



Grantmakers in the Arts
2004 Conference

DANCING WITH DIFFERENT PARTNERS

Proceedings from the Conference

October 17-20, 2004
Renaissance Cleveland Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

PARTNERSHIPS FOR PARTICIPATION

In pursuit of fostering participation in the arts, foundations often encourage and sometimes even require arts organizations to collaborate with other organizations in their communities. Yet, research shows that successful partnerships are a challenge to design and manage. As part of a recently concluded initiative, the Wallace Foundation enlisted the Urban Institute to gather lessons on the promise and perils of partnerships, resulting in a publication entitled "Cultural Collaborations: Building Partnerships for Arts Participation." This session will highlight some of the synergies and challenges that were uncovered and will reflect on how foundations can effectively support partnerships. Panelists will provide insights on various programs such as Leadership and Excellence in Arts Participation (LEAP), Community Partnerships for Cultural Participation (CPCP), State Arts Partnerships for Cultural Participation (START), and other collaborative efforts that demonstrate lessons for effective partnerships.

Session Organizer: Rory MacPherson, *senior program officer*
The Wallace Foundation

Presented by: Rory MacPherson
Robert Booker, *executive director*
Minnesota State Arts Board
Larry Coppard, Ph.D., *senior consultant*
Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan
Katherine Freshley, *program officer*
Meyer Foundation
Francie Ostrower, *senior research associate*
Urban Institute

October 18, 2004, 4:30 p.m.

MACPHERSON: Welcome, everyone. I'm Rory MacPherson, I'm a senior program officer with the Arts Program at the Wallace Foundation. Welcome to Partnerships for Participation.

We're going to talk about how foundations can effectively support partnerships. We're also going to talk about how foundations can operate in partnership with other funding agencies.

We have a distinguished panel that's joining me to help explore these topics. To my far left is Bob Booker, who's executive director of the Minnesota State Arts Board; Kathy Freshley is the program officer with the Meyer Foundation in Washington, D.C.; Larry Coppard, senior consultant with the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan; and Francie Ostrower who is senior research associate with the Urban Institute.

When I think about partnerships and building participation, my thoughts immediately turn to partnerships among nonprofit arts organizations and other community organizations. That's where things happen on the ground for nonprofits partnering with other arts groups or with for-profits, with churches, with schools, with libraries. As we know, these can be powerfully effective ways that arts organizations can connect with and engage new constituencies. There are potential pitfalls, as well, of partnerships. Some of what Francie will tell us about her research will highlight some of those.

In addition to those kinds of partnerships, we have an opportunity here to talk about how private and public agencies can work with each other to foster greater levels of engagement in the arts by a broad public and pursue other shared goals.

To explore that area of public and private partnerships, I'd like to start with an example from a program that Wallace operates that we have nicknamed START, and it stands for State Arts Partnerships for Cultural Participation. It's not a strict acronym, but START is what we call it.

This is a program that we began in 2001. We awarded multi-year grants to thirteen state arts agencies, totaling \$9.6 million, so they could develop techniques to build arts participation on a statewide level. One of the states in this initiative is the Minnesota State Arts Board.

Before I ask Bob to talk about some of the partnerships his agency operates and has developed, I'd like to mention that this commitment of a national private foundation

and an array of state arts agencies across the country, is unprecedented in many ways. One of the ways that it's quite unique is that it represents a tremendous learning opportunity for us and for other state agencies and other public agencies to understand the opportunities that states have to promote arts participation and demonstrate the public value of the arts in general.

For that reason, our initiative, START, provided not only funding directly in terms of grant dollars for the states to create pilot programs, to modify existing programs, to provide expanded technical assistance to arts organizations they work with, convene statewide meetings and communications efforts, we also operated a series of executive training sessions for the executive directors and key staff of the thirteen states.

They were operated by the director of the Hauser Center for Nonprofits at the Kennedy School at Harvard, Mark Moore. Both the states and the Wallace Foundation representatives who were able to be part of those sessions found it an incredibly valuable experience.

Mark Moore is the author of a profoundly important book called *Creating Public Value*. It is about how public agencies have a very important role of expanding their constituency, have to constantly seek out and discover and operate new ways to create value for the general public. It was a real revelation for us.

In terms of information sharing and building, we also commissioned the RAND Corporation to look at state arts agencies, their history, the opportunities, and create a series of publications about the activities they were exploring and the activities that they're undertaking with our support and beyond our support.

We at Wallace have been very pleased to have formed this relationship, and we're learning so much from the states. I look forward to the opportunity to learn more from Bob about partnerships.

BOOKER: Great. Thank you, Rory.

Somehow I always feel like talking a lot about collaboration is a bit like talking about sex. If you're talking a lot about it, you're probably not participating in it as much as you'd really like to be. *[Laughter]* However, I do believe that in Minnesota we have a number of partnerships and a number of collaborations that really do work.

I arrived at the airport and ran into many of my colleagues. I was on the same plane with Neal from McKnight, and Carolyn Bye from



Metropolitan Regional Arts Council, Vickie from Jerome, Gloria and Fred Sewell and John Nuechterlein from the American Composers Forum. Later we were joined by Cindy Gehrig, Gayle Ober, the new arts czar at St. Paul, and we all gathered together and flew out here.

There are two examples with the partnership that we have in Minnesota between private and public partners that helps tell the story of our environment. We were really whacked by our legislature two years ago. We lost 30 percent of our grant funds and 60 percent of our administrative funds. Our regional arts councils lost 30 percent of their grant and administrative funds as well.

After losing half the staff, the first thing that happened was our neighbor, the Jerome Foundation, with offices right below us, threw us a party, invited all the other funders, invited all the arts leaders and really gathered the community together to rally for the State Arts Board and our team.

When Chairman Gioia visited Minnesota we had a full-packed day for his visit to our state, and it was wrapped up by a reception hosted and paid for by the McKnight Foundation. The McKnight Foundation stepped forward to invite other foundations, other private funders, other corporate funders, other arts community people to celebrate the visit of a public arts executive, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts.

As private and public funders we talk as colleagues, we ask each other questions, we take each other to lunch, we ponder big and small issues in our state, and work collectively to better our citizens' access to the arts. We see each other at openings, we sit together at luncheons, we watch each other's kids grow older. This prized relationship that we have between public and private funders really is a model of interaction that could be seen statewide. It's something that I come from in Minnesota, and I'm very, very proud of.

We also are the home of the second oldest decentralized arts funding system in the country. Our eleven regional arts councils, Carolyn Bye is here and is the director of the Metropolitan Regional Arts Council, were established in 1976, and is one of the sixteen decentralized funding systems of a state arts agency in the country.

Right now, these eleven regional arts councils receive about 29 percent of our state legislative funding. They are independent and, in most cases, nonprofit arts organizations. They work

in partnership with the arts board in ensuring that the state support goes to every county in our state. We can show that on an annual basis.

Each of the eleven regional arts councils is governed by their own board of directors. This board is made up of individuals from each of the counties in that particular area of the state. They develop their programs, they develop their needs assessment survey tools. They go out, they find what their community needs, and they develop programs that relate specifically to their region of the state.

This is overlaid by the activities of the Minnesota State Arts Board. So together we serve the state in two distinct ways but together. Again, we're one of the sixteen decentralized systems across the country.

It works in Minnesota, and I believe that decentralized systems are often created for two reasons. Revolution or poverty. [Laughter] Minnesota's was created in revolution. We have seen some states create theirs in poverty. They continue to get cut administratively, administratively, administratively, to the point where the only way they can go is to decentralize their funding system.

In Minnesota earlier than 1976, we were not getting the dollars out across the state. The dollars were centralized in our major urban area, they weren't going to artists and educators and arts organizations across the state. So there was a revolution, and a legislative mandate created what we now have as eleven regional arts councils.

This is a system, almost thirty years later, built on mutual respect, trust, years of history addressing the statewide community needs, and advocacy. Did I say trust? And mutual respect? The two key points, I think, to what we have.

I've been with the arts board since 1985, and I've been the director for about eight years. The relationship that we have built together between regional arts councils and the state arts board continues to grow and flourish, and the START program was one of the ways that we tested this newfound collaboration, this newfound connection.

Even though we service their fiscal agent, review their biannual plan for completeness and are ultimately responsible to the legislature for the actions of all of this public funding, we talk, we work together, and we're linked by our common goals and support each other.



When we began the investigation about the START program, I was in New York, as well as some of my other colleagues around the states, really pitching why Wallace should invest in Minnesota. The first thing that came to my mind was our relationship with our regional arts council partners, these eleven key players across the state, and how they would help us impart the knowledge that RAND and Wallace developed for us to use across Minnesota.

The first thing we did was invite our regional arts council partners to our annual board meeting, and there we had Jerry Yoshitomi come and do some of his early workshops, his early discovery about participation, about being involved in the arts, about broadening, deepening and diversifying, all terms you hear with the START program.

Then we went in to developing a training program that we were going to roll out across the state in each of our eleven regions of the state. The initial rollout of that training program included arts board staff, board members and our regional arts council directors. The idea being that who best to retool that training and retool that workbook than the people that are really the core players.

It was a rough meeting. The training wasn't right. The book wasn't right. We spent a lot of time. We used little colored cards to write down our comments, and I kept watching the stack of little cards get taller and taller and taller until we ended the session, and we all went back and said, man, we have got to retool this. We've got to retool it because of what our staff thought, what our board thought, and what our regional arts council colleagues thought.

We retooled it. We rolled it out across the state. At this point now, our regional arts councils, the executive directors and our staff members, are at the same level of knowledge. When we would go out into communities we were the experts, we were the players and the knowledgeable folks on this training. That gave us all a foot-up in working with our communities all across the state.

Eventually, we have now managed to serve training sessions in all of our communities across Minnesota. We've got a rollout of a great grant program. We've used our regional arts council partners in helping identify not only the training but the grantees that should get the awards. They continue to participate on our leadership council that guides this program.

That's really at the point of where we are now. Small and midsized arts programs across

the state have now been able to connect with both agencies and develop innovative and complementary programs to develop and increase participation in the arts.

I'm going to stop here because I want to keep it timely. But just to note, that collaboration, like sex, is best when you involve individuals with a long history, trust or respect for your partners, and, yes, new and creative ideas. *[Laughter]*

MACPHERSON: Before I ask if anyone has immediate questions for Bob about the Minnesota Arts Board or any of the other topics that he brought up, I might just mention, he talked about Jerry Yoshitomi, a consultant that Wallace Foundation has enjoyed working with to disseminate some very key ideas about participation building that were discovered through the work of the RAND Corporation on the book *New Framework for Building Participation in the Arts*. In case you're curious about broadening, deepening and diversifying as three ways to approach participation building, this book is available for download on thewallacefoundation.org website or rand.org. I highly recommend it. I have one copy for whoever comes first for it when the session is over.

Let's turn our attention to the example of a community foundation. By way of introduction, let me say that Wallace Foundation came to understand the prodigious skill and effectiveness of the community for southeastern Michigan's effectiveness in developing partnerships and making the most of them through a program that we invested in starting in 1998. Ten community foundations across the country participated in a program called Community Partnerships for Cultural Participation. CPCP for short.

This was a program that awarded nearly \$9.5 million to help community foundations to research and develop strategies for building participation in localities, establish grantmaking and technical assistance programs to guide cultural organizations in serving diverse audiences within their communities, and create or enhance permanent restricted funds to support audience building beyond our grant.

We also put in place a knowledge-building and communications component. We always seem to do that, and I'll be telling you more about that because Francie Ostrower's institute, the Urban Institute, operated it after we hear from Larry Coppard.

COPPARD: Thank you, Rory. Since you started it, I'm going to take that metaphor.



Often we think what we're about is consummating the relationship, but, in fact, what we're doing is trying to encourage courting, and we sometimes confuse the two. I'll try to explain what I mean by that as we go through this.

I'm at a community foundation in Metro Detroit, five million people in our service area. We've got about \$400 million of assets, most of it locked up in funds that we don't have complete control over.

If we want to do anything of consequence in our region, we have to do it with other people. We have to partner. That is true in terms of the work we do as a foundation, partnering with national foundations like Wallace and Kresge, but also partnering with other local foundations. The effort that Rory talked about that Wallace got us started on. They made the lead gift, but we ended up bringing in fifteen more funders to make that happen.

The effectiveness of our work long-term in the community is dependent, to a large extent on our ability to keep those national foundations hooked with us in the conversation, which is happening with Wallace – and this is beyond dollars – to actually be partners with us as we work in the community.

It's a lot more than money, money is important, but it's the involvement, the intellectual and emotional involvement of the leadership of our foundation partners that's really made the big difference.

We fund also all kinds of partnerships in the community. I'm not going to explain any of those. I mean, they run from like-minded institutions like the big cultural institutions, to the small institutions, collaborations between large and small and every which way. Because just as we need to partner to leverage our resources, we pretty much recognize that that has to be done at the institutional level too. A lot of that is going on.

What I'd like to share with you is five things that we've heard as we've done this kind of work, and how it's made a difference in our work. Francie is going to put numbers on this. Let me just tell you about our experience. I think they're going to support each other. We'll see.

As I go to meetings around some of this collaborative work, often I'll have a discussion with a person and say, "Have you met so and so?" or, "Do you know about this?" And I find myself often saying, "You're kidding! You have

never met that person? You've never sat down and talked with them?"

When we first got involved in this work, the first thing that amazed me was the number of the executives, the CEOs of the major institutions who had not spent any more than perfunctory time with each other at some meeting, that they had not sat down in each other's office and talked. And that, of course, occurs throughout the sector. That's one observation.

The other is the insularity of people's work. They know about what they do, but they know very little about what anybody else does. The ideas that other people are working on, there's tremendous blank spots in people's experience. When you're from a community that believes that if it wasn't invented here it can't be any good, and you're not thinking about all the stuff that's interesting in other communities, that just adds to it.

We have tried to take that to heart now in all the work that we're doing. And we're doing two things. One is, whenever we launch any kind of new grant program, we don't move the grant money very quickly. We hold that back and spend a lot of time in what we call just public forums.

Bring people in to talk about the idea. Get people together to meet each other and talk about the idea. What happens is that, first off, when someone is writing a proposal to us, if they haven't had that period of time, they're going to send us the same ideas they've been sending us all along.

If you delay that process, and you introduce a bunch of new ideas and new players into the discussion, we get a very different quality of stuff coming back to us. So we are deeply committed now to that kind of delaying, community forum discussion at the front-end of our work.

The other thing is because we can only fund a limited amount of stuff, we're trying to build communications not just into what we do, but into the grants that we make to organizations and say we're giving you the money to run your program, but we're also giving you part of that money to tell the story to other people in the community, because we don't have enough money to give it to everybody.

We want you to be ambassadors, to get to know the other people who might be involved in similar work. We've been fortunate, we have a current partnership with public television that has put a program together that's thematically around the same topic. They've been able to



highlight a lot of the grantees in the television show. What that's allowed them to do is to learn the skills of how to communicate what they're doing. They meet other people, they get recognition.

In the years to come, we're going to be far more involved in communications because of that. We are finding that that is a way to move these ideas, get people talking about new ideas, and for people to meet each other.

This work's a lot harder than it seems. That's what people keep talking to us about now. Because we keep encouraging it and they say, yeah, but this is really hard! That's the point I would make about dating.

When we first went into this with Wallace, we knew we wanted to encourage collaborations, but I think what we were doing was encouraging speed dating. You've got to work with somebody else to get the money, and so they meet with someone, and they cook up an arrangement and then they feed it back to us, and you look at it, and say, that seems reasonable, isn't that great, they're getting together.

Well, that just isn't the way it happens. It's not the way it happens in a human relationship, and why do we think it's going to happen in an organizational relationship, particularly when the parties may be really coming from very different places?

I now tend to talk about our work in this as less about putting a project together and more about building community and building relationships. I think that's really what this is all about. That is a very long-term enterprise.

I hate to admit it here, of course, but some of the collaborations that we funded a few years ago with Wallace and others, didn't turn out to be the really good stuff. The good stuff is what's happened later as people come back and say, I was able to build a relationship with this organization.

But that wasn't the relationship we funded. It was almost accidental. It was because these folks were all involved together in this conversation, and they naturally built those relationships as they went along. They've taken years. We're talking a six-year period that some of that stuff's come to fruition.

The third point is about culture. Collaborative work is really cross-cultural work. Almost in every example where you're bringing organizations together, they're different cultures.

We're not talking ethnicity here necessarily, although sometimes we are, race and ethnicity.

But the difference in the culture between the Detroit Institute of Arts, the Art Gallery, and Plowshares Theater, an African-American professional theater, or Matrix Theater, which is community-based, is enormous! They sit down and try to figure out a way to put together a relationship. We're talking totally different worlds!

We have to provide time and an opportunity to think through what it is, where there can be respect first off, but also a way to get to a point where there can be a recognition that there can be benefit to both sides. You can't have a marriage and you can't have a collaboration unless there's benefits on all sides. It's not going to last. You may be able to hold it together until the money runs out, but once the money's gone, this marriage is over!

Fourth point. The devil's in the details. Even when a relationship looks good on paper and all the players seem to get along, if they haven't worked out the details, particularly, how to handle the money, problems begin. Because the minute the check is cut, the fighting starts. Well, I thought I was given that piece or this piece, the roles and responsibilities. The big one, getting credit. Who gets billing, how do your names get represented in the press and all that kind of thing.

You think they get along, they're going to work these things out. But you do need a pre-nup in most of these kinds of collaboration. At least you've got to insist that that gets worked out.

Most of these experiences are good, even though they're painful, and people will come up to me now in meetings and say, when are you going to throw another party? There's a lot to that. We have got to continually be creating the venues for this dating and courting to go on. Those of us in foundations are in a wonderful spot to throw those kinds of parties.

I use the word party rather than something like a seminar, because what you want to do is to create an opportunity where people can really interact at a different level than just going and taking notes and reading reports and so on. That's really important too.

We have tried in this cultural participation area to create not only things that we would do, because we don't have the resources to do this all the time, but to create some things that could continue to bring people together. We funded a fairly large cooperative marketing program. Alan Brown helped us design it, and it's taken on its



own life. The children are acting in ways maybe we didn't particularly design, but they're getting together, people are working together, and that provides an opportunity.

We funded another thing to bring together the cultural organizations, all of whom do youth mentoring programs. They've been operating in different corners of the community. We gave them a little money, so now they continually meet and they're doing things and bringing the youth workers together from cultural organizations. So that's going on.

We do not have a regional arts council. People like Debbie Mikula who's here from MACAA, the Michigan Association of Community Arts Agencies, is an organization that brings people together around the state, and there are some other organizations like that.

But a formal regional arts council doesn't exist. So you've got to provide some other venue to get people talking. We're working on the idea of a regional cultural roundtable. Next year maybe I can tell you whether it works. We think the time is right, there's enough frustration in the major institutions that they're not getting support. We've had two tax referendums that have failed.

They're saying, hey, maybe we've got to think about this in a different way. So bringing together the large, medium and small organizations, we'll see what happens.

MACPHERSON: Thank you, Larry. When Larry was talking about relying on grantees to be the ambassadors to spread the word and share their experience and expertise, it struck a familiar chord. I know it did for Lexie Bazzutto, my colleague who co-manages with me the program at Wallace we call LEAP, Leadership and Excellence in Arts Participation, which is the program that directly supports arts providers. It makes implicit as part of the deal that they must organize ways to share their expertise, their knowledge, their experience with peer audiences, whether it be in published form or convening meetings, mentorships, a variety of strategies that they lay out in advance before the grant is made. I found it to be really interesting and a very effective strategy.

Any immediate questions for Larry before we move on? We'll have time for questions at the end as well.

AUDIENCE: Yes. My sense is that you're setting up these organizations, almost like on a date, you meet, talk. Is that right? You're bringing them together. They're not coming to you saying, we're

wanting to work together. You're fostering that relationship at the beginning.

Are you providing consultants or people to broker these discussions and then the driver for funding being released is then coming back to you with a project? Or are you just feeling that a relationship has been cultivated that warrants more support?

COPPARD: The best example is the latest one we did with Wallace. We called it Great Outdoors, which is trying to get organizations to run programming for children and parents to do stuff in the outdoors.

We had a pot of money for grants in that area. We announced that we had this new initiative and that down the road we're going to have some grant money. But first, we're going to have this set of discussions over the next several months.

Everybody knew there was some grant money at the end. Let's be honest, that's what got people to the forums. It was a defined area, and people self-selected who wanted to come.

We didn't go any farther than that. We didn't say, now, you get yourself hooked up with each other. We didn't do any of that. We said, we're all learning. We brought in some national experts on that topic, had some very interesting discussions, and we would report where we were in terms of putting the guidelines together at different meetings.

The fact of the matter was, we didn't say they had to talk to anybody else, we didn't say they had to hook up, but they did. They came back to us with very different stuff than I thought they were going to.

So it's more creating the opportunity for the discussion, not forcing...

AUDIENCE: So it's organic.

COPPARD: Correct.

AUDIENCE: What about when you receive grants that you can see similarities in, groups that may not be aware of each other or maybe wouldn't see that similarity and yet you can see the theme just jumping out. Do you make an attempt...

COPPARD: And encourage them to work together, matchmaker?

AUDIENCE: Do you make attempts to bring them together and say, we think maybe you have something in common, have a visit?



COPPARD: Because this forum process takes place over several months, people start pitching us ideas. As they'd pitch an idea I'd say, what you're interested in sounds very similar to this other organization. Why don't you go talk to them?

AUDIENCE: I guess what I'm talking about is you've put out, here's an area, there's going to be some money, let's have a discussion. But if people independently are bringing you something, for instance, a science center who says, we're going to do this bird thing. Then another group says, nobody's done anything about this bit of industry, and we want to do a play about it.

You say, this is a big organization that really doesn't get arts but thinks it's a nice hook. And here's an organization that's focused on industry but doesn't realize they're really doing something about art. Wouldn't it be nice if they could talk to each other, even though we can't fund both of them, we might fund something that comes out together, but that's almost like forcing the conversation.

COPPARD: We try to stay away from the forcing, but we do do a lot of matchmaking like that, and the program people talk about this all the time. Let's get these people talking to those people. Not to say, if you do that you're going to get our dollars, because we can't put ourselves in that position.

AUDIENCE: I have a question too, Larry. In formulating your new programs like the Great Outdoors program, has that organically come out of learnings that you have had from other partnerships or these convenings and conversations? Was the idea for the Great Outdoors generated internally or through this partnership?

COPPARD: It actually did. That one grew out of a \$25 million effort we had to build greenways in the region. We'd been working with nonprofits and municipalities for some time, and environmental organizations had to figure, it's one thing to build them, it's quite another thing to get people out using them. They hadn't even worked on that.

MACPHERSON: Great. I think we'll hear more about the perils of shotgun weddings in just a minute from Francie.

BOOKER: That analogy is now alive through the whole thing!

MACPHERSON: That's it. We're talking about relationships here. Wallace Foundation could not resist the opportunity represented by

working with the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan and a number of other outstanding community foundations, to conduct some research, to get some in-depth information about how and why people participate in the arts and what is the nature of some of the collaborations that happen in communities.

We commissioned the Urban Institute to use surveys, interviews, a variety of methodologies to compile some very in-depth knowledge that has become a whole series of publications. I brought one copy of each of them just to whet your appetite. I didn't lug enough copies for everybody, but I assure they are all available for download at wallacefoundation.org as well as at urban.org.

The earliest in the series is "Reggae to Rachmaninoff: How and Why People Participate in Arts and Culture." It goes through briefings and monographs, including "Arts and Culture Community Connections," and "Participation in the Arts and Culture: the Importance of Community Venues." "Cultural Collaborations: Building Partnerships for Arts Participation." Francie authored. So she's particularly qualified to talk to us about partnerships, as well as some of her insights about lessons for funders about partnerships. Francie?

OSTROWER: As Rory said, I'm going to be talking today about partnerships among cultural organizations in the CPCP initiative and partnerships as one tool for expanding cultural participation, which was the purpose of these.

My talk is based on our study of nineteen partnerships that were funded by five different community foundations in the initiative. For this we interviewed forty-five cultural organizations who participated in these partnerships, as well as staff at the Community Foundation and the cities that funded them.

I can't resist, because Larry said I'd be giving you some numbers, I want to throw out a number for you. These are actually interview-based, but I want to throw out a number for you you may find interesting from another study that the Urban Institute recently did. Our study "Attitudes and Practices Toward Foundation Effectiveness."

We did a survey of over 1,190 foundations. We found that 69 percent of the foundations said they actively encourage grantee collaboration. Forty-two percent of these said they sometimes or always require it.

This is something for which there is a great deal of enthusiasm in the foundation world. Part of



what this research Wallace commissioned helps us to think about whether partnerships are doing what it is people think they're doing. What are some ways that they can be done better, avoid some of the problems?

Let me tell you what we found. We found that partnerships proved to be effective for enhancing cultural participation and strengthening organizations in several ways.

Echoing what was said before, the most significant benefits often were unanticipated, while the intended goals weren't achieved. Overall, we found that partnership really does offer a powerful tool, but grantmakers and grantees need to better recognize its possibilities and limitations.

Grantees sometimes felt that foundations should be more realistic and responsive in the way that they fund these. I can say something more about that later.

Roughly, the partnerships fell into four overlapping categories. There are partnerships between organizations in different artistic fields, theaters and museums for instance. Partnerships between very large and small organizations, and these by the way were both among the most successful and the most challenging partnerships out there.

Cross-ethnic partnerships, where organizations involve, present art and draw their audiences from different ethnic groups, and these often were also large-small partnerships.

Venue-related partnerships, and by that I mean that one partner's role was to provide a space for some type of activity. For instance, there was a partnership where a group of theatrical groups got together with a library to bring theatrical performances to different library branches.

Partnerships help strengthen cultural participation in a variety of ways. They help the organizations expand their artistic programming, reach new audiences, engage donors, engage artists, and enlarge their organizational networks and capabilities.

I'll throw out in some detail one case to give you a feel for some of these. Some of these are quite creative and unusual.

In this case a movie theater, a language school and a filmmaker collaborated to present a film festival whose point was to rekindle Franco-American culture in the community. The theater's director had tried to attract more

Franco-Americans to the theater on his own, but said he hadn't been successful because he didn't have the right contacts and he didn't have knowledge of the people and the language. But he got some partners who did.

What they explained was that locally, French language and culture had become stigmatized and nearly invisible even to the Franco-Americans who had met prejudice when they immigrated in order to fill working class jobs in the community.

Franco-Americans were also embarrassed about what they felt were their poor French language skills compared with the French taught in schools or spoken in Quebec, from which their ancestors had come.

The partners designed a film festival, followed by music, food, discussion. In order to make the people who came comfortable, the festival was not publicized to certain groups, such as French language teachers who might make people ill at ease. They got a respected member of the Franco-American community to urge people to come. The emotion-laden, very emotional event turned out to be quite a success.

One participant who is in his fifties, who had initially said he couldn't speak or understand French, delivered a speech in French by the time they got a few showings later.

The project spawned unanticipated benefits too, an effort, for instance, to start a museum dedicated to Franco-American culture. At the time of the interviews they were trying to replicate this in some other communities.

But partnership is certainly no silver bullet. Even really successful partnerships could be quite challenging and didn't necessarily meet all of their goals. For instance, one partnership between a large ballet and several small Latino organizations did accomplish some goals, such as establishing a scholarship for young Latino dancers. But it didn't meet other goals, such as audience diversification and a joint performance between the ballet and a Latino folkloric group.

The partners themselves acknowledged that some of their goals really were unrealistic, given the length and amount of the grant. Yet, although the collaboration was intended to be long-term, the formal partnership ended at the conclusion of the grant.

Indeed, most of the partnerships in the initiative wouldn't have existed without a grant. Only two



organizations said for sure it would have been formed without a grant.

In two interesting cases, though, partners didn't seem to have the same idea about whether or not their partnership was still going on. This can be taken as a pretty clear indicator of the difficulty of maintaining good communication and shared expectations in partnerships. In one case the grant was still going on. We found, though, several reasons why it seemed to prove so difficult to really sustain active partnerships. One was that funders often didn't provide enough financial support to sustain the partnerships until they achieved their goal, could become self-sustaining, or get other funding.

In other cases, one or more partners didn't view the partnership's activities or goals as central to its core institutional mission, might have thought it was nice but not nice enough, once the grant ended, to divert time and energy and money from other things. A related reason is that one or more partners decided that the logistics of maintaining the partnership were just too great relative to the returns.

A fourth reason is that partnership had been pursued by the organizations only for the grant. Therefore, when the grants ended, so did the partnership. It was actually fairly rare that a grant was the only reason. It factored in a lot, but the only reason, I think, not that usual. But it's still important.

Even though, however, the formal partnerships typically ended, about half the partners really kept up warm relations, ongoing contacts, and called on one another for things. A small and large theater partnered, and the small one would call if they needed to borrow props and were able to get it. The large theater would call the smaller theater, which was a Latino theater, if they had questions or wanted to make contacts with Latino groups.

Partnerships are not easy much of time, they were often time-consuming, required more money than the grants actually gave, and they were sometimes contentious. Partners, for instance, should establish long-term goals only if they're really going to make a long-term commitment, otherwise, the partnership will flounder and likely dissolve.

This all sounds very common-sensical, but what sounds easy in theory often turns out to be quite difficult to implement in practice.

Larry alluded to this before: early planning. I cannot overestimate how important that was, to

clarify goals, responsibilities, who's going to get what rewards at the outset, was key. Many of the partnership difficulties could be traced back to doing a lack of that planning. People often don't do it because it's costly and time-consuming, but, frankly, in the end it can be more costly and time-consuming if it's not done early on.

The findings have similar implications for funders. Foundations, of course, want to support partnerships to achieve the foundation's goals, and often they did. But some grantmaking practices really are ill-suited to achieving their goals.

When foundations mandate partnerships – your shotgun weddings – they really are inviting the very type of in-name-only partnerships that they want to avoid. However, let me say that while grantees very much did not think that foundations should mandate partnerships, they really, really thought it was very useful when foundations got in and played a convening role of introducing organizations, who could then go on and make connections and partner if they wanted.

In the case of large/small organizations that really might never cross one another, this could be quite useful too.

Funders also need to be clear about their level of commitment and realistic about matching resources to their stated goals. If foundations want to achieve ambitious goals, they have to provide the higher levels and more sustained funding needed and should consider funding a planning process and the administrative costs of partnership.

In large/small partnerships they should particularly consider the special needs of small organizations for which these can be particularly taxing administratively.

On a final note, sometimes the most valuable rewards of these partnerships were those that partners and funders didn't and really couldn't have anticipated. Even if they do carefully plan, funders and partners will benefit by keeping an open mind to the new possibilities and opportunities that can emerge over the course of a partnership.

Thank you.

MACPHERSON: Great. Francie mentioned partnerships between large and small cultural organizations, and she very kindly brought a number of copies that are available for nearly every one of the briefing "Partnerships Between Large and Small Cultural Organizations." Thank



you for carting those here. You're welcome to come up at the end and take one.

Any instant questions for Francie?

AUDIENCE: That subject is one that interests me, and in a way you both talked about it. You talked about cultural differences. For eighteen years I managed a very large cultural institution, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, and we engaged in a lot of partnerships with small organizations. I think it's difficult, almost equally difficult for both the large and the small.

I wonder if any of you have ever thought about offering any kind of... I don't know if coaching is the word. But the styles of management can be so different, the Chicago Symphony has a staff of seventy-five or eighty people, departments, a decision-making mechanism inside, which may not even involve the CEO. A small organization may be a one-person shop. That person may or may not have a board who gets involved in details that the board of the big one never gets involved in.

There's such a different style of working that it's almost like men are from Mars and women from Venus. It's almost like speaking different languages. Even if the CEO has goodwill, in the staff, there's frustration sometimes with the opposite organization.

Have any of you looked at the idea of helping them understand how to get along with each other, how to work in a partnership, and understand each other?

OSTROWER: Two things came out. Larger organizations would be pulling their hair out because they'd say, there's one person in this small organization, probably the director, who we can talk to, so if the director is not around, everything has to stop.

But the small organization would say, there's ten people, we don't know who to talk to. What's happening? They also often felt that they weren't really treated as an equal partner at the table.

When you mix up the large/small also with cross-ethnic, these problems are only more pronounced. Two things turned out in the cases where they happened to be quite helpful.

In one case, they did a funded planning process. One of the small organizations said, we never would have done it if we hadn't gotten funding to do it, but it really helped because we didn't feel like the small guy. Everybody got to know each other, and by the time we hopped into really

doing it, we felt like we were there, we were at the table. So that was one thing that proved quite useful. The other thing that is important in any partnership but is essential in large/small ones is that you have got to set up a system up-front where you know roles and responsibilities and rewards, very, very specifically. That is one of the important ingredients in getting mutual respect.

The other thing is if it's a large partnership, kicking-in to have a project manager can help as well. You have somebody there who is not necessarily full time, but somebody whose job is to manage the partnership and some of the dealing with the organizations.

I'll tell you what one of the grantees suggested, if you may think this is something worth considering. One of the things that got tricky was we looked at partnerships where you had organizations with fifty times the budget of the small one. We had grassroots organizations that were all volunteer. You want to have a meeting, when are you going to have it?

For the large organizations you're going to have it during the day when you're working. The small organization, they couldn't come! One of the partnerships was supposed to allow the head of a small grassroots organization to shadow the staff at the larger one, which was great except that he couldn't really get off from work after a while.

One of the people who we spoke with said, why wouldn't a foundation give a little stipend so the person could take some time off from work to do things like that?

These are things, again, that need to be discussed and negotiated beforehand, because they're going to come up. And the time is sooner rather than later. So those are a few things.

AUDIENCE: The first time a large and small organization enter into a partnership, somebody, maybe with more experience, needs to warn them of what those differences are. Because they can come as a real surprise the first time.

OSTROWER: There were some consultants brought in. In one case it was very useful and in one case it was not. The foundation can be very helpful in keying people into this, which is useful not only because they want to fund successful ones but, of course, because if they don't it may wind up being in their office with these guys all lined up.

It's very important because in some cases people don't know. The foundation needs to think about from its point of view, is there evidence that the



people they're going to fund are ready? Are they willing both to fund planning, but also have the partners show that they're ready? Because if not, there may well be a lot of problems.

MACPHERSON: Is there another question? Yes?

AUDIENCE: I was just going to comment from the small organization's side, the organization that I'm with participated in the Arts Partners Program. The planning was a big key of that.

The other thing was establishing very clearly what the responsibilities were and valuing what both partners brought to the table, not necessarily based on monetary value, but the value of what the small organization is bringing. Defining what that meant at the beginning, made it easier to facilitate the process, as well as to accomplish most of the goals that we had intended.

And the third factor was a real discussion that there was equity with respect to artistic decisions in the process. What we learned from it was that the more clear we were at the beginning of the process, the easier it was to navigate those issues.

The last factor is having a period that the partnership could develop over two years and three years. That was key because each organization learned about the culture of the other organization. It provided an opportunity for the small organization to share and develop that interest beyond the person who first started the partnership in that organization. That became an organizational commitment and not the person who was interested in the partnership.

MACPHERSON: Great points. The Arts Partners Program, recently concluded, and was administered by the Association of Performing Arts Presenters for long-term residencies for building audiences that happen in collaboration with one or more community-based organizations. It had to be three weeks of residency, not necessarily three weeks in a row, so that a project itself could happen over a year or two years, but a very important component for the planning grant process.

AUDIENCE: And that planning, in that project that we started with the Washington Performing Arts Society eight or nine years ago continues even though there's no longer funding for two organizations.

MACPHERSON: Wow. Outstanding. I don't know if there's a repository of knowledge from that. The best might exist in back issues of *Inside Arts*, the magazine of arts presenters, chronicling some of those.

COPPARD: The bottom line is, if we're going to encourage these kinds of collaborations and fund them, it's absolutely irresponsible of us not to have thought through how the organizations can get some third-party assistance when they inevitably will run into problems. Either we've got to be ready to jump into the breach and do it ourselves, or we've got to provide it because otherwise I think we're just encouraging disasters.

OSTROWER: Can I just make one comment, along the lines of that as well. Thank you so much for raising the point, in case it wasn't clear, that the mutual respect issue is not just about money. There was one case that was quite successful in many ways, but that was the big issue. In fact, the large organization said, why do they have to feel that they always need to be involved in everything? They don't have the staff. They can't carry through.

The small organization was not unaware of this attitude, and said, we may be small, they may be large, but it is fifty/fifty in terms of the artistic content and decision. They really felt they had to fight to work through that. That is another area where a third party, up front, makes it clear because they feel then that they're devalued in terms of what they bring to the party.

So thank you for that comment. It's not just money.

MACPHERSON: I'm glad you brought up party again, Francie, when I think of coming to our final panelist.

If there is a secondary theme through each of the presentations in addition to intimate human relationships, I think it is that of a party. Bob mentioned Jerome Foundation throwing a party for Minnesota State Arts Board. Larry talked about the importance of parties. Francie and the Franco-American community reception.

We at Wallace are very much looking forward to a joint conference that the Meyer Foundation, through the kind efforts of Kathy Freshley, is co-sponsoring with us. It will happen in Washington, D.C.

We've been very pleased to operate our meetings of grantees always in collaboration with a colleague funder, and bring our grantees and ask our colleague to invite their grantees to expand the conversation, test the ideas among a different audience, and have local examples to learn from and point to. We look forward to that conference in early December.



FRESHLEY: We are too, we're very excited about it.

The Meyer Foundation has been in existence for sixty years. It's not the largest foundation in Washington, D.C., but it has a reputation for being the most "leaderly." That is a reputation that it still enjoys. It's a generalist funder, and our mission is to build community in the greater Washington region, which is Washington, D.C., and the eight surrounding counties and the cities and towns within those counties.

This, I want to point out, is two different states and a jurisdiction that doesn't have the right to vote. They can vote for president, but they can't vote for representation.

D.C. is always the weak link because they have nothing to barter, nobody on the Hill that's really representing them, but everybody on the Hill looking at them as a way to develop a model program or to present a model program that we think is doing important work. We're under the thumb. We consider ourselves in D.C. as the last plantation.

There is a considerable effort to try and eliminate that. I try and get that message out because it is a great inequity.

The Meyer Foundation, obviously, does grantmaking. We don't issue any kind of initiatives or RFPs, we're all across the transom. We have three rounds a year, and people bring ideas to us. But, as you were saying, often these ideas converge.

While these ideas come across the transom, we see ways that things can fit together better, ways partnerships could be made. Why create this new program when this group you don't even know about is doing a similar program that would really solve your problem. So there's a lot of that matchmaking.

I would like to think that we don't do forced matchmaking, but I think we have to admit that we do represent money, and a suggestion even can sometimes be misinterpreted.

I want to talk today about how we work by looking at one organization and how it has evolved over an eight-year period. Meyer is very committed to general operating support. We are very supportive of capacity building. We have a management assistance program that gives our grantees one-on-one consulting support to help them with particular issues they're confronting, like government issues or strategic planning or financial management, technology issues, executive leadership training.

We also have a cash-flow loan program to help organizations through rough periods of time, and have a great deal of interest in walking with our grantees through halls that they may not have access to.

In 1996, two humanities organizations came to us, the Historical Society and the Humanities Council. They came to us with the idea of creating a coalition of heritage organizations in the District of Columbia, because they felt that the heritage organizations got no respect.

Funders didn't want to fund the individual little house museums. So funders didn't understand them. The City's Economic Development, they didn't get it. And the convention and tourism typical vehicles, certainly didn't get it.

This was a group that got together, and they had to learn a whole new language, a tourism language. They wanted to come together to foster heritage tourism in neighborhoods. And, through that, to create economic development and workforce employment opportunities in neighborhoods that had rich assets, but no one knew those stories.

Meyer is very interested in community-based, neighborhood level funding. We don't support the Smithsonian; we don't support the National Gallery; we don't support the organizations that would pop into your mind when you think of the big museums and cultural institutions in D.C. We're looking more at those neighborhood organizations. This seemed like a wonderful way of leveraging exactly what they were talking about. It was an extraordinarily hard sell. Initially there were seventy groups, and the groups that came together were disenfranchised, the ones that never got any money and were really struggling to fix the roof, let alone, market to tourists.

They had similar goals. They were like institutions. Some may have been a little bit larger, but they all were at that same level of struggling. The first thing we did was to fund them. We thought this is a risk, but it's an interesting risk, and we're interested in taking it and going on this journey.

By funding them in the beginning, it was only \$6,000. Over that eight-year period we've given them now half a million dollars worth of direct funding. Now their budget, which was initially \$70,000, well, initially \$6,000 because we were the first grant for their first year, is now \$1.3 million.

This is an organization that's evolved. They had to figure out how to do this work, and they had



to get the attention of people that didn't get it, to get them to rethink. At the time, the culture, the convention and tourism bureaus – we had three competing organizations that played that role – got the hotel tax money to promote tourism, they only marketed D.C. as a capital.

So you went to D.C. because you went to see Congress, you went to see the monuments, you went to the Mall, you went to the Smithsonian Institutions. They turned their backs, the very city in which you live, turned its back on any of its neighborhood organizations. There were plenty of organizations. In fact, there are sixty house museums in the District of Columbia. Who knew? [Laughter] And, in fact, that was one of the things nobody really knew. No one knew those stories.

Timing was really wonderful because D.C. was going through quite a process. It was bankrupt, we had a receivership. A new mayor came in, and that new mayor was very interested in economic development.

And the second year that they were in operation, we funded a research piece called "Capital Assets," that inventoried all of the heritage assets in Washington, D.C., by neighborhood, and talked about their readiness for tourism. Some of them just needed better signage! Better marketing. Some of them needed full scale help. Here's an abandoned site that was a very important historic site.

When the new mayor came into office, the president of our foundation and myself and the new leadership of this group went to visit him. Our president knew him personally. They didn't have that entree; we made that walk with them. I worked very closely with members of the city's Economic Development and Arts Commission, D.C. Arts and Humanities Commission, but it doesn't fund in humanities.

There was a lot of getting them at the right tables. By being at those tables and through those conversations, they were able to foster a partnership with the Department of Transportation in D.C. to set up a whole new sign marker system in the city, so if you're walking around downtown there are historic markers that tell you what's happened here.

There are now walking tours and products that they have developed because nobody was developing products, which of course was a term that they didn't even know existed – a product! They understood that that's what the tourism people use. They want heads on beds. They want products that they can deliver to the tourists.

They developed walking tours. They did the African-American Heritage Trail. They've developed a lot of products. They started working with Metro, and we helped make that introduction through one of our board members.

So they started working with Metro to do walking tours on Metro. It worked to Metro's advantage... This is our subway system, I'm sorry. I use the lingo. The subway system is they take the subway to U Street, and this is the walking tour on U Street. They worked with community development organizations in those neighborhoods, and other groups that we funded, to help partner workforce development opportunities.

So when you come out of that subway now, you're greeted by a person who, typically, is a low-income person that has lived in those neighborhoods and may or may not know those stories very well, of the history of their neighborhood, but that person is trained to be a meeter, a greeter, to talk about their neighborhoods, who now knows the history of their neighborhood.

They don't take people on the walking tour, but they make sure that things look neat and clean and that they're presenting their neighborhood to its best advantage.

What we see is this nice synergy that's starting to develop. D.C. has all these wonderful historic fire call-boxes that are on every other block, and they have been sitting there abandoned. Once we went to a 911 system, we didn't run to the corner and call. These call-boxes are these very wonderful ornamental boxes.

They have partnered with the D.C. Arts Commission to commission artists to do sculptures, or somehow convey the heritage of those neighborhoods in these call boxes. One neighborhood, Adams Morgan, now has eight sculptures in their call-boxes that tell a little bit about the importance of this neighborhood.

The interesting thing is that it's not just building community for tourists – and we have a great number of international tourists and national tourists that come to Washington, D.C., as you would imagine – but it's building up an understanding of the story for D.C. residents and for regional residents to come to D.C. In fact there are now "Come to D.C. for the Weekend" tours, where you can do your walking tour, you can go to a play, and the synergies are starting to happen.



Interestingly enough, up to 9/11 this was only a heritage organization. But they were starting to get “noticed” by the arts and cultural institutions, probably not those on the Mall as much as the other arts and cultural institutions, the theaters and whatnot.

Before 9/11, none of the major institutions would have dealt with them. They were on two different planes. They didn’t need each other. They didn’t talk to each other. Most of the major organizations didn’t even bother to communicate with smaller, community-based organizations.

But 9/11 changed the dynamic in a very perverse way, because after 9/11, tourists did not come to D.C. School groups no longer went to the theaters for the afternoon matinees. Many organizations were in deep financial trouble because of loss of income from these audiences.

The Smithsonian’s Air and Space Museum lost \$5 million just in their shop. So the arts organizations started moaning, “The heritage groups get all the respect! They get all the partnerships!” The heritage groups invited the arts and cultural groups in, and now they have changed their name to Cultural Tourism D.C. We are seeing the first time in D.C. where we have cultural tourism packages.

The National Gallery of Art, Romare Bearden, there were seventeen other exhibits going on in the community, and it was marketed as a package. We’ve now done the third cultural tourism package, and it’s paying off. Now we have people in Northern Virginia and in Maryland, they want to get in on the action too, which is going to lead to some regional dialogues that I’ve been trying to execute for some time.

MACPHERSON: Great, Kathy. Thank you. Once again, necessity is the mother of innovation. Wonderful story.

We have about ten minutes for general discussion if people have questions for any panelists or panelists of each other.

AUDIENCE: This is directed to Larry and Francie, but I’d be interested in what any of you have to say about it because it certainly relates to community and cultural tourism. I’m interested if you’re going into a grant initiative with the idea of wanting to do community building, how do you promote community building versus a project outcome for a partnership?

You, Larry, talked about we bring the groups together and we have this money and it’s going to be for projects, but the outcomes that have

really been successful have been community-building outcomes. What do you do at the get-go to talk about those outcomes? How do you measure whether you say to the groups, we want you to do this project and we’re interested in those outcomes, or talk to them about the community building?

COPPARD: Just a couple of brief things. I think one is, through these discussions in the beginning we try to keep the discussion on a larger plane. Why is this important? How is the community going to be different? How do we have to all pull together if we’re going to make a difference in this or that area?

That’s part of it. Encouraging people to work together and talk to the community is another thing. That is a value that we do exude. It’s not a matter of saying you’ve got to partner with this or that group, but you’ve got to work together!

We try to articulate a set of values, which are needed if the community is going to develop.

OSTROWER: The only thing I would add to that is to be absolutely sure that at least one of the partners at the table knows how to do it. Some of the large/small partnerships work because the large organizations didn’t really feel they knew how to work at a community level and looked to a smaller organization that had a lot of experience doing that.

I would recommend unpacking the idea of what kind of community building you’re talking about, who do you need to reach, and being sure that there are partners at the table who know how to reach those people.

One of the problems in some partnerships is that, if the partners don’t have a good understanding of the target audience that they need to get to, it’s not going to work any better in partnership than it would have doing it alone. That’s a really important ingredient.

COPPARD: We’ve got to avoid jargon too, when these discussions start using code words. Frankly, we have a real challenge trying to get our trustees to understand all of this. And the grantees too.

You’ve got to bring it down to the ground in very practical ways. Make questions like, have you talked to people in your community that you intend to serve? That’s pretty basic. How are you going to work with the other organizations in your community? That’s all about community-building, but you don’t have to use the word. It’s



just those basic things, and I think we should be asking those questions.

BOOKER: Another concept is to also make sure that your team that you're taking out of the community has representation of all that community. We did a great scenic byway mission in Minnesota, and we used a person from tourism; my office; the Department of Natural Resources; Minnesota Historical Society; and the Department of Transportation.

The finalists would go out as a team into communities and work and convene these gatherings of scenic byway folks, historical folks, arts folks, heritage folks. Because you have five of them still representing each of the disciplines, each one of those people that they meet had a point person to relate to.

By that way, we helped them into the partnership by showing an example of our own partnership from five distinct state agencies. By example we showed that we could get along and so they could get along. As we went through the day, there was that understanding of each other's role and each other's backgrounds. That helped as well. It's by example.

MACPHERSON: Any other questions for the panel? We've probably got time for one or two.

AUDIENCE: You were talking about cultural heritage and arts or humanities and arts. I know in our New York state region one of our questions is why, in our coastal water area, doesn't the Passenger Vessel Association see the benefit of linking up with the Hudson River Park Conservancy or the Arts and Business Council going out to these little groups. It's a third leg, or a third dimension to that triangle, which has nothing normally to those small businesses or activities that are nonprofit often, but largely have nothing to do right away with an understood, upfront humanities or cultural base or an arts base.

We're trying to make those links too. I was wondering if you had any experience in making that kind of link, or how do you convince someone who's normally never involved in culture or heritage or arts in any way whatsoever to get involved.

FRESHLEY: Cultural Tourism D.C. now includes many of those environmental groups, the Anacostia Partnership, looking at the National Parks Service as part of their organization; community development corporations. Anyone who really sees an area of connection that can advance their goals are now part of it.

You appeal to those people because you're going to make a case that this is going to be beneficial to them on a higher level, that there is an umbrella. If you're going to clean up the Anacostia River or the Potomac River, there are partnerships that you can forge that will help to get your message across.

It's moving the conversation to a little higher plane so you can see it in a bird's eye view.

AUDIENCE: One of the things in forging partnerships is not to say, why can't they be convinced of the value of being a partner with us, but rather to go in and talk to organizations or people and say, "We think we'd like to partner with you, and we are the X. What would you like to get out of such a relationship? How can we help you?" Leaving it wide open.

That's true between nonprofit organizations, but also between for profit. Going back to my world, the major orchestra world, when you go on tours you try to find corporate sponsors. You don't go into a corporation and say, "we want a half million dollars to go to Japan, would you please underwrite it?" You say, "If you were to be our sponsor in Japan where we know you do business, how could we work with you so that you believe you're getting benefits out of it?"

Then you find, Motorola is not that interested in the publicity side of it in Japan because they're not a consumer company in Japan. They sell parts to the companies I would think of as Motorola's competitors, Hitachi and Sony. What they want is post-concert receptions that they can invite their best customers to, and that we would invite a conductor to. I never would have thought of that.

Part of it, I think in forming any partnership, is saying to the people that you'd like to partner with, if you had a relationship with us, how could it help you?

AUDIENCE: How can we help each other?

MACPHERSON: Very good. I learned a lot from the audience, I want to thank you all for coming as well as for my fellow panelists. Thank you.

END

