1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Cuyahoga Arts & Culture (CAC) Board of Trustees was called to order at 4:01 p.m. at SPACES, 2220 Superior Viaduct, Cleveland, OH 44113.

The roll call showed that Trustees Matt Charboneau, Sari Feldman and Eliza Wing were present. It was determined that there was a quorum.

Also in attendance were: CAC staff: Karen Gahl-Mills, executive director; Jill Paulsen, deputy director; Meg Harris, director of administration; Jesse Hernandez, program manager; Stacey Hoffman, program manager; Jake Sinatra, program associate; and communications manager, Jennifer Schlosser.

Motion by Trustee Charboneau, seconded by Trustee Wing, to approve the minutes from the Board meeting held on June 16, 2014. Discussion: None. Vote: all ayes. The motion carried.

[Trustee Joe Gibbons arrived at 4:02 p.m.]

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

Raymond Bobgan made a public comment regarding the discussion agenda item related to the Creative Workforce Fellowship.

3. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Gahl-Mills welcomed Board members and attendees and gave an overview of the meeting’s agenda. She thanked SPACES for hosting the meeting.

Ms. Gahl-Mills informed the Board that revenue year-to-date continued to track well below forecast. She added that it is the first time CAC has seen revenues below projections.

She invited Greg Peckham, managing director of LAND studio, to make a presentation about the successes of the AHA! Cleveland festival, which CAC funded through its Creative Culture Grants program. Mr. Peckham gave a presentation in which he outlined how the AHA! Cleveland festival of large-scale light installations in downtown Cleveland highlighted the recent positive developments happening in downtown Cleveland, drew thousands of residents to participate, and met the goals of the program.
4. CONNECT WITH CULTURE

Christina Vassallo, executive director of SPACES, made a brief presentation to the Board. Ms. Vassallo described SPACES’ mission, history and work and thanked CAC for providing unrestricted funds to the organization through the General Operating Support grant program.

5. FINANCE REPORT

Ms. Harris gave a report on Cuyahoga Arts & Culture’s finances through August 2014. Ms. Harris reported that tax receipts through August were just under $10,590,000. This figure is $247,000 below forecast for the period and 4.2% below revenue for the same period in 2013. Interest revenue through August was $61,511. This figure exceeded the forecast for the period by $11,511. Cash expenditures through August were just over $14.2 million. This figure is on budget for expenditures year-to-date.

6. BOARD DISCUSSION

a. Recap From June 16 Board Retreat

Ms. Gahl-Mills brought the Board’s attention to the memorandum “2014 board retreat: summary and next steps” (see summary), which was provided in advance. She stated that the document provides a recap of the Board’s discussion at the Board Retreat held on June 16, 2014 and outlines next steps for strategic planning for CAC’s next 10 years.

Trustee Feldman stated that it will be important for CAC to focus on data collection and data analysis. Trustee Wing asked Ms. Gahl-Mills to clarify whether CAC’s intention is to form a community strategic planning committee and involve the community in strategic planning. Ms. Gahl-Mills stated that yes, CAC intends to work with the community and gather data to inform a longer-range strategic planning process.

b. Funding for Individual Artists

Ms. Gahl-Mills gave an overview of CAC’s recommendations to the Board regarding the continuation of funding for individual artists (see Supporting Individual Artists Board Discussion Guide). Staff recommends:

1. Continuing to provide funding for a fellowship program: $800,000 over two years ($400,000 in 2015; $400,000 in 2016) for a fellowship program that is retooled to ensure that fellows engage the residents of Cuyahoga County in their work, in line with CAC’s commitment to public benefit. CAC hopes to continue working with CPAC, and that they will design and run the program within these parameters.

2. Entering into an open community planning process in 2015 to explore how CAC can support creative professionals and their role and strengthening our community into the second 10 years of our work.

Trustee Feldman stated that refining the program to make it more “community-facing” would allow opportunities for the public to better connect with artists and foster an understanding of the artist’s process. She stated that it would allow for clearer outcomes and objectives of the program, helping residents to see the intent of the program for the greater community. She stated that, with CAC’s revenue shrinking, continuing to fund individual artists will mean fewer dollars in CAC’s other grant programs. She stated that CAC’s application process puts General Operating Support and Project
Support grant recipients through a rigorous process in order to ensure CAC’s funding criteria, with an emphasis on public benefit, is met before they can receive funding. Ms. Gahl-Mills agreed, and stated that she knows that CPAC takes the application process seriously.

Trustee Wing asked whether CAC would clearly define “community-facing,” or let CPAC define it. Ms. Gahl-Mills stated that the requirement for fellowship recipients to serve their community in some way during their fellowship year is not a new requirement; it was a requirement in the 2013-14 fellowships. She stated that CAC will provide CPAC with CAC’s clearly outlined goals for this program and ask CPAC to create a proposal, which CAC would then bring before the Board.

Ms. Paulsen commended CPAC for their excellent work on this program in the past, including their ability to run a fair and balanced panel review process. She stated that CAC trusts CPAC and their ability to run this type of grant program and that CAC wishes to give CPAC the creativity to continue to design and run this program within CAC’s parameters.

Trustee Gibbons stated his wish to learn more about the process, including the pros and cons of different ways of running the program, and looks forward to more interaction with CPAC. He stated that many people care about this program and want to do the right thing, which is not always easy. He stated that CAC’s responsibility is to carry out its mission with accountability to the residents of Cuyahoga County. He stated that he looks forward to learning more and seeing CPAC’s proposal.

Trustee Charboneau stated that he agrees with the staff’s approach and recommendations in terms of aligning the program with CAC’s mission. He stated that if CAC is asking all of its General Operating Support and Project Support grant recipients to connect back to their community and demonstrate public value, then it must ask the same of Creative Workforce Fellows. He stated that because CAC’s revenue comes from taxpayers, CAC must make sure it is spending the dollars wisely to give the public access back to its investment. He stated concern about the Fellowship being regarded as a prize, which it is not. He stated that a prize rewards artists for accomplishments already achieved, whereas a fellowship is forward-facing and aims to allow the artist to accomplish new work. He stated that reinforcing the importance of the community-facing element makes it a fellowship rather than a prize.

Ms. Gahl-Mills stated that the next step is for CAC to give a set of expectations and goals for the program to CPAC before September 26. CPAC will have the opportunity to review and react to this document and to let CAC know if they would like to submit a proposal to run the CWF program in 2015. Should CPAC decide to move forward, they will submit an interim draft proposal to CAC in December and the formal proposal will be presented to the Board for its review and approval at the February 2015 meeting.

Trustee Feldman stated that the Board would like to receive an interim report on the status of the CWF program at its meeting in December.

7. BOARD ACTION

There were no administrative matters to consider, and no Board action was taken.

Ms. Gahl-Mills drew the Board’s attention to the schedule of CAC Board Meeting dates set for 2015.
8. PUBLIC COMMENT

The following individuals made public comments regarding the Creative Workforce Fellowship: Steve Cagan, Faye Hargate, Gary Williams, Chris Ebert, Liz Maugans, Raymond Bobgan, Christine Borne, R.A. Washington, Eric Schmiedl, Kathleen O’Malley, Christina Vassallo, Achala Wali and Christina Mauersberger.

9. BOARD WORK SESSION: BUDGET & ALLOCATION FOR 2015

Ms. Gahl-Mills walked the board through the Allocation Memo (see memo) and facilitated a discussion of this topic in preparation for the November 24 board meeting.

Next meeting: The next meeting will be held at 4:00 p.m. on November 24, 2014, at the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum, 1100 Rock & Roll Boulevard, Cleveland, OH 44114.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Trustee Charboneau, seconded by Trustee Gibbons, to adjourn the meeting. No discussion. Vote: all ayes. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

______________________________
Sari Feldman, President, Board of Trustees

Attest:

______________________________
Steven Minter, Secretary, Board of Trustees
Thank you for spending important time thinking together with the team about CAC’s future at our June 16th board retreat.

Our retreat has become the one time of year that we leave the purely administrative work of the board behind and take time to think about the road ahead.

Let’s look back and summarize where our retreats have taken us:

⇒ In 2010, we took a first look at improvements & explorations: ways to improve our grantmaking work and our governance work combined with explorations of new ideas, all as a way to chart a course for both the near-term and long-term future.

⇒ In 2011, those “improvements” led to the creation of a revised mission statement for CAC, something that has guided all of our work going forward. We also planted the seeds for Creative Culture Grants, a creative response to surfacing creative talent in the community beyond our two primary grant programs.

⇒ In 2012, aligned around our mission, vision & values, we began to explore new work, specifically in the areas of advocacy, stewardship, convening, and thought leadership. The board challenged the staff to build its capacity in each of those areas, and the board challenged itself to play a key volunteer role in the upcoming campaign to renew CAC’s tax funding.

⇒ In 2013, with the staff engaged in implementing new initiatives in all four areas identified in 2012, we explored specific governance and “bright future” issues, paying particular attention to maintaining a climate of fairness for organizations of all sizes as politically charged situations begin to crop up. You also challenged the staff to take on a research project and to ensure that the voice of the public was brought to the board whenever possible.

In 2014, our intention was to accomplish the following:

a) To review/reaffirm the mission/vision/values framework as the internal dashboard for change. Given that the composition of our board has changed as we’ve welcomed new members, it seemed important and timely to review this material to ensure that everyone is thinking about our future with the same foundation in mind.

b) To share/discuss the results of our baseline evaluation work with the board, following up on a key internal initiative: moving from activity to outcomes. As this work represented our first look
back, we thought it important to build a shared understanding about our internal data practice and how we will measure progress going forward.

c) To share/discuss the progress to date with the Helicon Collaborative on our public value initiative, the research project that the team has been engaged in for much of 2014, and to begin to understand the ramifications of what we’ve found and the directions it might take us.

d) And then, with those sets of information in hand, identify a set of key issues for CAC’s future, so that we can move forward with a sense of alignment and purpose, also mindful of the upcoming levy campaign to renew our resource and how that will influence our future work.

Our discussions were lively and wide-ranging, with thanks to Randy McShepard for his expert guidance and facilitation. The baseline assessment generated many questions about both methodology and conclusions, and you gave the staff useful feedback that will inform our work. Our team will continue to work with this data set precisely as a baseline – as a point from which to measure progress as our work continues. We always meant for it to be internal work, and we do not intend to publish it; rather, we will refer to it as we move forward.

The public value initiative is very much a work in progress, as you no doubt realized as our conversation with Holly Sidford and Nick Rabkin unfolded. We are on the leading edge of this research, venturing into territory that is somewhat uncharted, and the initial findings from Holly and Nick are provocative and important. Your early stage feedback and challenging questions will make their report more robust, and we look forward to sharing it with you shortly.

As we moved into the key issues discussion, it became clear that we have some important choices ahead. There is much more that our agency could do within the limits of our authority; the need in the arts & cultural community is great, whether in the area of connecting authentically with community, in building financial literacy and sustainability, or in building on innovation and blue-sky thinking. We have a growing role to play in convening our cultural partners both so that we can learn from them and so that they can learn from us. We also have work to do to better understand how the community perceives our work and how we build a robust communications strategy grounded in that understanding. And we always have to balance the concerns of those who voice their opinions loudly vs. the concerns of all of the organizations that we fund. These choices are upon us at a time that our tax resource continues to shrink while demand grows, and how we will chart our course with the community’s need in mind is an important question for us to consider.

Cuyahoga Arts & Culture is a young agency, and we haven’t yet embarked on the type of formal planning process that other institutions take on regularly. But perhaps the time for such a process has come.

You might remember that, in late 2012, Maureen Robinson, a facilitator who worked with CAC on the first three of its retreats, suggested the following:

“Strategic thinking and decision-making have been integral to CAC’s work in the last few years. Identifying issues, framing them, engaging stakeholders have all been done systematically but also incrementally...a number of issues that emerged from the retreat around influence regionally and nationally as well as taking on a more intentional role as a thought leader may benefit from being evaluated and thought through within the context of a fuller and more open planning process.”

And so, as we look ahead, I propose that we do it deliberately and in the context of a formal planning process. A process built on engaging a wide ranging group of stakeholders in helping to determine our
future, guided by our mission and vision and grounded in our values. A process that is inclusive in nature and rigorous in practice, led by a planning committee that would include board members and other community volunteers. And an unconventional process grounded in the public value research that is so critical to our future and to the future of the arts and cultural organizations that we support.

Taking on this planning work now is optimal as we anticipate the passage of another 10-year levy to fund arts and culture. A process that engages stakeholders in our work over the next 12 months – and in building the future of our agency – will allow us to raise awareness of our work in the near term and implement the ideas a planning process generates early in next levy cycle, thereby assuring that the public remains engaged in our work and can see the value that investing public funds in arts and culture continues to have for our community.

With that in mind, here are our next steps:

⇒ Staff will continue to refine our internal data collection practice, using these baseline statistics as a fixed point from which we will measure progress.
⇒ Staff will consider ways to continue to collect information from our cultural partners and from the public at large via surveys, polls, etc., so that our decisions are all informed by fresh data.
⇒ Staff will continue to increase our focus on public relations and storytelling, both for CAC and for the organizations that receive CAC funding, particularly as the campaign to renew our tax resource gets closer.
⇒ Staff will commission a written report from Holly Sidford and Nick Rabkin which will summarize the methodology and findings from their public value research work and include a set of recommendations for the future. We anticipate sharing such a document with the board prior to presenting a high-level summary of what we learned at the national Grantmakers in the Arts conference in October.
⇒ Staff will explore ways to undertake a long-range planning process and include provision for it in CAC’s 2015 operating budget.
⇒ At the September meeting, staff will share early stage conclusions about our financial picture and future operating budgets through a work session on the allocation process, so that we can put this decision-making framework in context.

* * *

As always, thank you for the thoughtful insights you bring to the work of Cuyahoga Arts & Culture. I welcome your questions and comments about our next steps anytime.
Question
How can Cuyahoga Arts & Culture (CAC) best support individual artists – in the context of all our grantmaking and aligned with our mission, vision and values?

Background
CAC’s mission, to strengthen the community by investing in arts and culture, was revised in 2011. Since 2009, CAC has provided three grants (two years each) to an intermediary, the Community Partnership for Arts and Culture (CPAC), to establish and manage an individual artists regranting program known as the Creative Workforce Fellowship (CWF).

Investment & Results
CAC’s total investment in the program, to date, is $3,283,850, resulting in 122 individuals receiving fellowships or runner-up prizes.

Reviewing CAC’s Investment
As we do with all our grant programs, CAC continually reviews its work to ensure that investments are grounded in our mission and in line with our allocation policy. Today’s Board discussion is an important step to help CAC move forward on a continued path to support artists.

For additional background, please see CAC’s update on the status of the CWF, posted on our website earlier this summer.

Key Issues
As CAC reflects on how it will continue to support artists and ensure that they connect with and serve County residents, it is important to consider two key issues:

Alignment with CAC Mission: Focus on Public Benefit
Two goals of the current CWF program, designed in 2008, are to reward artistic excellence and validate artists. While notable, these aims do not align with CAC’s mission. Our primary grant programs (general operating support and project support), as well as our other investments have been revised to have as their central premise: benefitting and serving the residents of Cuyahoga County. Looking ahead, it is vital that our investments in individual artists be retooled to also have this same primary focus.

CAC’s Financial Reality
As noted in the Allocation of 2015-16 Funds memo included in this Board packet, CAC revenue has declined at a greater than anticipated rate in 2014 and is forecast to continue to decline in 2015. This means there will be less money to allocate to our two primary grant programs: general operating support and project support, as well as our other grant investments, including the Creative Workforce Fellowship. We anticipate having $3.5M less in revenue in 2014 than we did when the fellowship was first offered.
National Comparisons
It is also important to ground our assessment of CAC’s current investment in individual artists – and our future commitment – in a national context. Below are several findings that outline how other public funders support creative professionals:

- Fewer than 40% of public funders in the United States Urban Arts Federation (23 of 58) offer direct funding to individuals artists; of those that directly support artists, 10 provide fellowships, ranging in size from $1,500 - $20,000.
- CWF’s awards are the largest in terms of dollars ($20,000 each) and number awarded (20 per year) of publically-funded grants to individuals in the nation.
- 74% of publically-funded grant programs include a community engagement component; artists are expected to involve their community in their work.

Recommendation
Despite CAC’s decreasing revenue, CAC strongly believes that artists are a vital part of our community’s cultural ecosystem. We have a social responsibility to – in some meaningful way – support artists and ensure that their important contributions connect with the residents of Cuyahoga County. Staff, therefore, proposes the following path for the Board’s consideration:

**Step One:** Continue to provide funding for a fellowship program: $800,000 over two years ($400,000 in 2015; $400,000 in 2016) for a fellowship program that is retooled to ensure that fellows engage the residents of Cuyahoga County in their work, in line with CAC’s commitment to public benefit. This commitment to residents is an essential element that – as a public grantmaker – drives all our investments.

We hope to continue working with CPAC, and that they will design and run the program within these parameters. We recommend inviting CPAC to make a proposal to CAC for the Board’s consideration at the February 2015 board meeting. This timeline would allow artists to apply for fellowships to support their work in the community in 2015.

**Step Two:** On a parallel path, we recommend entering into an open community planning process in 2015 to explore how CAC can support creative professionals and their role in strengthening our community into the second 10 years of our work. This effort would be done in partnership with CPAC and will include a broad base of Cuyahoga County residents. We are excited by CPAC’s recent neighborhood-based work ([When Artists Break Ground](#)) and that of other models nationwide that support artists in their work to connect with residents. We anticipate that these strong models will inform CAC’s future investments.

Summary
While we will not request any formal Board action at the September meeting, we will look to the Board to: 1) reaffirm CAC’s commitment to individual artists; and 2) support the two-step process outlined above. Pending positive Board feedback on this path, staff will work immediately to develop a simple grant guideline sheet that guides a retooled version an individual artists regranting program in 2015.

References
- [Cuyahoga Arts & Culture’s Allocation Policy](#) (approved by CAC Board, 2013).
- *Environmental Scan: Local Public Funding for Individual Artists, a review of how publically-funded agencies nation-wide define and directly support individual artists* (commissioned by CAC, 2014).
- [External Evaluation: Creative Workforce Fellowship](#) (commissioned by CPAC, 2014).
MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2014
To: CAC Board of Trustees
From: Karen Gahl-Mills, executive director  
Jill M. Paulsen, deputy director  
Meg Harris, director of administration

Re: Discussion: allocation of 2015-16 program funds

IN BRIEF: At the September 15th board meeting, CAC’s staff will engage the Board of Trustees in a discussion of how CAC will allocate program funds for 2015-16. This memo provides background material to consider as we address this important issue. You will recall that revenue has declined at a greater than anticipated rate in 2014 and is forecast to continue the same trend in 2015. CAC will have less money to allocate to our two primary grant programs and other grant investments.

Feedback from today’s discussion will inform the recommendations that the Board will be asked to approve in November. The Board will take no formal action at the September meeting.

Background
To make decisions about how much to allocate, we need to ground our thinking in some basic facts: what policies guide our work, what program and community objectives are we trying to achieve, how have we allocated it in the past, and how much money may be available.

What Policies Guide Our Work?
This Board crafted and approved an Allocation Policy (available here) to help guide our decision making. The language of the policy reads:

- **Two primary programs**: General Operating Support and Project Support are CAC’s two primary programs, the main way we accomplish our mission.
  - *General Operating Support*: CAC will endeavor to invest the majority of its excise tax revenues in the General Operating Support program.
  - *Project Support*: CAC will endeavor to grow the program and provide meaningful grants that meet community demand.

- **Other Grants and Grant Programs**: They may be approved from time to time in order to expand the reach of CAC’s funding for specific purposes. Grants falling within this category shall not take precedence to the General Operating Support and Project Support grant programs. (Current investments include: Creative Culture Grants; Creative Workforce Fellowship; Public Square Concert; and Neighborhood Connections.)
• Safeguarding a Reserve for Year 10: CAC’s “reserve” will be treated as the 10th year of funding and not used to fund current grant programs.

Objectives: What Are We Trying to Achieve?
Informed by our history and the continuing refinement of our revenue projections, the team has created a set of objectives to guide the allocation process for the coming year:

Overall
• Be intentional with the allocation process, ensuring that it aligns with our mission, vision and values.
• Use our allocation policy as our “guiding light” through the process.
• While endeavoring to maximize the funds we invest in the community, base allocation decisions in the financial reality of shrinking revenue.

General Operating Support
• In a climate of shrinking revenues, maximize our investment while still managing expectations that future grants will likely be smaller.
• Understand cash flow implications in future cycle to ensure CAC is liquid enough to continue 50-40-10% grant payment disbursements.
• Preserve the equivalent of the 10th year of funding.
• The allocation should not be influenced by who is in the grant pool.

Project Support I & II
• Recognize that previous cycles’ growth (in budget and participants) was intentional.
• Ensure that the allocation is large enough to ensure the successful completion of approved applicant projects. (If approved projects are funded at 50% of the request amount due to the small size of the allocation, can those projects be completed successfully?)

Other Grants and Grant Programs

Creative Culture Grants
• Cease program due to decrease in revenue – resulting in savings of ~$320,000 in 2015.
• Consider ways to achieve program goals (connect with residents; build awareness of importance of public funding) through modest investments in communications, including social media and CAC’s Cultural Liaisons initiative.

Creative Workforce Fellowship
• Maintain a commitment to individual artists, at a reduced investment. Creative professionals are a vital part of our community’s cultural ecosystem.
• Be conscious of new financial reality; plan for decreased allocation, as we anticipate across all CAC investments.

Public Square Concert
• Complete existing commitment (contract through 2015 for a grant of “up to $200,000”).
• Recognize cost savings and efficiencies; The Cleveland Orchestra has not drawn down full grant amount in 3 years. Allocate accordingly for future years.

Neighborhood Connections
• Maintain a commitment to this resident-run mini-grant program, recognizing its ability for CAC to reach new audiences/residents, achieve our vision for building vibrant neighborhoods, and help CAC test our initial diversity-equity-inclusion work.
• Minimize impact of modest cut to this program, recognizing that all CAC investments will likely decrease in 2015.
**What Have We Done in the Past?**
The chart on page 37 provides a history of our revenues and how funds were allocated going back to 2007.

In 2010, we surveyed the GOS applicant pool before allocation decisions were made to better understand the impact of smaller vs. larger grants on their operations. That data gathering yielded an unsurprising result: organizations generally wanted to see tapered grants from CAC over time, rather than bigger grants in the near term at the expense of smaller grants in future years. We used that feedback to guide the 2011-12 and the 2013-14 allocations, and will also use it to inform our 2015-16 planning.

**How Much May Be Available?**
We are ever-mindful that CAC utilizes a revenue source that shrinks each year. We have seen smaller revenues in 2014 than in other years, and, looking forward, we anticipate that our revenue will continue to decline. (As a point of reference, revenue in 2014 is projected to be $3.5M less than CAC received in 2008.)

In addition to the historically declining revenue, there are other considerations that must be taken into account when forecasting future revenue for CAC. Governor Kasich has proposed a 60 cent per pack increase on cigarettes. While this initiative has not yet been enacted, it is still a very real possibility that Governor Kasich will continue to pursue this issue. Additionally, a recent poll conducted by the Fallon Research found that 63% of those surveyed support an even greater tax increase than the proposed $.60 per pack. If enacted, the price of cigarettes would increase by approximately 10% which will result in a decrease in demand in addition to the normal annual decrease in purchases.

Considering the revenue reality in 2014 and the possibility of a tax increase on cigarettes, we believe that a conservative projection is warranted: we believe that modeling future revenues based on a decline of 7.5% in 2015 and 4% thereafter is appropriate and prudent.

**In Summary:**
- We are working in an environment where there is less revenue; there will need to be reductions to the allocations for all grant programs.
- Allocations and reductions should be made in line with our Allocation Policy.
- We will continue to communicate clearly to our cultural partners our financial situation.
- Allocations can be reevaluated in future years should revenue improve.

We look forward to the public discussion about this important issue at our September 15th meeting.
## History of CAC’s Revenue and Grant Allocations

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,815,996</td>
<td>$19,540,480</td>
<td>$18,222,183</td>
<td>$17,456,610</td>
<td>$17,241,240</td>
<td>$16,791,300</td>
<td>$16,719,606</td>
<td>$15,952,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change from previous year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$724,484</td>
<td>($1,318,297)</td>
<td>($765,573)</td>
<td>($215,370)</td>
<td>($449,940)</td>
<td>($71,694)</td>
<td>($766,756)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Grant Allocations

#### General Operating Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| # of grants | 68 | 67 | 66 | 68 | 66 | 57 | 57 |      |

#### Project Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$979,900</td>
<td>$825,695</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$757,477</td>
<td>$1,029,164</td>
<td>$1,559,218</td>
<td>$1,891,902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| # of grants | 54 | 55 | n/a | 56 | 88 | 118 | 139 |      |

*There was no project support grant cycle in 2010. This was an intentional shift to move the program onto Cuyahoga Arts & Culture's fiscal year.*

#### Other Grants

- **Creative Culture Grants**
  - $280,422
  - # of grants: 2

  *This program was offered once. The grants cover a two year period.*

- **Creative Workforce Fellowship**
  - $500,000
  - $500,000
  - $577,250
  - $577,250
  - $564,675
  - $564,675

  | # of grants | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |      |

  | #CWFellowships | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |      |

  *This program was awarded a grant in two year cycles.*

- **Public Square Concert**
  - $275,000
  - $275,000
  - $275,000
  - $250,000
  - $250,000
  - $250,000
  - $200,000
  - $200,000

  | # of grants | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

  *This concert is approved for funding through 2015.*

- **Neighborhood Connections**
  - $75,000
  - $85,000

  | # of funded projects | 35 | 46+ |