



Power of culture

UNOFFICIAL DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS NEXT MEETING

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF
MASS CULTURAL COUNCIL
GRANTS COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2020

**MASS CULTURAL COUNCIL OFFICE
10 ST JAMES AVENUE-3D FLOOR
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS**

Chair Victoria Marsh called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM

Committee Members Present

Victoria Marsh, Chair of Grants Committee
Nina Fialkow, Chair of Mass Cultural Council
Marc Carroll, Vice Chair, Mass Cultural Council
Jo-Ann Davis
Karen Barry
Sandy Dunn (by phone)
Kathy Castro (by phone)
Barbara Schaffer Bacon (by phone)
Cecil Barron Jensen (by phone)
Karen Hurvitz (by phone)

Staff members present were

Anita Walker, Executive Director
David Slatery, Deputy Director
Bethann Steiner, Communications Director
Jen Lawless, Operations Director
Erik Holmgren, Program Manager CYD
Sara Glidden, Program Manager CIP

Prepared on 5/12/20

Victoria Marsh opened the meeting by referring to the Open Meeting Law requirements.

Victoria then called for a vote on the minutes of the January 7, 2020 Grants Committee meeting. A few corrections were noted. Marc Carroll indicated that he had attended in person and not by phone. Also, Bethann Steiner, Communications Director name was inadvertently left off the names of the attendees (and the name of the former External Relations Director was listed by mistake). Also, the motion for the first vote noted should have been for the approval of the prior *Grants* Committee meeting minutes. It was also requested that in the future minutes reflect more of the specific points of the discussion when the Committee engaged in a general discussion as occurred with the Projects program at the prior meeting.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Grants Committee approves the minutes of the January 7, 2020 Grants Committee Meeting in the form presented to the Grants Committee at its March 3, 2020 Meeting, corrected as set forth above.

Victoria then asked Executive Director Anita Walker for her report. Anita reported on the CultureRx initiative. Since we partnered with the Mass Health Connector on the Card to Culture, the program's sign-ups had increased by 5% which we hoped that the partnership helped advance. We have held a kaizen of the Social Prescription Pilot with internal and external participants which program will be discussed later in the meeting and we received data on the EBT Card to Culture program indicating that there had been over 480,000 usages of the benefit since the program was rolled out.

Anita then began to describe the details of the proposed Social Prescription Pilot emphasizing that this was proposal was a pilot and we hoped to learn more from it and employ those lessons for future iterations of the program. Anita explained that this program will be funded from the 1/4th of the casino tax revenues the Council is receiving under Massachusetts Gaming Law. The Social Prescription Program represents the revenues dedicated to "organizational support" under the statute. Anita briefly described the kaizen process that staff had held for this Pilot

and asked Erik Holmgren, Program Manager, Creative Youth Development to further describe the effort.

Erik summarized the Council's preliminary efforts in this arena which had been approved at the August 2019 Council Meeting and which was funded out of the Council's regular appropriation. There were some sample programs in Springfield and the Berkshires from which staff had learned much. Erik also mentioned a program of Harvard Street Neighborhood Health Center- who had heard about our efforts and approached the Council. Erik emphasized that our initial efforts had uncovered a great deal of excitement- both in the cultural and healthcare field for this type of program and that staff's design process had involved a large number of people from both fields. He mentioned a study that had been undertaken showing that over 80 cultural organizations had relationships of some sort with healthcare providers and we are actively investigating those relationships and how they work. The aim of this pilot will be to focus on a number of such existing arrangements and focus on the details of such programs, creating a specific scope of work for each. Our aim will be, if this program is approved, to start reimbursements in July and we will be undertaking a great deal of training with cultural organizations before then. As an example, he reported on some training that the Norman Rockwell Museum was undertaking in "Cultural Humility" to better interact with participants who receive social prescriptions and might not be familiar or feel welcome at a cultural organization. He then turned to Sara Glidden, Program Manager of the Cultural Investment Portfolio for further description of the Pilot from the organizational perspective.

Sara described to the Committee the value of the *kaizen* process in that it mapped out each step in the program over the course of the next year and built in space for anticipated adjustments based upon experience. She noted that 200 organizations had expressed interest in the program and the 80 of those had a preexisting relationship of some sort with a health care provider. The Berkshires organizations had spent many years putting together their current partnership.

Marc Carroll indicated he had attended the end of the *kaizen* and had been impressed with the final presentations and them mapping out of the program through July 2021.

Karen Barry asked if we had collected data from the Berkshires and Springfield pilots. Erik mentioned that we had but that each program

had a different emphasis. The Springfield group was focusing on readiness by organizations and formed advisory groups- e.g. How will the Nepalese community relate to the Springfield Museums. The aim is to design something that is effective. The Berkshires had focused on a collaborative model so that many different players in the system were communicating- schools, pediatricians, mental health services, social workers and organizations. The Berkshire pilot is already using prescriptions. Karen asked if there were HIPAA concerns around data and Erik indicated that measures were in place so that the Council never knew the names of individuals receiving prescriptions

Jo-Ann Davis complimented the work described as really “cutting edge” and to the staff for employing a fantastic vision. Karen Barry asked about measuring outcomes. Erik indicated that in Year 1, we are focusing on building that model. He mentioned that the Franklin Park Zoo program (as described in the materials) had concrete measurements built in. He mentioned the need for an external evaluator at the end of the year. Jen Lawless indicated that the outcomes will be driven in the Pilot by the existing partnerships- the parties will identify them- we are not dictating them.

Cecil Barron Jensen mentioned the “Always Fresh” program in Nantucket to introduce healthy foods into communities and the importance of collaborations.

Barbara Schaffer Bacon mentioned that the zoo program mentioned in the materials will give us a greater opportunity to discuss outcomes and weigh the roles of the community partners.

A question was asked about the cost to the cultural organization of fulfilling prescriptions. Jen explained we were using the idea of published price of admission for this pilot- not the cost of service. Anita mentioned that each participating organization will also get a \$5000 stipend.

Karen Barry asked if the program is missing any constituencies. Jen replied the responses to our call for programs will help us answer this question.

Anita mentioned she had recently met with the new chair of the Mass Gaming Commission who was very excited that casino tax revenues were being used for a program like this. The Mass Gaming law had some public health aspects such as requiring counselors be present at all

gaming facilities. Karen also mentioned that the Mass Council on Compulsive Gambling was a good resource and encourages staff to speak with them. She also mentioned that she hoped we would look outside of Boston and at the Plainridge slots facility noting the risk of compulsive gambling to immigrants and senior communities.

Jen mentioned that geographic diversity is built into the Pilot as applications could come from anywhere in the state and that the zoo proposal mentioned in the materials represented one small program that would be addressed in the Pilot.

Kathy Castro asked that members be given a list of local organizations that might be able to participate in the Pilot.

Karen Hurvitz asked if the program is focusing on local populations near casinos. Anita stated that while we did fund an early pilot in Springfield where the MGM casino was located, it should be noted that the statute providing the Council with gaming revenues does not require any connection to gambling facilities for this part of the program. Seventy-five percent of the casino tax revenues will go to the Gaming Mitigation Program which was approved in January but the remaining 25% of the revenues is dedicated to "organizational support" generally of cultural organizations and there is no required connection to gaming.

Barbara inquired as to how the decision was made to use the "organizational support" funds for the Social Prescription Pilot. Anita answered that originally the thought had been to use the funds to supplement the CIP allocation but thought that might be seen as replacement funds for an existing program and decided to focus on new innovative ways to deploy the resource to support the field. Barbara asked who is going to pay for these prescriptions beyond our funding. Anita indicated the hope is that insurance companies will and that we had received some interest in this area.

Victoria then called for the vote and referred to the draft resolution that had been circulated with the meeting materials. Upon motion duly made and seconded it was:

RESOLVED: To recommend to Mass Cultural Council approval of the Social Prescription Pilot, including the proposal from Franklin Park Zoo-Harvard Street Neighborhood Health Center, and any adjustments to said pilot or other proposals addressing

the same or similar goals, as described in a memo presented to and reviewed by the Grants Committee at its March 3, 2020 meeting.

Victoria then called on Sara Glidden to discuss the CIP Projects program which had come for discussion at the very end of the January Committee meeting. Sara indicated that she had taken the comments of the members in the earlier discussion and had worked on some adjustments to the program to address issues which had arisen around the program. In looking at the program, staff had focused on two goals as enunciated by the Committee- 1) keep the program open to a wide variety of different types of organizations and 2) simplify the eligibility and application process as much as possible. Staff had been concerned that the program was creating a great deal of work and analysis for what was not a large amount of money (\$2500) for an individual project. The updated program (as described in the materials) would be simplified and barriers to entry would be lowered. The application would be shortened and so-called "gotcha" questions around eligibility would be eliminated. The program would keep the flat rate award so as to avoid adding any complexity and will allow organizations to apply both to the Projects program and the Gateway program without any penalty.

Anita stated that the plan was for the next Grants Committee meeting to focus on various aspects of the Grants programs. Anita also mentioned various ways that Grants Committee members could participate in seeing the various programs in action- such as attending panel discussions and site visits.

Victoria questioned whether it might be a good idea to have a requirement for Grants Committee members to participate and indicated that this would be a good discussion point for the next meeting

The stated end time for the meeting having been reached, Victoria as Chair then adjourned the meeting.