



**City of San Antonio  
Department of Arts &  
Culture**

**Art Funding Division  
Funding Guidelines**

**CORE PROGRAMS**

**Cultural Arts  
Operational Support**

**1. Eligibility  
Requirements**

**2. Organizational  
Maximum Funding  
Awards and Match  
Requirements,  
Verification of Arts-  
Related Budget**

**Art Funding Guidelines Feedback**

**General Statements:**

- a. Artists Re-Granting - Employ "Local" professional artists and **musicians** (include musicians)
- b. Contract requires too much specificity going through revisions
- c. You get dinged for bad weather revisions be more flexible
- d. Use SBEDA Principals to help support favor those at that class
- e. Several complaints about getting in without following guidelines like Briscoe
- f. Why are Arts Organizations concerned with SA2020, remove SA2020 and keep criteria
- g. Clean up redundancy & buzzwords from text (Guidelines)
- h. Add Technical Staff to Artistic Excellence
- i. Move professional staff to administrative capability
- j. Re-establish rebuttal process
- k. How do you measure "impact"

**Definitional Requests:**

- a. Is Community based Organizations only about funding, please define
- b. Define what Arts & Culture means and differences
- c. Define Art or Artistic Relevance and/or relevant work experience (in definition)
- d. Define "relevant"
- e. Define "showcase"
- f. How is Education defined
- g. What is economic competitiveness
- h. Define culminating event???

**General Eligibility Statements**

- a. Have a salaried full or part-time administrator, define part-time, how many hours
- b. Have all culminating events open to the public and ensure accessibility for the disabled;
- c. Can there be a "semi-closed" environment like when activity is in a public school
- d. It is mandatory to attend prescribed workshops to be eligible for funding in this category

**Geographic**

- a. Would like to have Inner-cities considered San Antonio based, especially if San Antonian's attend
- b. Further explain geographic eligibility
- c. Allow outside geographic (surrounding cities) A&C performances so impact of San Antonio can be greater
- d. "Be in a City Council District – Unincorporated
- e. Allow offices to be in inner-cities that perform San Antonio City wide

**Proven track record of at least 2 years**

- a. Why have 2 years, why not 3 or 1, restore the 3 years
- b. If you have had a track record of more than 2 before, why 2 now
- c. Track record is a key point, need to pay dues before they are eligible
- d. Employ "Local" professional artists and **musicians**

**Funding Categories**

- a. Simplify into three categories
- b. Change the funding category names to reflect budget size not discipline
- c. Category/Budget restrictions limit growth (like community based)
- d. Get rid of budget regarding the community based foundations because funding is up to 50%
- e. Organizations are Arts & Culture not community based

- f. Why do major institutions get City funding, Can we reconsider funding groups under \$1 million at higher percentages
- g. Art Center: just as there is an exception for the school of art, Guadalupe should be in CBO

### **Budget Size**

- a. Community based group are being held to less funding, not be limited to \$800,000 or less
- b. Based on % seems arbitrary ex.  $\$800,000 * 35\% = \$280,000$ , over  $\$810,000 * 20\% = \$162,000$
- c. Need a bigger pie
- d. Award size should not be based on budget but it should be based on impact
- e. When decided on actual budget size of the organizations consider past dollar history of endowments and reserves
- f. Assets need to be considered in budget
- g. Maximize opportunities for community building based on original needs and community wide fund raising (these divide rather than unite)
- h. Revisit the funding formula
- i. Symphony musicians become City employees, set aside for Symphony
- j. Symphony should get from General Fund

### **Hotel Occupancy Tax**

- a. Maintain the HOT at 15%
- b. Explore additional funding not just HOT from the City

### **Match**

- a. Cash match and % equals to metrics, why?
- b. How can you grow if you are between budget sizes and match
- c. Get rid of match
- d. 1:3 match for 2 million budget is not equitable, should be raised to \$5 million plus
- e. Bring back in-kind contributions for all organizations as allowed match
- f. In-kind needs to count, or at least a percentage of it to contribute to match

### **Cap**

- a. Take out the CAP of 10% for budgets over \$2 million
- b. For CBO put no CAP on budgets
- c. Paid administrator, How if \$10K CAP

## 3. Application Process

### **General**

- a. Include a glossary of terms
- b. Can't comply with notifying City Council when you are in "Blackout" period due to RFP/Bid rules
- c. Make everyone follow guidelines
- d. New applicants should be a mandatory visit by Department of Arts & Culture
- e. Need a rebuttal process
- f. Better appeal process
- g. Simplify the process
- h. Don't "recall" on criteria during the process
- i. Insurance requirement should be for all or just performers?
- j. Application had errors: Submit form to City Clerk (not needed) and other areas are not clear
- k. Very time consuming, too many processes
- l. Streamline the application questions, make sure they are clear and succinct. Do not repeat questions throughout the application
- m. Agencies need an acknowledgement that application was received and how many pages, but has cut off in the past or not received and did not know, this is not fair
- n. Too many processes already and added processes with Tri-Art so not worth it
- o. Consistency of communication from COSA

- p. Consistency of reporting benchmarks
- q. City does not need to have programs that compete with any applicants
- r. Rent for non-profits, some pay a \$1 and others \$1000s and they do not get subsidies to offset, so lose staff

### **Workshops**

- a. Please continue mandatory workshops
- b. Workshops are great and very helpful
- c. I like the due dates for questions
- d. I like the workshops but now that I have been to a few, need to accommodate the new and the experienced (maybe webinars)

### **Internet/Web**

- a. I like the WEB Based process but please get links working
- b. Need universal web based process
- c. Support larger file uploads
- d. Not all links work in the application
- e. Consistency in application with email and link address, like: artfunding@ or artsfunding@ or art.funding@
- f. If links not working or application large why cannot submit paper application?

### **Funding Process**

- a. If receiving a small amount of funding why cannot application process suit the size of the organization
- b. Extend funding to three years
- c. Should be able to operationally fund two different projects within the same organization and not get dinged for being “already funded”
- d. Stick to your rules!!

## 4. Applicant Categories

### **Fit/Explain**

- a. Why does Arts San Antonio qualify?
- b. What is the purpose/value of categories?
- c. Align with State and National Application Categories/structure
- d. Where does Film fit?
- e. Categories are too confining as currently configured, revise the language
- f. Protect local artists
- g. 3 Categories are limiting, expand to include Visual, Performance, Folk-art, Literature, Multi-disciplinary, media arts, etc.
- h. Live Performance should be limited to locally produced works, not commercial touring acts
- i. You shouldn't have to apply to a category to avoid a different outcome or to get in-kind
- j. Categories should not be tied to budget

### **Multi-Disciplinary**

- a. Currently excluded from categories, add as a fourth
- b. Do not qualify for Museums, Visual Arts, Exhibitions and/or Live

### **Community Based Organizations**

- a. Is because it is just attached to funding, need true definition
- b. Change from CBO too Small to Midsize Organizations
- c. CBO should be small, midsize and large (over \$1M)
- d. CBOs are presented as “less than” only as if culturally underserved communities deserve only, CBOs
- e. Mission should be what drives the Community Based organization not budget

## 5. Review Criteria

What is the cost of the review process?

### Review Panelists

- a. Better vetting of Adjudicators on review panels
- b. Panel members assigned to correct types of art
- c. Competent Reviewers, qualified panelists
- d. Reviewers need to understand the amount of work and do their prep work
- e. Provide training to panelists
- f. It's obvious that most panelists do not read through the applications in its entirety
- g. Reviewers should be paid in order to hold them accountable
- h. Employ local music critics to review the music organizations
- i. Panelists should represent cultural sensitivity knowledge of local area
- j. Long-term community engagement versus one time visit
- k. Review of the reviewers (ask past reviewers what they think)
- l. Outside panelists not understanding diversity of community
- m. Be judge by a jury of your peers
- n. Check conflicts of interests among peer panelists so there aren't many recusals
- o. Panelists to be paid so they have a vested interest in the reviews
- p. Consider capping the number of reviews assigned to each adjudicator
- q. Give organizations access to the review panelists
- r. Allow for communication with presenter to panelists to ensure clear understanding
- s. Allow applicants to speak to panel before scoring

### Transparency Scoring

- a. Would like objective scoring or better explanation of subjective score
- b. Transparency of scoring non-existent
- c. Following or adhering to process on scoring
- d. No transparency by staff regarding financial position, Administrative Capacity
- e. Need to review how full panel scores compare with panel scores where there are revisions
- f. Better scoring transparency
- g. More detail on why scores are how they are
- h. Greater transparency in review scores provided to agencies. Do not require FOIA request
- i. Clearer and immediate feedback on scores
- j. Adjust scoring to increase staff and lower community