From: Amy Mattern <amattern@laspositascollege.edu>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 6:17 PM
To: Sarah Thompson <SThompson@laspositascollege.edu>; Dyrell Foster
<dfoster@laspositascollege.edu>
Cc: David Wagner <dwagner@laspositascollege.edu>
Subject: Update: Art AP 6625 Proposed Edits

Hi Dr. Foster and Sarah,

I wanted to let you know that the Art on Campus Taskforce reviewed the updates to the AP 6625 about public art that was discussed at Senate last week. We had reviewed the original draft of this document last year and made a number of edits in our Art on Campus Taskforce, and in partnership with my Dean counterpart and the Public Arts Committee at Chabot. We recently learned that Chabot's Senate made more edits that are now being routed. Once I saw that edited draft (which concerned me due to some language our public arts committees had developed being removed/modified), I worked on some additional suggestions with the Dean from Chabot and Owen Letcher. We think we developed a good compromise between what our Public Arts Committees had proposed and what Chabot's Senate was trying to accomplish. I actually do believe they were trying to be helpful. The Dean went and met with their Senate to make sure we all understood their goal and could propose additional edits with a frame of understanding their goals.

I vetted the more updated suggestions with the Art on Campus Taskforce this Monday and they were happy with the result. We actually think it will serve us all well. Here are the key points:

- Essentially, rather than have a dollar threshold in the AP to ensure the BOT doesn't have authority to review each and every piece of artwork, this edited version empowers the public arts committees and *only those purchases that would exceed purchasing thresholds would go to the BOT for review*. That's already in the purchasing BP and would happen regardless of this new AP. Therefore, we simply put reference to that BP in the new AP. But, the AP draft has been edited to give the Public Arts committees the authority to decide what's worthy of a purchase and if it falls in the District/College mission before we decide to make the purchase and process the requisition, not the BOT.
- Additionally, all purchases go through the President anyways as they would be on a requisition. Therefore, there is no need to state in the AP about the committees recommending to the President. Already happens. We can make local decisions about large projects that should be vetted more in advance with Facilities/ Exec Facilities/SLT, like we do already (e.g. the mural).
- Finally, gifts also have their own existing BP which Owen added to the new AP.
- One concern that our Taskforce raised was whether our committee would have authority over each and every piece of artwork on campus. We don't want to be the art police for everything an employee puts on their own wall or in a program's space, etc. We decided that since the new AP allows the public arts committees to develop policies and procedures around acquiring and placing public art, once it's approved we can work on guidelines that define what we do and don't "control."

Between Chabot Senate's suggestions, as well as our suggestions, we feel fine with this updated draft attached. I wanted to share this with you both, particularly since Dave Wagner (copied here) let me know the LPC Senate discussed the new AP draft and was going to be voting on it soon. *We do not recommend that you vote to approve the version Chabot's Senate developed (the one you reviewed*)

last week) unless the additional edits seen in this current draft attached are included. I assume the Chabot Dean Kunkel-Wu will take this back to her Senate.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if you need me to come to Senate to share about this at all (assuming I don't have a conflict at the time). Dave can also represent our Taskforce if he feels comfortable.

Thanks, Amy

Amy Mattern (she/her) Dean, Arts and Humanities Las Positas College 925-424-1382 amattern@laspositascollege.edu