds great. They are thinking increasingly broadly, which is fun to see. They are thinking internationally, nationally and locally. This triple front situation is commendable, as well as rare and difficult. They did a show called *Tenderloin*, about where they are, which they decided was time to explore. Instead of being plopped in the middle, they talked to folks and created a show about it. It was successful and extended a bunch of times. I do have one question, when they state how timely this production will be in San Francisco, they don't say why. I believe them, but that statement wasn't explicated. I have a sense of the attraction and passion of the piece, and their good partnership, but as to why in San Francisco and how this contributes to their momentum, I would have loved more information about it. That speaks to the target audience. They've been good at ferreting out their people. There's not a lot here that's revolutionary, but it speaks to their thoughtfulness. They're doing a lot of things others do as well, but they do it well and thoroughly. This first paragraph is about the project. They have plans to reach out to the French, Middle Eastern populations, etc. They're on it! The timeline and work plan is sensible, so I have no concerns there. They make a claim that this will allow them to build upon the reputation of classic play translation. However, it is not my understanding that this is a classic play, so I was confused there. Their budget seems sensible and achievable, and they are basing their admissions on a realistic percentage. I have a question about the artistic project expense, about the director representing the artistic director fee, but the next line talks about a managing director salary, so I'm not sure what that means. The organization is growing and growing smartly. They hired a full time managing director who has clearly spent time whipping this organization into shape. There are lots of details to the CCDP budget notes. Their budget narrative on the first page explains the deficit, which was due to costs incurred from restructuring, and they do have a surplus now. This is a responsible and smart company. As for the work sample, I found it a little challenging because it was heavily edited in a way. It could just be about how to translate theater you are meant to see live into a film simple, but I didn't get a sense of what was going on in the performance. Maybe that's more of a field/policy question about how to show the work.

You handled most of the points. Another strategic reason to be in partnership with European partners is that there is money to be contributed. More people these days are reaching out to international partners, with a large view of international work that can then be brought to the local. I think it's a smart strategy. I was also very impressed by the work sample too.

In regards to the work sample, I would have liked to see one video and maybe have one script to read. This was a case where, if I had something to read, it would have given me a sense of the themes in the play, what they want to explore, connection to San Francisco, etc. It's this poetry versus realistic depiction.

I still remember from the production of *Tenderloin*, they raised \$24,000 more than they expected. They're in the *Tenderloin*. They're such an important theater, bringing audiences to a neighborhood that might not otherwise be attractive. In terms of outreach, they're strategically working with Golden Thread and the French consulate. That's an ingrained way to grow partnerships and audiences that would be interested in the new work, because of the subject matter. I was reading a paragraph as being from the writer, about the images in *Benghazi* and the timeliness of the project. I think that's from the translator, Rob Melrose, who is from the company.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

First Voice

Project description

MU, One ocean, One world, a dance drama by Tony-nominated choreographer Kimi Okada, NEA Playwright Brenda Wong Aoki, & Emmy award-winning composer Mark Izu. Inspired by the lost continent of MU and a Japanese legend, 16 dancers and musicians will tell the tale of a teenage boy in San Francisco, with a dead I-phone, who dives into the sea and enters the primordial stew that connects us all. World Premiere: Jewish Community Center San Francisco.

Group Size

Small

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

I was really excited to read this application. I found it really interesting and it's a very ambitious undertaking, but it's also an original story idea and concept, and a relevant theme. It is very interdisciplinary and features some of our most important voices here in San Francisco. There are some great names involved with this project. The project goals seem very clear to me. It's a \$185K project, the fundraising and production expenses are shared with the JCC, and the date is set. A lot of major funding has been confirmed, and they have other pending foundation support. They're only \$45K short of fulfilling their budget needs, so they're in great shape. This is a very artist driven organization. This would be one of their most ambitious projects to date, and could impact them to open touring and support for their work.

With all these collaborators involved, they are sure to appeal to many people in San Francisco, particularly the Asian-American artistic community. They attract a lot of genres of practice, from music to dance to theater. This would be a highly attended event. To speak to their organizational capacity, they list a producer as administrative, not a technical director. I think having a technical director is essential for this piece, and I did not see one listed. They have a small deficit but they show a lot of activity, with a long history of carrying out projects, so I have confidence this work can happen. I really like what they say about measuring for success, getting feedback from ticket sales, surveys, media visibility. I found community engagement opportunities missing in the narrative. They have potential to do more and serve a diverse group of folks. They're focused on the actual production. I like the story idea. I find it very poignant. It refers back to the tsunami, makes us think about the environment, and creates a beautiful myth.

This was a really fleshed out proposal. It's already very far along, clearly thought through, and they have strong collaborators. The whole thing communicates a successful application. The aesthetic is clear from the work samples, and one gets a good sense of performance style and music. There is clearly a commitment to the story and the story telling process. They have an audience they can tap into. I don't doubt they will do that. There is a solid timeline.

Yes, the timeline is strong. The funding is also very strong. It seems like the project will happen with or without us. I agree with that. Looking at capacity, the project budget is significantly higher than any other annual budgets recently, but they've already raised so much that it seems covered.

I would only say, to your question about a technical director, I think the managing director is actually that person, and they're using the terms interchangeably.

I like how they call themselves 'early adapters'. It's an exciting group of collaborators. I see many opportunities for intergenerational audience. This one will really be satisfying and I'm looking forward to it.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Theatre of Yugen

Project description

Theatre of Yugen will develop/present "This Lingering Life", by Japanese-born, New York City-based playwright Chiori Miyagawa, retelling stories from eight Japanese Noh plays, capturing their essence while transposing them into modern times, interweaving them into an epic portrait of the human experience. A two-year development cycle will include retreats, a Rough Reading in collaboration with the Playwright's Foundation, workshops and in-progress public presentations, educational outreach, and a premiere linked to Asian Pacific Heritage Month.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

The accumulated growing surplus is a great sign. They have an \$88K surplus! The proposal is actually a long development plan towards this production. This is a request for the development phase of the featured work, which is a retelling of stories of classical Japanese Noh plays. This was a good example of harking on tradition, while also reaching forward was one scene they mentioned. It was a cool description of how they will reinterpret the play and make it contemporary. I felt an excitement towards the work. They're bringing in national and international artists, and the collaborative team is very strong. I wanted more information on the CG animators, as it wasn't clear to me how the work is incorporated into this. The project budget is heavy on the travel, but I thought it was kind of a missing place for me. The artists are strong and part of the creative team. It's not clear if they're only a part of the web based element. Their development process plan is super clear. The playwright they're commissioning, based in New York City, is a highly prestigious individual, decorated with many awards, and an important collaborator for the organization. Their project budget was really clear. Their foundation projections are high at \$35K of the \$99K. They have a confirmed MAP fund grant. The project budget seems realistic for the scale of the work, though it's heavy on traveling expenses. There are plenty of details provided.

Staff: Does the travel make sense for the development?

That was my question. What are their roles is this production?

My impression was the animators would come here to develop the work. The first sample did have some projections by the animators.

I just wanted to know more about it because it seems to be an integral part of this collaborative effort. It accounts for the larger project budget that they have. I thought maybe it is just some supplemental work for the website? In any case, they are a super healthy organization. They enjoy board giving, individual donors, and growing ticket sales. It will have a great impact on the organization from an artistic point of view.

They were founded in 1978, and the founder is still involved. The succession plan has already taken place. She is strongly invested in caring for this organization. That said, we should also note that no one else does this work. The study of Noh is a lifetime pursuit, but one of the foremost musicologist of Noh has said that you find things at Theatre of Yugen that are not being practiced in Japan. Perhaps this is more of that axiom, 'the farther you get from the source, the more traditional you tend to be'. This idea of including CG animation, considering the whole continuum of Japanese artistic and animated expression, brings an exciting element to this piece. There are so many compelling things about this project. The fact that they're two years out in development seems completely consistent with the fact that Noh is slow to develop. They're counting on a lot of foundation support. The MAP fund is encouraging, and their ticket sales are growing. This project seems like it's going to get done.

I want to add that this is a very well known and respected playwright. It is good for the organization to work with her. Its great that they're collaborating with the Playwrights Foundation. It's a really smart partnership. This is a very sensible collaboration, partnering with an organization that develops scripts. This is a script that has been floating around for a while, so it's one that hasn't found a home until now. This is a home that makes perfect sense. It's found its' place. I was happy to read this.

These mock séances for teens to draw in a new audiences are cool. This demonstrates creative audience development to attract new young audiences. It sounds like so much fun! It's a really good way to engage San Francisco high school students.

I really appreciated the budget notes. Every little detail is provided. You can really see how they're thinking. They're professionals. They even took into account contingency money! They're stretching their vocabulary with these smart partnerships. This project has been two years in planning and it shows. They take their time to develop their work. This was a very well structured application and a valuable project.

The admissions they're projecting look reasonable to me. They're counting on a good marketing campaign, and this is a bit of a leap, but it still seems feasible.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Eye Zen Art

Group Size Small

Project description

Request: \$15,000

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support a two-week run of *Homo File at CounterPULSE* in September 2013. This evening-length multidisciplinary performance piece chronicles the iconoclastic life of Samuel Steward (1909-1993), a college professor, a prolific author of homoerotic fiction, an influential tattoo artist, and a queer sexual rebel who lived his final three decades in the Bay Area before dying in obscurity in his 80s. Awarded funds will support the fees of the participating artists.

Recommended: \$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This is a project that is quite far along. It's a theatrical work that is already in existence in a 40-minute workshop form. It will be expanded to 90 minutes. The work sample was very, very helpful, as it showed all the components they're working with and how they are integrated. The piece is centered on an interesting and timely topic. The subjects files have opened up, and it's such a treasure trove of material. It covers a time period in gay history that is not totally documented and in such a personal way. It's fantastic that an artist is delving into this material to see what's there, and explore. I think it's also interesting that the organization is in such a period of growth. Not only in regards to the budget increase, but also the discussion about incorporation. Whether this is a project that's going to expand the organization into something bigger is a question. This is clearly a larger scale work than some of their previous programming. This project seems to be in a state that's well formed enough that I can see it growing into a larger work. The audience is quite clear, and there are partnerships in place to be able to reach these communities. Based on the work sample, it seems like it's in good shape. In terms of the budget, it looks very reasonable- eight shows, 80 tickets per piece, and a Kickstarter campaign that seems very doable. I'm into it. The personal are interesting and I'd like to see it continue to grow.

I really liked the video clip. It was a well written proposal, had a clear timeline, and provided well researched historical content. The work is interdisciplinary, and they're bringing in a huge artistic team with great collaborators. This illuminates pre-stonewall history, through one mans life, which is deeply connected to our history here in the Bay Area.

The budget was realistic, and they enjoy a lot of committed funding sources. They have to develop their administrative infrastructure, which I think they recognize. Attendance has been decreasing over the last three years, and they've had no government funding for the last two years. They've been working with individual contractors and spending more on staff and contracted works. They're also increasing their revenues at the same time, so that's a good indication. In terms of impact on the organization, uncovering these stories is going to be very important to the organization and the history of queer culture.

In terms of targeted audience, they will certainly benefit from this historical information. It's already been work-shopped, worked on through a residency, and had sold out performances, so this has really good potential to do well. In terms of capacity and capability, they've been going strong for about five years and have a great team. I think what they need to do for the next step is to develop their infrastructure. This is one of the few applications that had a real outreach plan. They are an organization that presents LGBTQ to the community, is really important for the community, and will potentially mark them as an archivist. This story has to be told, and to me it is way too important to not develop further.

I loved this application also. I enjoyed how specific their plan for success was. This was one of the ones that spoke to me in terms of bringing together disciplines in a thoughtful, integrated, and artistically ambitious fashion. The writing was really strong in the sample, and having Brian Freeman as a consultant is important and it shows. I love the sound in the work sample, and everything coming together made me very happy. The one question I have is, with the coming together of these disciplines, the incorporation of more text. When people are generally living in a movement based discipline and suddenly incorporate text and speaking as they're performing, it raises a question in my mind about how they get up to speed, artistically. In the sample, there was a moment, a disparity from the man in the lead. I don't know what to say, because we're asking our artists to do everything. I thought they did a fantastic job of it, and I watch things differently when I know they're combining disparate elements. Overall, I found this to be a great proposal.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Circuit Network

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Circuit Network plans to produce "Can't Stop Won't Stop", an adaptation of Jeff Chang's history of Hip Hop by renowned Bay Area theater collective Felonious in collaboration with director Sean San Jose. The project will be developed through a series of workshops and activities over an 18-month period, and will be premiered in May 2014.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This project is the work of a group of artists that are very well established in the area. They are exploring what is hip-hop, hip-hop theatre, and hip-hop performance. That's what they do. I think this is a project that is totally within their area of expertise, and that they'll do it well and thoroughly. Their partners are great, especially the students, Stanford, etc. It makes sense because the project has an academic bent to it, and hopefully it will move on to universities as a sort of source material. I find this interesting. They are sort of chronicling hip-hop music from 1968 to 2001. I do question if it's too soon for this. How soon can you do a retrospective of culture? I'm not sure. Also, I don't know if this is fair, so feel free to argue with me about this. For this group, I had a question about the project's capacity to move the organization forward. I'm not sure what the new challenge is for them with this. They'll do it well, but I'm not sure what the challenge is. Maybe it's a structural challenge with their three-four episodic structure? Their timeline looks logical. It's also possible that the new challenge for them is touring. In terms of target audience, this is a group that works with Intersection a lot, and Sean San Jose is a part of this project. All of that is well integrated, and it's a well-oiled machine. Community is what they're all about, and I have no question about their ability to reach out. Their audience is already in place. In terms of budget, nothing in particular jumped out at me, as they have perfectly reasonable income goals. As for foundation funding, they have a MAP fund pending. A lot of the budget is pending. I am unclear on the feasibility of the project. The work sample was a good representation of what they do. Their performances are very visceral. It feels very fluid. It doesn't feel like there's a wall between audience and performer.

Circuit Network has been around for a really long time, since 1984. They've really increased the roster of artists they represent, some of which are now pretty seminal artists in San Francisco. They are really getting San Francisco artists out there, in both national and international venues. It's a really important organization in this way. Also, I agree and echo your thoughts on the great collaborators involved, and in terms of reflecting on hip hop, we are in a post hip-hop period and this retrospective is fitting. This is very relevant, and will help the younger generations continue to create new vocabulary in hip-hop. The project goals are realistic and the partnerships are great. I agree that the budget is very bare bones, and it's a little concerning that there are so many funds pending. They have a little contingency money of \$2,000. They don't have a deficit, and they have an annual budget of around \$248,000. This project is doable, particularly with the fact they have other producers, presenters, and venues. In terms of targeted audience, I wish I heard more about this. They do more of the grassroots marketing. It would have been useful to have heard more about this particular project and how they're going to target this particular form.

In terms of documenting this theater form, Jeff Chang is the leader in this. There was this really intense NY-SF conference, maybe twelve-fourteen years ago, talking about how hip-hop artists define their roles in the field of theater. This is an ongoing discussion about hip-hop in theater. Those of us who have grown up in the hip-hop culture as kids are now academics, writers, cultural producers, etc. The project budget was a bit ambitious, but this is one of those projects I want to champion. It's an important time for San Francisco to come out with a piece that addresses this conversation. There's a leap for them in this project as well, a progression. That's why they have this ambition to tour and also why they're working with Circuit. I did not enjoy the work sample, because it didn't capture how amazing it can be. I really like this application.

This is a really worthy project and exciting, because all of the support around creating this is in place. Circuit is very careful about who they take on, and there's a lot of sense in their roster. There's integrity and quality in their work. Because it's broken down into history, it's still a living tradition, and I feel really confident that they're going to be attracting the funding needed. This project has all the elements of outreach, diversity, and multigenerational wins.

It's nice to be reminded that a lot of people don't realize that there wasn't always hip-hop. It's an excellent thing to say, 'Hey, take a look at this chapter in time and see how it happened.'



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Musical Traditions, Inc. / Paul Dresher

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

To produce the world premiere of the new musical theater work, *Max Understood*, collaboratively created by playwright Nancy Carlin and composer Michael Rasbury, and produced by The Paul Dresher Ensemble over 2 weeks in October 2014 at San Francisco's Z Space. This dramatization of a magical odyssey undertaken by a 7-year old autistic boy and his family will have 6 evening performances (Thurs -- Sat) and four reduced-price matinees (Sat – Sun, targeted toward family and senior audiences).

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This is a project that stretches the ensemble in that they say it's a departure for them. They say this is closer to producing musical theater compared to what they've done in the past. They're in a producing role. The subject matter is really fascinating, and the concept of looking at autism from the point of view of an autistic child and parents is very evocative. They talk about outreaching to people who are involved, in a very real way, with autism. The timeline is very generous, is well into production mode, and will premiere in October of 2014. The Paul Dresher Ensemble, with its long history of producing and working in tandem with other art forms seems to be well positioned to take on this challenge. The budget looks reasonable and doable. They have long lasting, long established foundation support and individual giving. These are all of the components of a healthy and experienced non profit.

This is a very interesting project for them to be taking on. It's not what I would have expected out of them, but it's great and is a realm of expansion. The natural fits that I see in this are the heavy use of sound design in this production to try to realize what the autistic experience is like, sonically. There are very personal connections to autism within the creative team, and it makes it not feel like those instances when someone comes in to coopt something. I have no doubt that the Paul Drescher Ensemble, musically, will be able to execute. They're very experienced with musical language, sound design, etc. The project is quite far along. There's the draft, excerpts of performances, a complete performance that has won awards, and now we're looking for a full stage production where the work will be expanded. In terms of the organizational capacity to produce this, I feel that they have experience doing stage work. That's all set. The musical language is sort of a different language than what they do. I don't doubt that they are capable in doing that. It is a departure, but the casting will take care of that component. The big concern I have is that there is no director named. Or at least, I don't recall seeing one. There is a lot about the production of it, but what we're talking about is creating a fully staged production of a musical theater work. I think that it's a giant concern that a director hasn't been named. It's a little strange that this person isn't identified. Could this be an omission from the application, or could it have been accidentally left out of the application? Under expenses, there is a fee for a director with no name is supplied.

It's a project that's been in development for a while, so it's had various directors along the way. My guess is that those directors weren't local, and they want someone local. It would have been nice to hear more about that. In terms of this piece, it's another one that's been floating around a bit and trying to find a home. I haven't read it, but people in my office have, and for a first go-around, the word on the street is that it's a strong project artistically. The fact that she got accepted to the Emile Musical Theater Conference speaks to that. That's all good. However, this is a tricky one, because it's sort of for family audiences and it's sort of not. It doesn't really make sense for a lot of theaters to produce this show. I think this is a collaboration that makes a lot of sense. It's very cool that they're branching out of their comfort zone, and it's a worthwhile endeavor. The focus on sound design is a very nice complement to the subject matter. Trying to create that autistic experience sonically is an exciting idea. The fact that they've secured Debra Taylor as a producer makes me have little question about their ability to raise funds and execute the project. It's a cool piece that needed a home, and this could be it.

They have allotted \$5,000 for an outreach coordinator, which is a really significant amount of money for that. That's really great.

They have amazing reserves! It looks like they have over \$100,000 in accumulated surplus. They do have a \$20,000 grant already secured towards this project. I did have a little question in terms of Paul Drescher having the capacity to produce this, because they actually haven't put on musical theater before. It's good to learn their producer is so stellar. I'm excited that it's a commissioned work, and they are presenting this work. I really like all the aspects of this project, especially all the partnerships. It speaks to a larger, more impactful program.

How big is the cast? I'm not sure if it's mentioned. There are seven actors and one musician. It's listed on the timeline, page four.

I like the fact that they're using sounds an autistic child might hear in the house, such as the dishwasher, fridge, etc.

It's hard to say if the admissions match the attendance records, because this project is so different. Perhaps the audience will be different. I would agree with that but also speculate that with Nancy there, she will draw at least half of that.

2013 Organization Project Grants - Performing Arts New Work Summaries



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

Post:Ballet

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Post Ballet presents its fourth annual home season program, Four Plays, in San Francisco on July 26 & 27, 2013. The concerts feature a World Premiere collaboration between Artistic Director/choreographer Robert Dekkers and architect Robert Gilson. Also on the program are three critically acclaimed works from the repertoire, including Colouring (2011 , original score by Daniel Berkman, live visual art by Enrique Quintero, photography by Natalia Perez), and When in Doubt (2012, original score by Jacob Wolkenhauer).

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

In terms of clarity, this was one of the clearest applications I read. They are a relatively new company that has created a distinct choreographic voice, with successful collaborations. This company has created a strong following. In the five year plan, they outlined an interesting way of adding to their repertoire via repeating some work. As demonstrated in the work sample, I thought this was an extremely skilled use of media and form which spoke to an artistic whole. Their home seasons are deliberate with long term vision. The work seems achievable because their goals are so clear. Remarkably, according to the project budget, individual contributions exceed foundation support. This is exactly what folks strive for and dream of. They are moving to YBCA due to the sold out performances of previous seasons. They show measured growth in terms of artistic collaboration. There is an articulation of work with the architect. The two investigations were nicely delineated. This reminded me of Cunningham's work in creating parameters.

It's nice that they have this goal to reach out to younger audiences. They are smart about harnessing people from Post Art and Sneak Peek. They have a clear plan. The project idea is great. Collaborating with an architect is an interesting way to bring in new ideas and to bring the exterior into the interior. This was articulated clearly. I thought this was a very strongly written proposal. The budget also makes sense.

It is very gratifying to see a young company on an upward trajectory. Their numbers and descriptions are clear. They are already reaching a younger audience. They know how to do this. They speak in a marketing language that is consistent for this audience. There is a lot of personal support behind their work, and donors are committed to this company. The choreography is fascinating and beautiful.

The other part of it that's exciting is their mission/vision is to work with visual arts/non-dancers. This is a ballet company doing this! It's so different! This tells me they are a new generation with a new voice. The choreographer has a business degree, which may be helpful. You can see that there's a real consciousness around the numbers.

Yes, the business choreographer stood out! The work sample stood out as well. I thought it was awesome and fresh. It sounds exciting to collaborate with this architect. The budget looks sound.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Asian Improv aRts

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Asian Improv aRts respectfully requests a grant of \$15,000 to support the development and premiere of Oyama Canon in D Kokinchoshi, which commemorates the centennial of the 1913 California Alien Land Law. The composition, a four movement work for an eight-member jazz ensemble with shamisen (3 string Japanese lute) master Tatsu Aoki, will be composed by Jon Jang and performed by his ensemble Jon Jang and the Pan Asian Arkestra.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

I have two questions: Firstly, does this work have text? Is that clear? I didn't think it had text. I think it would have text. In their prior work they usually have some text. It's so thematic. So I wasn't clear about that. Secondly, what is the length of the work? The length of the work informs commission fees, etc. The text question refers to the second work sample. If the piece does include text, that work sample becomes much more informative. These are very established artists working in and exploring issues of Asian community, immigration and integration into America and the conflicts and problems arisen as a result. They've explored these themes quite a bit in their work and are very successful in that. This continues in that theme with a musical ensemble that is also very familiar to them. The musicians have worked with Jon for a long time. There is a natural musical language that already exists. They've added instrumentation outside of the western genre into their repertoire and this too is all natural to them. It's all aligned with their normal artistic activity. I have no questions that the piece will be written and performed at a high level. The text question is central to me. Will the themes be explored purely through music or will there be narration woven into it? the second sample it reveals how important it is to have someone who knows how to deliver text and that you have compelling text to deliver. It is as essential as the rest of your musical composition. There can be problems with integrating text when it's not at the same level of the other components. The second sample had merit in the subject matter it was exploring. Is it just one performance?

There's a performance at Yoshis in October and a work-in-progress in August at Chinatown Music Festival, which is an outdoor festival. The text question is a good question. But is it fair to consider it, because they didn't mention it. I assumed it wasn't there. In my mind I was assuming it was there and they just hadn't explored it. But I agree with you. In the second work sample, maybe we shouldn't have interpreted something from it. How are they using this music to commemorate this? That was the part that was missing. Is someone giving facts and talking about this change? The subject is so specific and detailed. Are those details being communicated through program notes or a discussion beforehand or is it coming through the work? Maybe the question "is there" or "is there not text?" is not really the right the question. I'm not understanding the inspiration of the musical work and how they intend to explore it through the actual creative work.

How are the details being communicated? I do enjoy the explication of their thinking. They care for this topic and know a lot about this topic and feel the need to elucidate for a public audience. I enjoyed that they want to create something with an elder generation in mind. There's so much focus today on the kids. There's no question regarding the target audience. It's clear who they are and how they will reach them. CCDP indicates that they had a switch from 2010-2012 from a mostly paid audience to a mostly free audience, which is interesting. This is probably due to it being an outdoor festival. I wanted more context for the first work sample. I wanted more information on what the piece was about and what I was listening for. It was lovely.

When you have these very large historical events to commemorate and you're working in an idiom like jazz that's interpretative, how do you volley between that literalness or is it enough to say that we're doing a piece in commemoration of this. I want to know how, they would use this as a springboard to create new work, whether it uses literal elements or it's just this commission to commemorate and acknowledge this piece of history. Because the explanation is not there, but there's so much thinking around it, I wonder if it is a crucial piece to know.

The history of Jon Jang, his music, and his projects in San Francisco have been both didactic and abstract and very improvisatory, so it could be both. It could be using text or using text and a commemoration. It's interesting that it wasn't stated. It would be helpful for them that if they aren't going to use text to make be clear of their whole vision. I didn't see any projections when they've used them in the past. It's hard to gauge and have a visual of what's going to happen with this piece. Considering the integrity of these musicians, there's no doubt that Jon Jang is an internationally renowned musician and composer with a long history of creating work and performing all throughout the world. They are performing and being presented a lot and they do self-productions as well.

Staff: Are we focused on the text because of the work sample and because their first work sample might not have been as illuminating about how they might have done this similar theme for another subject matter and therefore, we're relying on the text to tell us something about the artistic creative process. They also say that they're using the instruments from second generation of Japanese.

The first sample might have been doing that also, but we don't know. I don't think it's essential. The initial question is just to clarify the project. There are musical works that commemorate things that explore the depth of feeling behind and underneath things and unearth various aspects of historical events or relationships to events that aren't text based. I'm not saying that they need text or expect them to have text. I'm just clarifying, because text has been used before. They've gone into a lot of detail and the movement titles are specific to dates. There's a lot of specificity and data. Is there an intent to communicate a lot of data? To answer your question, I think it could be an entirely musical experience. If they produce explanatory materials to distribute, it would be helpful to say in the narrative about how they intend to educate everyone about these events.

It's also commemorating laws in a period of time. Unless you've taken an Asian American history course in college, there's no



**2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations**

way to know that there were laws that stopped immigrants from particular countries from entering the country at the end of the 1800s or that when they were allowed in, they couldn't buy land. This is really an important part of American history. This is what I was looking for. This is exactly what the organization is doing. They are cultural ambassadors. They also have the right and expertise and with the level of their music form and performance to say we are just commemorating this. They are such an established organization and this is their mission. Their desire is to communicate this too.

I was also asking if there would be projections, because they've had them in the past. I was wondering if one of the recently elected Asian American politicians might be reading this. That would be timely right now. That would have been cool to know if one of them were reading. If it's what the organization is doing, they are the experts to be doing this commemoration. Maybe it would have been cool. We don't know.

Financially, they have a huge reserve and it's increasing!



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Dance Brigade

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Dance Brigade will produce "The Proud," a new hybrid dance-play with a live Taiko drumming score that will premiere in fall 2013 in San Francisco. The Proud explores the pervasive mistreatment of women in the U.S. military and the impact of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) on today's returning female and male Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

Here is another iconic San Francisco dance company with a huge long history. They have been doing incredible, important, revolutionary feminist work within their communities. They are politically minded and make elegant work. This particular project is a little different than other projects that I've seen or heard. It is a hybrid dance theater play exploring wars impact on soldiers with PTSD and the mistreatment of women. It is going to be directed by Timon. It features very seasoned and important artists in our city. The work is already being developed. I found the video sample really engaging. It is also stretching Dance Brigades work through the collaboration with Iraq veterans and the hiring of equity actors in principle roles. They are integrating dance, music, and theater.

The budget is \$180K and they're requesting \$15K. The organization has a track record of producing and presenting work. They have a venue secured. They have a few foundation applications pending with previous funders. It's likely they will receive some of these grants. Their fundraising efforts seem solid. The ticket revenue sales in the last 3 years have fluctuated, but they have a really great mix of revenue sources, from classes, touring, special event fundraising, contracted work, rental, and sponsorship. They have good diverse revenues as well as some individual and foundation support. The board is contributing. They also have sponsorships.

In terms of the project impact, this new work supports their mission to draw attention to very important social issues. The work could have a really important impact on their future, in regards to working with vets. They have a proven track record of drawing audiences. I would have liked to hear more about the community engagement aspect of their efforts. How does the outreach coordinator work with the vets and get involved in their communities? That is not completely explained in the narrative. This is a very resourceful organization with a healthy financial background. They have consistent activity and have expanded individual support. I think it's a very doable project.

I always get happy when I hear about Dance Brigade because they have so much going on and are supporting so many dancers and artists, etc. They're so important and integral to the city. When I first saw the work sample, I was like whoa, where are they learning their Taiko from? It was pretty great, but part of me was like, are they just appropriating this? What's going on? Then I dug into the bios and found the composer of the project. They're touching on a subject that's very real and very true. It's sad that there isn't a lot about the reality of women in the military. I think it's really important. It fits perfectly with the kind of work that they're producing. The playwright is basing this writing on actual interviews. The playwright is a strong younger playwright. He has a following and a support system.

Their partnership with ACT is kind of perfect. It is a great way to share resources and collaborate. I thought the foundation support projections were a bit high. This is a remarkable organization with 70% earned income. That is the most healthy percentage you can have.

This is a really interesting project. I was very moved by the work sample and glad they had a sample of it. It was a really nice illustration of how important it is, when you have a multi-disciplinary project for each element to be up to the same standard. That's wonderful to see. The subject matter is interesting. I am not sure if it's true in other artistic worlds, but in theater, there's actually a lot of war plays. When I see that, I do have a little hesitation, in terms of what they are adding, but this is a unique slant and something to add. They said the Bay Area has the highest percentage of Iraq war vets? Is that true?

Regarding the project budget, they say they are projecting 85-95% targeted audience capacity for each night, but when you look at it, they're basically budgeting for 100% capacity and that's always questionable. Other than that, great proposal. I would add that they really are a unique voice and the consistency of the voice, the championing of social justice and artistic output has been untiring and unflagging. That is something to be underscored. That kind of commitment can come and go, and that is not the case with Dance Brigade. I was really excited to know that the piece is in workshop and ACT folks are involved and helping to rewrite and reshape. I hope that they will continue to bring outside eyes in to evaluate as they're moving toward creating on a larger scale. I think this can only bring strength. I would add that I wish this project had a dramaturg, speaking of an outside eye.

The work sample was very very helpful. Wonderful to see how these different groups were being brought together into a the stage production. This was very useful to me.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Dancers' Group	Group Size	Mid-Size
Project description	Request:	\$15,000
	Recommended:	\$12,750

Dancers' Group will present "Eye of Horus" as the next free site-specific performance in its ONSITE program. Through Dancers' Group's ONSITE, we will commission choreographer Sara Shelton Mann to create a series of site-specific solos presented outdoors and admission-free in different city sites. The piece will be both intimate and large-scale, and will re-envision San Francisco as a transformative space of sound, light and visual movement.

Notes on panel's commentary

This is one of the most high impact organizations in San Francisco. Beyond San Francisco, it has a reach to the entire Bay Area. They are sort of like the little engine that could. There is so much that goes on in this organization that affects hundreds and hundreds of dancers. They're a tremendous resource. They're a tremendous hub of importance; the heartbeat of the dance community, both emerging and established. They are really singular in that way, and to be commended. The piece in question here is their free outdoor and indoor Sarah Shelton Mann commission. A process that was so process oriented that on paper is a little harder to understand. Here's an example, think of a commission body providing the structure and letting a creative artist come in and do their work the best they can. Whether these solos are the same solos reflected in that piece, doesn't really matter. This is an artist of tremendous capability; nimble and experienced enough that this is a very exciting project. There will be 10 performance solos, 10 times and sites, and 10 different people. There is a history of Dancers' Group of mounting these kinds of events. It's a gift in that it's free. They have a good outreach machine, and the fact that it is free certainly gives the potential for audience by chance, which is part of the magic. The timeline and the work plan are both really solid. The funding is there.

This is a project that sounds really interesting and has a lot of potential for interaction. I like it happening in different places. There's something about that that gives the potential to reach many people. They clearly have a history of doing this kind of work. One thing I want to say is that in their measures for success, they said they support their artists and that's the reason they exist; great. The timeline sounds reasonable. I like that in terms of the target audience, a key group is the audience they accidentally stumble upon. It's a nice way to say that this is for everybody. There is something nice, universal and inclusive about that.

The part missing for me was, why Sarah Shelton Mann. The plan is clear, but as this is a commissioned work, why are they selecting her? This part was really missing for me. This is solely the organization bringing in her choreography. It is hard to assess the originality of it. Not her work, but the partnership at play. Organizationally, Dancers' Group is totally stable with an amazing staff. They are definitely capable. In terms of key project personal, it did not articulate why exactly at this time, the artist Sarah Shelton Mann, though the project bios add to our understanding of who they are.

I wanted a more articulated rationale for the partnership. It's not a question of the quality of the organization or artist. I want to know about the relevance of partnership.

The only question I have, given that this new work is conceived as both a very intimate work and a large-scale spectacle, how do you translate a solo into a spectacle in an outside setting? It doesn't affect anything really, but it's an interesting statement and more articulation would be nice. In the one work sample we saw with Niagra, obviously, that's a spectacle, so if there were something they're already thinking, it'd be nice to know. I hear that and I can't see what's going to happen. Am I making up that there's a moment when they all come together? Yes, that's right.

Staff: Is it one solo dancer?

They are all solos happening all over the place. Then they come together.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Volti

Project description

To support Volti in co-commissioning and performing a major new work by composer Ted Hearne, in collaboration with The Crossing (a professional choir similar to us in Philadelphia), on the subject of the earth -- our place on it, our responsibility for caring for its beauty, etc. If funding sources are found, the collaboration may also include instrumental musicians - the International Contemporary Ensemble in Philadelphia, and the Left Coast Chamber Ensemble here.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

Volti has been doing extraordinary work. They are an acapella group, but this project would be a different kind of project for them. It's going to enhance their capability to work with a new music choir. There's a real collaboration between the two choirs, as well as the possibility of working with musicians. As a rising star composer, this really makes it a real national collaboration. The thematic aspect of the piece is also really quite relevant to us, in terms of the environmental responsibility that we should have towards the earth. It's combining a lot of different things that are original and interesting, and working with well known and respected artists. These artists are dedicated to discovering performance on new vocal music. There are very few choirs in the US bringing in chorale music at the levels that they do. There's also another interesting aspect of the work which is commissioning concert programs, educational outreach, and working with youth. This is really wonderful and important. They're planning 2014 to focus on the earth and environmental responsibility. It's taking them to a new direction. The impact of the project is at the core of their mission, and will strengthen their reputation. I had some timeline questions. There is no actual venue listed as confirmed for their 2014 show. This is concerning because it is hard in this city to find a good venue for events of this magnitude. I worry that the timeline might have to be extended if they can't find a venue. This is a very ambitious project, with a pretty large budget for what they're hoping to do. Their projected budget seems kind of low, particularly the artistic budget. I didn't see travel costs listed anywhere.

They had a note in there for travel. It was on a different line than it should have been. I believe they have \$400 in there for a New York flight? \$800 seems very low if they're bringing in a Philly group and some Chicago based artists.

It does say they're bringing Ted out twice. That seems pretty clear to me.

Right, but what about the other collaborators? It says bringing them out, there's a possibility of having an instrumentalist.

My understanding of the project is that the work is being created and performed here and in Philly, so they're not bringing in people.

In terms of target audience, they have to think a little bigger, because this has the potential to attract a diverse group. There's more potential for engaging the community than what is written here. They're healthy in terms of organizational support. They have no major debts, the board contributes, they have a healthy mix of corporate, individual and government support, as well as healthy ticket sales and contracted work. This is a healthy organization.

This was a really exciting proposal. In the conclusion, they say what is exciting about this project. They spell it all out and I love that. It's difficult to fit in the parameters of the narrative and they made it fit. It's exciting that they have an artist they're really interested in working with. The work samples were great, really helpful, and felt fresh. They're challenging themselves artistically, as this is an ambitious scale for the work. The question of a venue is good. They rehearsed at the Unitarian church. I'm assuming it's a built in venue for them if they need it. The lack of an explicit venue wasn't a huge concern for me. I appreciate their awareness of co-commissioning with a different organization that has a different point of view. They're going in with their eyes open, which is very smart and very key. In terms of a target audience, for this kind of chorale music, it's very hard to specify. I don't know what I would suggest for them in this paragraph, but I feel like chorale music is such a specific niche that I wouldn't run out and tell everyone to see it. I would target certain people.

They characterize it very well, a small and eclectic group of dedicated members. Experiencing this music visually and orally are such different experiences. The visual is an important component. My two cents is that this is a really exciting project, they're an important part of San Francisco, commissioning in their niche. The application is just smart. Ted Hearn seems like an exciting composer and really invigorating for the field.

You can get a sense of how excited they are that this artist has committed to working with them. They are looking to this young person to really invigorate them. This may help them reach a younger audience too.

It seemed like a small budget to me, but actually breaking it down, it makes sense. I rescind my previous concerns about their project budget. The artistic samples were very illuminating, and that they had a good understanding of their audience. The \$350 paid attendance number seems reasonable. We can't say for sure. Some notes would help, but it sounds like they have a small and loyal band of music lovers.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

inkBoat

Group Size Small

Project description

Request: \$15,000

The "Without Us" dance performance/installation is a durational meditation on the decay of human artifacts and a celebration of what can still grow and thrive despite the damages humans have visited upon this planet. "Without Us" will be a two-week series of performances, workshop and installation, free and open daily, at the Esperanza Gardens for Sustainable Living, San Francisco.

Recommended: \$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

I really liked this proposal a lot. It is thoughtful. It's responding to the ongoing conversation around the world about environmentalism. They say there's an artistic movement brewing and they want to contribute to that conversation. That is great. The image of the tall obelisk they've described is heart stopping to think about. They talk a lot about the durational aspect of the work, and about how you can sort of wander in and get a sense of it. I wonder how long will s/he be in there? This is a really lovely project that will make people think and have an impact.

The timeline seems perfectly reasonable. I like that they're thinking the project will be replicable in a variety of communities. They have a vision for this project beyond this one moment, and intend for it to take on a life of its own. Perhaps it could live as a model for other people to take on, which is interesting.

In terms of the target audience, it's clear that people are sort of wandering through. They're thinking about people who are interested in things other than performance, which is good. I don't know how they will gauge success, as it's based on raising awareness of environmental degradation. How can they measure their efforts?

In terms of the project budget, it seems reasonable. They have \$33K in foundation funding coming from the MAP fund, but we're not sure if it's secured. It's a big chunk and it's unclear if it's pending or declared. The financial activity details indicate to me a company that is flexible. Looking at the three-year budget break down, fluctuation occurs pretty frequently. Their explanation makes sense to me as there are multiple projects simultaneously in motion. I don't get a sense of fiscal irresponsibility.

I'm not familiar with the collaborators, but I gather they have a high caliber aesthetic and ability. I love the work samples and found them to be very helpful in demonstrating what they were talking about. Overall, I found it to be a strong proposal.

I'll add that I found the concept fascinating and well articulated. This would happen in my neighborhood. It gave me great pleasure to imagine this going up in my own backyard! It seems like something that people would just stop to take a look at. It's a nice thing. The area is undergoing a lot of transformation and a lot of commercial activity. I think this is a nice balance to that. The collaborative partners seem like a good fit, judging from the work sample. Their project budget seems reasonable. The big question for me is the status of the \$33K coming from the MAP fund.

This was one of my favorite proposals. It was exciting to read. The idea of doing it in this wonderful garden, I can't wait to see it happen. When I saw who the collaborators were, I was even more excited! This project feels very San Francisco. The question of the pending or secured status of the \$33K MAP fund grant isn't a huge concern for me. This is the kind of project that could gain more interest and resources for funding.



**2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations**

San Francisco Chamber Orchestra

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The SFCO will premiere two New Works commissions designed to broaden the appeal of classical music, in its admission-free Main Stage Concert series next season. Klezmer musician, trumpeter and Gospel Shabbat creator Stephen Saxon will compose *Luck vs. Wisdom*, to be narrated by noted storyteller Joel Ben Izzy and also presented at two admission-free Family Concerts. Laurie San Martin will compose a piece for double marimba, to be performed by two internationally renowned percussion virtuosi.

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

This is a small professional orchestra that had one artistic director for a very long time, and then they got Ben Simon who has made a lot of changes. They're playing very well, and my sense is Ben is beloved by their musicians. They changed their model to a membership model about five years ago. Their attendance has increased significantly. I felt I needed a little clarification in some areas of this application. There are two new works they are commissioning, but these funds don't actually go to that—they go to the performances of the new works. So of the two works, one has a narrative, the other is a double marimba concerto, so artistically speaking, it's very accomplished. They have a history of creating works that have narration and appeal to family audiences. No doubt they'll be able to play whatever's in front of them. They do have a regular audience now who knows about their work, i.e. a high quality orchestra for free. Looking at their project budget, there's a good chunk of unsecured foundation money. Under line fifteen, \$11,550 for new works, plus \$250 special event TBD. There is also \$970 for food sales? Capacity wise, there are no problems. They have done work of this scale before. I also like how their work samples demonstrate that the orchestra is accustomed to playing in non-western classical style, which is a useful thing to show in the samples.

The vision of this organization and commitment to both the new composer and the new music, as well as becoming free to the audience, has really changed the dynamics of the organization. The outreach is more effective and attendance is way up. In the application, I think it would have been interesting for them to answer the demographic information. They mention it in the narrative, that they're reaching a broad array of people, but more data would have been nice. They do give numbers on page four. It says San Francisco audiences are primarily Caucasian. More details would have been good. The age diversity is what I would draw attention to.

The quality of the sample, the quality of the artists involved, and the actual commissioning are all strengths for them. The other thing I want to draw to your attention is in terms of the budget. Now that they're no longer receiving income from ticket sales, they're wholly dependent on external support. The individual donors have really gone up from \$57,000 to \$116,000 over 2009-2011. Foundation support has jumped as well. They don't have a lot of income revenue aside from food sales. They also have no federal support, so that is something to look in to, particularly because they're one of a handful of orchestras that do this for free nationally. I would think they'd be able to get more funding from the government. As for their impact, they dedicate themselves to make classical music more accessible. All of this will impact their organization. They have an excellent and diverse board of multitalented and broad individuals. This organization has a great track record of producing and presenting. They have also provided an excellent timeline.

Are they asking for funding for two separate things that are not presented together? According to the project budget notes, are they commissioning these two works? Yes, one is in collaboration with UC Davis. The project budget notes do not include composer fees. However, under income, this fee is listed. It's just not reflected in the expense section.

My initial reaction is that this fits, generally speaking. I didn't feel any excitement about these particular composers. It's just that I'm not that familiar with the music that this orchestra is presenting. I don't know if this is an exciting project for them, but I just don't really get that sense. I wanted to get a tug that the group is really excited about premiering these two productions. I was hoping to get a sense if this was a great artistic change or commitment for this group. Is this exciting or new for them? There has been a lot of organizational change, but artistically, what are these two concerts representing?

Steve Saxton is a really interesting guy. He is so talented, and the breadth of what he can do is amazing. He is an all-around musician, so I'm very curious what he has in store. I found it interesting that he's on the application and writing on the orchestra. I think it's an interesting idea, and I'm very curious to see what he'll bring.

In terms of audience, they're really focused on brining in young people and giving them this experience, and we know elderly attend too. If you just look at their concerts and their roster, you can see that they're extremely accessible. All of this work is free, so it makes perfect sense that people who appreciate it contribute, which is reflected in individual donations. Looking at the CCDP, we can see there is a ton of foundation support. We're not necessarily seeing the updated version of that, but for artists it's great arts education and a way to get paid. There are very few things like this, with this much activity and excitement. The commissioning piece is really what they are about and brings the the right level of 'wow!'. I'm also excited about seeing Steven Saxton. He is definitely an artist who is just brilliant. I think it's really exciting to see this person involved with this project and that they are bringing on someone who is so broad in their vocabulary.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Capacitor Performance

Group Size Small

Project description

Request: \$15,000

Capacitor partners with UCSF and GAFFTA to develop "Synaptic Motion", a work that responds to the question: "What is the physiology of creativity?". Using magnetic source imaging, Capacitor will create a contemporary ballet film, live aerial performance, and immersive experience for audiences. The choreographic process of creating the work will be documented in fMRIs and MEG scans. These images will become video content for the pieces from which the scans were collected.

Recommended: \$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

This project is conceptually fascinating. I don't know how to respond to it because I don't know how it would look, but that's the point. That's the core question and an interesting one. The route that they have identified is also interesting. They have identified scientists and specific mechanisms to help pursue this inquiry, and it speaks well to project. It's interesting that Jody is the daughter of a biomedical researcher and visual artist. She is drawing from some personal interests that are deeply rooted. I am concerned because their projected admissions seem ambitious compared to previous ticket sales. 120 tickets over eight nights at Fort Mason gave me a pause. Can they really draw this audience?

I have a question about the work samples. It was hard to tell from the first work sample what it was, because it was edited. The question is not so much about the choreography, rather it's how does science interact with choreography in reality. The first sample was space-agey with costuming, heavily edited with strong lighting, but the core of the science wasn't there. The second sample had to do with flocking as a concept, and maybe there was not enough info, but I didn't see the concepts discussed in the work sample description play out so much. The concept is very interesting.

The timeline is clear and part of normal operations. They're already in conversation with a specific researcher. They have a clear documentation plan which is essential to draw in the more science-y audience. The documentation is high quality. My main questions are about ticket sales and about how science and choreography will really play out.

I had questions about the budget, and notes. It would have been helpful to provide some context for them. I was excited after watching work the sample. What's promising is the science has been identified, along with the relationship with the institution. It fits with what the organization is doing. This is the company's thing, dance and science. Jody is a choreographer and an awesome videographer with training in photography and dance. The music is awesome! They also feature a cool set design with an aerial structure, all designed by Jody. All the partnerships are in place.

There was no real clear plan for outreach. They have such significant attendance numbers, it would be nice to learn about their audience! What is the administrative support? The investigation of UCSF's research is in alignment with their vision.

Staff: Are there any comments on managing leadership?

The target audience is specific to each project. It does mention that they are targeting underserved community, and I'm assuming that is the scientific community. I'm not sure if I would call the scientific community underserved. On the second page, for demographic information, they have checked all of the boxes. I wanted to go back to the first work sample. This will be an immersive experience and will become a film, I challenge you to imagine the first sample without the editing. It would have been quite a different experience. This project really piques my interest. She mentions that some of the brain waves will be pre-recorded for the piece. I'm curious how this will emerge in the piece. This is really such a fascinating project.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Joe Goode Performance Group

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Joe Goode will create a walk-through dance theater installation in the new Joe Goode Annex. This intimate experience will accommodate 60 people per viewing, who will create their own narrative by viewing different "rooms." Goode will adapt a book entitled The Poetics of Space by French philosopher Gaston Bachelard. The installation will turn in unconventional directions depending on choices made by the audience about the order and location from which they experience the work.

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

This organization is another stellar organization, even though they have an ongoing deficit. They have this accumulated surplus that they're running on in 2012. Financially they are viable. They have a strong artistic team for the project. They're doing 16 showings of the work in progress. Part of the request and description is for the architect, one of the collaborating partners in this, Cass Calder Smith, who is developing the new space. This piece will leave the theater space with usable set developments that they can continue using in the space. They will be available to other dancers.

They are no longer self-producing. This is a great stride for them. The strategic change is to have an outside organization producing and dealing with education and outreach. In terms of outreach they have a detailed audience survey. They want to diversify audience; a large percentage of the audience has been white.

The project budget is straightforward. Financially the organization has the capacity to raise individual funds so no questions there. This was lacking the tug and pull for the vision of this piece.

This is a mature artist and organization, who is now exploring this new tremendous resource in terms of their space. They are maximizing the use of it with these new pieces. The interesting part for me was taking dance theater out of the theater setting. I know he's interested in exploring this; others have done it of course, but to look at removing it from the stage and bringing it into direct connection with the viewer and how that experience changes; that's interesting. The idea isn't revolutionary, but it is interesting that they are exploring it at this point of his career. These are small performances, drawing small audiences. He is drawing them into his space. That's interesting to me too. This is a mature organization that knows how to manage itself. I have no question about the workshop period happening. If it evolves into something larger, they can evaluate it after this.

What is interesting about the proposal is that Joe Goode has been experimenting with outside the box and the proscenium, for a while; much like their project at the Mint on a large scale. They're doing small performances and audiences now and taking them into a different experimentation. They were doing large and broad; this is exciting.

I also think it's cool that they're really thinking ahead and planning strategically. They have a new strategic plan and a lot of individual support. They have room for their space to be rented out and have increased resources that way. They have real helpful foundation support and a diverse board. They have a lot going for them doing this new work in their space. I have no doubt with the management that they can carry this out.

I appreciate the budget notes that detail out what they're thinking about and who is involved.

Having a dedicated space is really the great innovation. If I had to characterize his work, it is to make intimate many parts of life, whether in proscenium, or elsewhere. It's to bring into a realm of intimacy. That's done here with limited audience numbers. They are developing interesting ways to interact with the audience in a space that's theirs. They are working with architectural elements and collaborators. They are working with a composer but I don't know anything about him. This is not first time working with an architect, but it is the first time in this new space. These things will linger beyond the life of this project. It seems like the right trajectory.

I don't know the composer either; there was no bio.

There's a lot around the capital part, building the space out, so I wasn't sure how to present the artistic originality. Capital was very important and tied in, so I wasn't sure how to present this. This is what I would expect in a creative space grant proposal. I had a hard time focusing back onto the artistic.

Staff: Was there enough information there?

The panel discussion is helpful, but I had a hard time assessing it. I had a stronger sense of the capital part of it rather than the artistic premiere and production. But other panelists covered that.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Navarette x Kajiyama Dance Theater

Group Size	Tiny
Request:	\$10,800
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

"BAILOUT! or Can you picture this prophecy? The temperatures are too hot for me" is a proposed gallery installation with performances that will address the 3.11 earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear disaster in Northern Japan. The project looks at humanity's relationship with the oceans and how we cope in the face of catastrophic environmental disasters, and will take place in November 2013 at the Luggage Store Annex or Performance Art Institute in SF.

Notes on panel's commentary

This proposal and this team of artists are a real beacon of taking a subject and digging deep. This same investigation has appeared and will appear again. It can be seen as a nimble project, functioning indoor, outdoors. Wherever it's going, it's going to really mine the investigation. They talk about the kind of work they've done by actually going and immersing themselves in an environment, such as the post-tsunami clean up in Japan, and they're quite humble about their motives to impact critical thinking about these things. They have received a lot of attention and support as an artistic team. YBCA, CounterPulse, and ODC have all been incubators for them. I am concerned about their work in terms of the direction. For example, as I watched one of the samples it felt like there were a lot of interesting things happening in the structured improvisation but there was a real reliance on props. It's almost bordering on shtick. Meaning, if there was a context to it that was supposed to be humorous, or ironic, it was not done justice by the work sample. In creating these kinds of improv exercises, I wasn't as aware of a through line. I sort of got lost in the props, or the reliance on these objects.

I wanted to see the work develop. They do tend to create this beautiful architecture, this visual statement. The second sample was a very successful use of that as a metaphor. But this is an artistic development question that I'm raising. I am curious to see this particular artistic team working with this reliance on props and beyond it. Otherwise, everything about this is taking a query and mining deep, working multiple venues, and watching them grow.

I echo everything, up until the work sample. I think that their timeline is very interesting, the different spaces are interesting, and their collaborators are interesting. They have secured foundation money, which is good, and I was pleased that the work sample revealed an aerialist would be involved. I wonder how this works with tsunami imagery? I think all of this is good. With the first work sample it wasn't clear to me how the exploration that they have undertaken was manifesting in this sample. More explanation around this would have been helpful. That said, the second sample shows where they go. I think this a really interesting place that reveals a depth of exploration. I'm interested in seeing where this goes.

Staff: In the next comments, could we please address project budgets, mission, and target audience?

Their project budget seems straightforward with no unrealistic projections. They've already secured funding. I wanted to know more about the administrative team, and their time and plans in the production. There are no notes to explain the zero ticket sales, and I wasn't sure if they were free shows or what was happening. Not having notes for the budget is not good. This is another organization without a particular outreach plan.

Yes, their target audience is loosely defined as folks who care about environmental issues, but it's not really articulated how they plan to reach them.

Staff: Regarding the budget notes, there are notes in the CCDP where they describe their history with ticket sales. So you can compare their history with their projection.

Right, I remember in the admissions I had to dig through this. They wanted 25 people for 18-24 performances, so approximately 50 dollars per person would cover it.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Amy Seiwert's Imagery

Group Size Small
Request: \$10,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Now in its third year under the direction of Amy Seiwert, this year's SKETCH project will commission an international and intergenerational roster of choreographers to create new works of contemporary ballet on Amy Seiwert's Imagery. Critically acclaimed choreographers Marc Brew and Val Caniparoli will contribute works along with Seiwert. Sketch residency and creation phase will launch on June 22, 2013, and will conclude with four public performances at ODC Theater on July 25-28, 2013.

Notes on panel's commentary

As an organization, they're really strong. They're new at self-presenting, but it's a great artistic step for Amy because she will be working in collaboration with other choreographers. It's providing a platform for those interested in being commissioned by this organization, with an international focus. I wanted a bit more of a 'tug' from the narrative, to pull me in and really champion her cause. What was pulling me in was the collaboration. It's great for the dancers because it's a rare opportunity to simultaneously inhabit completely different vocabularies while participating in the creative process. She is working with Axis Dance Company, which is really interesting to me. It's a real step towards outreaching to a new community. It's relevant, and it make sense. She has really thought about the artist as the center of her work.

Her projections for the project budget seem fine. I wish the supporting foundations of the \$47K were listed. I'm not sure why she referred to the sketch two budget, but I assume it's an unrelated project. Notes would have been really helpful here. Does anyone know what the \$4,000 for number 14 city and county is? The money is not listed under the project notes. Regarding artistic excellence and vision, this is an emerging choreographer in San Francisco who has really gotten a lot of attention in the last ten years. There's been a lot of press and attention about her and she's received many awards. I wasn't so excited about the narrative. I found it a bit boring. She didn't explain what the theme was, at least not in a way that I could understand. I wish this was expressed in a way that we could visually and mentally grasp. The video sample really helped. It showed the dance vocabulary she's building, and the use of technique, particularly lighting, showed off her aesthetic. The collaborators are people who have been engaged for many years, with good reputations and long histories in the city. It's a young organization. This is their second full production. The individual support, the board support, special events, and fundraising areas are good. They have a significant amount of support. They have board donations, and individual donations, over \$20,000. The project budget seems realistic, and I appreciate the notes.

The residency program, in terms of the impact, provided her an opportunity to expand her vocabulary. Sketch allowed her to take risks, present new ideas and collaborate with other choreographers. In terms of targeted audience, I wasn't impressed. I didn't see a specific outreach plan. They have four part time staff, which includes some seasoned personnel. They have enough, realistic income projection for this project. Though they weren't specific as to how they arrived at their ticket sales figure of \$8K. Overall, I'm confident they can pull this off. Regarding the admissions tickets, it didn't raise a red flag for me because they have had similar ticket income in the past. But they're paid attendance is dropping a bit. There are CCDP notes on it. They changed from a calendar year to fiscal year, so if you look at it like that they've been steadily growing.

This proposal makes a lot of sense. She has positioned herself as a leader. She stepped into huge shoes as the resident choreographer. What is interesting in this is that she's trying to create. This work will be created on her company, and the idea of succession, to develop a workshop and lab to keep your company going, will break some of the images over who creates ballet. I think there are a lot of elements wrapped up here that are very, very smart and I'm impressed by the vision here, to keep something alive beyond oneself. I have a question in response to that line of thought. Specifically about giving space to create the work, giving time and space, dialogue, and not having to present finished work all the time. In short, some breathing room for the creative process. Given that, does this timeline make sense? Is it reasonable? Or does it reflect that intent. I ask because it seems short to me. It's a good question. It's pretty intensive. I don't have that question because she specifies it's a work in progress. She doesn't specify what work in progress means, so it could be something really early. The timeline doesn't seem to be an issue for me, because you could show anything; it's whatever you do. The intent is not about what is being shown, but creating an opportunity for multiple choreographers to work with a group of people and develop something. It doesn't seem like enough space to give everybody a chance to come in and develop a work in progress then to step away and come back, etc. That sort of interchange did not seem possible to me in this timeframe. Does the project extend beyond the presentation? I don't know. I think that speaks to what the goals of the residency are. I'm still hearing a focus on the end product. Giving the artist the gift of time, or just to see what other people are doing, is valuable. Maybe they won't be able to implement the whole plan during this time, but I see a lot of valuable things happening.

Staff: To address the budget question earlier about what the funders were, it says that they received foundation and Silicon Valley funds for Sketch II in the CCDP.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Carpentbag Brigade Physical Theater

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Open Society Project is a site-flexible performance at Yerba Buena Gardens for the San Francisco International Arts Festival in August 2013. The Carpentbag Brigade and Nemcatocoa Teatro from Bogota, Colombia (supported by Mid-Atlantic Arts Foundation) will conduct a bilingual performance intensive sharing acrobatic stilt and physical theater skills to integrating seasoned SF based performance practitioners into a large scale outdoor community performance modeled on Nemcatocoa Teatro's performance "Landscape Reinvention Society"

Notes on panel's commentary

They're asking funding for a component of a larger activity, which is an ongoing activity of training and collaboration with other artists who work in this medium. This makes the budget a little complicated because it's all built into the framework of a tour. It's a little difficult to tease out what is what. That said, they've been doing it since 1997, and its very unusual and interesting, and they go in deep. The investigation is into how stilt walking, acrobatics, and physical theater can be utilized in a cultural and artistic way towards community building. They have quite a lot of experience doing this type of work and they have a lot of experience working with their specific collaborators. They do describe their work as being primarily outside of San Francisco, and that this is a project they would like to bring to their hometown, and it's made possible because of their out of town touring. In terms of feasibility, I see no real issues because this is what they do and they seem to do it consistently. This is part of the San Francisco International Arts Festival. They have a location identified, they know how to work with their collaborators, and they've done the workshops before. It all seems realistic to me. They're very committed to transmitting the knowledge of this artform to other people.

In terms of artistic merit, the other interesting aspect of this project is the intercultural collaboration with Columbian practitioners of this artform. Columbia has a history of presenting this artform in the streets. They have gone there to study, brought that knowledge back to San Francisco, and are now bringing the Columbians back here to share as well as inviting other local artists to collaborate with them. This is a real model for intercultural work. I also want to confirm, they're asking us to fund the last phase of their performance at Yerba Buena Gardens on August 17th. They already have a date and platform, they have largely been funded, the Columbian artists have been funded, and funding for a tour is in motion. They also earn a lot of their revenue through workshops, which they're bringing to SF. They have a tour manager for the whole tour. This seems like very tourable kind of work. They have an administrative assistant working on the project. The impact for this organization is to be presented in San Francisco, because they're always going outside of San Francisco to present.

This may be a policy thing, but, there's no question about the artistic merit. I'm wondering about who exactly are we supporting, as this is a company that has not been working here. Is our policy about how many components of one single festival these funds are supporting? There are a number of components that are coming in from one festival. It's just a question, though I think it's an important one. Second, it also seems that this is already finished. It's a done deal, and everything is in place. So, if I choose not to advocate for it, I'm sure it's going to happen anyway. There's something so airtight about it that I'm feeling that it's an allocations issue. It is a wonderful opportunity to see this craft in San Francisco.

Staff: CEG currently does not dictate venues projects will be performed at as long as they are in SF. There have been experiences when other festivals also had multiple participants seeking funds for their own work.

The San Francisco International Arts festival is working with lots of different arts organizations in the city, but in my experience, most of these organizations must raise their own funds. The festival is not really supporting them to produce their work. Is that correct?

Staff: It's a hybrid model.

So on page 15 in the project budget, they speak to what their request for support is for. In the narrative, it also discusses how the funds will be spent for the city. The new work part of it is in this one week of compositions. After they've developed skills with the participants, a new work is being created in that week and then presented. So perhaps all the components to make the work are in place, but they haven't actually created the work yet. From what I understood, during the workshop phase, that's when they'll be creating this final piece.

For me, the work sample really changed the tone of how I read the application. It took me five reads to tease out what was happening with the umbrella organization. Then I decided to watch the work sample, and that first sample really showed me what they did.

Is there a board of directors?

My hesitation is with the question, where have they been performing. If the organization is based here but traveling for the next 15 years, outside and coming back, that's one thing, but then if you're here, it's another thing.

Staff: Well, let me clarify this, they do fit the criteria for the commission. Maybe we can speak about the impact to the

2013 Organization Project Grants - Performing Arts New Work Summaries



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

community?

I think being placed in the Mission, is absolutely the right place. There's a real affinity built into that community. They're aligning themselves with the Mission Cultural Center, Loco Boco, and other organizations that are very much apart of San Francisco history.

They're choosing to go where the work is. I don't read in here any desire not to be here; rather, there is an excitement to be here.

The ability to build up the extensive touring that they've done reveals an organizational competency to develop complex projects with long timeframes in multiple locations internationally. Managerially, I have confidence in them.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Push Dance Company

Group Size

Tiny

Project description

Request:

\$7,500

Raissa Simpson's Retrospective Schoolgirl, captures the curious expressive nature of arguments for and against affirmative action with set design by Benito Steen and music by Tori Quinn. Taking personal stories from San Francisco's university educators and entering college students, this project actively brings forward modern narrative on the shifts in attitude towards or against diversity in higher education.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

They're requesting \$7500 for a work set to premier at ODC in June of 2013. This organization was founded in 2005 and incorporated in 2008. They have an annual budget of around \$24,000. They have served around nine artists this year, and expect to reach 2,000 individuals with this project. This work will be presented as part of their annual season show. For such a young organization, I found this to be an excellent, well-written proposal. I found the concepts for the proposed project very original, very relevant, and very interesting. In terms of artistic value, this artist is doing social, political dance. The work they do engages community and could be transformative. That's the mission of the organization. They are asking questions that are looking at relevant political issues, in this case, what if the 1960's decision on affirmative action was repealed? Through dance, they will bring the story to life, engaging lots of different communities, professors, schools, and students. They really want to reach out into the community, even as far as facilitating visits to civil rights groups and non-profit organizations. I find it to be really inspiring work. They have a track record of creating other works of this kind. It's not the first time they are doing this. The organization has a real potential to address an issue that is relevant to our society, in terms of race, gender, and affirmative action. They demonstrate a sophisticated way of thinking about this topic through dance. In regards to project planning, the organization has expressed how they will carry out their vision. They have received a lot of funding and support from individuals, businesses, and foundations. They need to develop more contingency plans, and figure out how to create a surplus because at the moment they're really bare bones. If you look at the organizational budget from 2009-2011 it has almost doubled. There's potential here. They're a little unrealistic in terms of income, with the two performances projected at 75% capacity. To be more realistic they should budget at around 50% for a younger organization. They have been starting to build some foundation support. This particular organization has the capacity, opportunity and possibility of getting much more support for the work that they're doing.

They're obviously a volunteer run organization, project driven, artistically driven, and they're paying all the folks involved, including the dancers. They have an administrative director, which I think is a good thing for a young organization. They have a publicist for their grassroots market.

As for targeted audience, this very ambitious project has a lot of potential to draw a diverse group, including activists, artists, students, etc. I didn't see a lot written about how they would reach out, though they did mention 80% of their audience was people of color, so these communities are their focus. If they pull this project off, it will support their organization's mission. In terms of the capability to implement this project, they have the resources to implement some of these goals.

It's a really well articulated application. It's one of my favorites, as there's no question that the artist is passionate about the material. It's an interesting contrast because it sounds so dry and factual, and yet the passion comes through, which makes me believe she has the confidence to pull this piece off. Often works that are trying to convey facts, often come off as preachy, boring, or didactic, but I don't think this will be an issue for her. The work samples were really interesting and helped the application. It helped me understand how she translated this information into movement. I like what she's doing to include the members of the community by incorporating their stories. She can meet her income goal of \$10,000, if she's actually talking to all these people. There's great potential for her to actually achieve 75% attendance. I have a question about the plan to evaluate impact. I'm not sure how you find this information out, or how she intends to measure this by surveys.

Speaking to target community, there's a lot of confidence in it. She's a very strong choreographer, and the work sample really grounded this. It's exciting to see such strong company members work with youth and really incorporate them into the piece in a seamless way. There was a lot of thought given to it, and I thought this was a smart application.

It wasn't totally clear to me how large a role text has to play in the piece. I'm curious about this. Are these arguments being made? How much text is involved? How much is a singer songwriter incorporating the data that's gathered through the interviews? How do the interviews work with the piece? It is really text based. I would like to have heard the singer songwriter, for example. It's only a 15 minute piece, so it's a lot of material to develop in 15 minutes. As fascinating as it is, it seems a rather small scale for what she's talking about. Looking at previous years for ticket sales, the numbers are fairly modest. This jump to \$10,000 is quite a lot. The math doesn't really work. 170 times \$25 does not equal \$10,000.

I agree with everything. I also thought the \$10,000 was a high estimate for the ticket sales. The numbers are high for attendance, but the ticket sales weren't. More notes here would have been helpful.

She does say in 2009 they changed format including low cost and free performances.

Yes, but times five, that's a lot.



**2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations**

Dandelion Dance Theater

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

Savage/Love is Eric Kupers' interdisciplinary, cross-cultural adaptation of the play by Sam Shepard and Joe Chaikin. Savage/Love will be directed and choreographed by Kupers, with musical collaborators Dr. Ysaye M. Barnwell of Sweet Honey in the Rock and Ben Schenck of Panorama Jazz Band, and movement consultant Laura Elaine Ellis. SFAC support for Savage/Love will fund artists' fees for performances by Dandelion Dancetheater's Dandelion and guest artists at CounterPULSE in October and November, 2014

Notes on panel's commentary

This application is a really clear articulation of a vision of an interpretation of a classic piece. Sam Shepard is kind of a Bay area darling, so doing this reinvigoration of his work here is nice. Eric Cuppers has done this before with a companion piece. He had a vision for it and he did it successfully. He has a connection to the material and a vision that comes through in the application. I'm not sure that I can articulate it so I don't know how it's coming through, but I believe it. This project definitely speaks to the mission of the organization. The collaborators on this project are of a really high caliber, as well as an interesting mix of people.

The fact that the audience will experience the piece from the center of a large circle is an interesting thing to experiment with. There's a long theatrical tradition of making the audience uncomfortable, or confused in a way, and that's what is going to happen here when you are not be able to see all parts of the performance at one time. It adds another element to the work. It makes sense with Sam Shepard's aesthetic, which I understand to be kind of this pushing, jabbing, let's challenge you kind of feel.

The company seems to be on good fund raising footing. I have a concern with their projected admissions. They're doing two performances a night, and counting on selling out 30 seats per performance, but still, counting on selling out is always kind of a risk. The rest of the budget looks reasonable. In terms of target audience, their methods to reach this new audience all seem fine, and the timeline looks reasonable. This is a strong proposal.

The work samples were helpful. The video in the work sample was not as integrated as it could have been. I enjoyed the sample as a whole, with all the dancing, singing, and music. Seeing the incorporation of a number of disciplines gave me confidence. It's very reassuring to me to hear you say that it made sense to you. I'm aware of Sam Shepard, but I'm not really familiar with his work. And I don't know anything about Savage Love. So it wasn't totally clear to me, as the "why?" part of it didn't come through. That was the big question for me. What is the intersection of Jewish and African American music and dance in this work about? That it made sense to you was reassuring to me. He's already done this before, which displays continuity and competency. The quality of the collaborators is quite a cool thing. I thought the work sample was very helpful. I wasn't getting a clear picture from the narrative and the work sample allowed me to see the production quality and integration of various communities. I still don't quite understand, why this artistic approach to this existing artistic work.

I'm excited by the collaborators they're bringing in. I like the idea of disrupting passive audiences. The experience of being at a Dandelion Dance Theater production is to witness intense collaboration. Sometimes the collaborative process feels inclusive and sometimes it feels exclusive, but as an observer, there's no question that you're experiencing an intense, committed company. Their commitment to success, or commitment to failure, is 100% without apology. The process they're about to undergo with these collaborators could be enriching for both company and audience.

The actual piece wasn't very clear. What pulled me in was the collaboration between the artists. In that sense, I thought the curation of bringing in these two made an interesting mix of musical forms. Working with these high caliber artists would be an important step for the organization. Their proposed admissions number was a conservative estimate. Their foundation support seemed a bit high because not all the funds are yet confirmed. They're going to do the typical grassroots, social media outreach marketing plan. It's not really specific. There's a heavy dependence on their collaborators, and an assumed increase in audience that their partners will bring in. I'm wondering, if the limited audience capacity, means they're not trying too hard to get the word out there. Yes, it's a very deliberate minimizing of space. They're only asking for it to be occupied by one third.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Fecund Arts

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support 8 performances of POST-PORN MODERNISTS--THE NEXT GENERATION during a week in May and a week in June 2014 National Queer Arts Festival in a theater in San Francisco. This intergenerational production will re-interpret and update Annie Sprinkle's classic solo performance piece that she staged in 14 different countries before over 38,000 people from 1989 to 1996. Awarded funds will support the participating artists' fees, the production's space rental and promotional expenses.

Notes on panel's commentary

I felt a little conflicted about this application, and I don't know how I feel about it. The project that they're doing, it is in keeping with the goal of the organization and its very much in the world of what they do. The piece they're proposing to update was/is a really revolutionary work. Their plans for updating it artistically make sense. The question of how technology has changed female sexuality is a very interesting question. All of that fits and works for me. It was the first work sample that got in my way. The second was helpful; it was from the piece. I got to see what it was, and it did feel dated, so that was smart. As for the first work sample, the writing did not grab me. I understand it was an experimental form and interaction with the audience is prioritized, but it just felt preachy to me. There was a lack of depth and a lack of investigative thinking to it.

I thought it was a bit strange. When reading the narrative, I was kind of like, 'huh?' 'marrying people to the earth'? Yes, and going off of that, the organization has a focus on the environmental movement. I have a question as to whether this piece will further that aspect of their organization. I think the connection is pretty weak. As I understand the link, female sexuality unto itself is emblematic of mother earth and therefore the environment. I would like a stronger articulation of this link, and this particular piece. They are requesting a big chunk of their budget for this project. What they've asked for and how they propose to spend it is reasonable. I think their admission goals are ambitious, but Annie Sprinkle is such a name that I think they'll attract an audience. They're also very specific about their evaluation. The timeline is reasonable. All that is great. I just feel a little muddled about it.

While reading this, some moments in there were like, 'what?', but then getting into it, they're already doing it as far as working with commissioned artists. And they have promising leaders. This is really risky subject matter. It's really San Francisco, and there's a stigma around sex workers. Also, it's not like they're dealing with a subject matter they have no personal connection to. There's interest in it there. It all sounded good until I got to the financials. All I saw was zero, zero, zero. Is \$14,000 realistic? I have nothing to compare it to. Are they a viable organization? I have nothing to compare it to. This project would be great for the organization, and it could be something special, but when I look at their finances, there's nothing to back this possibility up. It was hard to continue evaluating after seeing that. Does it mean that they don't fundraise? No, it's all drafts. The CCDP is incomplete. I come from being a funder, and I know it's tough with the smaller organizations, but this is what we have to base our assessment on. They have fiscal sponsorship with the Queer Cultural Council. Annie Sprinkle and Beth Stevens are a duo, and the way I looked at the finances, they've largely been working as individual artists.

This is a new organization, and where this really deserves some focus is that it is so quintessentially based in San Francisco. San Francisco is a beacon of pushing the boundaries and Annie Sprinkle is iconic in that way. Her partnership here is to mine a metaphor, with the earth as lover, through the lens of sexuality, taking it and making it around the world, consistently challenging, offending, accepting. It's what this process is about. And I think what they're asking for here really has great merit. This updating of that iconic work, so important in sexuality studies and in theater, is important. We have these iconic artists involved, and I think it's worthy of a retrospective.

My reaction is, "I don't know, does it matter?" When I saw it was Annie Sprinkle and what she wanted to do, to me it's a legendary piece, and she's really revamping it and recontextualizing it. Looking at where we are now, this is interesting to me. I did have a problem with the lack of any background. She's saying is there will be eight performances with 120 tickets for each performance. Maybe that's ambitious, but maybe not; it's Annie Sprinkle, after all. My initial reaction is, 'sure'. I had the same feeling with Kickstarter, as it struck me as something that will speak easily to a lot of people. So there were a lot of things that I sort of forgave, such as the first sample and total lack of background. I think she's the kind of artist and iconic San Francisco creative that is very resourceful, and will find ways to get this done. In this city, this kind of project will be well received. I did the same thing as you, a lot of what was here, I was like, 'what?!' There are no numbers, etc., but I have faith she can pull it off. She's more of an artist that is presented as opposed to produced.

Staff: You can see from the CCDP, a lot of those figures are from touring fees. Are there any more comments about producing this?

There are some artists and some projects that, by the power of the art itself, you can forgive a lot of shortcomings...and this may be one of them. How does that relate to our conversation before about scoring based on what's in the application and not bringing personal sentiments into judging?

Staff: We should keep that in mind, but you can speak to their qualifications and score accordingly in those areas. Where this application is toddling seems to be between creative leadership and management. Artistic excellence is only one of our areas of critique.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Shakespeare Festival

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The San Francisco Shakespeare Festival requests support for Free Shakespeare in the Park, one of the city’s most eagerly anticipated cultural traditions, and a collective experience that embraces the ethnic, political, educational and economic diversity that is a hallmark of San Francisco. Free Shakespeare in the Park is also a gateway to our vibrant arts community, the first traditional theater experience of 75% of our audience each year, who subsequently seek out additional arts activities.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This is an organization that provides the tremendous resource of high quality theater to the public for free. This particular season they’re presenting Macbeth. It is a fantastic thing to see this play live in front of you, rather than on a page. The 3-year budget narrative, you can’t ignore the rather large deficit that’s slowly being chipped away. I appreciate that the large amount incurred in 2001, but I want to know why. It is very good to see that the deficit is declining, but one cannot ignore that fact that this is part of their regular programming.

Organizationally, they have a machine that knows how to do this, so I have no questions about their capability. They have very clear plans about how to mount these productions. They go into how the contracts are structured. All these sorts of mechanics are in place. They mention a 9K audience in 2012, a quarter of the audience are children and young adults. It is diverse in age.

Seeing classic theater live is invaluable. Under “Foundations” of the project budget, there is \$17K, but it doesn’t say if it’s secured or not. There is a surprising lack of detail or breakdown in the project budget notes. I don’t understand the reasoning for that. I would expect that all of this would be on a spreadsheet, well laid out. Knowing the artistic breakdown would be nice.

Going back to CCDP, they have a tremendous amount of income from their camp tuition. Going back to the deficit, we’re not getting the full picture at all. There is some mystery around it. They have gotten a big push with the Irvine Foundation. My sense is with the capacity that they have, they’re really putting a lot of their effort elsewhere.

I agree that access to free art is fantastic. One thing about being in the Presidio, is that it is not easy to get to. It is not accessible. Actually, it’s a major commitment to get there by public transportation. It’s a journey across time, space, and culture. Placing accessibly free art there, is that it is about trying to break down barriers. If the engagement piece is so important, then it would be nice to have it more clearly articulated. They have the potential to reach many more people through their camps and youth work. So again, it would like to know more about those activities. Do they always perform in the presidio? No, that is relatively new. But it would be so great if they could travel. They plunk down and are there with a fence around it. I am not sure why the fence is there because it’s free. I don’t get it.

I didn’t get any real excitement from this. I was disappointed that it wasn’t an application about their pop-up program. That would have been more relevant and with a great curatorial vision. It’s disappointing. They could have made more of a case for ingenuity, excitement and more outreach had they actually talked about their pop-up. It is unclear if they’re continuing the pop-up. It is their 30th anniversary. They are planning to reprise and extend their pop-up Shakespeare offering. That’s what I find the most exciting thing about this company. Otherwise, it’s exactly what they’re called, Shakespeare in the park. What is new?

In terms of the budget, they either received a loan or had a really generous donor. What made me feel a little more comfortable is that the deficit is going down every year. They are paying that off and are committed to paying it off over time. They have cut what it was in half, so they’re dealing with it.

Staff: There are not a lot of CCDP notes.

I wish there were more detailed notes.

I want to echo, how important it is to have free, accessible art. I love the idea of the pop-up, which sounds like they’re going to expand. They’re obviously serving a certain segment of San Francisco because it’s difficult to get to the Presidio but in some ways they are not reaching out in terms of where they’re performing. Why such a difficult place to access like the Presidio? The problematic component is the location of the Presidio. The Presidio has its own inherent difficulties.

I would have liked the quality of the video itself to be better. I couldn’t really see faces in the video, but maybe you can’t in the park either.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Flyaway Productions

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Give a Woman a Lift is an evening-length dance that explores the meanings inherent in the idea of “going up,” especially as seen through a feminist lens. Here, going up is at once a political, and physical endeavor. This interdisciplinary dance will integrate physical risk, nontraditional lighting, and repurposed steel. It will expand the role of suspension in cultivating a vertical stage, and will push toward a more articulate off-the-ground movement vocabulary.

Notes on panel's commentary

I will start with page 2, which was a great pleasure to look at because they have a surplus. It's nice to have healthy financial management in place. It communicates a certain level of competence. This project is fascinating. The work samples give real touchstones of the work they do and their aesthetic. The work is full of risk, and by taking the human body off the ground, they're seeing what can happen in that space. The choreographer has a very clear idea of the strength of the female body and wants to explore the ways in which it can challenge peoples expectations and capabilities. They have a seventeen-year history looking at aerial work as their mode of expression. The timelines are very reasonable to me. The musical collaborations are fascinating. I'm really interested to hear this fantastic group of musicians explore the question, 'what does up sound like?'. This was a very interesting question. The budget seemed solid and reasonable to me. Expecting 100 people at a show, considering the spectacle quality to it, is reasonable. It was a very good selection of work samples, because I was unaware of the work previously. They were great examples.

Kudos to having this great accumulated surplus. This group has been such an iconic San Francisco company. We've seen them and their amazing work throughout the city. What's exciting about this is having the inquiry on the inside. I think it will stretch them a bit more, maybe make them go a bit deeper. It's exciting to see that they're stretching their vocabulary that way. They have collaborated a lot with these musicians before. I can see that this time is going to be even more exciting. The originality of the program, the strength of concept presented in the well-written narrative, are testaments to the strength of the proposal. The site is pretty perfect in terms of how they're projecting their budget, by spacing it in 10 shows. They've enjoyed individual support and foundation support as well. I'm not sure about city support. They have a lot more potential for support than what they've gotten. This is as an area of potential growth. This is a very artistic, driven mission. San Francisco is one of the most important sites for aerial work. They're one of the more renowned companies. I like that this is going to involve suspended lighting and the use of repurposed steel. What is 'repurposed steel'? Basically recycled. I wonder if that means they're not going to purchase it? That's a good question. They didn't really clarify.

I was confused about how the lighting is going to be incorporated into the piece. They already have a grant for this part of the development. It's such a short and concise narrative, but it seems like the lighting part of this project is a new feature. It's an important part of this project. They already have confirmed funds, but I wish it was a little more clear what was happening there. This is a new collaboration, so it could have been more in how the rigor was involved this time. This is an application where we have trust in the organization, and trust in the artists because of their iconic status, but there were missed opportunities within the application to really sell the project. Also, I thought their admission numbers were a bit high, since they haven't charged for tickets before.

Staff: Do their outreach plans help to support this figure?

I'm going to jump in here. It's short and concise and also not clear. The reason I find myself like this, to hold feet to the fire of these established artists, is because we're doing it with all of the applicants. The work is so spectacular and stunning, you have to stop and just appreciate the work. But this application is so full of rhetoric and totally unclear for me. Feminism was the defining social movement of my time, but what in the world is this? It's not clear. Vertical is what they do. This in itself is not new. If there's something new in this application, it's that they're moving towards the fantastic. They need to specify how it is they're progressing. They're going to 'physicalize', which means what? There is too much rhetoric and their ideas need to be explained in plain English so we know what they're going to do. I bet whatever it is will be amazing cause they're all strong artists, but it was too much for me. Where is this project taking you that you haven't been before? 'Repurposed steel'? We're all recycling, but tell me what you're going to do with it and why. Tell me who you're bringing in here. I love this work, but I don't love the shorthand of this application. There's this kind of assumed laziness from more established artists. But the work samples were so stunning! I'm not coming in with the history. I found the samples to be very influential and beautiful.

I fall in the middle of all of this. I'm not super familiar with her work. It is stunning and spectacular. In this narrative, I went back and forth between question marks and exclamation points. Some of it is super exciting and very rich, but then I wasn't clear on the how part. I don't have questions about can it or will it happen, because she's so talented and the collaborators are so strong, but if we're going by what's on the paper, more elucidation of her thinking would be good. And this is me being stupid and nitpicky, but this whole project is called 'Give a woman a lift', and seems to go against the ethos of the project.

Staff: They say this project hopes to add rigor to the theatrical dialogue. Does anyone have any comments regarding this?

I don't know what that means. I see what you mean about the rhetoric. What is really clear is this energy and charge to be as strong as they can be. They're an all woman company. It almost reads as if they went into a sort of strategic plan and emerged recharged.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Bindlestiff Studio

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Bindlestiff Studio is proud to present "A History of a Body" a multidisciplinary theater production created by Aimee Suzara in October 2013 in celebration of Filipino History Month. This project fuses spoken word poetry, theater narrative, dance, visual projections, and music into a theatrical piece exploring the impacts of colonization and the media on the body.

Notes on panel's commentary

I just want to start by pointing out that the grant request amount is an error. The request is for \$2,575, not \$2,775. Just in case someone flagged it, it was a simple error and no big deal. Looking at the 3-year budget narrative, they have been running a deficit. Their explanation is reasonable. They are responsibly trying to bridge the gap. They were expecting funding that didn't come through. They have their own space, some rental income, etc. This company been around since 1989, and they have a niche for themselves. They do work that other people don't. While they're not a new company, it seems like they're in a push to move to a new level. They definitely seem to be moving towards a more professional situation. They have been working with more professional playwrights, and they want to pay their artists. All these things are great. They're looking around, but they have a challenge, a good challenge. The organization is devoted to Filipino artists. There just isn't an endless supply of professional Filipino artists. So they want to develop them. That said, in terms of this project, I think it's an interesting topic. The global usage of whitening creams is a really interesting addition to the race conversation. The topic is timely, interesting, meaty. How are they going to go about developing this particular project. They're using multiple art forms to access this topic. The play fuses spoken word, theater, dance, projections, music, etc. This is a lot going on, and I don't see any artistic description of how these things come together or why they bring them together. It's trying to do a lot. There's no specific timeline, and the work sample did not help me understand. The use of video in the first sample was not adding to the experience of the live performance, so there is work to be done in this kind of visual language. The images of flyers were good, but nothing in the samples gave me a sense of their live performance work. I really want to stress is on the third page of their narrative. They want to grow capacity in 2013 by hiring a full-time managing director and part-time artistic director. I understand they're building, thinking about income, and closing their deficit, however, if you have aspirations as a theater group, the intention is solid, but the artistic director cannot be part-time but full-time. It shows me that their artistic aspirations are not quite there. I don't know. It seems like they're more into their community than the art. The lack of a project timeline was concerning. As for the target audience, I have no questions about that as it's very clear whom they serve, and they do it well. Looking at project budget, they're asking for a large chunk of the project. I do feel that this project will move forward. I have a sense that they'll do it. In the project budget notes, there is another indication of their priorities- they pay their grant writer more than their playwright and director. I think this is sad. They've had a marked increase in individual giving, which is fantastic. Their foundation funds have gone down, however, this has been true for many of us.

I value the topic. I found the work sample to be more helpful, as it helped me see how they were articulating these ideas in movement. Regarding the quality of the dialogue between visual projection and text, I can see your concern, but I can also see how that it might develop through time. The lack of a specific timeline is the biggest question mark for me. The video I believe is from 2011 in a staged rehearsal, and then it goes up for real in October of this year. Filling in that space a bit would be really helpful for me. Organizationally, they are obviously in a huge transition. Every project they do will move the organization forward. They're growing into their space, and still figuring out a model that will work for them. In the artistic and curatorial vision, the director and playwright are mentioned, but otherwise the collaborators are not mentioned.

Staff: In her bio, it says she's collaborating with choreographers.

Thanks. It looks like they haven't even applied for the small amount of foundation funds they have in their budget. I wonder if there's a capacity issue here. There maybe not enough staff. They clearly put a huge amount of effort into the fundraiser, and campaigning for the space, so maybe they're a little drained. To put this in context, this is an organization that is really crucial because of the real renaissance of Filipino artists and activity. These artist are really bursting in diverse forms, from traditional dance, film, hip hop, etc. For playwrights, Bindlestiff is the epicenter. Bindlestiff suffered a major blow with the Ford Foundation grant falling out. It's complicated, but they secured this space. I think the prioritizing of the managing director over the artistic director makes sense in this context. I had to fill in the blanks with the lack of specificity in the timeline, but because they're collaborating with so many other entities, it's to be expected a bit. The work is so compelling, to see it develop could be really exciting. They operate at the intersection of theater and activism. I'm more forgiving towards the lack of timeline.

I was going to say something very similar, in terms of the impact this organization will have on feeding the artistic community. There's not a lot of theaters focusing on this population. They're in the heart of a Filipino neighborhood, and they're doing a lot of work around activism, social engagement, and political engagement. These are really important topics, and it's something that's been understated. The subject matter itself is great. There's a lot of value to this organization continuing to develop. There are a lot of red flags around the small deficit, and their lack of foundation funds. They depend on this funding to carry out this project. If they don't get it, can they pull it off. One good sign are their ticket sales, and the ability to rent space. There are opportunities here to grow. If you look at the work sample, it does identify a choreographer and composer, which I didn't notice before. As a side note to the organization, it might be useful to provide biographies for their collaborators as well.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Scott Wells and Dancers

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Scott Wells & Dancers will present Double Booked at ODC in May, 2014. Double Booked will be a whimsical and illuminating dance event that will spark the work of 3 renown Bay Area's choreographers, 4 teachers and 48 dancers. It will juxtapose ballet, modern, Butoh and Jazz Dance in a unique format.

Notes on panel's commentary

This application made me laugh out loud, in a good way. It was great. It's a very clever idea, both whimsical and illuminating. It's great to turn the page and see that a mid-career artist who has done a lot of work, has his own space, and has an idea to expand the movement of his company out to include other choreographers in different disciplines. He is willing to see what happens when those disciplines collide. This could be something of great interest to the dance community. I had higher hopes than what was shown in work sample of the workshop. I acknowledge that it was a preliminary study and needed to be shaped more. Given the work that he has created, I know that he knows how to structure a piece, so I remain interested. The budget seems really reasonable, and overall, it seems like a very reasonable project to me.

I got really excited about the show jazz juxtaposition too. It's brilliant in it's way!

That's true, but I did keep looking for that in the work samples. I thought the second sample was actually stronger because it showed what Scott's working with, i.e. non-artists, boxers, skateboarders, etc. It really exemplifies the kind of work that he's creating. They have a great business model, they bring in great funds, mainly from renting out their space. They should be applauded for their reserves. I haven't seen that kind of reserve for arts organizations in some time. The financial stability is a testament to the soundness and quality of the work they produce. The piece calls for collaboration with three established choreographers. The work samples weren't compelling because I feel the theatrical elements of the piece were lost. It seemed thrown together, and the dialogue was kind of weak. This is another organization that has the gift of funds committed to the project. The strongest point for the impact of the project is the visibility increase due to the number of dancers and new choreographers. I was curious about the management of the actual project. I did not really get a sense of that plan. They have increased audience because of the Butoh community.

Given the scale of other work, this is definitely humorous. There's something kind of precious about this. It feels a little bit in-group, in that they are all very developed individual choreographers. It seems really fun, kind of an easy and light use of really talented people, but I'm not sure it really exercises a great deal of artistic excellence. In a way, that's inherent in the collaborators, but I'm not sure this investigation is super strong. I would just say it's delightful, but thinking about all the allocations here, I'm not sure I'm ready to do delightful.

There's the bringing twelve people into the classroom element, but then there's actually choreographing when things get intertwined. That's why I see it move beyond theatrical shtick to be delightful and interesting.

Can I just ask, is 'delightful' worth less than 'investigative'?

I guess I'm using that word because I don't know how developed this content is. I don't think it's as developed in content as what we've seen from this particular choreographer in the past, and the strength of this proposal is the all-star choreographer list.

The question that I had was how do you set this up without it feeling contrived. The work sample pushed me in the direction of it feeling contrived. Do they want to avoid it feeling like a contrived situation or do they want to go with it? It's at a crossroads, and either way is fine, but I hope that it chooses. How do you do this? Is it scripted? How to set it up and leave space? How to allow the combustible energy but keep it structured?

It could also work as contrived. That's why I don't feel there's a lot of vigor in this; it could go either way. That means it doesn't have a set vision. Contrived, funny, fine, that can all work. But this is not necessarily developed in my opinion.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Contraband / Mixed Bag Productions

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$14,500
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

Mixed Bag Productions proposes a new dance theater work for 7-9 soloists, "Out of the Box" based on a journey of their archetypes in interaction with the ecstasy of sacred sound. Choreographer Sara Shelton Mann will work with media artist David Szlasa and composer/ethnomusicologist Robbie Behrs to develop the work over a 6-month period, with a premiere at Z Space in November 2013.

Notes on panel's commentary

I had a little difficulty with this proposal. The artist is a very conceptual artist. There are a lot of ideas expressed that are hard to articulate and translate. It feels like a real personal quest, inspired by a trip to Russia and Germany. Primarily, she's exploring ideas of insanity, ecstasy, and prayer. She states that Documenta 13, and all the cultures present there, served as an inspiration. She wants to develop solos for artists with different backgrounds who are open and curious culturally.

She has a really long history in San Francisco, and is considered a revolutionary artist, who really created a new art form by combining performance with dance. She pioneered a lot of improvisational and experimental work with Contraband over the years. She's been in this region for many years, and the organization has been around since the late 1970s. She has a very long tenure in the Bay area, and is very well regarded.

She talks about the soundness of the project, and she provides a timeline which details a ten month period of work-shopping with classes and rehearsals.

The budget is bare bones and somewhat dependent on this grant. I think for an artist of this magnitude, it's interesting to see how little support she has from foundations. It's curious to me, she has a huge track record of her work, and I don't doubt this will get done, but I don't know why there hasn't been more development of her organization. Fiscal years 2009-2012, in fact, show that the organization has been losing funding and the average has gone down, from 59 to 42 plus. She works with amazing collaborators, has been presented at YBCA, and has premiered many different shows. It makes me wonder. Also, what are her other resources? There wasn't a lot of explanation about resources, which needed more details.

As for the impact of the organization, it's artist driven and project driven, and I do think the impact will continue to develop her vocabulary and explorations as an artist. It is in line with the questions that she has been engaged with for a number of years, from socio-political to very personal (socially relevant) work.

She is very aware her audience is a niche audience, being mostly the contemporary dance/performance/art SOMA crowd. She is very involved in that community. She's offering to offer discounted admission to the dance community. I didn't get a sense of any further outreach.

As for organizational capacity, again, she is a person with a long track record of resourcefulness, and she's contributed to the reputation of San Francisco being experimental. I'm certain she has the ability to manage this project, but I'm also certain she can get more support.

In reading her budget narrative, I didn't interpret the decline to be that bad. They indicated fiscal year 2009-2010 was a spike. If you look at the organizational budget notes, she's being supported by other organizations and she's had a lot of work out of them. Maybe it's not showing on the budget for this because she's been working as an individual artist creating choreography.

This is another one of those situations where we are presented with an established artist who we have faith in. In terms of this particular narrative, it was hard for me to wrap my head around it. It was talking about some things that were interesting ideas separately, but how they came together did not work for me. She's reaching for some really big ideas.

But she's a conceptual artists, so it's in her imagination, and this will come out when she does the work, a lot of which is improvised.

And that makes sense. This is so small and stupid, but the title 'Out of the Box' does not match for me.

In terms of the target audience, she has a following, she has people, but the narrative doesn't actually mention who the audience is.

Partly because we get a sense of whom the target audience by the people she's referencing.

I guess for me, as a non-dance person, those names don't mean anything to me.

I would just say that this is an established artist who has been creating work for a long time and who knows how to create work. This is an artist who does not fit comfortably into describing the work through narrative, the need for a title, or the need to describe her ideas verbally. Maybe her work is not something that's well articulated. And yet, we know from the work samples what caliber the work is. It's consistently interesting and challenging. You can tell from the written description, she has a lot of ideas. How it will manifest as a stage production, remains to be seen.

The work sample was a very successful demonstration of weaving multiple media. It really informed her investigation of large, complex ideas. They were really beautiful work samples.

2013 Organization Project Grants - Performing Arts New Work Summaries



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

There've been great narratives written about the themes of her work but just from reading the application, but I feel like because we love and trust an artist, we give him/her the benefit of the doubt. It's a little unfair to other applications if we're going to forgive what's in front of us because some of us have faith in an established artist. I honestly didn't get a strong pull towards this project. There wasn't anything extremely unique from what was presented in this project. My assessment was that there wasn't a huge relevance to the San Francisco arts community.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Theatre Flamenco of San Francisco

Project description

“Con Nombre y Apellido” (With First & Last Names) presents the current trends of flamenco in a theatrical scenario, one that promotes innovations and fresh ideas of dancers today. Respecting our predecessors that created today’s traditions, we present the continuation of the development of our art. Eight new original choreographies with unique lighting and media treatments that promise to captivate. Live music, full costume and a performance that extends beyond our own personal stories.

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This company has been a part of San Francisco Flamenco history. They are one of the first companies to work with Flamenco in San Francisco. There have been many phases in its history. I found the narrative in this one lacking in detail and information about the piece. The work sample helped me. The two samples gave me the flavor of what they’re going for in terms of their mission and vision, to create a contemporary feel for Flamenco. The sample really gave me a sense of what they’re going for. It would be useful to have a full roster of everyone involved in the project, besides the guest artist and volunteers. The musicians, instrumentation, etc. The involvement of international guest artists was a great way to connect with Spain and continue that connection. Marin of Seville is a modernist flamenco artist that will create contemporary work with them. They use multimedia, props, slides and archival films, all of which stretches the company in a good way towards developing that contemporary style. I commend them for taking that risk. There’s also controversy here in San Francisco, even more than in Spain where they have been innovating the form for years. What often happens with many immigrant dance and music companies is they tend to perform very traditionally to display their authenticity and are afraid to innovate and stray too far. I commend them on creating this opportunity for themselves and creating a connection with the actual dancers from the old country. I had went to their site to get a better sense of what they’re doing and who they are. It would have been helpful if some of that was in the narrative.

Their timeline seemed fine to me. They have a long history of presenting shows, even though they’re all volunteer and/or contracted. There is no paid administrative support. They rely on tickets, lecture and other fees, and the city for fiscal support to create their projects. Their project budget seems fine. It’s hard to read this small writing, but it looks like, for admission fees, they expect to raise \$30K by selling tickets at a reasonable level. They have experience in that realm. They’re also doing workshops and have fees coming in from there. There are food sales as well. This company is very savvy in producing their shows. This work is being presented during their annual season, so it’s not outside of what they do. They are ambitious in creating 8 new choreographies. I’m not sure how that’s done with the timeline we see here.

They enjoy healthy attendance averages, and are targeting modern dance outside of the Latino/Flamenco community. In terms of outreach, they rely on publicity and social media, and grassroots marketing. They do a relatively good job of that. They are community driven, in terms of infrastructure. I see a good track record being presented here. They are not just self-produced, and have been supported by larger events, such as the Yerba Buena Gardens and Ethnic Dance Festival.

I love the ambition that comes across. They are taking an art form and making it their own. The work sample was great showing what that new form looks and feels like. The project narrative didn’t really get there for me. I believe they can do it because of the work sample. Unfortunately, the description was very general to me. I don’t know what it is other than some ‘dances with multimedia’. What are those dances? I wanted more information about the guest artist, what he brings and what they hope to learn from him. He is venerable and experienced, but I wanted more details. Coming from theater, when you do a show relying on film and multimedia—they want people with staging and theater design experience—that person is usually a core part of the overall design and must come in early in the process. What they have going on feels late to me. That is usually a more collaborative process with the designer. This seems like a contrast between what they want and how they execute. Either is fine, but they may want to think about it more.

They have \$5,000 of their GFTA funds committed. I have a question about whether this premieres in Mountain View? The note wasn’t clear to me.

Cowell was mentioned. That’s where they usually do their San Francisco season.

It’s world premiere of 8 new works. I didn’t get much information beyond that. I kept looking for information about the 8 new works. Why will this be a ‘must see’? Is the foundation funding secured or pending? It’s hard to assess how realistic this project is.

I’d like to point out that only the artistic director is paid here. Everyone else is a volunteer. They are the second oldest dance company in California. That’s a heavy moniker. They do a good job. They want to explore multimedia. Everyone in their artistic process learns from failures, which then become learning experiences. This is another part of their hunger to produce and their vitality. 8 premieres for your home season is ambitious and really something to talk about. Their collaborators have been working together since 2005. There has been solid relationship building with their Spain-based artists and California company. There’s a renowned local modern dancer involved. That’s pretty exciting. I think he’s also in the drag scene, so that’s evocative as well. But I’m not sure. They need to supply more information, to bring their strengths to the table and clearly show us, because I believe they’re doing a remarkable job.

I found the number eight curious. It’s so specific. ‘There are eight dances in mind’. As opposed to, ‘I want to create an evening of dance’. Not detailing this is curious. As for the multimedia aspect and timeline, it reads to me like a project where the other disciplines are secondary to dance and not integral or integrated.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

ZiRu Productions

Group Size Small

Project description

Request: \$15,000

“Arete” is an hour-long performance to be premiered at the San Francisco International Arts Festival in August 2013 and expanded at the March 2014 Home Season Performance at ZSpace. Philein Wang (San Francisco) and Zhou Liang (Beijing, China) will meld their distinct choreographic voices and their cultural ties to Mainland China creating a unique aesthetic and perspective for San Francisco audiences to be performed by ZiRu Productions dancers.

Recommended: \$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This was a new company to my knowledge. I was excited to learn about it. The director, a Chinese-American, is exploring with a mainland artist and wanting to collaborate. They’ve had an interesting history with so many international works produced in six home seasons. I would have liked to see what her trademark movement is. She talks about a fusion of tiger hip hop motion, wushu, taichi, and modern contemporary dance. I absolutely didn’t see this in the work sample. In fact, the sample did a great disservice to the application. It was very dark and the lighting was distracting. In terms of all of these things that would have been interesting and bridged over to the guest artist, it was hard to imagine. The choreographic segment we saw was not fluid. It was very stop and go. The movement seemed very elementary. The comment I’d give is to carefully choose a sample that will show the uniqueness of her choreographic vision. In contrast to the work samples, the master artist is masterful. There is lots of promise in what was written. Unfortunately, this was not evidenced in the artistic strength shown in the sample. They display a terrific sense of timeline, and I believe they have the ability to carry out production needs, and international coordinating needs as well. They have a good sense of the business of art making. They also have a realistic sense of budget and admissions. The organization enjoys foundation support.

In terms of management, all the right things are there. The timeline is very specific. Clearly this application was written by an experienced person. They are very entrepreneurial and a capable self presenter. I hadn’t heard of her before and I’m impressed with what she has accomplished. She has ties to both Taiwan and China, and has made use of those ties for artistic purposes and built relationships. She has demonstrated a strong ability to present and create work.

My biggest issue is that work sample. It just didn’t seem to relate to what she was describing. The second sample was quite good, but it seemed so disparate that it was hard to get a sense of what the distinct work would be together. They didn’t seem to relate to each other in any organic way, even though the description suggested this. I had a better sense of the guest artist’s work than hers. What she demonstrated didn’t match with the narrative description, so the marriage of the two was difficult for me.

I will disagree about the second work sample. For me, as a non-dance person, I found the highlight reel format unhelpful. I got a sense of the visual aesthetic but not how bodies move in space and the movement aesthetic. I would have liked more about that. I did get a sense of how she’s a worthwhile artist and desirable to collaborate with, but I wanted more about why. What speaks to her about this particular collaboration and conversation that she wants to have. I had a sense of competence, ambition, energy and passion, so I trust this project will happen, but I wanted more information about what will happen and why.

The ‘why?’ is a big question.

The role of the staff members in their biographies was very helpful. It speaks to the organizational capacity. The roles are clear. The staff is filling them and you know the timing of when they come in. This was a great way to talk about the administrative side.

In terms of target audience, there is a network of information that gets out to the Chinese community that she is aware of. I trust she can tap into it, but we don’t see any proof. I wanted to see more media specifics, about her plan of action. She specified the Dragon Singers. I looked them up. They’re based in El Cerrito, but I didn’t find a lot about them. I like to see more detail in the media section.

If they can pull this off, it will be fantastic for the organization.

It’s great that it’s in the international arts festival. That’s great exposure for an organization that hasn’t been on people’s radar.

The numbers seem like realistic projections. They went low given their past history.

I put a lot of weight on the arts festival. It seems reasonable given the support behind them. On their own, maybe those numbers would look less realistic.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Mark Foehringer Dance Project

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

Using his imaginative and inventive staging ideas, San Francisco based choreographer Mark Foehringer creates a new 60 minute contemporary ballet version of "Dracula" based on Bram Stoker's novel but placed in the city of San Francisco. Performed to live music with musical direction by Maestro Michael Morgan with sets by Peter Crompton. "Dracula" will be an annual event each October to coincide with Halloween, opening in October 2013 at Fort Mason Center's Festival Pavilion.

Notes on panel's commentary

In their mission statement, they were very clear about naming the kind of work that they do. They're extremely active, putting on 25-35 performances a year. That's more than twice a month. Maybe this includes workshops, but they're definitely active. They're proposing to create another touchstone in the calendar with their version of the Nutcracker. In terms of thinking about what works and generating money, they're on to something in creating a 'Halloween moment' in their calendar. I was glad for the second work sample. I think there is plenty of room for more Nutcrackers. The work sample was a delightful view of the Nutcracker, in terms of sets, costumes, etc. This Halloween version has that kind of potential, and is definitely playing to their strengths. The first work sample was not a good example of angularity or musicality. It really labored, as if they were struggling against their costumes. It was a bit difficult to watch. There were a lot of choices in the aesthetic of the costumes, but the positioning did nothing to serve it. The strength is in the storytelling and staging, so a Halloween Nutcracker is playing to their strengths. As for the budget, individual contributions, as opposed to foundation funds, are really strong. It looks like individuals are contributing far more than the foundations, which is a good sign towards longevity.

I have a question regarding individual income. It seems like that \$25K is all of their individual income. I'm wondering if there's any of that reserved for their mainstay production, the Nutcracker suites.

I'm going to offer a different perspective on this project. I agree, in that the Nutcracker is the dance equivalent of the Christmas Carol, and both get a bad reputation in the artistic community just because they are income generators. I don't think there's anything wrong with that. If you do it well, and are able to reach a large audience, just because its popular doesn't make it artistically lesser. However, I question having two Nutcracker's in your repertoire because it's a huge chunk of your producing calendar. You can be hamstrung by it, and if the audience demands it, you're caught in a cycle of having to do it. Which is fine, if you genuinely love those pieces. In this narrative, I get almost zero artistic impulse towards this work. I don't know why they're doing it besides to make money. So that makes sense, but do they need another one? I don't know why. Their deficit is due to their investment sets, costumes, and they'll make it back I believe. I wished for more of the 'why?', and if it is simply, 'we need another income generator', then tell us for what. The reason for doing this is lost on me. As for the project budget, a huge chunk of it is devoted to advertising and marketing, and that's fine, but again I question if it's the best use of the company's resources.

Staff: So part of what I'm hearing is that, we don't have as much clarity about artistic impulse as some of the other productions? Is it a problem of situating this within their history?

Not everyone is giving us a whole history of the work. Their mission statement actually is super simple. I don't get a sense in their narrative of what the company is about, what their vision is, or what they bring to the conversation. I'm not seeing it. Information regarding their target audience is also missing. They mention community a lot, but fail to specify who they're referring to as this 'vast underserved community'.

This application read like a traditional company that knows that the Nutcracker sells. It's clear that income generating is the main goal of these two projects. They've got a set in mind, and are thinking of how to change it up for the audience. There are things in motion already, and a drive for them to do this. They have no more investments towards it, and now it's just marketing costs. It seems like they're there. I understand why these kinds of seasonal shows for families have been such moneymakers. These are some of the strengths of the proposal, they are playing for families looking for entertainment.

That's fine if they're going to do an October Halloween family show, but it doesn't necessarily have to be the same blockbuster.

It just sounds like they're trying to refund the company. It's really about building these two pillars in their season, and this could develop very well. They have competent and talented artists, they have given a lot of thought to their production, and they have one model that already works so they know how to put that machine into motion. It's a different time of year, but they understand the machine and can make it work. It really seems to me that this is a redefinition of the company.

If they're putting on 25-35 performances a year, I'm wondering about the quality.

Staff: A calendar of arts activities might help the situation.

I just think they're doing kind of mainstream work.

They're busy. Maybe they're really doing a lot. If it is a redefinition, do they know that? Are they being intentional about it?

They're targeting the family market, and creating work that will be both fun and lucrative.

2013 Organization Project Grants - Performing Arts New Work Summaries



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

I think we're hung up on is the 'artistic merit' criteria of the project.

I recommend in the future, spell checking people's names. (Philip Glass)

Is it correct that they had no foundation contribution in 2011-2012? Also, it looks as if individual contributions have really gone down.

It could be that some big donor joined the board. Ticket sales have tripled. That's where they're looking for income. I guess their model is working. In terms of staffing, his main dancer has worked with him for a while, and he seems to have some infrastructure in place to teach dance and manage.

Staff: Any other comments on the budget?

In terms of marketing expenses for this kind of work, I think the budget is appropriate.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Guerilla Rep

Project description

Violently swirling through Hurricane Katrina, David Copperfield is reborn as an African American man struggling to break the back of cyclical poverty in Claire Rice's breathtaking new nod to Tennessee Williams, "Water Line", a rich tapestry of a passionate but flawed America, and a visceral exploration of how domestic violence is all too often rooted in poverty, gender roles and intergenerational cycles of abuse.

Group Size

Tiny

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

Staff: Because of their budget size and cash income in 2011, this organization is only eligible to apply for 50% of their previous years cash income, for a total of \$5288.

This is a very small company. They seem to have aspirations towards growth and expansion. Looking at the budget from 2010 to 2011, we see that it has doubled. Their total project budget is \$25,000, and they have requested \$15,000 from the Arts Commission. The percentage of the total budget they are asking from us concerns me, because if they're not funded by us, they will have a lot of money to make up. They are confident about a fund raising plan, but there are not a lot of details about said plan. We need more information pertaining to fundraising. In terms of their project, I think the idea is interesting but I do have a sense that it is trying to accomplish too much. It's very ambitious, and I'm not clear on how the different components come together. I was hoping for an articulation towards a clear, compelling artistic reason for this project. I'm not sure why they've chosen this particular story, this setting, or what is compelling from the artist's point of view. In short, I'm not sure why this story needs to be told. I do like what they're talking about in terms of 'theater magic', like when they said the 'audience will witness James drowning'. I like that they're boldly planning to show it. I love this kind of stuff, and I'm glad that its there. I believe they're thinking about the right things. They are a relatively young company, founded in 2008. I get a sense that they're looking at the field around them, learning, thinking about where they want to go. The plans for evaluation are fine, timeline and work plan are fine. I wish they said more about the trajectory of the script development, what questions they're investigating, what work needs to be done, etc. In terms of target audience, I see an assumption here I find a little disappointing. I think this is just experience, not negligence, but often people in theater make an assumption that if we do a play about African-American people, African-Americans will show up. It doesn't work like that. You can't just tell a story and expect a certain demographic to show up, because it takes more work than that. I wanted to see deeper thinking about this. As for the budget, I'm not quite sure. The project budget notes look reasonable, and I like that they want to pay their artists, but one thing I find sad is that the budget for the grant writer is more than the budget for playwright, director, and artists. Also, in the CCDP, is the virtual attendance a new category? I felt really excited about this project. For a small organization, I felt the writing about the concept was pretty clear. The theme of the project is relevant, and it's an exciting collaboration with the directors. Reading the line where, 'the audience will witness James drowning...', made me want to see the piece for myself. To me, this is a small shoestring performance group. The work samples actually hurt the application more than they assisted it, and they didn't really show me any possibilities between the collaboration. I thought they were able to talk about the work. I was impressed by the sophistication of the writing. In terms of outreach, there haven't been past foundation funds, so I'm glad that they're fiscally sponsored. The two managers have over 15 years of production experience. The script has been developed over five years and they're moving on to mounting their next production. This small, volunteer organization is a great incubator program. Set designers and other designers have gained skills here and moved on to influential, larger institutions.

Staff: Considering organizations at this budget size, are they where they should be at with this budget size?

Yes, I'm putting into context their budget size. The fact is that everyone starts somewhere. Seeing the work live, they have a particular narrative that they're telling. Their work is diverse, with almost a built-in diverse audience. It's really great work for a tiny organization, they have good grant writing, and cool tools on stage. I wish their work samples were stronger. What sort of mitigated the budget for me was their three-year narrative. This worked in their favor. Looking at people in this category, we know that first grant can be a catalyst for attracting other grants. I'm going to think about their budget size, and their newcomer status as I'm scoring this. From the work samples and reading their narrative, I thought there were a lot of huge thoughts, but it's not clear to me how Dickens plus Williams all fits together. The work sample I saw did not inform my understanding of this project. The fundamental misunderstanding of what percentage they could apply for is unfortunate, as is the fact that they cannot update their ask because now the budget seems unfeasible. They said they would partner with the local NAACP, and they didn't bother to continue explaining in what capacity. What does that mean? You can tell the big thoughts are there, the intent is there, and maybe they can execute their plans, but I didn't feel compelled that this would be made into a reality.

Staff: You would have liked to hear and seen more about the project?

Yes, whether it was a script, a video, or something else. This work sample did not work in their favor. I agree. They are a small organization, they have had a track record of doing productions in the past. Intersection for the Arts is their fiscal sponsor, which I think says something. I trust that relationship. I agree that taking into account the new information about the budget, I just don't know if it's feasible anymore. It seems doubtful in my eye that they could do all the things they hope to accomplish in the proposal. But I agree, they have been focused on and serving people of color and queer communities. The diversity is built in. They have some expertise. In terms of what I'm reading about here, and looking at the budget, I don't see how this project is possible.

Staff: Is there potential for this project to further their organizational mission?

If they could present it, I think so. If they're funded, it could be a catalyst for growth.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Fictional Artists' Contemporary Theatre / San Francisco (FACT/CF)

Group Size Small
Request: \$10,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Invidious, a contemporary dance work for six performers, provides a new way of viewing performance and considers some darker realities of the American middle-class. The work will play out inside of a free standing, four-room, furnished, house – constructed inside the performance venue. Audience members will be led through the home in 10 five-minute circuits, viewing 20% of each room's 50-minute saga – teasing out the relationship between 'seeing' and 'understanding'.

Notes on panel's commentary

Looking forward to a performance in 2013, Invidious is inspired by the decline of the middle class. The set is key in this piece, though the set designer has yet to be identified. The creative interactive stage, the idea and tool, and the theatrics are original. The first work sample wasn't too impressive because there was no real original dance techniques exhibited. I'm not sure about moving the audience ten times within the show. The idea and concept is great but I'm not sure about putting it into practice.

I have a concern regarding the projected ticket sales, because only \$1,200 was raised in 2012. Some notes regarding this jump in attendance would have been helpful here. Foundation money is pending, but individual donors have pledged a fair amount. There were 2,500 attending in shows free?

They are reframing the performance experience by establishing a closeness and intimacy between the work and the audience. I'm not sure what other impact this project would have for the organization. I didn't get a real sense of an outreach plan. They did have great detailed organizational budget notes. This is an artistic leap and challenge in creating this interactive set. Laying out the logistics of moving a small group of people through four rooms, ten times, for a 50 minute piece is interesting. There's a lot of attention given to the moving of audience in the narrative. The work sample helped me understand this concept more and the way it relates to the artistic choreography. I would have liked to understand more, 'why the middle class?', and how investigating it is going to be utilized. What might this intimacy look like, what are the themes they're investigating with this intimacy, etc. I wanted something to give us a sense of interest, something that we don't see on TV, where we analyze and dissect the middle class ad nauseam. This company has been quite remarkable in the amount of performances and productions they've put on, fourteen cities worldwide, since incorporating in 2008. They have a great deal of experience in putting together successful tours, and their budget looks strong.

I had a question about the narrative. I think this is a really interesting project. It is a little curious that the set designer has yet to be determined, as that component is such an integral part of the piece. If the piece is performed from end to beginning, but the audience is only seeing 20% of the performance, how will they know how much they are seeing? Is it important to them that the story is told backwards? I find it hard to understand, how if you're only getting 20% of the experience, you'll know that is happening. I appreciate the ambition of this project, but would have liked more clarification regarding it. I do like when they say they want to share incredible nuance and specificity. It's super valuable in today's cultural moment, and really important for people.

My questions center on the set-not just who is doing it, I'm curious about how large it is, how noisy it is, the size, the set up, and all that stuff. How are they going to hold the monthly work showings? How do you have a work in progress without the set? It seems like this piece is dependent on the set. I'm not saying that it can't be done. I think it sounds really cool. The set is such a huge part of the project. It's a little surprising that there aren't more details about it. It leaves us with a lot of logistical questions left unanswered. The most ambitious part of the project is that set. There are a lot of things you have to consider, not only the size and scope, but also being up to code, etc. There's a lot, and I don't know if it's possible to create something like this within this time frame. We have to keep in mind, when these applications were written and turned in, it was almost a year ago. We don't know what people have done in the meantime, and we have to think from these applications, 'do we believe they can follow through?'

Their foundation funding is was \$6,000 in 2010, \$8,000 in 2011, and \$0 in 2012. Individual donors are high, however.

Staff: Are you drawing from the narrative that they have a history of carrying out projects of this scope?

No, not for me. I believe this is a first, this constructed set piece. What is impressive is the international touring and that these relationships can be converted into performances for this project. It's very impressive.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Jess Curtis/Gravity

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Jess Curtis/Gravity is seeking SFAC support to create THE DANCE THAT DOCUMENTS ITSELF, a dance of community. During the project period, e-sources and electronic representations will first meet in a virtual dance of minds, imagining a dance into existence, and ultimately culminating in a meeting of material bodies to share in four evenings of live interaction – embodying previously imagined, documented, and rehearsed material events – at CounterPULSE in March 2014.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

I oscillated a lot on this one. The whole point is to look at the performance experience and creative process and say, ‘what is the process and how much of it is art?’. I didn’t truly believe the seriousness of the inquiry. I’m was inclined to say, “alright, I’ll go with your line of inquiry and lets go from there”, but there was a certain amount of me convincing myself to take it seriously. I’m not sure, the case has been made that what we’re doing right now is the art, or ‘artwork’.

It was not clear to me how this information translates into performance or, performance of interest. I don’t know how our part in the process, this panel discussion here, translates into the final work. Yes, we’re generating some content but I’m not sure how we’re generating it. There’s material on Facebook with emails being sent back and forth that’s also generating material. I’m just not sure what everything is. I did look at the Facebook page and it’s not rich in material. There was something about collecting movement ideas. I didn’t see a link to that page from the main Jess Curtis site, so I didn’t see an active collection of data coming in. Perhaps we’re too early in the timeline, but I have a lot of questions about what the project really is. Is it thought through? Does it matter if it’s thought through fully because it’s taking material generated in real time?

I kept reading, then rereading. It really wasn’t clear to me. I thought at first, ‘what a unique grant request’. I continued to read and thought, ‘am I being hypnotized?’. It ended up being an unsuccessful tool to use as a narrative. Wait, I get it, ‘I’m part of the process’, wait, I don’t get it. It would be more effective if this proposal had been written more clearly and explained this creative process. We know that artists are really using Facebook and online media as tools to get their work out there, so I was curious at first. I thought maybe there was some sort of interactive choreography going on, then I realized I was being hopeful. It really was not clear to me at all.

We don’t learn who the collaborators are until the bios. I don’t understand their conception of the process of creation and collaboration through online media. I don’t see how they’re arriving at a final performance. What’s the significance of the process? How are they developing work through these 8 weeks? A lot of it started getting lost in the language.

They have high projections for funds, but it’s all pending foundation income. Their projected admissions seem a bit high because their ticket sales have declined over the years. Board giving has gone to zero and individual giving went to zero in 2011. It seems pieces are slowly losing support.

Staff: There are notes on the board contributions.

To speak to that, there is not a dip reflected in the 3-year average budget; a little dip from 2009, but it seems they have an accumulated surplus of \$58K. Their financial health is not a particular question for me.

Organizations that are like this are always going to fluctuate financially. I want to go back to the beginning of the conversation. I know the company, they’ve performed at YBCA and I’ve seen their work. This is a company that is more about process than the end result. It’s more about asking questions about performance art and dance and theater, and their work is very hard to define. The work is very expressive and really brings and draws from surrealism, and a kind of contact improvisation. They are in a similar tradition to Sarah Shelton Mann, and Keith Hennessy. They’re looking at developing the work in different ways. This particular piece is a little difficult to grasp because it’s so conceptual. It’s difficult to explain. I had the same problem with Sarah’s narrative, which was also difficult to grasp. What this is about is getting inside the mind of the dancer and creating the dance through these different experiences, whether online, with us in this room, etc. There could be a whole slew of ideas on how to develop the work later on. I had issues in understanding how we were going to be part of this. The online aspect of it is difficult to understand as well.

To me, the online part is the easiest to understand. People can comment and exchange, but I didn’t see it happening. The narrative does point out that this piece is in reference to another piece of Susan Lay Foster, and intends to engage with the nature of the artistic process. The proposal draws heavily on choreography as a mobilization of social and financial forces. It’s pretty heavy on theory and politics.

I appreciate the aspiration to be inclusive. This ended up saying to me that you are included in this process, but somehow in the end I ended up feeling excluded. It felt so convoluted. As a person on the funding panel that is supposedly a part of this, I did not feel a part of it. The application took me on an emotional rollercoaster that would be interesting, if they could somehow document it, but they don’t tell us how that might happen. I appreciate that it’s a conceptual piece, that it’s theory based, but reading this, it’s just not clear. There are a lot of ideas and the plan for execution is unclear. It mystifies me why someone who has been around this long, who has been funded before, would write the most obscure funding request. We’ve unwittingly become part of what they’re trying to explore, trying to parse out, “what is performance?” Ok I get it, we just participated in this, but then that’s the creative process and it doesn’t help to understand the product. We as the funding body must follow certain criteria, and we are required to make a leap of faith with this application. They hope that their long track record and work speaks for itself. I think they’re great, but that’s not enough to warrant not acknowledging the criteria. The question here seems to be referencing back to superb thinkers that are deconstructing performance. I felt like I was reading an academic paper. Are we supposed to read this with that kind of grit? We’re here from many different perspectives. I appreciate the effort,

2013 Organization Project Grants - Performing Arts New Work Summaries



2013 OPG Dance Panel Recommendations

but I feel it's a little manipulative. Just be clear and tell us what it is you're investigating. This proposal is worthy, but it's not clear. The work samples don't help with what the live performance would be. There's no question that there's a great deal of artistry here, but the method here is not helping me to be equitable to all the applications. We must base our evaluation on the criteria. Regarding target audience, they want to include more individuals but if you're going to be so obscure, you're not opening any doors.



2013 OPG Music
Panel Recommendations

Not Quite Opera Productions

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$5,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

"Give A Man A Mask" is an original full-length musical for three actors with minimal production requirements. Inspired by Oscar Wilde quotes and directed by the renowned Robert Kalfin, the show embraces magical realism: a reclusive psychologist falls down the rabbit hole of mid-life crisis and faces off with a mysterious lady from Hollywood's golden age and a seductive, yet callow, rent-boy until he learns the only way out is in.

Notes on panel's commentary

This organization is requesting \$5,000 to go towards their production, to premier in June 2014 at the Alcove. The organization was founded in 2001. The proposed piece is an original, full length, two act musical. The artistic director is seasoned and highly regarded, and there are very good collaborators involved. They say in their application they're committed to 'transformative collaborative projects' that have the ability to transform. The subject is AIDS in the 80's and 90's, a tragic time in our history, particularly here in San Francisco. They are also very interested in looking at things in a nuanced, challenging way, and are always looking to experiment. As for the work samples, the first sample was really about their sell out show. It helped me to create an image for this piece, but I was very thankful to the second sample which gave me a clearer picture of the collaborator and the scope of the work. They have a really great opportunity, that is, they have their own space to help them. They can rent it for income, as well as create opportunities for themselves to engage with local artists and public. They seem to have a lot of good resources. This will be the largest project that they've ever put together, in regards to the scale. They do have professional management, and people who have business backgrounds. Their income estimate is doable, at 30 tickets a show for four shows, with four week runs. That is pretty possible with the collaborators they have in mind. They have a lot of individual support, which tells me they have fans. They don't have foundation support, which I think they could try to develop more. They don't seem to have any federal, state or city funding. The total budget seems to be reasonable, for the scale of the work, and they did a good job of explaining the timeline. They're very particular about putting exactly where things are coming from and reasons for everything. They provide a nice in-kind contribution summary of their professional support. They have a salaried artistic managing director, so they have some infrastructure to be able to do this work. They have a fundraising professional. They have a PR person. They have built in the infrastructure to develop the funding for the project.

Targeting the LGBT community during pride month is very smart. They can be part of that whole 'June in San Francisco' citywide events. This is a really good idea. As to the impact of the organization, this is going to have a really positive impact for the organization. The emphasis on this is on the production, so I would have liked to hear more about community engagement, how they intend on tying in the LGBT community, and the process in general as opposed to the end result. They have a very energetic board, and a very diverse board, and good individual support.

I would add that the excitement from the opportunity to work with Robert Towson is communicated here. I'm hoping that someone will talk about where this theater fits into the local ecology.

I was underwhelmed by this application. I think there are nice aspirations here, they're clearly energetic and they have momentum. In terms of this particular project, The theater has a very long history of traversing this territory. The seminal piece of work in contemporary theater is 'Angels in America', that deals with this 'falsettos as a musical', that was very popular and deals exactly with this subject matter. There's 'The Normal Heart' which is sort of a classic. I mean, the list goes on, so I didn't get from this what their particular contribution would be to that conversation and it felt very generic to me. To say that the author has a 'long career of using new musical theater as a vehicle to explore psychological complexities not normally associated with the form' is very interesting thing, but I would have loved some explication of what that actually means, how he does that and what his unique take is. What is his artistic vision? I take issue with, when they articulate that they have something unique to offer, and they say specifically "there's nothing like what we do in San Francisco, for example, TheaterWorks develops larger scale music theater with an eye to Broadway", I think that's a really unfair thing to say about TheaterWorks. I think, sure they have an eye to Broadway, but they also develop a lot of smaller scale musicals that are very intimate, such as 'Girlfriend' which Berkeley Rep did a few years ago. I also think Shotgun Players, while they're not in San Francisco, they are Bay Area, and they do this. I think Z Space does this. There are other companies developing intimate musicals, so that feels like not playing fair to me.

I would have liked a little more detail about artistic fees and how they're allocating their funds in the project budget. There's no writer fee included anywhere, so I'm assuming it's a commission? I would have liked more information about this. Richard Eisen's bio, has good credentials, and to be up front mainstream musical theater is not my world, so these are not artists I'm personally familiar with. That said, I know a bit about them, and this is not to discredit his credentials because they're obviously substantial and important, but he does say, 'other musical works include Spring Awakening' which was a very popular musical you may have seen on television before.

That production is different.

It's a different one.

Staff: You're saying that he doesn't have a connection to the Spring Awakening?

It's a different Spring Awakening than the one we think of. There is an aesthetic here that harkens back to an earlier day of musical theater. I think it's a bit of a lost art and fallen by the wayside, with people creating new forms of musical theater, bringing in nontraditional forms and artists, and there is something nice about it, like it feels very pure in a way. But I'm left

2013 Organization Project Grants - Performing Arts New Work Summaries



2013 OPG Music Panel Recommendations

with the ‘why?’ of it, I’m left with ‘what is their specific unique contribution’, and I’m not sure that I’m getting a good feeling from this.

I found it very curious in the project summary there was no mention of the playwright or composer, but the director was mentioned. I’m gathering it’s because the director has a reputation, so it’s curious that’s where the emphasis went. There wasn’t any information on the instrumentation of the musical. The sample was fine but did not reveal all that was said about it. It did not quite match up.

You mentioned the strong individual support, and there’s the confirmed \$25K, which is clearly strong, but then if you look at page 3 of the CCDP, last year was \$2,500. They did two Kickstarters that they counted in the individual contributions, but you can only do so many Kickstarters.

This project would be great for the organization. It would be opening during pride month, which lends itself to the outreach that they’re intending to do. I think it would have been more beneficial to this organization if they identified the LGBT community as their target audience. Sometimes, I think it’s a loss when an applicant checks all of the boxes, because being specific and clear about an intended audience is important. The comment about there not being any other theaters doing this work, does leave a sour taste in the mouth. There are other theaters doing this kind of work.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

Carolina Lugo's & Carolé Acuña's Ballet
Project description

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Carolina and Carole's new works will celebrate the legacy of the extraordinary flowering of arts and culture that began in medieval Andalusia when the Moors lived in southern Spain and culminated when the two cultures mixed, sparking the foundation of the Renaissance. The blending of these cultures proved to be the perfect recipe for the development of the art form of flamenco and the classical music of Manuel de Falla..

Notes on panel's commentary

We live in an extraordinary area with a lot of flamenco available to us. This company occupies a particular place in that ecology. For an artist of her stature and age, and she is fabulous, the form honors her experience. She is an important practitioner of this style. She and her daughter are carrying on a legacy. In San Francisco, we have a wide variety of expression, of artists from Spain and other traditions. Flamenco is a real cornerstone of culturally specific dances accessible in the Bay area. It's a first introduction for many people. This proposal is for a work that will be, primarily, based on a 37-minute work by the composer. She does well in the Spanish theater flamenco dance niche.

In the application, we have a long explanation of the evolution of the form. The Christian, Muslim, Gypsy, and Jewish influences, plus the context of San Francisco, is somewhat confusing. I think I understand where the narrative is going. It is trying to weave in the multicultural influences of the community in order to appreciate the art form, but there isn't a clear through line. It detracts from what we're trying to see here. It's hard to pull out what the project is. I think I know, but that's speculation based upon prior information rather than what's here in the application. They're successful in the natural occurrences of Flamenco like performing in cabaret settings in North Beach. They have been doing this bi-weekly. That's a really intense schedule. Their collaboration and relationship is with Navia from Sukay. And they mention Lamon, a Lebanese classical musician. It stops there so we don't know if that's the collaboration.

The narrative is short on laying out the actual project. We have a lot of information on the history, but the timeline doesn't give a lot of help with this. What's happening with Eddie and George? We know who will be involved, but what does the piece entail, and where does it take place? We are in the service of making multicultural connections and environments here in the Bay, not to conflate everything into ideas like 'Bay area Hispanics'. They are a very diverse group of people and it's hard to say when you're talking about the impact of the work on a viewer. I would recommend talking about the impact of the work on audiences instead of saying that it 'raises self confidence of a community'. I'm not sure that is the best way to talk about the impact of your art making. It may be many things, but in any case, I was confused where that was going. I feel like there are some pages missing here, as if some editing may have accidentally happened. The timeline is too short. They do have a good formula with admissions and work in the cabaret. They have produced mostly in the East Bay, and they have a good and loyal following. It's a beloved form in the way it is being practiced.

When I was reading this I got the same feeling. I was being educated in a form of dance, and an area of Spain, and that's all really great. They enjoy a great history. But what is mentioned in terms of collaborating doesn't go anywhere until the last paragraph. So I wish there were pages addressing the details, fleshing out the collaboration and the rehearsals. Then, I could be just as excited about that as I am about the history. When you're a cultural ambassador of the work you're doing, and a mother and daughter passing this form on, you want to document everything, it's unfortunate so much of grant application is focused on that. They missed the opportunity to talk about and get into their project.

The project budget is straightforward. They have realistic admissions and they have raised money. Good income from classes! That could have spoken to the organization's health. Earned income is important and shows they're self sustaining. I wish they talked about that and fleshed that out in the project. There were a lot of missed opportunities everywhere.

The recordings I had were 25 minutes, not 37. I'm not sure if there was a mix up. It's a big piece, in any case. It's intended to be played by a virtuosic pianist with full orchestral accompaniment, I'm not sure what they have planned for the full instrumentation, but this is a big deal. If they're taking about a piano concerto with a full orchestra, and reducing it to a smaller piece, then that's a very big job.

I also thought that there were pages missing. There's a lot of missing information. Where is this taking place? In the budget notes it mentions capacity and admissions at the Marine's theater but it was not clear; there's math that needed to be done. That made me wonder if there's other information missing. There was no breakdown of artistic expenses. I found that unfortunate.



2013 OPG Theater Arts
Panel Recommendations

Mugwumpin

Project description

Mugwumpin, a San Francisco-based theater company, requests \$15,000 to support the process of researching and creating *The Push*, an ensemble-devised theater piece exploring the tension between the limits of exhaustion and the power of human endurance. The project will consist of 2 phases. First, the company will partner with a physical rehabilitation clinic, researching experiences of bodies pushed to the limit; the ensemble will then create a fully produced performance based on that research.

Group Size

Tiny

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

They have a history of collaboration with communities that do not self-identify as artists. Regarding, the artistic quality of this project, this relationship of collaboration with rehabilitation centers is really not clear to me. It can be a difficult partnership to clarify and define. What is the role of these rehabilitation centers? The assumption is the patients in these centers are willing to participate. I wonder, as individuals, if they're into it. Rehabilitation and therapy are often very private experiences for people. It seems like a great idea but it also feels like it's in the fleshing out stage. I wasn't that intrigued by the subject matter at first, exploring prophecy in America, etc.

What foundation support is secured in the budget? There is \$30,000 listed as proposed, but only \$13,000 was shown as foundation support. They have proposed \$45,000 in ticket sales, with 1,800 people buying tickets. I thought these figures were extremely unrealistic. That's basically doubling the expected attendance from 2011. The work has been successful, and individual donor campaigns have been successful. This is the first time Mugwumpin has conducted a residency in a non-arts facility. It would have a good impact on the organization for them to see this out. It's not clear who their intended audience is. Perhaps it would be 'the disabled community', but they've had no experience reaching out to this community. It shows a non-familiarity. What I commend is that the organization went through a strategic planning process where they went dark. I always commend organizations that take the time to do this; it suggests to me that the leadership is qualified.

I'm going to be less generous in terms of content. I found this application confusing. Their examples of previous work with non-arts communities are the Mint, etc. They did nothing to convince me they are qualified to do this. It sounded invasive to me. I kept thinking they were undercutting themselves by being at once honest, but not fully going through with it. I wish they had worked with the material that first brought them to this idea. They were first interested in extreme acts of endurance. That might have been the place they entered in from, but how did we get to suddenly working with this demographic?

I thought the work samples didn't support a lot of physical theater. I didn't see evidence that talked about the feasibility of the project, based on the timeline and the scope. I don't think it's as easy as this timeline would suggest to build trust and integrate within a community.

This is a very interesting conversation because I had a very different response. I think it's because I know these people. But I'm glad to hear what you said. I don't disagree with anything that's been said. As a company, they have a very collective aesthetic, which allows them to really figure out how to solve problems together. They're really good at working with people, so I have a certain level of trust that it is possible to build trust with these people and gain access to whatever it is. They recognize the situation, and I believe they are displaying a certain sensitivity to this population. Their theater skills are valuable, and they're very good at it. I don't have the extreme response of, "they can't execute this". But they have no experience with this demographic, and that is valid.

I will echo you almost exactly. My impression was based off a certain amount of trust that these particular folks will be able to delve in there and find something. The biggest issue I have now is timeline. And I think that this shows a certain amount of naivety, because if they're really interested in working with a whole new population with a whole different set of physical abilities, that takes time. 'We are in conversation with 3 physical therapy institutions' is not enough at this stage.

My first reaction was that these are very resourceful artists who will delve in and find something interesting, but I don't know if they have enough time.

I'm basing my opinion on the application. I felt the tone was a bit condescending. It felt like they were outsiders trying to go in and do their own work and experiment with their art form by using this population. It didn't feel authentic to me. I just wasn't able to connect with the proposed project, nor with the sample.

The first sample didn't represent how they work together. But I really enjoyed the second sample. This showed their strengths.

The narrative varied a lot. It went from really sensitive, to naïve, to brutally honest. It was a little schizophrenic in that way.



2013 OPG Dance
Panel Recommendations

KUNST-STOFF

Group Size Small
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

Yannis Adoniou's KUNST-STOFF Dance Company proposes their 15-Year Anniversary Season, during which they will premiere a repertory-inspired new work that actively engages members from our diverse community. Yannis Adoniou and co-founder Tomi Paasonen will collaborate on this evening length work that reflects their years of art making history. Performers include the KUNST-STOFF company dancers alongside nine community members. The concert will take place at ODC Theater, 7-10 November 2013.

Notes on panel's commentary

Fifteen years marks an auspicious anniversary for choreographers who have produced a great deal of work and are really a cornerstone of the contemporary dance world. The idea is to mine their repertoire and create something together; to look at what it was and reinterpret it. It's really important to revisit a chronicle of one's artistic life, like a living diary of work. The premier of this would be in their home season at ODC. There is some narrative about what works will be mined. What is less clear is the timeline; it's pretty thin. The project will start in September and we'll end up with the production. We know they can produce, they produced for fifteen years, but this was just a real short cut without enough information. We can take the leap that they'll do it, as they've done it before, but if we're looking at the criteria that everyone has to adhere to, this timeline is not quite there. The other concern is that they have a deficit, and they have no notes about it or why it exists. That is an important thing to understand, as it has been there for 3-years. What happened in 2011? There has been a huge jump in attendance from 2010-2013, according to the CCDP. This speaks to the work that's being done in the Central Market community. We saw a bit of that in the work sample, involving the community as audience. The personnel bios are very strong. They have strong collaborators, and a sense of continuity with the company and collaborators. They have also spent time in the last year outside of the Bay area.

I wasn't thrilled about the first work sample. It didn't really give me a sense of the choreographer. I'm aware of the work, but that particular sample I found weak. It showed an engagement with audience but didn't show me the artistic merit of the piece. I agree that it's important for a choreographer to retrace the work that they've done, and I really like that idea. I have concerns about the deficit. In terms of the budget, I don't understand how they will be able to create this piece. The admission figures seem pretty realistic. They show \$19K in foundation support, but I don't know if this is pending. It's a big chunk that's pending. Their technical staff is pretty low pay. I wish there had been more notes speaking to the budget. Although, the attendance did go way up.

It's all virtual audience. Right?

I thought it was also because they were presented at the mid-Market festival, where there was just a larger general attendance. ... 'paid virtual attendance'. Am I reading that right? There's total paid attendance, virtual versus physical. Maybe they have some online 'pay to watch' thing?

This is where the CCDP statistics get mushy. It's like, "how do you know?"

And there are also no notes.

Their board is giving. They're getting more individual support. Their foundation money from 2010-2012 has increased a lot.

There's a jump there because he did receive a \$50,000 commission grant.

Staff: Has anyone spoken about the audience plan for this project?

I don't see one. Right?

There was no explanation about targeted audience that I saw.

I also found it strange that they didn't bother to explain the deficit. Also, regarding the sample, if this project is about mining past works, why would these not be represented in the sample? I've seen his solo work before, and the second sample was great. But I found it curious that there were rare, specific works in this retrospective and they're not being shown.

For me, the tone was set when I saw their continuing deficit. It informed me of the health of the organization, and their ability to carry this project through. This is an organization that needs to address its infrastructure. And then getting into the narrative, there were some descriptions of what they thought might happen, but it wasn't exactly a plan.

Staff: And our policy is that if you have a deficit, you should address it.

Right, they were the only applicant that had a deficit and did not acknowledge it at all. It's an indicator of risk for me.



FY2012-2013 Organization Project Grant- Visual, Literary and Media

RANKING

Panel Rating	Organizaton	Grant Request	Grant Amount
116.2	3rd i South Asian Independent Film Festival	\$15,000	\$12,750
111	Queer Women of Color Media Arts Project	\$15,000	\$12,750
103.5	Radar Productions	\$15,000	\$12,750
100.8	Chrysalis Studio	\$13,000	\$11,050
100	San Francisco Transgender Film Festival (Tranny Fest)	\$7,900	\$6,715
99.8	Root Division	\$15,000	\$12,750
96.8	Center for the Art of Translation	\$15,000	\$12,750
94.8	Southern Exposure	\$15,000	\$12,750
94.5	Girl Talk	\$10,000	\$7,500
94.5	Out of Site: Center for Arts Education	\$15,000	\$11,250
93.8	ArtSpan	\$15,000	\$11,250
93.2	San Francisco Silent Film Festival	\$15,000	\$11,250
93	Asian Contemporary Arts Consortium San Francisco	\$15,000	\$11,250
91.5	Litquake	\$15,000	\$11,250
90.8	Sixth Street Photography Workshop	\$15,000	\$11,250
89.3	San Francisco Independent Film Festival	\$14,000	\$0
87.8	Writers Among Artists	\$4,200	\$0
86.5	Kearny Street Workshop	\$15,000	\$0
86.3	Kulintang Arts Inc.	\$15,000	\$0
83.5	Small Press Traffic Literary Arts Center	\$15,000	\$0
78.2	Chinese Culture Foundation of San Francisco	\$15,000	\$0
77.5	Precita Eyes Muralists Association, Inc.	\$15,000	\$0
73.4	San Francisco Cinematheque	\$15,000	\$0
67.5	American Indian Film Institute	\$15,000	\$0
66	PhotoAlliance	\$15,000	\$0
45.5	Diasporic Vietnamese Artists Network	\$7,500	\$0
30.8	Artists Guild of San Francisco	\$15,000	\$0
TOTAL		\$371,600	\$169,265

**Cultural Equity Grants
FY2012-2013 Operational Project Grants – Visual, Literary, & Media
Panelists**

Santhosh Daniel

Director of Programs, Global Film Initiative

Santhosh Daniel is Director of Programs at the Global Film Initiative, a San Francisco-based arts organization with a focus in grantmaking, film exhibition and distribution, and public education. Mr. Daniel oversees all programs at the Initiative, with emphasis on film granting and programming, business management and development, international relations, and community programs. Prior to his work at the Initiative, Mr. Daniel was a creative consultant in the arts, entertainment, and technology sectors. He also worked extensively in academic publishing, and as a writer and editor for arts and culture publications, independent literary and film projects, and collaborative works with writers, visual artists and filmmakers in the United States, India and Mexico. Mr. Daniel is current Board President of the Puerto Rico Film Society and a Board member of the Ninth Street Independent Film Center. He has sat on a variety of funding panels for independent and creative media, and presented on film funding and distribution at festivals and conferences worldwide. Mr. Daniel holds a B.A. in English from the University of Washington and a M.F.A. in English from the University of Iowa.

Mimi Lok

Executive Director/Editor, McSweeney's Voice of Witness Series

Mimi Lok is a writer and arts educator, and serves as the executive director/editor of the McSweeney's *Voice of Witness* series. She holds a B.A. in Fine Art from Northumbria University, U.K., and an M.F.A. in Creative Writing from San Francisco State University. She has lived and worked in England, Hong Kong and the U.S., and has contributed to various publications, including the Washington Post, USA Today, Hyphen, Dimsum, and nimble. As well as her work with *Voice of Witness*, Mimi consults for literary and arts education programs around the world. She lives in San Francisco with her husband, artist Julien Lallemand.

Renny Pritikin

Senior Adjunct Professor, California College of the Arts

Renny Pritikin was the director of New Langton Arts and the chief curator of Yerba Buena Center for the Arts. While at those institutions, he gave early support to the careers of such artists as Nancy Rubins, Nayland Blake, Fred Tomaselli, Tim Hawkinson, and many others. Pritikin is known for working with figures from outside the fine arts in the museum context such as Ed "Big Daddy" Roth, the auto customizer; Syd Mead the visual futurist and "Blade Runner" designer; Don Ed Hardy, the tattoo master; and Ricky Jay, the master sleight-of-hand artist, cultural historian, and collector.

Pritikin is the current director of the Richard L. Nelson Gallery and the Fine Arts Collection at UC Davis. He recently has written catalog essays for painter Cornelia Schulz (Pat Sweetow Gallery); multimedia artist Julia Couzens (Cal State Stanislaus); sculptor Tony May (retrospective at San Jose Institute for Contemporary Art); painter John Bankston (beta pictoris Gallery, Birmingham, and reprinted in *Art Paper*, Atlanta; a forthcoming catalog for visual artists Jim Melchert and Nancy Genn, Sanchez Art Center, Pacifica, California, 2011; and an essay in the book *Trimpin: Contraptions for Art and Sound* (Marquand Books, 2011). Pritikin was a commissioned columnist for the SFMOMA Open Space blog throughout 2010 and is a regular contributor to the online critical journal *Art Practical. Proximity*, a Chicago-based art magazine, published an extensive interview with Pritikin in 2009 and his essay "On Otherness in the Arts" in 2010.

He has lectured in Japanese museums as a guest of the USIA; toured Israel as a Koret Israel Prize Fellow; was the curator chosen to represent the United States at the Cuenca (Ecuador) Bienal; and lectured in three cities in New Zealand as a Fulbright Fellow. In 2010 he was visiting lecturer at Pacific Northwest College of Art in Portland, Oregon. In addition to teaching at CCA, Pritikin has taught art administration and artist professional skills training at California State University, San Francisco, and Golden Gate University. Renny has also authored three books of poetry, most recently *How We Talk* (POD Press, 2007).

Ani Rivera

Executive Director, Galería de la Raza

Executive Director Ani Rivera joined the Galería in 2004 and served as the Business Manager through 2007; she joined the Board of Directors in 2010. In 2007, she became the Compliance Specialist at Community Initiatives, a nonprofit fiscal sponsor located in San Francisco, CA, where she worked for five years. Project and contract management was a central function of her position. She provided operation administration for a \$16 million revenue portfolio (most recent audit). The portfolio is composed from contributions from private foundations, local city, and federal government agencies providing funding to support the operations of 90 fiscally sponsored projects. In the project management capacity, she provided in depth one-on-one counseling to projects on budget development, program goals, work plan and evaluation designs to accommodate each project's unique operations.



2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations

3rd i South Asian Independent Film Festival

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$12,750

Project description

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support the 11th Anniversary South Asian International Film Festival at the Castro and New People Theaters in November 2013. Curated by 3rd i's Artistic Director Ivan Jaigirdar, the 5-day Festival will screen approximately 12 programs (full length features, documentaries and short films) by independent South Asian filmmakers. The Festival will attract an estimated 5000 ticket buyers; approximately 65% will be Bay Area South Asian Americans.

Notes on panel's commentary

This isn't a new program; it's a standard film festival that is very professionally run. The work samples were at a high level. They're already broadly distributed. I would have liked them to address the distinction from the Asian American film festival (CAAM). What's their mission in regards to that context? The qualifications and experience are first rate. The director has an impressive resume. The clarity and feasibility are fine. I like the idea of the woman theme, especially in that culture. It is well chosen and not easy to decide. With the thoroughness of the implementation plan, the first rate promo material, and the great big staff, they really are a model small organization. They have strong ticket sales, strong business and corporate giving, and an accumulated surplus of 6 months, which is what you're supposed to have. I like that our grant request is all to pay for artist fees. The impact again, like so many of our applicants, continues their service to the community, but is not necessarily innovative. They have audience of 5k and a sophisticated use of Facebook. They have been around for a decade. They don't have any board giving listed and not much individual giving, but they are very strong on earned, foundation and corporate giving. The board is small, which is my one managerial criticism. Otherwise, I'm very impressed.

Staff: We've seen in the past with the CCDP, board contributions are sometimes listed under individual contributions. Sometimes that is the explanation. It's not clear.

Again, I echo that I am very impressed with the quality of the work samples, the quality of the production. They really gave us the story of the whole community involvement and supporters. I am really impressed with the proposal, the first rate publicity. The stories are very compelling and speak to a global marginalized community. To be fair, I should bring up that we see the same thing happening, in regards to too much reliance on one person. It makes sense to develop the board, administrative staff, etc. Overall this is a really well put together project. Regarding the audience, the theater looked sold out and the audience looked engaged. They had photos of the event, live video, and a really comprehensive sample, a very savvy choice. In terms of competitiveness, this one really stood out to me.

It's unclear to me if it's a film selection committee or curatorial board. Is there the infrastructure to support the AD?

At it's worst, traditionally, it's a red flag if there's a small board and the director is in control and does not want to be questioned. The director is one of the five board members; it's a minor concern.

In terms of how the director is supported, there is a long list of seasonal staff. It is a good combination of paid and volunteer staff. Another reason I liked this proposal as that it had a really sound audience outreach plan. They knew whom they were and how to reach them. It is impressive all around.



2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations

Queer Women of Color Media Arts Project

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

This proposal requests \$15,000 to support QWOCMAP's 10th annual Queer Women of Color Film Festival in June 2014. This free 3-day Film Festival will world premiere films from around the globe and showcase 30 new QWOCMAP films in 5 screening programs, panel discussions and audience engagement events. The Festival Focus, Re-Generation: Strong LBTQ Families of Color, will draw anticipated audiences of 3,000 people including youth, elders and families from the throughout the nation and world.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

On the quality of the samples, they were very professional. The theme that they're exploring and the way they go about curating, allows for the festival to stay innovative and on top of current issues. It was really savvy. Maybe you do have a lot of the same audiences, but new themes and dialogue happening. The leadership in place seems to have the technical skills and strong civic engagement necessary to push the mission forward. Within the leadership there is also a lot of staffing involved, which is savvy about this organization compared to other film festivals focused around a nucleus.

I feel like a leadership in the board that is also present on staff shifts the focus of the organization to a broader range, which is great. The basis of the festival comes from providing training to artists and individuals. They also find ways to bring in income. One of things I noticed is the change in venue. Regarding target impact on audience, I wanted to know a little bit more. I wanted to know more about the move to YBCA and now the move to the Castro Theater, targeting outreach, assuming same demographic, etc. I also noticed they went from having a consultancy staff to staff employees. I was curious about this move. Why now? I wanted more information. Overall, it's a great program. It's relevant and fits within the CEG guidelines. The change of theme in every festival is commendable.

There's something really refreshing about seeing an entire festival change its name every year and allow that festival to be free for audiences. It's not easy to do that, especially in this city. It's a great opportunity. I like what they're doing. Their focus this year is on families. It is timely and contemporary. I have a few questions about the actual funding and what it is going to be applied to. It sounds like the festival takes place in San Francisco and also in other places around the world.

Staff: That's distribution; the festival is here.

Ok, so the funds will stay in the city, got it. That was a red flag, but good. Aside from that, the other place I would comment on is the infrastructure. They seem to have a sound approach to what they're doing; it would be good to know more about what's going on internally. You want to see what the vision is for longevity and sustainability. We want to keep these organizations going with the funds. The thing that I would say as a criticism is they're underestimating or under explaining their impact; I wonder why. They're global and they're tapping into a huge demographic, and it's not explained very well here. I know we can assume that they do tap into it, but as a proposal, you really want to know what that demographic is for the funds to be used properly.

One more thing I left out, there's a conscious effort to outreach every year to 15-20 partners; this is phenomenal. They're using these partners to further their audiences and raise their profile. Looking at the list of sponsors, it's huge. So why aren't they talking about that impact? This is an organization that has a 13-year history. Regarding their changing themes every year, etc., this organization is the opposite of complacency. It's terrific.

I wasn't familiar with this organization at all. They blew me away. This was one of the best-written grant applications I've ever read. It is so clear and there is no BS. It's thorough. The large number of grants took my breath away including the multi-year grants. No other applicant has come close to this organization. They gave us complete backgrounds on board and advisors, very impressive. Whoever runs this place is really a pro. They have 3 full-time employees with benefits, amazing! The one negative I would say is I thought their work samples were really dull, predictable and disappointing. I'm going to agree. I thought they'd be more vibrant. The proposal is so strong that you expect more. I still think they're good; they just don't have that energy that comes off the pages of the proposal. For me it was a conflict between the content and the presentation. There were certain things that jumped out at me from the folks in the film, but the way it was edited or the quality of the film, didn't quite serve the content. So maybe it's just selecting a more diverse series of clips.



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Radar Productions

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

This proposal requests \$15000 to support the world premiere of Valencia and 6 interpretive programs during the San Francisco International LGBT Film Festival in late June 2013. The project comprises film screenings, live music performances, panel discussions, a visual arts exhibition and interactive programs featuring the film's director and cast. Awarded funds will support the project's production costs, including honoraria paid to speakers and panelists, venue rental and insurance.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

I really liked this project; it's really interesting. It stood out to me from the others because it's doing something different with film. It's a collaborative film, 18 actors, 18 directors, tapping into SF history, so in that sense, by definition of what the project is, in terms of impact, it has the potential for very strong community impact. It has built-in outreach due to the number of participants. There is something very unique about this. In terms of the film itself, looking at the quality of it, I can't say I was that impressed; they were very literal. But it's ok. The questions that I have primarily center around what the money is actually supporting. They've got a lot of the plan laid out, everything else is clear. The budget is the one thing that isn't clear. The example is venue. The budget allocates funding for "venue rental", but in parts of the application, it states "Frameline is underwriting the venue". The last line says "honoraria, insurance, etc.", but then they say Frameline is the venue. Anyways, it's a general statement, but I was just not able to track the money and how it's being spent. Even though some items are clearly stated in the budget.

They do say Frameline will cover the Castro, but there are six other events they have to pay for.

What are the six events? Where are they?

They are the parallel activities to the film screenings, the panels and lectures, live music, etc.

The panels are listed out, actually.

I see. The last paragraph on page 3 talking about "human resources..." I read this as - these expenses are already paid for by the existing budget.

I read it as though they have staff on hand, so they won't have to recruit or hire, but they still need the funds; it could just be the language.

They haven't named the panelist, speakers, etc.

Right, so that whole paragraph just got me a little turned around, but as a project, I find it very interesting.

This was a really excellent, vivid and compelling proposal. I could visualize what it was going to be. It seemed really clear what they wanted to achieve. I quite liked work sample, actually. I enjoyed the animated bit, which didn't seem literal to me at all. Some of the different interpretations that are suggested in the narrative, I would have liked that diversity to be reflected a little bit more. I didn't have much to add to what's been said in regards to target audience and impact. I'm wondering about the organization as a whole, it seems to have such a strong audience base that there's a lot of potential to increase their donor revenue through that pool. There's an impressive board here. I did notice that the board-giving amount had declined, in 2010 it was \$2.5K and now it's \$2.4K. I'm wondering what happened there.

Staff: In the budget notes, relating to the board, it says the board has contributed in other ways, shifting support from a straight donation to supporting other endeavors.

Then I would consider a give or get and personal contribution for projects of this quality, when the board gives.

Buying tickets to an organization's events is not giving; it's standard.

It's an exciting project; this is serving a lot of artists. There has a real strong following and it's an audience that's definitely engaged. That being said, the six events, for me, seem a bit too much, especially with all the artist talks, panels, etc. It's exciting to do all this, but considering the timeline, there is so much going on in June, as an overly saturated month. There is diversity in how they're doing it - evening, daytime and diverse events, but getting audiences to come to all this, I have questions. It's tough to engage audiences that long. There's just a lot going on; I would recommend one



**2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations**

day or two day.

In response to that, you can justify packing a lot of events in a short amount if you're reaching different audiences. I see a diverse audience, but there is some overlap. So you have a point.

But in general, it's great. The film is going to be presented and it will be great to see all those different communities reflected. I really want to see it now.

There are two points I wanted to point out. They have a substantial surplus, to their credit. The other thing that was odd to me is that in the project budget, they have zero for admissions, but in the notes, they say that the money goes through Frameline's budget. I'm skeptical of that. Frameline is not going to keep that \$10,000, are they? What this does is allow them to ask for more money from SFAC.

Staff: What we aren't told is if there is admission connected to the other events.

That's very good, that should be reported. They're going to make money off those events.

In terms of Frameline, if it's a marquis exhibition, the festivals tend to take the entire box office over to the exhibition costs. I'm wondering if that's what they're doing.

So, if we are just talking about the one screening at Frameline, typically they would take the whole box office and not give to the film. I haven't seen any film organization ever return the money to the filmmaker in that situation. I say that because at my organization, we lease the film, it's a flat fee, they pay us and they take the box office.

So, is this part of Frameline's festival?

That's how I read it. But we don't know if the other events they've outlined will be revenue generating. And if not, is it a free event? This should be clarified.

So, if Radar isn't the presenter, what is their role? I don't quite understand.

They're the curator, for sure.

They're the event organizer of the entire six events.

Is Radar the fiscal agent for Frameline?

Staff: This project looks like one of Radar's programs. Certain venues and presentations are through partnerships with organizations, and others are straight rentals.

This is the way I see it. Radar is providing the content and Frameline is providing the platform.

In any case, these details need to be made clear. The project budget notes need clarification as well.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Chrysalis Studio

Project description

This proposal requests \$13,000 to organize an exhibition of linocut prints exploring Queer Ancestry at the LGBT Center in April 2014. Ten emerging artists aged 18 to 26 will create the prints in a free sixteen-week workshop at Chrysalis Studio in SOMArts. The project will build community through the arts, connect Queer young artists with their ancestors, and provide the wider community a glimpse of a collective future that integrates the wisdom of our past.

Group Size

Tiny

Request:

\$13,000

Recommended:

\$11,050

Notes on panel's commentary

The project proposes an intergenerational relationship and focuses on building relationships. I don't see a direct connection to the final product. Even though the idea is there it need to be flushed out. Emerging artists seem to be creating great samples but it is not reflective in the proposal. I didn't understand impact in terms of project. I felt it read as a social service project and an art project but the proposal isn't as strong as it could be. My concern is that they state that the project's been successful, but if two-thirds of the applicants are rejected, how successful is the project? If it's supposed to be a safe haven for youth, turning two-thirds down is a lot.

I have a different reaction. This is working with youth and their work products were terrific. They're working with an old fashioned form, which is difficult but beautiful. I like historical research on queer history; it is cutting edge.

The leadership is impressive. The project is clear and explicit. They did it once, so they can do it again.

The budget wasn't as strong as the proposal; 65% of income is to come from this grant and foundations.

It is in line with their mission. The youth and audience are exposed to research on queer history. The host is established in community.

Their financial health ok; it is not impressive but not worrisome. The board is unusually strong.

I love the concept of this: using art to speak on queer history. It requires them to understand the history of the medium and art history. This part is compelling. I wonder about ancestry: how easily are the youth going to connect and follow through with it in the project. It is a good idea to speak about queer history. That in its self is new and engaging. I am wondering how they are going to fully communicate their concept to their audience.

Why question if they will be able to communicate?

The concept of ancestry spans generations and aesthetics. When speaking with emerging artists, how will they explain this concept and get them to buy into this. The artistic vision may be too complicated for youth.

The ages are actually 18-26 years old.

The concept is smart. There's a through line with artistic vision and they become part of more immediate ancestry. The cuts were interesting. The proposal read well; but how does it connect with the bigger concept? Including some artist statements could have helped.

Staff: On page 1 there is a quote from a participant in program matching their expectations and abilities.

It's not a huge concern, but seeing 2 pages of artistic vision made me wonder if they'll grasp the concept of ancestry.

Since the space is donated by the host. I expected the in-kind amount to be more significant. (On 3yr budget table). Their cost is \$800 but the rest is donated by SOMArts. I imagine the value would be higher. What's the real cost?

I thought about whether there's a space in the application for the applicant to address certain questions. Has this been done before? Is anyone else doing this? Is this just happening in the city?

They do talk about the demographics that fall outside the youth workshops, which is unique.

Staff: They've gone to Native communities as well. It's been an evolution of what they've seen as a need.



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

Just a curiosity about what's being done in other cities.

I would've appreciated that because I had a hard time with what they are doing and why. If they connected it to the larger issues, it would've been helpful. They say why they are doing it but what is the success in regards to suicide, fair education trust act etc., and how is that shaping what they are doing?

My understanding is that queer youth have a suicide problem because of a lack of understanding of their queer history. They've been isolated. It's about pride and looking at that historical line back.

In the application it explains why this age range is prioritized. Providing a network to create community support acts as a way to address suicide and other challenges in the community. They talk about this in the project impact. There's an urgency that was articulated.



2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Transgender Film Festival

Project description

This proposal requests \$7,900 to support the four-night 12th annual San Francisco Transgender Film Festival at CounterPulse in November 2013. Awarded funds will support the curatorial fee of Artistic Director Shawna Virago, the Festival's marketing expenses and the venue's rental costs.

Group Size

Tiny

Request:

\$7,900

Recommended:

\$6,715

Notes on panel's commentary

The relevance for this community and breadth of topics tackled, even in the few clips we saw, is very high. The documentary scene is quite powerful; the wit of self-satire is refreshing.

The production values on the Vimeo clips are not as high as I'd like to see.

The organization leans heavily on its director and increasingly on its advisory board. There is a reasonable amount of experience on the board; more than adequate festival experience.

The project clarity and feasibility is high. There is a long track record, which has upgraded in professionalism over the past 5 years.

They have solid fiscal support. The budget is very modest, but grant money is trickling in. They are increasingly their commitment to pay one staff member for more hours. There's an intention; this is a pivotal year, as director hours and salary have been increased.

They are adding a 4th night of programming and building better infrastructure. This is a small but vital community. The argument is made well that this festival is a cornerstone of the community; the festival is central to this process of community building. Based on their credibility, their plans for audience are likely achievable. The qualifications for administration and staff are adequate.

The overall financial health is ok, for a new organization taking first steps. They have a history of growing roots in the community and success.

I echo a lot of that. It has a lot of potential. I want to praise the collaborators. They're doing a great job. My concern is regarding what I think is a lot of pressure on the director; the project is very heavily based on one person. Looking at the advisory committee, they need more outreach to build more infrastructures to support the director. But they're on track. Its been 12 years and I hope to see more come from this group.

The video sample production quality I agree needs to be higher. The content, however, was amazing. I loved the multilingual approach and different economic perspectives. It's really well rounded.

I am in agreement regarding the pressure being put on one person. They need to hear our comments about this. The project is great in vision, execution, and smarts, but it puts itself in a dangerous place having it all rest on one person like that. If that person goes, then the idea goes, and we see it all the time in theaters. From a funding standpoint, the question is do you fund something like that? Sometimes, yes, but you really need to look at how to create this support and infrastructure to support the future generations of what you're doing, or else, our funding is not really investing in the future of this organization.

They're adding another date to the festival, and I'm curious if they've done any analysis on the impact of the fourth night. Is it because they want to show more video or for the audience, etc.?

Staff: They state that it is due to demand.

Why not choose a bigger venue instead of an extra night. I would advise to them to do a review of venue, maybe a bigger venue is better if their demand is so high. Then, if you have the demand, you can have more ticket sales, you can start building some roots and start growing. I would advise them to look at that.

The work sample was funny and ran the gamut of emotions for me. My only question was in terms of audience. There seems to be a bit of a dissonance between challenging mainstream media's stereotypes of transgender, but their audience is nearly all transgender and queer. If part of the outcome is to challenge the mainstream, surely you want



**2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations**

some straight folks/mainstream audience to be engaged as well.

I read that as challenging [stereotypes] for their selves. That they're bombarded with images through the media, and they're going to develop a culture that counters that.

It's clear that they're creating their own narrative, but I grew up without any real role models for Asian people, and I saw the most impact when communities formed counter narratives and blended it with this time and age. With all the opportunities for cross-pollination, some thought should be given to diversifying their audience. It seems that in the media it's either one extreme or the other. I'm wondering if they're thinking about bringing some of these stories to and/or infiltrating the mainstream media. That would offer up a wider platform, perhaps.

It's true, maybe a political one for that project but we don't have enough info.

Staff: I want to go back to sustainability. It looks like the information is there. They're talking about building an advisory board, forming an outreach committee, and also compensating the AD, appropriately. How does this affect what you're seeing with this organization, at this juncture, with this budget size? Is this an appropriate strategy?

It's clear that that's what they're planning for. I read it, and the festival is at this point where the demand has increased. A question comes up for me from operational standpoint. I start wondering what is the drawback, what is halting them from expanding. Did they just put that on the proposal to make it seem more sustainable? They say a small budget limits their ability to be affective, and you wonder what that means for the future. What are you really trying to be, if you're being small scale, etc.? If someone is hinting at an expansion, it becomes important to look at it from an operational funding standpoint; what are you really supporting and is there a plan for that. The planning that goes behind this must be pretty significant.

Staff: What is the average kind of facility space rental for a bigger space than CounterPulse?

Depends on their connections; they have a strong connection with Frameline and others. Speaking from my experience, if you collaborate with the right institution, you can get a theater of 300-400 for a \$600. But you have to look at the whole program, etc. I think CounterPulse only fits about 100 folks.

It could just be where their audience feels comfortable. Maybe they're not comfortable at YBCA.

Staff: Right. So considering factors like audience comfort, not just that they are growing so they should get a bigger venue, is there more to add.

You're right, it is a legitimate point, but if you work in non profits, you see institutions blossom and grow built on a dynamic leader, and then leader burns out and moves to New York. What's left for the institution then?

That's all it is, then. You worry if this fourth day adding on is a tipping point or the best thing in the world. It's a great event and much needed.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Root Division

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The Second Saturday Exhibition Series is a collection of visual art events taking place on the 2nd Saturday of every month. By presenting eclectic & engaging work in an approachable atmosphere, the project draws a diverse range of 3600+ visitors and broadens the arts- interested public while offering exhibition/curatorial opportunities to 350 + emerging artists. Funding would support our efforts to diversify our audience & participants as well as to produce 12 high-quality exhibitions.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

This has a really strong community aspect to it. In terms of quality of proposal, there's no doubt about the quality. As a proposal, it's one of the most clearly articulated in terms of how it will impact the audience and how it will use the gallery space. It is very clear how it's going to be activated. The vision is very strong. The quality and soundness is clear. The architecture laid out is very strong and I have confidence that whatever funds they get will be put to good use. In the capabilities and resources section, their statement is especially strong.

In terms of impact on audience, this again is being inferred based on participation. This is the biggest question I have with the proposal. The summary says something like 'the focus is to diversify their audience with 12 high quality exhibitions, but I don't see a strategy for diversifying audience and increasing participation. A couple things stand out specifically, like ensuring success by participation of youth and families and 40% artists of color. Both of these are desirable targets, but what do they really mean? What are the metrics being used here and what are the strategies? The creative statement is the only action. There is a very slim description. This seems grossly inadequate to qualify what they're asking. Regarding, children and families and the 40% artist of color target, what's the comparison? What's the engagement strategy? A small line talks about creating Latino teaching artists, a community cultural center etc., but it's not a compelling case for how its going to be done. That's my main criticism. That said, I still think it is one of the strongest proposals that we have. In terms of what the proposal is, the Second Saturday program is what they're looking for funding for. Diversifying audiences is an organizational goal.

It's interesting that its not usual strategy for organizations like this to use their education programs to bring in the diversity. But that is what they're doing it seems. It's a classic artist space with lots of young artists. The work samples are unusually strong. The leadership seems quite dedicated and has been with the organization for a long time. Their growth record reflects well. The clarity and feasibility is strong based on their track record. The implementation is impressive including the history and documentation. Getting on the Warhol support system is huge and very difficult. In the whole country there's only a handful that get it, so that is impressive. They require dollar contributions per board member, impressive. Attendance is high for a small organization. Their board has lots of businesses. They have a cash reserve and a growing income. The critique about their strategy is quite apt.

That was the main thing that stuck out for me too. They seem to show a real awareness, and level of maturity in how they run their organization. They are worth supporting. When they say they work with underserved youth, I wonder if the artists get any training and ask what is the quality of that relationship.

I agree that the extended diversification outlook plan needs to be fleshed out.

Staff: So in general, it sounds like in that area, you wanted more details about what these partnerships would look like and what the exchange of resources is.

The statements being made here are really sincere, they are defined goals, but they're very big statements to make without qualifying them in some way. Separating that out, it's still a great project and worthy of support, but you don't bring that up in a proposal and just leave it hanging like that.

Yes, what's your starting point, what's the metric, and why do you think it is necessary etc.?

Staff: I'm wondering, since the focus of the project is around curation. Is there something more specific you can comment on?

Just do it so there can be no confusion from the panel what they're addressing. They're just throwing it out to score points. But where are you starting from, why did you pick these goals, and how will you do it?



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Center for the Art of Translation

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The Two Voices reading series spotlights international writers and translators, presenting thought-provoking literature from around the world. Events bring world-class writers and translators to local audiences and provide a venue for important cultural dialogue and exchange. Featuring bilingual readings and performances of fresh new literature from around the world, Two Voices serves the ethnically and linguistically diverse Bay Area and offers the global community online access to compelling conversations through video, podcast, and social media.

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

I have a natural bias towards projects that involve translation, because they're a critical aspect of the arts that is being lost. As a literary standpoint, it's very good a project like this exists. They are bringing in international writers, and people here will translate the work produced. I wouldn't say the proposal itself really talks about that, but inherently it's valuable. What seems to be missing from the proposal is an explanation of why something like this is important. I feel like it's not really talked about here. We talk about artistic quality and excellence, and this isn't presenting to us why this is valuable. Yes, it's somebody translating the work of a known artist into English so people can have access, but I think it's underselling itself. The true value of it doesn't come out. I can see that there were things that could have been said here that weren't. In terms of project planning, it's very clear that it will carry on. It's received funding before, and it seems to be doing well. One critical comment, there's something interesting about this in that if it is meant to translate works from writers around the world for people here, the online component seems to be a critical public access point. One point I noticed that is definitively missing from this is anything that talks about this. We all know where the future is headed, and looking at things online is almost part and parcel of anything dealing with public arts exhibitions these days. The budget has \$1,000 for advertising. I'm not sure if that has to do with the online process. In terms of vision, it's a critical missing point. That said, it's a really good, stable project. I have difficulty in assessing its impact on audience. On page sixteen of 26, there is a part that talks about the online presence. It's just not as tied to this project as it could be. That needs to be emphasized. Talking about it in the vision statement and in the budget, if funds are going to it. Maybe it's just an omission, but I think it's critical to mention.

They do say that this offers the global community online access, social media, etc. But, you're right. They don't point us there, or tell us what resources they're putting there.

Staff: They have staff time devoted to seeing online and other audience development in the project budget on line twenty. It's brief.

It helps us infer that they are doing it. I was impressed. I haven't heard of this organization, but it's original. The way it's relevant to cultural equity is in the linguistic democracy. It's very high-level material, with high-level people, artists and academics. They have a \$500,000 budget from foundations. I suspect family foundations. It's an impressive, professional organization. My only real question concerns the budget. Two-thirds of the budget is for salary? That's pretty unusual. I'm not sure what that indicates. And then, I'm wondering whom they're targeting. Are they academics, populists?

In response, they don't emphasize this. My general impression is that they're all top shelf renowned authors, but they also give a platform for lesser known, younger artists and translators as well. It doesn't come across, but there's a general sense. Some of their events are more academic perhaps, but some are really, really lively, such as the linguistic equivalent of a demolition derby. It's not just a celebration of renowned artists, it's a participatory and youthful and energetic organization. That's one element of their audience that has potential for growth that's not cited here.

You can also see where they've held their events like the Latin American Club. I agree that you have to make that more explicit. Who is that audience? This is another proposal that really is using the Consulate as a strategic partner, and we have to look at that. Why the consulate? I find it interesting.

This one makes more sense, because they're international.

You know one of the aspects of bringing in the consulate is that it's one of the only tangible links of bringing it to San Francisco. Other proposals don't have this form of cultural diplomacy through the arts.

The work sample did not do the application justice. They were almost two completely different things for me. I had to stop and reread this application to appreciate it. I would advise them to edit their samples. The value of the translation, and the whole process wasn't relevant in the dialogue. It was very personal, casual. It didn't really support this at all.

2013 Organization Project Grants - Visual, Literary, & Media Summaries

2013 OPG Literary Arts

Panel Recommendations



They looked like two different programs. I would have chosen a different work sample. Perhaps an event based sample that's as dynamic as possible.

I understood having the website as a sample. It was a lot better at working with the narrative to support it.



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

Southern Exposure

Project description

Mission Voices focuses on arts-based community development by pairing local artists and teens through an intensive summer program with the goal of producing a major exhibition and several events that is presented to the public at Southern Exposure. Lead artists, interns, site staff, youth leaders and 40 youth come together to create artwork around a self-selected, socially relevant theme on view in July-August 2013.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$12,750

Notes on panel's commentary

The project has a strong artistic vision. They have a 17-year history that is tried and true. And yet, they are constantly improving through experience. I like the tiered leadership structure they have. In terms of the clarity and feasibility of project goals, I would have liked more information as to what they would want participants to leave with. They're not stated as clearly as they could be. The work sample conveyed the participatory element, interacting with the work, etc. effectively. What was harder to make out was the quality of the work. Perhaps, because there was such a great turn out, the focus wasn't given to the works. In terms of project planning, the implementation could have used a bit more clarity. I think there were some typos in the dates. I would have liked to have more of a sense of the different stages, such as how they're broken down, the activities, and the trips. In terms of the budget, it looks like they've identified divers regarding funding sources. The projections are based on previous years. It definitely furthers their mission. Regarding their impact on target audience, with such a long history, organizations make assumptions about audience. But some data would have lifted the narrative a bit. Getting a sense of the kind of students that are served and their experiences would be nice. They partner with a lot of relevant organizations, which demonstrates the diversity. Overall, with their track record and history, they have the capacity and ability to carry out the project. They have a decreasing deficit, so looks like they're addressing that. I had one question about the CCDP notes on item seven, page five, gallery publication sales jumps up to \$86,000, and I didn't see any notes on that. Overall, a bit more clarity would help. They have a strong vision and are serving a diverse community. It's a very well thought out project.

Staff: In clarifying the timeline and implementation, they say that the themes will be determined by the youth. But, we don't know them yet.

But, we don't know the process about how they're doing it. It's the 17th year, so even if they have placeholders, that would have helped.

It's critical to this kind of proposal. In the second paragraph description of the organization, it says it's a nationally recognized artist and education program, etc. It says all these things it does, and if the theme for 2013 is to be determined by the youth, that should be discussed. It's hard to fund something if you don't know what you're supporting. The process to benefit the youth needs to be discussed. It's a critical element missing from the proposal. It doesn't make it a negative point. I believe they can carry out what they say. But for me, from an evaluation perspective, it's something that I really want to know. Otherwise, we're funding on faith based on what they've done in the past. In addition to that, the only other thing I'd say is it'd be nice to have more information on what's been done in previous years, such as testimonials on impact, etc. With 5,000 students, there's got to be at least five that can tell us the impact the organization has had on their life. We're investing in a youth program. You're investing in a future they're trying to help build, and you want to see what that future is going to be. An elaboration on why they're partnering with these organizations and the depth of the collaborations would have been helpful. I can infer, but I don't want to make an assumption.

It's very broad. What high schools? Explain the relationship. They do say the partners connect them with lower socio-economic students. They could have been clearer. Yes, you want to see the process front and back, and if we're looking at everything on the same playing field, demanding the same rigor from everyone else, we need to see this. But looking at the track record, maybe there's leeway to go a little on faith.

Maybe someone can point me to the clear number of youth being served this year? Yes, the narrative says that they've served 5,000 youth throughout their history. What is it for this particular year? I don't think we have a number on that. That's a good catch.

They want about 35-45 youth, with three teaching artists and assistants. But getting back to the specificity of youth served, they do elaborate a little more on the kind of youth demographic they serve, such as substance prevention programs, new immigrant youth, etc. Tying this to their partner organizations would have been useful.

Overall, this organization has a great track record. We know there is history there, and I would have liked more detail to

2013 Organization Project Grants - Visual, Literary, & Media Summaries



2013 OPG Visual Arts Panel Recommendations

understand the impact, but again, great organization. Great work, and they're always impressive. I do agree that on the work samples, I would have liked more focus on the quality of work, because that's also something that needs to be nurtured. Well supported by staff and the Board.

Something out of curiosity, why was their federal funding cut? I wouldn't put something like that into an application. The merits of the organization stand alone rather than introducing this emergency-funding scenario. Or just say why, if you're going to include it.



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Girl Talk

Project description

This proposal requests \$10,000 to support two performances of *Girl Talk's* Fifth Anniversary production at the African American Art & Culture Complex during the National Queer Arts Festival on June 26 and 27, 2013. This multi-media spoken word performance will explore relationships of all kinds between transgender and non-transgender women, and will build alliances and promote solidarity among Queer women. SFAC funding will underwrite the participating artists' fees, space rental costs and insurance expenses.

Group Size

Tiny

Request:

\$10,000

Recommended:

\$7,500

Notes on panel's commentary

The theme and concept were very timely. This is a dialogue that's been happening in this community. It's been going for some time; it still resonates and is very timely. I like the idea of creating this space and continuing the dialogue.

In terms of the artistic quality of the work sample, I wish I had seen more diversity. Some of the artists identified in the program weren't featured and it felt like a one-sided conversation. That is something to think about.

I would like to see the 'other' community that they're addressing. This may need to be developed, eventually. Maybe this isn't the time yet but I would have liked to see the long-term vision.

In terms of funding, they can get all the fundraising and balance their budgets; in online campaign donations they are projecting to raise \$1K. As all of us know, no matter the amount, there's a lot of effort that goes into online campaigns, so I would like to see the amount increased.

Staff: How does that relate to the project budget?

They're relying heavily on this grant. Extra cash flow is always good. Again, it's based on the idea that they are going to fundraise \$1K; they need to raise the bar. It takes the same amount of time and infrastructure. Once you get into the \$10 -15K range, it's different. I think the audience is there. There's a lot of support already, so very little will have to be done in that regard.

I agree about the relevance and value of this project, on increasing the online campaign target and relying less on the SFAC grant.

Regarding, impact of the organization, they said the 5th anniversary of GirlTalk will be really good for them, but I wanted this to be articulated more clearly. How exactly does the 5th anniversary accelerate their growth? Also, going back to the mission about fostering dialogue and facilitating healing, and promoting solidarity, I was wondering whether there is a space for Q&A or discussions within the programs themselves. That would be a way of extending that dialogue beyond the artists to the audiences. The positive feedback example they've given, I'm all for anecdotal feedback, but I would love to know whether getting feedback from the audience would include a follow-up a few months later, asking how the event inspired them and how the dialogue could continue in the community, etc.

Staff: Regarding additional engagement, I noticed they said there would be a reception hosted on opening night where the audience can engage the artists.

Some things jumped out to me on pages 5 of 7. In the financial activity part of the CCDP report, their budget barely exists in FY2010-2011 at \$2K. In 2012, contracted services/performance fees were \$17,866? Can someone explain how this jump happened?

Staff: On the second page, there's a 3-year budget narrative. They started accounting for income from touring.

Thank you. The other thing I wanted to point out was the typos. It makes me nervous if their grant application has typos in the figures. If you look at their fiscal numbers as well, there are some errors. If you do the math, the figures are slightly different, starting with their surplus for 2010-2011.

The only other thing I wanted to say was I loved the videotape. I thought the singer and accordionist, their relationship with each other and the audience, was so heart filled and absolutely delightful.



**2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations**

I agree.

I thought the writing was ok.

I'd also agree.

I'll echo what people said. They should think bigger. I feel like it's a good idea that has more potential than what they see. They say in here that they'll gauge the success based on 5 factors. I would have liked to know more about that. The overall application is strong, the planning is there, but it's keeping itself in this very small box. That's the only hesitation I have with it. I feel, if you're looking for this to be impactful and important at your 5th year, the potential is much greater and you must step out of the box, make a push to engage.

The media possibilities these days, with so many blogs going on; I just think there are so many opportunities for them.

Speaking to the fundraising comment made, \$1K is really tiny. For the scope of this project, it's really tiny. This should be communicated to the director or co-directors, to get behind it more and really push it out there, set the mark higher.

I will say that it is really a baby organization. I'm impressed they've already done so much that they're sending people out on extended tours and bringing in 5 figure incomes.

Staff: They do have some details in the marketing about whom they're trying to reach as audience.

I don't think it's a negative point. It's just an observation. You see this organization and you want them to be more visible because they do really valuable work.

It has such a compelling message about creating space, and it's reflective for so many other organizations out there. It has the potential to go there.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Out of Site: Center for Arts Education

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Out of Site requests \$15,000 in support of free after school programs in visual and performing arts for public high school youth. Located at the intersection of the OMI and Excelsior neighborhoods, our work responds to the need for relevant and conceptually based arts education that is guided by youth development ideas, and that connects underserved youth to the broader community. Our programs complement the work in the schools, helping to narrow the achievement gap.

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

The work sample was really good. It demonstrated what the program is. I bring it up because when reading the proposal, it is well written and clear on impact, but it lacked specificity. It was difficult for me to evaluate based on this criteria. I couldn't get a good gauge of what was going to happen in this program. That said, it's strong as an overall proposal. They have a true community presence. I do have the sense that it seems like this proposal is more about operational funding rather than a specific project. They have been around at least a decade and I wanted to know about generational impact. What's been done, what impact the organization had in the community, and how have they learned from what they've done? In terms of measures for success, they make a great statement. 250 teenagers a year is a lot, but I wanted to see more details and know more about what this means. It's really important when you're talking about a program like this and it's the only way you can truly measure impact. How does that impact carry itself out? Aside from that, it's a pretty strong application. Specifics are really what were missing. Otherwise, I have to assume that good things will happen.

I know we have to keep it to the application. This organization has had a larger impact and that wasn't really clear here. The work sample showed a particular clip of working in civic engagement in the arts, but it was really quick. I wanted more details on the impact; it should have been in the application. The measures and evaluation plans are not concrete steps. I want to commend the way they are engaging youth by providing workforce development, etc. The quality of work that they're doing is great. The silk-screening that they show is good. The video is good, but it's more of student narratives and not a focus on artistic quality. They look very dependent on foundation and government funding. With that said, they're financially 'ok'. On certain parts of the financials, I was a bit confused. I'm under the impression that they're getting a lot of the spaces in-kind, but I am not sure. I had to look several times to try and get a clear answer. If it were more organized and clear that would be good. Overall the project is great, I know they're doing great work and the quality is there.

On page 3 of the narrative there are six questions listed. I would have loved to hear the answers to those questions. In 2012 they had an assessment specialist come in; I wish we had seen some of that in the application. Just to cite a spot where I felt there was a lack of specificity.

I have a different take. Those questions are for the students learning skills to apply for the rest of their lives. There's no mention of art in that. It's more education and social services. The art is not being produced to a professional standard, but the business side is good.

They do say that in the work sample. They're very clear that the youth is doing it.

One more thing, in the notes for expenses-salary, they're paying \$25-30 an hour for their staff and art teachers. It's nice to see them putting a value to this. They're developing artist teachers and a new generation.

I was really impressed with the proposal. The passion behind this just jumped out at me. Compared to other applications, they clearly have a passionate and focused approach. The approach is pretty rigorous as well, in terms of their evaluation and goals. Overall, I was really impressed. A couple of questions I had regarding the numbers, the budget has a \$39K net that is not balanced. More specificity would have been great, for example, there was no timeline. They had a calendar, which they referred to. Maybe that was a misunderstanding with the application. I would like to know about recruitment and planning.

They have a good solid board. It is great that they have a youth advisor. It speaks volumes to me about how well they're engaging this youth and how the youth want to be there.

One thing that stands out about this is there's a clear sense of operational infrastructure and planning. There's clarity on how to carry this out that I don't think we've seen in a lot of proposals. That's really important.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

ArtSpan

Project description

ArtSpan requests for support of the 2012 SF Open Studios printed and virtual Guide to SF Open Studios and corresponding SF Open Studios Exhibition. The Guide and Exhibition are interdependent, as the artists' locations in the Guide denotes their artworks' locations in the Exhibition.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

The first area to discuss is artistic excellence. This is not a groundbreaking or particularly original, but it is unique. It's the only organization of its kind in San Francisco and the first in the Bay Area, if not in the country. The relevance it brings in over a quarter of a million dollars to local artists, quite remarkable. A lot of artists are served, as many as 1K. Its vision is completely democratic and inclusive, so that's what you get, the complete spectrum of artistic activity. The leadership is impressive in both staff and board bios. After 37 years, they've got the clarity and feasibility down. As far as the planning, they're completely professional. It's an unusually tight and confidence inspiring budget, solidly in the \$300-400K range. They have a wide range of sources. The modest numbers show efforts and success in all the fundraising areas. Its business as usual, but they take care of business. The audience is enriched; 60,000 people are a lot of people to bring to the arts. It's a significant contribution to the Bay Area. It's not insignificant to build a collecting community. It's almost like a museum without walls, for an introduction into collecting. They have a long history and stable dependable numbers. The board gives \$25K a year, which is unusually high for a small organization. There is a modest budget surplus but no cash reserve or endowment. They are largely dependent on artists subsidizing their institution through fees. Unlike other situations where artists have to pay, there's a definite pay out for these artists. They have a long history of carrying out the project. They have an unusual and long running, financially responsible organization.

In terms of work sample, we get to see the preview of the catalogue. Since so much emphasis is put on the catalog itself as an archive, I would have loved to see some past catalogs, even just the covers, to show how the quality has been consistent over time. In terms of the project goals, they've articulated a number of artists to be served this year and projected an audience of 65K. I wonder what their goal is for the number of artworks bought or sold this year, or if they anticipate similar numbers to last year. There's not much acknowledgment of any shifting trends or stability in the field. In terms of benefit to the artists, it would have been nice to see some artist testimonials or artists that have gone on to regular exposure as a result of the open studios. The outreach seems to be completely, crop dusting and very wide. When they're gathering information, they get a sense of who comes, who buys, etc. They mention that the audience completes surveys, but I wonder if they have surveys for artists, in terms of their experiences. My sense is that they've been doing this long enough to have that information and they're savvy enough to be collecting this information. I would have liked to see this expressed. I agree about the board; it seems like they've restored the fiscal health of organization. They're on the right track. Overall I think it's a worthy project, but they need a better demonstration of impact on artists.

Staff: Page 7, they mention a feedback form with the artists. They're projecting 8K sold in the exhibition, which is about what they had last year, therefore the same amount.

I echo what people have said. To emphasize, I really appreciate reading this proposal. It's so concrete. There's a cause and effect regarding what the funding will do. There's a rate of return. In looking at the budget, there's a \$2,500 line item for facilities and venue. I'm wondering what that was for. That's for SOMA space in the exhibition. Before you go out to the open studios you can go there and see whom you're interested in.

There's a statement in the proposal that talks about the website, and the number of views on the website is like 7,000. And they print 20,000 guides. So it's one-third of their targeted audience for their guides. They should emphasize getting information out through their online presence. There could be an engagement strategy that's not being used here. I would say, emphasize looking to the future to invest in some resources or do investigation into the online possibilities for broader access. Yes, particularly because that's how we got the work sample. We had to navigate to understand. They want to print 20,000 guides? I would really advise them to think digitally.

Staff: It does mention an application in development on page seven.

Yes, I'd like an exit strategy for printing so many guides. Unless they specify why they're printing it, it's a lot. In concept, it's a great project to fund, but then it's kind of like we're funding the printing of 20,000 guides and we can't measure their effect. It doesn't mean it's not worth it, but it's just something to think about.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Silent Film Festival

Group Size	Mid-Size
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$11,250

Project description

The 18th San Francisco Silent Film Festival takes place July 18-21, 2013 at the Castro Theatre. We will present a varied and lively program of restorations and preservation prints of rare and classic silent-era films, all with live musical accompaniment by world-renowned musicians. A special free presentation, Amazing Tales From the Archives, will introduce audience to film preservation issues, and other presentations will highlight musical accompaniment. An enchantment for the film savvy and the uninitiated!

Notes on panel's commentary

With regard to originality and depth of investment, this is a historical revival of 20th century art. There's a commitment to new sound scores, etc., but this is not new art. It's a recreation of old films. It is relevant, and the community has a deep commitment to film. These are the roots of 21st century art. The depth of investment is admirable. They have a worldwide network. The quality of proposal is sophisticated and there's a commitment to restoration. This is more of an art historical project. The artistic leadership and curators are first rate. They have a very strong team. 17 years of experience brings clarity and feasibility. The implementation plan is strong, and they have an impressive cash reserve with a wide array of funding sources. There's an unusually high board giving level of \$80,000. They have credibility in their outreach plan. They're making efforts to get into social media. Staff is impressively experienced, and the Board appears to be very business oriented, which is a strong point. Business boards tend to be bottom line oriented and may pressure staff for bottom line curating. On the other hand, they see to have the finances under control. They include an anecdote about the janitor and the daughter. That is not good grantsmanship. It does not come across well. I think they wanted to indicate the accessibility and diversity of their audience, but it comes across awkwardly at best.

I agree.

On a similar note, they say they want to reach out to more diverse audiences. We've seen so many sophisticated approaches, that this does not seem to be the most sophisticated. Overall, it's a terrific organization.

I concur. I do want to really highlight that comment did not sit well in the proposal. It was an afterthought of how they wanted to reach out. They should be aware of this. The work samples were high quality, and the work they're doing is innovative. And this is a challenge.

I agree. I would like to have more information about how to diversify audiences, and what to them would be a measure of success. The panel has been looking at applications that state projected audience numbers, and I'm wondering what their measurement of success is. The project budget doesn't balance, and I think it's because it's more of an organization budget. But that can be an easy fix if they just focus on the actual project budget.

I want to add that they describe reaching a wider audience through the production of an 88-page printed program with essays. Similar to other applications that are working with publications, I want more information as to why that format? And how will they know they're reaching the intended audience? Why put it out in print as opposed to other formats?

The commissioning of essays for their programs is terrific and partnering with other film festivals is great.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Asian Contemporary Arts Consortium San

Group Size Small

Project description

Request: \$15,000

A three-day conference centers on art criticism and its dissemination in a digital era, art books and individual publishing, and creative writing and language as art practice. It will be featured as the highlight program to kick off the second edition of the Asian Contemporary Art Week (ACAW 2013) with the participation of various local organizations.

Recommended: \$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

I was really excited to read this proposal. It's really bringing critical thinking to the table and really using the artists themselves to do that, rather than an intellectual panel. I like the fact that their proposed ideas and activities all seem doable. They have a good vision. They want to pull from the preexisting community organizations. It is feasible and really smart. I'm impressed with the narrative. The four goals are very clear.

In terms of the budget, it's doable. They can raise what they propose. There was one small typo on the 3-year budget; there should have been a deficit in the 3rd year, I believe, so some issues with 3-year average. That was the only thing I found disappointing, but they are just starting.

This proposal absolutely carries forward the mission of the organization. It fits in perfectly with the guidelines and work that CEG is doing. It's really innovative and smart. They identify and respond to the need to promote contemporary Asian American arts. They're working locally and internationally. It is so appropriate here in SF. They have the capacity to really do that. It will build its visibility with all the artists that they're working with. They've named writers and a lot of their advisory committee. If you look at their advisory committee, it looks pretty solid. I, more or less, know what some of the organizations do and they're well positioned to carry that dialogue.

Regarding target audience, one of the things that I wrote here is that the cost to participating organizations is zero. I see that as a true service to these organizations that need visibility. The fact that it is zero cost to them is great for arts non-profits. There is no list of participating organizations.

Within their working list of board of directors, they've been very purposeful in saying that they will connect colleges, cultural centers, alternative art spaces, and small non-profits. Its vague, but I'm interested in seeing who that will be. It's in the program. To answer the question, they list people including their keynote speakers.

The grant request represents 43% of the budget cost, and that's a huge percentage. I would advise diversifying their funding.

It would have been really useful to see what they did last year: the actual program, the title of the panels, the discussions, etc. There is a lot that can be inferred from this. It is encouraging to see this happen. It's good and smart but I would have hoped that after the first year, they would have provided some examples of what they had done. It would give a better scope of understanding of what they plan to do in the second year, instead of making us guess. Specificity would really help flesh out the concept and collaboration they're talking about. The unanswered question for me is when someone tells me they're hiring a PR associate I want to know why. It's not something done without a reason; there's got to be a reason why. Without an explanation, it makes one believe that attendance was low for the last one. Maybe it's true, maybe not, but there's one image from the sample that shows a panel with about three people from the audience. It would be good to know, does anyone even come to these events? It must be explained if the funds are going for it. Aside from these things, it's an intelligent proposal and one of the most well constructed narratives in terms of intellectual rigor. I agree it's a very high quality of speakers. I was curious about the PR hire as well. I'm curious about the accuracy in the CCDP, page 2, of 2011-2012; there's this huge jump and there are no number for paid attendance.

Staff: What I'm reading in this application is that in their first year, 2011, they were part of the art market fair. It says in their CCDP that the total attendance was for the art market fair. The organization did not receive revenue from art fair admissions. This year, it seems like they're switching formats and the art fair is out of the conversation. Perhaps this ties into the PR hire? What are their targeted goals for attendance?

I wanted to know what those were specifically regarding outreach to Asian American communities and other targets they mentioned and what their strategies look like. I'm assuming they're part of the, the new PR hire in order to put more attention into the strategy. On page 19, the last page of narrative, it seems like they're developing a strategy. One thing that's unclear is the timeline; it seems like it started in June of 2012. Is that correct? The dates contain errors. It must be a typo, but it carries all the way through to the end. They are clear about whom. I appreciate that they've



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

broken it into four sections, which they'll target for their audience. But there's not a comparative value to compare. Yes and if they have such a clear idea of who their demographic is, there should be a clear idea of an outreach plan. How are they going to tap into these demographics? I think because they have thought so thoroughly about the target audience, I'm sure that they know.

In some ways this organization is different from other organizations. This is an ethnically specific organization, but it's not about the immigrant experience. It's not about exploring Asian American identity. This is an international Pan-Asian culture. It's an intellectual organization and their audience is comprised of practitioners, writers, artists, and curators, who are locally and internationally interested in developing contemporary art in Asia and the US. It's not Asian American, particularly. That's understood, but because that's a specific audience, there needs to be some specificity in the outreach plan. What kind of publications, what kind of art, and what kind of websites are they reaching out to etc.? It's a simple request made of all our applicants.

Going back to our policy and guidelines, were they allowed to submit that information but didn't? I mean they do name brochures, social media campaigns, and banners in the city, as a general plan. It goes back to our comment about the cookie cutter outreach plan. If we're holding all groups to standards of specificity, we have to be consistent.

In terms of depth of investigation, this is more sophisticated than any other applicants in the pool. The director is young but a force. The Helen Kotter event did sell out; it was full.

Staff: Could you wrap this into the art project they've proposed here? What artists are they supporting? What are we seeing here?

One of the activities of the consortium, they mentioned under group zines/digital art book; that's an example of art being engaged. To be fair to that, we're saying that they're going to engage local artist, critics, curators, writers, but we don't know whom those people are. In terms of the quality of the sample, we don't have a lot to go by. At the same time, we value the curators and critics. We should have more of a sense of what's in store.

My only questions are about the PR side. My criticism is the absence of participants and participation. It is the most academic proposal we have here. It definitely incorporates true values with this. There is a certain level of rigor we've demanded of other proposals, knowing the participants etc., so, if we're placing everything on the same scale, I'll say we've given other projects leeway and that this applicant is a year old, so maybe now they've incorporated the participants. We do know two names. I do think we've looked at others that have been no more specificity. This is an organization that doesn't have a neighborhood. It's a constituency that's more academic and more international. I don't want to penalize them for not looking like the other applicants.



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Litquake

Project description

Litquake is a literary project that produces a week-long festival each fall along with literary events throughout the year. In 2013, Litquake will present one or two events each month and a 9-day literary festival Oct. 11-19, featuring a literary award ceremony, literary readings and performances, staged readings, 2 days of children’s events, teen events, cross-media literary happenings literary stars in conversation, a literary crawl in the Mission District, and much more.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Request:

\$15,000

Recommended:

\$11,250

Notes on panel's commentary

This is in their 11th year. They started in 2002. They have a long history of programming. They are basically one of those organizations with a long track record. They bring local and internationally renowned writers to San Francisco to create a hub of literary activity. Obviously, they are very good at bringing high profile names while, at the same time, being well connected with local writers with various degrees of renown. Additionally, the Lit Crawl is a good platform for emerging writers. Something that really struck me about this proposal is that they know what they want to do and they know how to do it. Is that because they’ve been doing it for so long? One problem I had with the narrative was the lack of real detail about how they were going to implement the project. They talk about the proposed project but what’s described is the overall approach. Some distinction of curatorial vision for Epicenter series, for example, would have been nice. There wasn’t a sense of what they were trying to do that was different, even with this new part of the program. More details about their criteria and vision for festival would have been helpful. The budget looks more like an organization budget than a project budget. It doesn’t clearly breakdown what the SFAC grant funds would be going to. Having said that, they seem to have very strong fundraising from a variety of sources. In terms of the impact of the organization, I would say generally, there wasn’t enough description of Epicenter the part of the programming and what it would add to the festival. In terms of impact on targeted audience, they talk about audiences being broad and general. They’re very up front about not really targeting, though they do have some targeted evenings events for women, Latino, API, queer, etc. I was interested in knowing what that proportion is and the ratio that they’re trying to achieve. In terms of audience feedback, they talk about their evaluation of success as audience size. Their projected target size is about 19K. But I’m wondering what kind of feedback they’re looking for.

They can carry out what they want to do. In terms of overall financial health, they’re growing and they have various revenue streams, but for an organization that’s been around for 11 years, they get pretty down to the wire. They had a small deficit in 2010 and again in 2011. I think that in the budget notes they talk about having investments but I couldn’t really find anything.

They do have a 19K surplus.

I’m not sure if that’s a reserve they dip into, if it’s for an emergency, or by accident. Also, what jumped out is that of the 7 directors on board, 6 are going to expire in December. So I’m wondering if they have a succession plan in place, or if they’re recruiting at all. They can obviously fundraise, but I’m wondering how much the board is supporting them or if it’s down to the staff.

I echo a lot of that. Yes, its an organization that has an 11 year history and based on by the work sample, I would advise them to really submit something that can give us more depth into what this event looks like. It didn’t give me the essence, but I know what happens in these events and it didn’t come across in the sample. I was also unclear about the funding request, whether it was an organization budget or actually a project budget. Goals and evaluation are based on audience attendance and observation, but I didn’t see in the proposal how it’s measurable. I know they have surveys, but what are they asking? I do think they serve a lot of artists and they’re a positive force. They talk about a lot of sites and venues as co-hosts; I would have liked more details on this relationship. How are those relationships going to support this?

Staff: You’re saying that they do have partnerships, but it doesn’t necessarily demonstrate that they will be able to access those audiences?

Correct. Looking at their numbers, it sounds stable and from what I’ve read, they know the nature of their business and when they need to staff up and staff down. They are very savvy.

I didn’t see a difference between the project and the organization. I don’t think there’s anything in the project that’s not everything they do.



**2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations**

But they identified two parts of their programming a fall festival, Epicenter and other events.

It's confusing. It's almost all. To reiterate, their income sources and size is impressive and very diverse. I wanted to ask, what do you think about this movie star business, i.e. Molly Ringwald, bringing those kinds of people in. Is it just a populist thing?

If they had described that, I would be able to tell you. I can only guess that they're trying to broaden their audience.

I'm just trying to figure out what this is; I've never been myself.

Lit Crawl is very open, almost like an open mic, but then you have your heavyweights, as well.

The only other thing I noted is the staff is very impressive, but the board is not. The board is also staff, so that is kind of a red flag for me. In general, it is a pretty impressive organization.

I echo that and have the same questions. If we're looking at every proposal with the same criteria, the explanation of what the funds go to is missing. I mean we know what they do, so we can guess. They provide a valuable service, but that information is missing. More explanation on how the funds are applied is necessary, right now it's just the assumption that they'll be used, appropriately. As a reviewer, it adds a certain level of conceit from the applicant. With that said, this is a strong organization. I point this out because in the monies that they're asking for, they bring up KidsQuake, a very interesting community program. Something like Litquake doesn't necessarily need money when you compare it to other organizations in this pool that are less financially stable. So, it would be useful to detail this out. These are the things that will distinguish it.

To add to that, when an organization has a history like this, it's always for us to think that they'll be perfectly fine without the funding, so for that reason, they need to be clear why they need it. It doesn't have that sense of urgency like some of the other applications.

Staff: To make a clarification for all applications and how to read accumulated surplus/deficits. The CEG application's three-year budget chart, asks for averaged numbers in the last column. For the accumulated surplus/deficit, do not use the averaged number across three years, but the most recent prior year for the correct number. In regards to this application then, Litquake has a \$10K surplus, not \$19K.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Sixth Street Photography Workshop

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$11,250

Project description

A photography workshop led by Tom Ferentz and S Renee Jones, will make Moving On with the Sixth Street Photography Workshop, an exhibition series to open our 7th Street Gallery/Photo studio in Hotel Isabel at Mission and 7th. It will be a lyrical document of a neighborhood our photographers know in a special way, as members of its underclass. We will give them the cameras, tools, technical and artistic support to make their pictures.

Notes on panel's commentary

I'm familiar with this organization from my days at YBCA, 20 years ago. They were always terrific. They do great work with little resources. This is proposal about an organization that never had a gallery and wants to move into a gallery. I feel that they make compelling argument in part because it is so tied to a community. The project is not exactly original but it's very relevant and the depth of investigation is compelling.

The quality of work is inconsistent, because these are photography students. Talented amateurs might be the best description. The leadership is very professional and Tom has been doing it for a very long time. Bringing in an alumnus of the program as assistant director is a nice move. The project is clear and feasible.

It's a major event after so many years to get a space/gallery/workshop. It seems they've lined up all their ducks to make this financially practical and feasible. The question I have is about the budget. There is an accumulated surplus of \$5K but the numbers just don't add up on the second page. It's unfortunate that such a strong program gives a reader pause about how well thought through the budgets are.

The numbers don't add up. They're off by a few thousand dollars. To reiterate, I don't doubt their abilities or plan. I'm concerned that such a simple thing is so unclear.

The impact of the project will definitely help the organization take their mission to another level. The audience has been and will continue to be well served. They're vague on their plan for securing new artists, but they've been doing it so long that they may be in the habit of doing it, and did not bother to articulate it. I would have liked a little more detail. It seems like a random recruitment process.

The administrative qualifications are high. The fiscal health is ok. They have a very long history. Their fiscal agent is very professional. It is not an arts organization. It's a low income housing organization, but they are a leader in their field. I'm interested in this project.

I agree with much of that. I had some questions about how the program is made available and how targeted or random is their outreach. This is something I thought was, maybe minor, but when I read the first line, I wrote down 'why'. Then on the next page, it explained that it was about developing self-esteem etc., if you're talking about that then you need to bring in the why, not just the how. Everything should be up front, about the value of the work, etc. I was interested in how participants are going to be supported beyond the technical training. One thing that seems to be emphasized is that these photos are supposed to be amplifying a certain point of view that doesn't get visibility.

I wanted to know how the element of the workshop is supported, whether it's not simply a case of teaching someone how to use a camera, and answering essential questions, etc. I was interested in that process. Also I wanted to know what they would consider to be a successful project, what are their targets, and how they're going to be evaluated. The impact on the targeted audience is inferred and obvious, but a few testimonials might have been helpful.

Another question I had was regarding item 20. The drop in earned income in FY2011-2012 has gone from \$16,800 to \$1,700.

I think they do say.

I didn't see it in any budget notes.

I remember that it was a special influx from a project with a gallery; a one time only thing, I believe.

This is a very inspired project. I like what I'm seeing here, especially because it's no secret what's happening in that part of the city, the "revitalizing". This is true revitalization of the neighborhood in a different way, and something that needs to be supported.



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

The point about the budget is a good point, it makes one wonder, but it is a smaller concern as opposed to recognizing and talking about the community engagement and strategy behind it. They talk about creating murals for the outside; it's harder to get them to come in than to look at an exterior wall. It would be interesting to see and know more about their strategy to draw people into this space. The proposal would have benefitted from a clear strategy for how those visions will be expressed to the community at large. It's important work and my greatest concern seeing their great work overshadowed by this lack of clear strategy.

I concur with what everyone said. I am very impressed with the history and everything they've done. I definitely get it from the work samples, despite the range. The one photo of the gentlemen looking out of the Laundromat really captured the essence of this project. It really sold me on it.

As you just mentioned, with all the changes happening in this corridor, its very timely. They have a lot of support and so much initiative and momentum. It is worth funding.

The budget part is disappointing.

The history of art photography is middle class white people taking pictures of poor kids. They're really turning the tables. These are definitely poor people, coming out of addiction. A sign of success is the cumulative number of people you can touch and having a staff member who is alumnus changing these lives.

More bragging would have been good! I know for a fact, a foundation I was working used 6th street workshop as a model. So that that kind of impact is incredible. I don't know if 6th street knows how far their influence goes!

The timeline is ok. I still have the question in terms of execution. It doesn't talk about murals in the project timeline. I guess we assume that it happens somewhere in there, though it seems like serious undertaking.

They're not asking for funding for the mural, so maybe that's why they left it out. But then the question is why not put it in context.

Yes, you're right, it is about the workshop, but they do bring in the exhibition at the end.

I think that's part of the exhibition; I don't think the mural is attached. It is unclear.



2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Independent Film Festival

Group Size Mid-Size
Request: \$14,000
Recommended: \$0

Project description

SF IndieFest appreciates your past support and enthusiastically requests your support again, so that we may continue to present the annual San Francisco DocFest. This well-loved film festival exhibits over two weeks of documentaries. Films that are programmed for this festival relay individual experiences and extraordinary stories from around the world that the San Francisco community would generally not have access to. SF DocFest is the only festival of its kind in San Francisco.

Notes on panel's commentary

In terms of delivery on its mission this is a model. It's growing from 1 to 3 festivals. The downside is I would say it suffers from being under fed and reliant on volunteers. It makes me wonder how long they can keep it up. They had no audit, no balance sheet and no full time staff. The artistic excellence of this project is difficult to define and frustratingly vague. They used "slice of life" to describe content. Maybe understood within the community or a code that I'm not familiar with. I suspect it's deliberately vague, so whatever appeals can be included. It appears to be geared towards documentary with eccentric people; I am inferring. It is original. With a lot of films that they've developed, the research has been strong. The poster was well designed. They have unusual and intriguing programs. The type was too small, and hard to read. The website and YouTube link were not functioning. So the panel must take the quality of programming on faith. The leadership based on the bios has a lot of experience and is strong. The festival has an audience. It is clear and feasible. They are well organized with partners and a clear schedule. They are dependent on ticket sales; this is probably standard. There is a big jump in 2011 with a round number that wasn't explained. They avoid explicit explanations of staffing. On page 20 the salaries are listed as zero, etc. Maybe people are paid as consultants not staff. It is impressive that they have no deficit, admirable.

A point of naivety is that they do not show a balanced project budget. They do an annual fundraiser to raise funds. There is a fee to submit films. I am not sure if its standard but I'm sensitive to it. An audience of 24K is impressive for an organization like this. They have a proven track record and credibility for doing this. The staff is experienced and impressive. The board is small and there is staff on the board. Regarding financial health, there is no deficit but the proposal gives the feeling of precariousness. My overall sense of the organization is that they have strong programming but need some attention on the business side.

I agree with a lot of that. The language is a little bit generic. You had to infer a lot in terms of vision. Sharpening their language would help a lot. I agree with the staff sizing and whether they're being supported enough. The unbalanced budget shouldn't be there. I really appreciated the thoughtfulness that was demonstrated through the notes, both in the narrative and budget notes. The talk about shifting trends in the industry and they explain fluctuations in attendance and admissions over the 3-year span and beyond. They do a really great job of this. The board is small but diverse; I think it's commendable. Having said that, I noticed a trend from 2010, on page 3 of CDP; board giving in 2009 was 33%, the following year it was 50%. So something's changing. Maybe they should push for 100% board giving. I was wondering about the jump in individual donations. Was that the result of fundraising? I would like to get a sense of how the board is supporting the organization in fundraising. It seems like the staff is extremely conscientious. They have a great vision.

Staff: Sounds like additional CDP notes would help.

Sometimes with organizations that do great work or with all organizations, there's a tendency to not anticipate foresight into their own capacity. The ED is often the last person to say, I need more help. Speaking of board and staff, I found it interesting that there's a festival director and founder and they also serve as the chair. In terms of governance, that is not standard. They need to look at their governance, especially when talking about financials, etc.

This is a great organization with great projects and is important. But things like that are red flags. An organization should not be mixing up the role of governance with the festival. I would also like them to more clearly and boldly articulate their vision. This organization holds an important place in this city; I don't want to see a proposal where it gets represented as an offshoot of something else. I think it holds its own place and its probably time for it to give itself a bolder statement of what it represents. This will really help it move forward.

In the notes, they say the audience should be 50% non-white, but where did this number come from and how will you achieve this?



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Writers Among Artists

Project description

This proposal requests \$4,200 to support Writers Among Artists' Fall 2013 visual exhibition, literary performance and journal entitled "Vincent Van Gogh-Go". The exhibition, journal release event and literary reading will take place at Mission neighborhood bookstore and exhibition space, Alley Cat Books, during October 2013 LitQuake.

Group Size

Tiny

Request:

\$4,200

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

This is a really interesting and sound project in terms of the multidisciplinary approach to public exhibition relating to the literary arts. It's something we see more and more now, people pushing to find different ways for artists to engage with a concept. One thing I would say about this is that the first iteration of what they did in the sample, "Faggot Dinosaur", was a great way to get artists to simply comment on a creative spark. This is sort of riffing on that first idea, to push themselves beyond their known boundaries. It's a sound concept. Most people would try to keep a project like this in, but asking artists to step out of that boundary is a really intuitive approach to public exhibition. This is really useful to the community in general.

In terms of timing, it has the capacity for being really well executed. There is no question that it would come together as a literary event and publication. I wish I could see the actual publication because that would be useful. The one question I do have, from the artist's standpoint, the question of choosing Van Gogh. "Faggot Dinosaur" seems to really propose a question that artists can respond to in a really interesting way, because it is so undefined. The concept of Van Gogh seems a bit disconnected from the audience and artists. It seems more focused on the founder and creator and their vision. I wonder if it will have the desired effect of drawing people in. I don't know if this personal vision will translate well. I don't see people responding to it the way they did for the first one. Aside from that, the overall project is a really good idea.

From a writing standpoint, if the previous artist call was to respond to "Faggot Dinosaur", it creates an inspirational moment. It seems to me, looking at it in this next phase or evolution, it was to get the artist to not just comment on their queer identity, but to respond to something in the cultural mainstream. I think pushing artists to step out of what they know, is a really intuitive approach to something.

I thought the Van Gogh was fine. I thought the work samples were fine. I see the Van Gogh project as very similar to the first one. I'm not quite sure I buy the distinction. I do like the idea of looking at a very mainstream art figure from a queer perspective. Based on the work samples from last year, I'm not sure how interesting it will be. I think Justin Chin was the strongest sample we saw from them. In terms of the samples, I was a little frustrated at the amount. It's not much to judge a whole grant on. I would have liked to see video of a reading or more.

Staff: In terms of our guidelines, we do have a maximum number of pages per literary submission, 10 pages. So maybe that's an item for policy discussion, if panelists feel we need to see more.

That makes sense. One of the things that did stand out was that only one work sample was submitted. If there were more components to it, it would have been helpful; like the actual execution.

In terms of leadership, it seemed like a smart and savvy group. I know Margaret is someone I respect very much. The clarity and feasibility is very modest and definitely doable by this organization. It does seem early in this organizations history. My reading of the budget is that it's pretty fully dependent on getting this CEG grant.

In terms of the impact, it's entirely appropriate for this group and will be meaningful in a modest way to this community. A one-night event for 300 people that publishes a book isn't likely to be hugely impactful.

The board is all artists, but it seems ok. They have done the project one other time, so they obviously can do it.

I believe they are projecting about 100 pieces to be submitted, which sounds about right. There'll be an exhibition and a reading and they are projecting about 200 journals to be sold. I agree that it is modest but it is still a strong impact. In terms of impact, I would have liked to hear a little more about what they want to come out of it. I was also curious about the concept. It's less minimal than "Faggot Dinosaur". You throw that phrase out and it just generates so many possibilities. This prompt is contained within certain conceptual parameters. I was wondering if any other artworks or artist were considered beyond this one? What is it about this particular artist? Why him?



**2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations**

Staff: So You would have like for the proposal to talk a little more about the process in coming to this theme?

Yes. I think there are different ways to give prompts, like just throw the word out there and see what you get. But when you have a stated intention, as there does here, they say this will generate material for queer artists; they need to elaborate on this.

It's the double-edged sword of a small organization with a powerful director; it's his or her vision and everyone else comes along for the ride. Given the components: strong, intelligent artists, queer perspective and Van Gogh; this could be a very provocative idea. Or it could be the opposite: the cliché, the tortured genius and the tortured queer person, which is not great.

Even a little elaboration on why the director got so obsessed would be good.

In terms of budget, it does seem very dependent on this grant. I found it interesting that they identified a bookstore as a primary collaborator. I'm wondering why there wasn't a mention of the marketing strategy. The bookstore wasn't even named. I would have liked to see more intentionality.

Staff: They said they sold through Alley Cat bookstore and Radar Productions.

Right, but I want to know more details regarding their strategy. How do they intend to sell their product? How involved are their collaborators and what's the timeline? It is very dependent on book sales and this grant.

What do you think about \$2K identified for book sales?

They based this figure on last year's sales.

FY 2011, was \$1,000, last year was \$1,500. Assuming the audience grows, \$2K is a reasonable prediction.

Staff: Does that help in you terms of having a realistic goal?

Yes, that's helpful.

Staff: Any comments on organization budget or attendance records?

I believe it said \$2K from Foundations: Rainbow Grocery FY12 and Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, FY11. They are applying for other foundation grants in 2013.

It would have made the proposal a lot stronger if they really clarified their collaborative relationships.

It's a conservative estimate.

Any time you create a lasting artifact out of a public endeavor; it's useful to articulate what your strategies are for getting it out to the public. It's collaboration, a literary event and a publication. If you're going to do a publication, especially since it's their second year, with essentially the same process, you need to take it to the next level and have a detailed plan that clearly addresses the why and the how.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Kearny Street Workshop

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

APAture is an annual multidisciplinary emerging artists festival that KSW presented from 1999 - 2009, and is rebooting in 2013. The festival will present around 100 artists in all disciplines and reach audiences of 2000-3000. APAture offers: an annual snapshot of emerging Asian Pacific American arts, an early opportunity for artists to present their work at a major festival, and a training ground for emerging cultural workers, who organize the festival.

Notes on panel's commentary

The project demonstrates that Kearny Street Workshop (KSW) is a long running organization that is about empowerment for emerging artists. So the project is relevant in that way. The curatorial leadership is young and early in their careers, but some are quite experienced for their age.

In terms of the quality of the work samples, they showed one artist and the work was hard to tell. There were a couple of videos and a couple of photos; the video was hard to read and the photos were opaque.

Staff: Did you get the email attachment?

Yes, the photos. I couldn't make much out of them.

It's very clear and feasible. They're asking for \$15K for a festival that will reach 2K. In terms of the clarity and soundness of plan, they do talk about a system they will use starting in January 2013, so it's too late for the application.

In terms of the budget, there's a heavy dependence on local foundation support, which was not confirmed at the time of the application. It constitutes \$8K out of \$30K. They have good support from the board and individuals. I was concerned that they charge artists a fee to apply and participate; that's how I read it (\$1500). In the budget, they're running an \$8K deficit, which is not a whole lot but the project budget has classic mistakes in it, like the \$5K surplus; they should ask for \$10K, not \$15K on page 19 at the bottom.

This seems like a strong, grassroots program, in the midst of a Chinese and Asian community. It's a little confusing why they can only claim 2K people in attendance.

I was very moved by the video of a cartoonist who talked about attending a workshop with other Asian American cartoonists and how that was a tipping point in their career. That was a well-chosen sample.

They have been doing things for a long time; I don't doubt their credibility. The board and staff are young but committed. They are carrying a small deficit.

Staff: To clarify about the timeline, we do have some projects that will start their project before the start of the grant window. We ask them to make clear what will be funded or not, but we want to make sure that the bulk of the activity is taking place in the window. In terms of the foundation funding, is the \$8K a concern because you have concerns about how realistic it is?

No, I just mentioned that because it's a large percentage of the budget and its speculative with nothing yet confirmed. I just wanted to point that out. It does say on line 7, artist submission fees are \$1500. I am just politically opposed to artists supporting their own organization.

Just to give more feedback, I'm very familiar with the work of KSW. We have to look at the impact beyond just the 2,000 coming into the event itself. It serves a place for artists to develop. I'm arguing that paying a \$10 dollar administrative fee is a fair charge. I think that covers basic fees. I think that the fact that this project is coming back and being presented again, speaks to it really serving a larger need. It is in response specifically to a strategic planning process with over 300 constituents requesting this project to come back. They let it go and realized they had to bring it back because it was serving a larger artist community. It really falls in line with the CEG guidelines. Regarding the quality of work submitted I would have liked to see something more diverse. The story was compelling and showed it was creating and developing community...

The one area of concern is the deficit; what is the strategy around taking care of that?

I do see that the leadership is young but they seem very capable and energized. It's appropriate to start bringing in new



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

leadership and a part of that is investing in it, so again, capacity development. I'm excited that this project is being proposed and I feel that it should be funded.

Staff: Did the explanatory notes on page 12 of 26 help explain the deficit and their plans to address it?

We know the story they're telling there all too well. These are familiar challenges for organizations at a similar age. I hope the new leadership brings the solutions they're looking for. It's good that they're approaching it by bringing new folks in.

What has been said is really important to note. This is an organization that has gone through a lot of transitions. One of their key projects was put aside to do other things. The intelligence of bringing back that project really shows how much they understand their constituents. This kind of ambition and vision is important to support. My concern around the deficit is because this is one of those situations where you can see that they are at a moment of critical mass, and it could shoot in the right direction, or all the energy goes into something like this, and the deficit never gets resolved. From a funding standpoint, I would say that this is the kind of risk you want to take. We have to be risk takers, and I think this is the kind of risk to take.

I don't have much to add. I agree with what's been said. I was curious about some of the specifics of the programming and the different disciplines that have been cited. It seems more weighted to certain art forms.

In terms of reconnecting with the emerging generation of their constituents, I was looking for something that spoke to a strategic outreach effort to recover this lost audience. I wanted to know whether their outreach plan reflects new strategies or whether they feel the festival in itself is going to attract them back.

Staff: You would have liked to see more detail around the outreach plan?

Right, it seems implied that just by having the festival, they will naturally regain their audience.

Staff: Do you feel your concerns are balanced with the staff, and senior board members Claire and Chris being there?

It's absolutely appropriate and I think it's necessary. There's a historical influence there that will guide them and allow them to take risks. It speaks volumes in terms of the health and realistic expectations. I think it's great.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Kulintang Arts Inc.

Project description

Kularts' Making Visible Project is a series of public artworks and events that gives visual presence to the Pilipino community. The Kodakan component is a media project by artists Wilfred Galila, Cece Carpio, and Peggy Peralta, taking photo/video of contemporary Pilipinos and juxtaposing with vintage images to explore changing expressions of cultural identity. Kodakan culminates in an exhibition at the SF Library's Jewett Gallery October 2013 to April 2014, with two additional video screenings.

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

Reading the proposal, I was really excited by and impressed with how it sounded. It seemed like it was responding to a community that's been historically underserved in the arts. The artist statement, the artistic vision of the piece and this juxtaposition of imagery intrigued me. When I got to the work samples, I have to say it was a let down, because it did seem to be a straight juxtaposition, very literal. I wonder if we would have gotten a more rounded or layered grasp of the project if there were those other elements described in the proposal were included. What we saw was just one facet of the proposal and I would have loved to see more. So the curatorial vision and execution didn't quite meld for me. In terms of budget, they included the in-kind support on line 22 for \$72K, but the total project budget should be \$17.8K not \$25K. They didn't list it on the income side, so it was a little confusing. Or maybe that grant request should be lower.

In terms of implementation, I got a good sense that they knew how to execute it and have a strong infrastructure. I was impressed by the impact of the organization. It seems to be aligned with their mission and vision and will continue increasing their visibility. There was a jump in attendance on page 2, from 6500 to 33,500. I was curious about this huge jump. How that happened would have been helpful. I was also interested in what percentage of attendance was from newcomers. They stated a target goal of 8k, and I wanted to know what percentage of newcomers they hoped to get from that. In terms of impact on target audience, projections seem high compared to current lists and web traffic. It just seems like there's a bit of discrepancy with the number of people who come to either events or the people on their mailing list/website. I was wondering about the participatory element for Filipino American communities and if there's any space for them to submit their own photos, work, etc. In terms of organizational capacity, they're running a two-year deficit but it's decreasing rapidly. I think that they need to increase board giving as one of their first steps. It's at 80% but should be 100%. They have an experienced staff and their strategic partners are strong. On paper, I was really interested, but felt the work sample did not give me the quality.

Good research on the proposed project. I agree that the new images were like snapshot quality, not professional quality. The vision is strong but the execution is just ok. The leadership is very experienced, especially in video. I have sensitivity to when people over promise, like 'this project will solve this or that', and I think they over promise too much in terms of what this will accomplish for the community. I'm nervous that they're going ahead with no secured funding and they are very foundation and government funding dependent. The project is right in line with their mission and it will serve their audience well. The library is small and self selected, but they're also going to do YBCA, so that's a more public experience. It's an impressive roster of intellectuals and artists on the board, but no representatives of other communities, including business. There are no earned or other sources of generated revenue otherwise the budget is appropriate. I have no doubt they can do this. The board is small and out of town and not really designed to be a working board.

Staff: What I'm hearing is that you're looking for more diversification of the funds? There are small sums coming in from different sources.

Yes, I'd like to see them bumped up a bit.

In concept it's a really interesting project, it's not something you see being done all the time. It's really useful. My big criticism is that it seems incomplete in its execution as far as how it's been written out. There are a lot of questions that are raised by what they're saying, for example, knowing how the library works and this co-sponsorship; I would have liked to learn more about this, given the installation is six months in the library. There is an absence of information on this, and I'm wondering, if they're tapping into the archive.

The other comment is on if they're seeing an impact. Their metric for impact is measured by hits on the website, which strikes me as them saying 'they have a web presence strategy for outreach'. But this has not been explained enough. The last part, the biggest question I have is around the idea of this being a participatory event; I don't really see that, largely, because the exhibition is all piggybacking on participatory events. The YBCA event is participatory, so therefore they are? The library event is participatory because it is happening during the book fair. There are just a lot of assumptions



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

here, that they will give a voice to community, which is a grand statement. This is a good project in concept and platform, but I feel like there are all these little pieces that are missing. Would love to know what the library's involvement is, why put it up as an exhibition, the web component; what are they doing? They have to tell us these things; they are really important in terms of impact and outreach strategy.

Staff: When I clicked on the second sample, I did see a way for people to submit. So perhaps this is the participatory element of the project? But you're right it's not highlighted.

Yes, that's a fair definition of participation. But then it should be explained that's what they mean by it.

Staff: You mean how that will be integrated?

Yes, if it were articulated with greater clarity, it would help direct the project itself. There seems to be this leaning towards using the word participatory a lot these days, and really that can just mean anything.

Staff: The second paragraph, on page 2, talks about getting more participants for their project and what they're envisioning.

The only other question I have is does the time frame matter on this? More than half of it takes place before the grant period. On page 3 of the narrative it says, April 2012 is when it starts.

Staff: It's fine if it starts before, but if there are substantial parts of their timeline that fall in the window; it's applicable.

I question the whole happening upon concept, I'm not sure that it really ties in, and also that I must add, in terms of the group they're representing, it's kind of exciting that they're trying to build that voice. I just think this project needs more time to develop. We need more substantial information.



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Small Press Traffic Literary Arts Center

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

Small Press Traffic (SPT) seeks support for its Reading Series and Dialogues initiatives, which comprise the main activities of the organization. SPT hosts one of the longest running programs for writers in the Bay Area. The Reading Series pairs local and out-of-town innovative writers along thematic lines. Dialogues pushes the work of these themes further through events designed to provoke inquiry and new forms.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

I am familiar with this organization and overall they represent a kind of literary activity that's quite particular to the Bay area. I'm not sure that you'd find this kind of writing or literary work in other locales. I read a lot of these writers in my own studies. I'm familiar with a lot of the work, and can speak to the quality of many of these writers. I see an effort to branch out from what could be considered a somewhat niche literary community.

Given the history of the organization and the standing of the writers involved, I'm curious about their audience size. I noticed that last year that their attendance was about 1K. This year 750 is projected. I'm wondering what the thinking was behind that. It seems to be dissonant with the efforts that they're making to cross-pollinate and expand.

In terms of artistic excellence, I wanted more dialogue about the themes and issues. It would have been helpful to get a sense of the themes and issues in order to understand more of the curatorial vision.

Regarding the budget, they renewed funding with past funders. The organization budget on the application form seems to be off with the deficit they've calculated.

I think that the project is in line with their mission.

In terms of impact on target audience, I had that question about the decline in audience numbers. Also in the narrative, they talk about how they respond to the needs of the community but they didn't really explain how.

I did notice something that wasn't true for every applicant - that they have 100% board giving. I would say this is a worthy project, with a few minor questions.

This represents a deep commitment to local experimental writers. I was very disappointed in the work sample. The audio was almost unintelligible, and quality of the second one was mediocre. Not a good representation of what I think is a strong organization.

The leadership, board and advisors, are some of the leading literary minds in the Bay Area. They've been around forever, and have proven viability. They have a very low profile that could be enhanced, which this grant may help with.

The budget is modest for such an old organization. They report a part-time staff and little fund raising. On the business side with so many experimental writers, they're lacking.

The project is feasible, but I wonder why they haven't professionalized more after such a long track record. The project continues to do an excellent job, especially the lectures; it's a strong argument for them. They have a small audience of less than 1K. It's the kind of organization that's been doing it for a long time. They talk about using community resources and social media. The overall financial health is just ok. This organization has been around forever. There is no question as to their ability to carry this out. The finances are like an immature organization, even though they are mature.

I have to echo on the poor work samples. I had a very hard time with them. I couldn't hear one at all. It didn't do it justice. They are going to celebrate 40 years, and are really putting a lot of value on that but with the low profile and small audience, I'm not so invested in that strategy. Maybe they should go back to the drawing board.

I know this organization really well, and I always appreciate what they do. They serve an important purpose in the community, especially in presenting writers who are often unheard. The value of what they do alone is worth funding. The only thing about this proposal that I would say is that it's kind of just standard. It doesn't strike me as anything innovative or new. We look at this and we compare it with all the other applications we have reviewed and this is just about status quo funding; maintenance. That's ok, but in the applicant pool, it's not jumping out at me.

The audio sample, I agree, I thought wow, why would you submit this. Is it just assumed that we'll give them money



**2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations**

because they're a great organization? Nothing about the application really struck me as being innovative. As an organization, they are the only one of it is kind doing what they're doing, and I would hate to see them not be funded. At the same time the proposal doesn't do that much for me.

Staff: It does have a curatorial premise that is articulated here.

It does. I just don't find it particularly compelling. Maybe more detail with curatorial process would have made it more inspiring

Staff: Can you comment on target audience?

My comments about target audience are my criticisms, in general. It's just assumed; 'writers' are the audience. It's kind of a service organization.

I think one thing they neglect to say, which is really valuable, is that they're more receptive to work by new writers that more mainstream publications wouldn't publish, due to the riskiness or the experimental nature, etc. It's a shame they left this out of their application. They need to do more bragging!



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Chinese Culture Foundation of San Francisco

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

The Chinese Culture Center (CCC) requests a grant of \$15,000 in support of the project, Into the Nearness of Distance. The project will be a collaboration between multimedia artist Summer Mei Ling Lee and cultural workers from the neighborhood that will mobilize Chinatown through participatory creative process, artistic intervention in public space, and video installation in CCC gallery.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

The relevance of what they're doing is appropriate. They have a track record of 48 years in producing similar events. The work samples chosen, in terms of what they're proposing, were well executed. The artists' websites and the videos were great, but the actual photos, I couldn't see what the work was or the scale. It was disappointing, but taking the videos, you can see what they're doing. I would have liked to see more detail of how they would be doing that. I don't understand the term 3.5 generation, so it would be nice if they could define that for me. One thing that stood out is how they're approaching this. Those concepts are exciting and innovative, and they're bringing them to the heart of the community. I like it, and I think it's exciting. The timeline seems appropriate. The budget seems okay. I get where the artistic expense is going. They talk about how they brought in Mabel Teng as Executive Director who could really focus on fundraising. That's great. However, I didn't feel that it was necessary to reiterate the same information in a number of areas. I would have preferred they spoke more on the other actual community engagement process. I kept on highlighting what is 1.5? What is 3.5? You have to describe it. It seems like they have a lot of media support to get their project out. In their performance evaluation, they talk about a "chance of attitude..." and I don't know what they're talking about or how to measure it. It's really vague. I need more specifics on that. One of the other things I highlighted is that they don't give me the detail of the impact. I didn't get the substance there. I really liked the video art. They chose qualified artists for the work samples.

I felt like, in terms of originality, it didn't quite meet the level of relevance. I feel the community needs a project with this kind of intention, but in terms of depth or originality, I don't know. In the work sample, we're looking at an art piece that is an artistic intervention for a large-scale event. If you're going to show it as a sample, it must give some sense of alignment and scale. You see a detail, for example. But, pulling back to show the whole object would have been interesting. I've written grants with flowery, artsy language before, but this language was infuriatingly opaque at times. In terms of the engagement with culture makers and critics, who would these people be? Metaphoric and tangible clues? What does that mean? That this will result in a sculpture, video, or performance. Those are three completely different things! That to me shows how shallow the depth of investigation here is. Maybe this is pre-mature, and maybe they should be looking for a planning grant rather than a project grant. I think this lacks maturity and doesn't quite live up to its stated goal of "mobilizing Chinatown through its participatory process".

A lot of assumptions are going on here. I don't know what the community engagement part would look like.

Yes, they talk about how this project will challenge the dusty conception of Chinatown. They want to promote it as a destination for this dynamic, contemporary art. Overall, I found this a very frustrating proposal, because I wholeheartedly support the intent and rational. It's just the conceptualizing and implementation that is severely lacking, which a shame because I really wanted to like this.

I have to agree. It's great that they're challenging themselves. It's pretty isolated. They're deliberately trying to break out of that, but I'm not sure they've thought it through. It's a notoriously conservative community, and this is sort of force-feeding conceptual art to them. There's a gap there. When I think of Chinese-American artists who've worked in community like Mel Chin, I think those are better choices to make such a leap with. I do want to complement their institutional budget. It's amazing. They have a two-year cash reserve, which is quite impressive. Also, they did the same thing as a couple of other organizations and provided no background on the board.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Precita Eyes Muralists Association, Inc.

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

This mural project will transform a long, undulating retaining wall which is approximately 5'x494', that borders the Laguna Honda Hospital campus across from the Forest Hill Muni station from its current monochromatic green into a panorama of images that represent the organizations nearly 150 years of providing skilled, compassionate health care to San Franciscans in need as well as the colorful story of the west side of the city.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

For someone living in San Francisco you see their work everywhere. The work sample conveyed their long history of doing 500 murals since the 1970s. They know what they're doing. With the Laguna Honda Clinic, Precita makes a good argument for the work that they do. I have questions about the process of collaborating with the clinic. In particular, I'd like more information about their collaboration with the constituents of the occupational therapy component. How will they deal with the different needs of language, disability, etc. of patients? I need more on process. They talk about having community input. What would that look like? Will the community be contributing ideas or content? How do they want to execute getting that input? Is there a process by which they have representatives talking about the process? In terms of budget, they put in \$25,000 of a \$53,000 project total. \$10,000 is secured, but what about other sources being pursued, even tentatively? These figures don't inspire much confidence for me financially. I'm wondering about their capability of getting this off the ground in terms of funding. There's no indication of how the SFAC funds would be used. The project is aligned closely with the mission and vision. They didn't go into depth with their collaboration. In terms of the health of organization, their funding is not yet identified. There's an awareness of things that need attention. They didn't mention a 5-year plan. Their work is valuable and the project is valuable. I need more detail of how they will do it. Will the rest of the funding come through in time? The timeline is long. Have they made provisions for fundraising?

Staff: Their window for fundraising is November 2012–December 2013. Their workshop is January–March 2014. Their application does note that they applied to Zellerbach Foundation and got \$7,000. The award letter is on its way.

Is this a SFAC public arts commission?

Staff: Laguna Honda is a SFAC public art site and SFAC has worked with them.

Are they receiving SFAC public art funding already?

Staff: No.

This is what they've been doing for a long time. The murals are a cornerstone of San Francisco's arts aesthetic. There's a little bit of dust and a feeling of the same thing in terms of the product. But they have a long-term commitment and model of murals. Partnering with Laguna is smart. But, I'm troubled by the budget. It's not helpful or generous for us to have so many holes. There's a problem with the project's rhetoric of this mural on the street. They say the mural will be "enriching the lives of residents". It's questionable. They have a strong management board team. There's a huge percent of earned income.

I want to reiterate the comments on the budget. I'm not sure if it's not having the experience or the confidence. Even though, it's similar, and I like the idea of them doing it at Laguna. It creates a different context of public art by a different community. That's good. That space is often overlooked. It's interesting, because it's unique: You take something common, the usual, and put it in a place where it's unexpected. But it's a leap to say that it will "enrich the lives of residents". There's no explanation of how it will enrich lives. When I read it there's a lot of conceit to say that it will enrich lives when you're dropping a common mural like that. It's a great place to put a mural. I see it will do something for that space.

It's one of the few murals on the west side of city. There are lots of murals on the east side. I drive there a lot and Laguna is an occupational therapy hospital. It's a residence. Residents are housebound and don't get out, so they won't see the mural.



2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations

San Francisco Cinematheque

Group Size	Small
Request:	\$15,000
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

During this funding period, San Francisco Cinematheque will present approximately 75 individual film/video screenings to local audiences. These screenings will include a diverse array of contemporary and historic avant-garde film, video and related performance and installation works from local, national and international artistic communities. These programs will be dispersed across three seasonal calendars (Fall 2013, Winter/Spring 2014 and Fall 2014) and will also be represented by CROSROADS 2014, the fifth manifestation of our annual festival.

Notes on panel's commentary

The work samples were very good, professional quality, good editing, etc. I didn't understand the narrative and how it connected to this larger visual arts vision; it was hard to understand what it was trying to say. The quality was good. I'm not sure how it's serving an underserved community, and didn't see how it's connecting to the goals of the CEG program. It feels like it's a very well established program.

Staff: OPG applicants are not required to serve underserved populations, but they do need to articulate who they're serving.

Cinematheque is serving emerging artists. I'm not sure if they'll serve other communities outside of these institutions. This is kind of an insert into large institutions, I don't see it as a body of work that will determine and shape the organization. I didn't see the artistic vision, but I see that the quality is great. The timeline looks good. Even the way they're talking about audience, as "some people will like this, some like that." There wasn't a strong outreach plan. In terms of the budget they're asking for, it seems like they can do it, but there is a deficit. It's very small, not bad. I had a problem with looking at the way they were defining the budget.

This is a tough one. The Cinematheque serves an important community in the Bay Area and they provide a clear alternative to what's being programmed in other festivals. It is experimental and avant-garde; it really is trying to do something very specific with the film community. It's had trouble funding itself precisely because of that; the community is so small. What they do present is compelling work; it does push the discourse forward in terms of film. My biggest problem with this application is I don't know where to draw the line. Its not asking for funds for a specific project; it's for operational maintenance. They're saying they will be doing x, y and z, but we don't really know that, so in essence, the funding would be to support Cinematheque and what it represents. That's how I read this proposal and I feel like that's a very different proposal from all the others we've read.

Staff: Are they asking for support for their year-round programming?

I'll put it this way, if the Arts Commission funds this, its not funding a specific project and conceivably, Cinematheque could spend the whole next year planning without doing anything.

I agree it feels like a general request, but in the budget breakdown, a lot of it is allocated to the Crossroads Festival. I question why they didn't highlight this.

That's fair to ask; I'm speaking more to the narrative itself, the tone of it. Maybe that's ok.

Staff: quality and soundness of the project planning, or the structure of the presentations?

That's what we're saying. This is a lot of the same. If the funds are going to the Crossroads program, the budget should be adjusted to reflect that. What is here doesn't feel like a project budget.

My math could be wrong here, but less than 15% goes to the Crossroads Festival. If you look at budget item 25, it's including printing of seasonal calendars. It's talking about the entire year.

Also, looking at attendance, it tripled in 2010 but the application did not explain.

Leaders and personnel seem very well trained. As for the board of directors, they are losing four members within a year, with no notes as to why, so that's a bit troublesome.



2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations

American Indian Film Institute

Group Size

Mid-Size

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

AIFI will produce and promote the 38th annual American Indian Film Festival, November 1 – 9, 2013 in San Francisco. AIFF will present over 80 documentaries (short/long) features; animation, music videos and short films. THINK LOCALLY, ACT GLOBALLY - the American Indian Film Festival is designed to inform, educate and foster mutual support and appreciation of contemporary Indian peoples in the media arts.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

I didn't have enough information on the project at all. We know the mission, and I did research. It's their 38th year and they've done very important work historically. But, the narrative and the ideas of the project were not well connected to what they do. The narrative was cut in half, so I didn't get a sense of artistic leadership, etc. There was a lot of information missing, and to be quite honest, I believe this application is incomplete. We don't have enough information to give it a fair score. We have several empty pages in the narrative.

Staff: One thing to know, the narrative exceeded the maximum of four pages. According to the guidelines, staff removed pages exceeding the four-page limit. There are also formatting issues, which is difficult to tell if it could be related to the application. As note to the applicant to read the application guidelines and follow instructions.

Is it fair then for us to evaluate this application? There is a ton of stuff missing.

Staff: Please evaluate on what materials are available.

We have no artistic leadership, the implementation is not clear, the budget request seems general, and it seems like they're asking for a specific part of the festival. There wasn't an audience or outreach plan included and not enough detail about the leadership was provided. I have no idea about their skills. The financials are not clear. I did not have budget notes. The staff bios are pretty substantial.

Overall, this is a very good and necessary festival to support. It's a relevant, critical endeavor. This is kind of one of the things that's lacking in the city, in terms of film. But, purely based on the merits of the application and proposal, I don't know what they're asking money for. Based on the way the application is put together with the project activity there seems to be three big endeavors. They seem to be significant, but when you look at the budget, it's requesting money for a venue rental. I don't see how it correlates. I hesitate to say that the request doesn't match the need here. I hate to say that, because I can see the value of what this is. There's a critical value of a producer's forum. It's where the future of film is right now. It's not just to create but also to learn about film, producing, and creating a generative industry to keep it going. It's a shame, because if this proposal was put together better, this is the kind of thing that has to happen. It's unfortunate. Based on how it's put together I cannot recommend funding.

The request is talking about an expansion, and it says the funding supports the expansion. But, to me, there just isn't any connection to what that means. How does renting a venue support this? I don't know. I don't see how it's tying together. Other festivals have requested funds for a venue, but it's clear what the funds are supporting. In this case, the venue could possibly support one of three things. We just don't see where this is applied.

I appreciate your comment on putting value on the producer's forum.

Staff: For clarification, it sounds like the touring program is outside the scope of this proposal.

I guess I'm surprised to hear the strong criticism. I didn't have so many problems with it. I think this is important, and we should talk about it. Where do they talk about expansion?

It's on page sixteen, under project activities.

Ok. I still don't get how the venue rental applies to the touring program. There are project budget notes or CCDP notes.

I have a note that the tribal contributions were strong, and something that this organization brings to their budget. I hear what you're saying, but I have less trouble with it. Maybe it's because I'm outside of the field. I have more trust that this will happen as described. I'm not as concerned about tying the specific money to a specific activity. I was more



**2013 OPG Media Arts
Panel Recommendations**

concerned with the quality of the film, which I thought was poor. So that was a surprise and disappointment. But, I'm still somewhat supportive of the project.

As for the video, the production quality was low, and surprisingly predictable. When I saw it, I was thinking of the public service announcement type. It was generic. I know it's a huge problem in the community, but that's not a sophisticated way to deal with that.

I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed about the value of the work. I think a lot of the capability of the organization in carrying this out is inferred through their long history. But again, it's an incomplete proposal. It's unclear for the amount of activity they're proposing. They have a very small staff, and it's not indicated what their roles will be. The Board of Directors is a four-person board, and the director is the president of the Board. We got a full and rich description of what the programs will look like, but we didn't get any of the planning.

They show an increase of 38% youth attendance. I would like to know about the strategy and how they got there. They seem to have been operating within their budget, but I don't know where their funding is coming from. I do have to say, looking at the three-year average, that I'd like an explanation of why the numbers haven't been finalized.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

PhotoAlliance

Group Size

Small

Project description

Request:

\$15,000

PhotoAlliance requests support for its annual Photography Lecture Series, bringing renowned photographers from across the country and world to present their art and vision to a diverse Bay Area audience. Each lecture has a main speaker and an introductory presentation generally by an emerging artist. International artists are also invited which adds an important global component. Placement of visiting artists in classrooms expands the outreach and commitment to education and dialogue with a diverse audience.

Recommended:

\$0

Notes on panel's commentary

As a project, the proposal is projecting funds for their most public face. It has a proven track record of success. From what I can tell, it's been pretty successful in terms of bridging the gap with filmmakers, photographers, etc. It's had a successful run from what I can tell. If you look at it in terms of review, the quality of the proposed project is strong. The previous work really supports their ability to carry it out.

I wish that the samples demonstrated more about the people in the project rather than a program guide. It would have been useful in helping us understand the visual scope.

Are we to assume that they are just going to carry it out the way they did last year? The application had the smallest planning section, which makes me think they wanted us to go off what they did last year. This strikes me as a request for operational maintenance funding, which is fine, but with the kind of access they have, it feels like they could do more than the same thing they did last year. I don't know what that would be, but I was looking for something in this proposal that said, after 10 years, they would find a new presentation for what they're doing.

A total attendance of 2K per year, that's good, but at this point you almost want it to step to the next level. That's just my natural inclination, funding new and innovative projects. There wasn't anything about it that I disagreed with, but nothing that was really inspiring.

Staff: Can you speak about community impact?

Yes, it has a statement that says its non-egocentric; it has an egalitarian focus. That in itself is important, but I have nothing to compare that against. It sounds like they've provided a creative space for people to bloom, so preserving that is important. In terms of the lecture series and what they're requesting funding for, there's very little spoken about impact. There needs to be more details here.

I would have liked more specificity about the curatorial vision and work plan. I know that they talk about the pairing of renowned and emerging artists, but I would have really liked to know what subject matters or genres have been brought into the discussion. When you pair an established artist and emerging, is it a random pairing? To me it implies some level of curation, but details would be helpful. I guess it was just hard for me to imagine what was going on here, not having been to one of these lectures.

The timeline seemed pretty vacant to me.

In terms of impact on target audience, they talk about low-income attendees. Are these students? It would have been nice to have some testimonials or examples of how it's enriched its target audience.

I'm going to echo a lot of that. I'm very confused about their financial situation. There's a consistent deficit and I don't believe there is an action plan to address this anywhere. The public series portion balances, but if you go into their CCDP report, none of the totals really match. A lot of the numbers are off and it troubles me that for an organization of this size there are discrepancies across the whole three years.

Staff: Are you referring to something specific?

The total for the earned revenue doesn't match. I don't know which is correct. There's no explanation on what they're doing to address the deficit in the budget notes. There are not explanations for the three listed years and none of the numbers gel? That's very troublesome.

I'm less worried about the deficit as it's less than 5%; it's almost standard. I'm more concerned with the program, which I found predictable, dull, safe, and not very diverse or cutting edge although they clearly have some established major



**2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations**

figures as part of their programming. On the plus side, financially, they have very good giving for non-foundation sources. As you said, in these applications we are getting organizations that are trying to reinvent themselves, and others that are just maintaining. Both are fine, but this is a very competitive program, and if everyone is being more dynamic, you will fall back.

Staff: One of our criteria is originality, relevance, and depth, so in a way challenging what you're doing, but ongoing programming is something we can support. What the panel is struggling with is the application articulating these areas. But there could be an internal progression.

Yes, but then we need to know more to be able to see this. They need to tell us what they're talking about, and there's just not enough information here.

A couple little things, the board list does not list the affiliations so it's impossible to understand what they bring to the table. They say somewhere they want to enhance the diversity by bringing in an international artist, which to me doesn't really make sense, especially in San Francisco.

Staff: They articulate that the board helps guide the selection of the lecture speakers.

Right, but we're supposed to evaluate the effectiveness of the board and I want to see if they're businessmen, filmmakers, artist, etc.

Yes, that's a really good point. I went to the very end and that was one thing that struck me. You don't know how it's going to be carried out, and you don't know anything about the people behind it. That's a critical affirmation from the community at large, so you can see where the creative confluence is. Without a description of the board members or in the proposal itself, it becomes kind of a cookie cutter, standard piece of presentation.

We don't know. It could be a terrific board, but we don't know either way. One last thing, they have gotten NEA funding consistently, to their credit.

Not be beat a dead horse here, that is a very specific mark there. I can't see this proposal getting funding. They must have been more explicit about that. To some extent it seems like they've under sold themselves. It's not easy to receive consistent NEA funding, so I would assume they did something a little more cutting edge to get their attention. Unfortunately, we don't see it here.



2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations

Diasporic Vietnamese Artists Network

Group Size	Tiny
Request:	\$7,500
Recommended:	\$0

Project description

DVAN's summer art program will be three weeks in length (40 hours) in June 2013. The program targets Southeast Asian high school youths in the Tenderloin neighbourhood. The program will increase the students' critical thinking about self, community and society through arts as measured by art projects produced during the program. The program will also increase the awareness about Vietnamese diasporic arts among second generation Southeast Asian Americans as measured by entry and exit surveys.

Notes on panel's commentary

My general impression is that this is the first year they're doing the project, in terms of the project summary, it is clearly a project that has potential merit.

I would have liked more information, generally, on how they were going to implement this, especially as a first-time project. It didn't really talk about why they felt this was relevant. Why now? They've been going since 2007. Why is this a good time to launch a summer youth program? Did they feel they had the resources and capacity or community need, etc.?

In terms of the depth of investigation of the project, there wasn't as much information as I would have liked to have back up that statement. They had a few examples, but I wanted to know more about program details. What are the issues being explored in community, depositions from within, essential questions being posed, etc.?

The work sample was the website, as far as I remember. It didn't give me much of a sense of the work. It didn't show much student work. There were a few poems, some mural work, and a video, but not that much that showed me they had the necessary resources and ability for carrying out the project.

I wasn't sure about the measures of success or how they would gauge success. I wasn't sure about their outreach plan and how they will talk to the youth.

In terms of the staff, there was some arts education programming experience, but not a great depth of experience. Regarding the artistic fees, one really stood out to me and maybe it's a typo. But the budget allocates \$2250, but on the application form the paid artists indicates \$0. If they're trying to connect the students with artists and part of that conversation is about being an artist in the world, then it's important to pay the artists. Maybe they are, maybe it's a typo, but I don't see it.

Staff: They only describe what the SFAC allocation of \$1250 goes to.

That's actually going to supplies, not fees. At least that is what they have described. Overall my impression is that this is a well-intentioned project but I'm not sure how the target audience is going to be served and enriched if there's not a clearly thought out program plan.

I agree with that. One thing that struck me is that it's a really good and inspired idea to do this in the Tenderloin. But, you get the sense as you go through the proposal that a lot of visionary statements are being made about the impact, but there are not a lot of specifics. The sense that I'm getting is that there is a heavy reliance on CCA and their advisors at CCA, who are guiding this. It's hard to see what this is actually going to be.

On the timeline that they've laid out, they say by June 2013, the program will be complete. It seems like a really truncated schedule and you would think that it would have a clearer vision for what's going to happen.

Staff: They said they started the program design in January 2013.

That maybe speaks to the difficulty in evaluating this. The program design starts in January, the application comes before hand, and it's really difficult to decide if it should be funded because it's all really vague as this point.

Staff: This is maybe related to this being their first year.

It's definitely related to that. If you ask me if this kind of idea should be supported, definitely, but are they going to get all these pieces together to make it a truly effective program. For this application it doesn't seem like they know what the program will be.



**2013 OPG Literary Arts
Panel Recommendations**

It seems like an exploratory grant will allow them time to bring in experts, etc. A planning grant would be good. I agree that something like this should be supported.

I want to really commend them. This is something that needs to be looked into. It is youth based and it is very compelling. This is a really good example of a proposal that could have used feedback prior to submitting the grant.

There are a lot of mistakes on their budget as well. They reported a surplus every year. My question is, if you have that much of a surplus, why ask for money? They seem to count on individual donor contributions, so I would advise that they pay artists, as you mentioned. I just felt that some of the numbers didn't match up.

Staff: We don't know if the surplus is a plan for reserve etc., so that may or may not be related to what they should be doing with the surplus.

I feel like if there is a community in need, it's the Vietnamese in the Tenderloin. So, we are all oriented to support this. It's a great project for the wrong grant program. This grant is to support professional level art and this is youth art. The quality of the product is not competitive in this grant category. The professional artists who are being brought in are talking, not making.

This grant does fund workshops.

Yes, but the artists are there to talk and inspire, not to make or collaborate.

Staff: It is the level of quality of the work that we need to look at. As a clarification, I see they use youth as opposed to kids or children.

They're teenagers. Again, from what we've seen, I don't think the artistic quality is competitive in this grant category.

I'd like to say to them, even if you don't get funding this time, you should consider applying at another time because this grant has merit. I believe they should perhaps consider working with someone to refine the grant and develop the project. The budget questions are pretty big.

To add to that, they use Intersection as a fiscal sponsor, why not use them for guidance?

They say their cash income for the past three years is \$11K and the average for three years is \$14K, so someone is not doing the numbers correctly.

Staff: The maximum amount they can apply for is less than what they are asking for, because you can only ask for half of the previous years cash income. It's listed in the guidelines.



2013 OPG Visual Arts
Panel Recommendations

Artists Guild of San Francisco

Project description

The Artists Guild of San Francisco Gallery Project will take the Artist's Guild of San Francisco to the next level by helping individual local artists be able to have their art provide their livelihood. The project will establish a gallery that will keep costs to the individual artists to a minimum and will provide emerging and established local artists the opportunity to expand their individual businesses. The AGSF Gallery physical space will also allow the opportunity to sponsor classes and workshops and expand the Guild's mission of bringing "art and artists into the community for public interaction and education"

Group Size Tiny
Request: \$15,000
Recommended: \$0

Notes on panel's commentary

In a general, as a proposal to fund a gallery space to benefit the artists by generating income, this is a good idea in principal. It is always a good idea to create gallery space to allow the artist to function. That said, from a holistic evaluation, I don't know the proposal has a strong enough vision for the actual space. This is probably the leanest narrative we've seen out of the pool. I don't know if it represents the gallery space well. It sort of assumed that the space itself would draw in people and community and provide a business model and income for the artists. I don't think its been explained enough for the funding requested. This is one of those proposals that fall into a category of cut and paste text. It felt like a lot of things were cut and pasted in. That works against the proposal because it doesn't seem like its speaking directly to what they're requesting money to fund. If you're talking about soundness of project planning, and revenue model, explain what that means. I would have appreciated hearing that. It's a broad statement. Sustainability in the arts these days is such a huge conversation and the level of detail in most applications far exceeds the level of detail we see here. It needs to be fleshed out a lot.

On another level, something that brings up questions is that they're going from public exhibition spaces to gallery space and that move is not discussed here, but it's a huge thing. I trust the executive director, but its not enough to say I know what I'm doing, you have to really articulate what you mean. We can't just fund it and assume everything will be ok. I concur. I want to stress that the artistic vision and narrative was not clearly defined. The business model also needed to be developed. It relies heavily on the buy-in of artists. There's a slight description of that but I tend to think this is a bit too ambitious for no real strategy. How will they do the 2-year lease rental? The proposal would have benefited from letting us know what the director's two successful ventures in the past were, so we could have more confidence in her.

I want to address that the organization is showing a deficit, with no mention of why it is there. This is another application that could have used editing and oversight. There were a lot of errors, typos, and incomplete sentences, so I would really recommend the applicant really pore over the application and proposal and flesh them out. For example the executive director's summary just drops off. I don't know why.

Staff: To circle back to the question about the 3-year average, I see that they have deficits carried over from FY 2010 -2011. They have an accumulated surplus. It appears that the deficit from 2010 was board approved in order to the hire an ED and build infrastructure.

I think any nonprofit that accumulates a \$64K surplus is doing something right. But, I agree, it's a big step to go from decades of experience doing outdoor art sales to running a gallery. It's almost a different animal. I give them credit for trying new paths despite their success, but it's not a convincing argument.

One thing that hasn't been addressed is the quality of work, which from the slides we've seen, is not strong. Some organizations are about aesthetics and some are about cultural expression; this one is about commercial sales. That's fine, but my experience is that this is not a particularly strong expression of contemporary art in the Bay area. They're proposing to open a gallery: a classic coop gallery where people pay dues and entitle them to have shows in the gallery. There's not enough information about artistic quality. It is juried, but they give no information on to the selection process. There is also a jump in budget from the \$46K to the proposed project budget. These numbers are not explained and there is a discrepancy in the numbers. If they are able to get all this funding from all the different sources they identified, how the funding will be sustained in the future remains to be seen. There is no description of a target audience. It's inferred by the participants and gallery space, but there really isn't any discussion. At the very minimum it would have been nice to know about the prior audience, the other exhibitions, attendees etc. That has not been addressed and that is at the heart of our criticism. It's absolutely critical for this kind of funding request to talk about these things. You can't ignore them.