

**COMMISSION ON THE THOMAS J. MOYER OHIO JUDICIAL CENTER  
MINUTES**

**June 5, 2013  
Supreme Court of Ohio**

**Members Present:** Chad Readler (Chair); Mick Ball (telephone); Richard Simpson; Richard Wallace, Barbara Powers; Marilyn Sheridan (telephone), Lane Beougher.

**Others Present:** D. Allan Asbury (Supreme Court), Mindi Wells (Supreme Court), Craig Morrow (Supreme Court), Steven Hollon (Supreme Court).

1. Mr. Readler called the meeting of the Commission to order at 11:25 a.m.
2. The minutes of the March 6, 2013 meeting were approved.
3. Mr. Readler reviewed the receipt of a grant from the Supreme Court in the amount of \$5,000. The amount is less than in the past – but monies had not been received for several years.

Mary Gray had recommended to Mr. Readler returning to the Cleveland artist originally contacted the last time the Commission had received funds from the Court.

Mr. Simpson wondered if loans were a better approach because of the costs associated with loans. Ms. Sheridan agrees with the idea to consider loans and to hold the money in abeyance.

Mr. Ball asked if the Commission should consider buying significant pieces of art versus buying several pieces of art at reasonable prices.

Mr. Ball left the meeting at 11:35 a.m.

Mr. Simpson asked whether the Chief Justice had a preference for permanent work over loans. Mr. Readler did not ask the Chief Justice the question, but had learned that most of the local resources had been tapped out for loans coupled with the costs associated with acquiring loans. Mr. Readler shared that Mary Gray felt it may be more economical to acquire permanent artwork rather than loans.

Ms. Powers reiterated that the criteria for acquisitions had been developed to assist in these decisions. Ms. Sheridan felt that the committee should come to the next meeting with recommendations.

Mr. Beougher opined that the spending of the money was key to receiving more money in the future. The plan should be to use the current grant and future grants in order to grow

the collection over time. The Court may be more receptive to future grants if there is a plan on how the money will be spent.

#### 4. Long-term funding

Mr. Readler stated that the Commission has been passive in its fundraising efforts. He indicated an event could be held to raise money. He wondered if the fundraiser could be held at the Supreme Court to feature the building. He stated that the Commission may need to seek other funding sources than the Court. He posed a question about fundraising in general to the Commission.

Mr. Simpson felt the Commission/Foundation existed to receive monies. An active fundraising body requires an articulated purpose and need for the money. He would want to know what the plan is to spend the money. In addition it is important for any fundraising effort to be consistent with the needs of the Commission or the Court. He felt that an active fundraising component was not needed.

Mr. Beougher believed that events are great for raising attention rather than money. His experience is that some events may actually lose money initially.

Mr. Wallace talked about the purpose/dream of the organization and the ability to connect with an individual fundraiser.

Ms. Powers recalled that some strategic goals related to fundraising were drafted in the past.

Mr. Readler recognized that fundraising is a lot of work – and maybe the consensus is that the Commission is actually doing what the membership feels it should be doing. He thinks there are reasons that could be identified to support a larger effort.

Ms. Sheridan indicated that the appropriate level of staffing would need to exist in order to accomplish any fundraising. She did not know how the Commission should raise money or how.

Steve Hollon arrived at 11:55 a.m.

Steve Hollon indicated that the Court looks to the Commission on advice on how to spend the money – e.g. purchase art, transport loans. In terms of fundraising, he indicated the original thoughts were the Commission would receive funds bequeathed or given to the Court. Also the nominal rental fees were to be charged for the use of the Judicial Center in order for the monies to build up a corpus over time. Big fundraisers were not anticipated.

Ms. Sheridan wondered if estate attorneys could be contacted to suggest the granting of artwork to the Court; or to promote to the bar associations that the

Commission/Foundation exists. One thought was a publication that could announce who the Commission is and what it does.

Other ideas including an article for the Ohio Lawyer Magazine, a letter to estate planning attorneys, or even a continuing legal education course were suggested. An assignment was made to the Civic Education/Communication Committee to explore these possibilities.

5. Guideline 36.2

Mr. Asbury presented an amended Guideline 36.2 to reflect that artwork would not be acquired for Justice's chambers. Mr. Simpson moved to adopt the amended Guideline. Mr. Beougher seconded the motion. The Guideline was approved unanimously.

6. Committee Reports:

a. **Civic Education / Communication** – Court staff will call the committee if needed and the committee will continue to give suggestions on topics for the Forum on the Law.

b. **Architecture Committee** – Additional meetings concerning the future symposium have been held. An evening event will be held with a prominent speaker. The location for the evening event may be the Judicial Center. During the day “nuts and bolts” sessions will be held. A date in 2014 is being targeted for the symposium.

c. **Fine Art Committee** – The latest acquisition to the Taft Map Collection will require framing. The Thomas J. Moyer Ohio Judicial Center Foundation, Inc. briefly convened to consider an allocation to staff to frame a recent acquisition from Sheldon Taft. Ms. Sheridan moved to approve framing not to exceed \$600.00. Mr. Readler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Allan Asbury