

GRANTMAKERS IN THE ARTS
Annual Conference
THE SOURCE:
2000

Proceedings from the Conference

October 15-18, 2000
Minneapolis, Minnesota

**Highlighting the Development of
Giving in New Communities**

Moderator: Pennelope Haru Snipper
Minnesota State Arts Board board member

Panelists: Abel Lopez
GALA Hispanic Theatre
Kit Waickman
Philanthrofund
Marcus Young
*Chinese American Association of Minnesota
(CAAM)*

October 17, 2000, 3:00 p.m.

© 2001 Grantmakers in the Arts

Snipper: Good afternoon. Thank you for coming to this session. We're an intimate group. My name is Penelope Snipper. I'm a member of the Minnesota State Arts Board. I was appointed last year, and it has been a wonderful learning year for me. When I'm not volunteering on the State Arts Board, I also work as a consultant to several foundations, and arts is one of the areas in which I do program reviewing.

I would like to introduce this wonderful panel. I will have much to learn from them this afternoon – I think we all will.

To my right is Kit Waickman, and she says that she is a passionate arts lover, from the time when she was a young child distributing programs for the Cleveland Orchestra. She has graduated with a B.A. in drama and dramatic literature, and received her Masters in arts administration, and subsequent M.B.A. from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

She has worked as an arts administrator for the Wisconsin State Arts Board, and the Madison Repertory Theater here in town. Kit is currently the executive director of Philanthrofund Foundation, in the Twin Cities, an endowed community foundation that enhances the quality of life for the gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender and allied communities in the upper Midwest.

The Foundation awards approximately \$50,000 in grants and scholarships annually. In the past year, Philanthrofund was chosen by Minnesota Council of Nonprofits for its Responsive Philanthropy Award and the best charity in 2000 by City Pages.

I will have Kit speak a little bit first. I would like to introduce everyone as they speak. After everyone has talked to you a little bit, then we will open it up for some questions and answers.

Waickman: Thank you, Penelope.

First, some demographics and definitions. How many people here openly identify as gay/lesbian/bisexual or transgender? Alright, so bear with me on the boring definitions.

Just to be clear on language, I will use GLBT and queer interchangeably, and that word "queer" gets into some of the diversity within our community. Queer, for folks who are older

than me, can be very hurtful. It was a wounding word. Queer, for those younger than me, is very empowering. Queer also incorporates GLBT's IQ. Gay and lesbian, bisexual, transgender, questioning, and intergender. So the diversity keeps multiplying and we have laughed that we are alphabet soup.

I have a feeling that you probably have much more exposure at this point to queer art and possibly donors who are interested in queer art than I do. I have worked with organizations that have supported queer artists, or donors, but none that have done it intentionally until Philanthrofund.

Briefly, on Philanthrofund, we are a GLBT community foundation. We are one of seventeen in the nation, and it is a movement, just like the women's foundations movement, and it's a lot about identity and celebrating our strengths.

We started twelve years ago. Four guys got together – one was HIV positive and wanted to give his money to his family of choice, that being the community that supported him. Thank goodness, they are all alive, all still involved with the Foundation and, actually, two of the founding members are donating a condo to us to sell and take the proceeds from in the next month.

We fund social service advocacy and arts all in one grant round, so you can probably guess how much service the arts get. I looked back on our history; we've awarded approximately \$200,000 over a life span, and a whopping \$30,000 of it has gone to the arts. And I'm including the GLBT library in the arts definition. I was trying to expand that dollar amount.

I've also incorporated some notes from Bill T's conversation. Can a foundation seek enjoyment, was one of Bill's questions. And Philanthrofund very much can seek enjoyment, because we are seeing a community built, and a positive community built. We are trying to change from a culture that says, oh my God, you're coming out as a gay male, you're going to get diseases, you're going to be beaten up, you're going to get fired, to a community that says, wow, you are so lucky. There are so many cool people in this GLBT and supportive community. What a

wonderful culture you're entering into. Aren't you special?

Trends, particularly in art skimming. The battle I saw waged over our measly \$38,500 last year was arts for arts' sake; arts for cultural celebration. We had Jolla Branner's *Mighty Real* piece that Intermedia Arts was presenting. No question, Jolla is a phenomenal performance artist. It's an honor that he lives in the Twin Cities. That got funded.

The chorale that's lesbian-run wanted to go to California to learn more about women's chorales. Oh, those girls can have a bake sale. That was not arty enough.

The Minnesota Freedom Band, which is hodgepodge. You would not say that is high art, to say the least. But when the Minnesota Freedom Band shows up, I stay intolerant. I am an arts snob. You know, it is fun; it's a celebration. None of those cultural celebration pieces are getting funded through Philanthrofund right now.

Our donors, and who might support GLBT arts, are very different. The G is very different from the L. It is very different from the B; it is very different from the T. We had a campaign – an anonymous donor gave us a \$25,000 challenge to create a fund specific for the bisexual community, and the bi-leaders had a cabaret. I'm also a recovering Catholic, and the material in the bi-cabaret – I died a thousand deaths watching it. I'm like, oh my God, it's so much explicit sex. That is very unique to that bi-activist community.

There are a whole lot of bi-folks who are in heterosexual or homosexual relationships who really say, Oh, bi-identity, what's that? I'm with a woman so I really sort of plug into the lesbian community; or I'm with a man and I plug into a progressive heterosexual community. So the diversity within our diversity is just intricate, possible landmines constantly. That statement, Ask questions. What work should you be doing? Am I making assumptions? That needs to be up on the table. I think I'm pretty knowledgeable, and I get into language trouble constantly.

Donors want to be identified as queer, so it's a strikethrough, Philanthrofund. People want to be giving through Philanthrofund so their money that goes to the Art Institute is queer. It's very clear. I've changed how I get recognized. I do Katherine (Kit) Waickman and Ann Bream because I don't want anyone to go, well, Kit could be a guy. That's very, very important in terms of overall community visibility. I would say it's either that extreme or I want to be anonymous, and the anonymous are getting much, much fewer.

We've done well in terms of creating a philanthropic spirit in the GLBT community, we are pretty good in raising money for ourselves. The HIV crisis forced us to do that. What we have done poorly is create philanthropists. We've created exchange peoples. If the party is not good enough, my donation wasn't worth it. We're not making the linkage back to community change.

We've created a very big culture, not so much in the Twin Cities, but I just came from our national conference. Along the coasts, they are burdened with these incredibly expensive, incredibly phenomenal parties as fundraising mechanisms, and that concept of philanthropy is not as instilled. Twin Cities is a different culture, thank goodness, but we have a little bit of it also.

The other piece that I wanted to make sure I got in here is more sort of my parents' voices echoing in my head. My parents live in Akron, Ohio. They went to a film festival and happened to walk into the gay section of it. Very, very sexually explicit. So Mom calls me, why are gay men always about sex? Well yes, we're about relationships. Yes, we're about a cultural sensitivity; but you know what makes us different? A lot of it has to do with sex, and as our funders, I would encourage you, don't shy away from that. I think we're moving a bit away from it, but the whole NEA explosion... Everything had to do with sex and the U. S. culture's fear around sex, and it's part of what we emerged from.

I am fascinated by the art that the twenty-year-olds are creating. If you're lucky enough to live in the Twin Cities, they have gender fluidity.

You can call me a girl today; tomorrow I might want you to call me a boy; or just don't use pronouns. There's incredible sexuality fluidity. The soccer girls might be dating one another and might be dating the soccer boys, and it's a non-issue. So will their art be as laden? Because, clearly, their coming out process is nowhere near as painful as my generation and the older generations. Will it become a non-issue? I doubt it.

It's not a small thing. I heard my mom saying that, and then I heard my father when I was old enough to drive, and I drove myself up to Cleveland to see Dream Girls on tour. Oh, I was just enthralled; I brought the tape back and my father said, Why do those people have to yell so? He totally didn't get it. And then I heard my mom say, Why did those people have to be so much about sex? It plugs into some of our cultural heritages, and so don't be scared of that.

Bill T. asked, What will you stand up for? Those are some of the GLBT issues. Sometimes we're trendy. You know, we're about as cool as we can be right now on TV. Carrie on *ER* is going to date a woman, not because she's a lesbian, but to explore her personality. Oh my God, how mainstream can you get?

At other times, when we're starting to talk about sexual addiction, domestic violence within same-sex couples, the alienation of the transgender community, the alienation of communities of color within the GLBT community. We're basically white, rich gay boys. Where are the women, anyway? It's not so pretty, and what will you stand up for, I would echo, because that is part of our community's struggle.

Snipper: Thanks.

Marcus Young, to Kit's right, holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree in music from Carlton College, and performed his Master of Fine Arts Studies in Theatre at the University of Minnesota. Marcus is a 2000 Bush artist fellow in performance art and will be in residence with Franklin Furnace at Parson's School of Design in 2001, and you're so lucky. In 1997, he served as apprentice to Harold Prince on the Broadway

production of *Candide*. One of the first recipients of the Jerome Performance Arts Commissions, he presented *Small All Spring Fall* in 1999. Most recently, his video work, *Phases*, was premiered at Taos Talking Pictures Festival, and was presented in festivals in Atlanta, New York, Minneapolis, New Jersey, Baltimore and Chicago.

In the Twin Cities, he has worked with the Minnesota Opera, Mixed Blood Theatre, and Theatre Mu. Currently, he is managing director, CAAM Chinese Dance Theatre, and a board member at Headwaters Fund. If you ever get a chance to see Marcus perform, take advantage. He is very talented.

Young: Thanks, Penny. This does not constitute a performance though, so please forgive me.

I'm excited to be here, so thanks very much. I'm going to be speaking from the point of a Midwest Asian American artist who is struggling with the place of traditional arts in our society, as well as the Asian American search for a new aesthetic that will speak to us as a merging community.

Mostly, I think I will be speaking from the point of view of need, since I am an artist myself, and an arts administrator. I'm bombarded daily by just sheer need, and so I'm hoping that in speaking to foundations, I can sway you in understanding our perspective. I hope that the specificity of what I say in the next ten minutes will translate to your organization's mission.

First, I think, who are we going to stand up for, or who are we going to support wholeheartedly? First comes to mind the emerging artists. For an Asian American young artist, the first few steps of becoming an artist are so critical and sometimes very difficult, whether it's the lack of role models or the dissuasion from family members, or the limited roles in theatre. I'm always reminded, as an Asian American male, I think, okay, I can be the houseboy in *South Pacific* or the evil brother in *Miss Saigon*. Not to complain, but relief from the traditional canon of musical theatre or theatre in general that's limited, and without that in front of you, really you are dissuaded to continue.

So any opportunity for foundations to support young emerging artists to speak and write their own language and their own vision I highly encourage. A great example of that is two years ago, Asian American Renaissance, an Asian American art service organization in town, with Jerome Foundation money, started a program specifically to target young Asian American artists and support their early development. What Asian American Renaissance can do that the Jerome Foundation can't do, of course, is to reach specifically the targeted people and break down the barriers of what it is to present and apply to a prestigious foundation and make it much more easy to walk through the door of Asian American Renaissance and say, Hey, do you want to sign up for this? You're an artist, consider yourself an artist, apply for this. You'll get a couple thousand dollars and you're on your way. So the first few steps are extremely important.

Another great opportunity in this town is Intermedia Arts and their mentorship program. Here you have people of color saying it's time to give back, and there is some money for both the mentor and the mentee, and you apply and you get not only some money that leads to a production or presentation, but you get some oversight and some mentorship from somebody that can lead you through the minefield it takes to become a more mature artist.

The first category of need is the emerging artist. Second, I would enumerate the connection with Asia. I would claim, and I hope it's not too controversial, that no Asian American artist is complete without an understanding of the original ethnic tradition from which he or she comes from. We see that in national conferences on the idea of home. There is an identity crisis for Asian Americans and where we belong. We are told we don't belong here, and when we go back to "home lands", we don't fit in there either. I don't think that's specific to Asian Americans so, again, I hope you translate that to your organization and the communities you serve, but I think it is very intense for Asian Americans – the search for home.

Because of that, we grew up without a sense of, well, what is Chinese Dance? We certainly don't get it in our K-12 system. What is Cambodian

visual arts, Hmong tapestry? So we grew up without that sense, both artists, young and old. I'm thinking about John Jang, who is a jazz artist from a generation older than myself. He is looking for that, so he is going back to China to figure out how does that influence what pretty much is a Western art tradition of jazz piano.

An example of a grant that strikes at this need is the Jerome Foundation Travel Grant. It lets artists like myself go back to China or go back to Asia and investigate what we are about, and can hopefully bring back. That connection with Asia is through this traveling that I will embark on next year. Hopefully, I will bring back to Minnesota something that's important, something that can enrich the cultural life for Asian Americans beyond myself.

What we don't have are grants that tackle bringing artists from Asia to here. I mean, the costs are so prohibitive, whether it's the visa or the application for the green card, or simply just a short-term residency. We don't really have monies that I can identify that allow for that. The visit, the residency of an artist from Asia is incredibly, incredibly enriching for people here, specifically in Minnesota, which is not a specific destination for artists of Asia. I mean, they avoid us – fly right over us to go to the East Coast, or land before they get to us on the West Coast. So the second category is the connection with Asia that I think is very important.

The third category is something that came up in this morning's roundtable, which is the immigrant artist population. I think that is interesting because they are both emerging and a connection to Asia. You get a two-for-one in this deal. Someone at the roundtable suggested very casually, but I think very smartly, a program for immigrant artists – newly arrived people, and what would that mean the first four or five years of their stay. In some ways, like social service, when people get here, you need to get them running when they hit the ground and provide for their well-being – work. They are trained, their life's work is being neglected, and is there something that the arts funding community can do to address a world-class artist who arrives and must consider working in a restaurant, or must consider working in a factory.

I am thinking about specific artists I know who are master artists – a filmmaker who has created over thirty films in Hong Kong working in a factory. A first-rank composer living in the Twin Cities who works in a restaurant, and I have to really convince him to take a day off from the restaurant work in order to perform because he gives up that income for that one day. Very specific examples, not just theories.

Finally, I'm going to wrap up by talking about a specific person I work with. Her name is Shen Pei, and she is the choreographer and artistic director of CAAM Chinese Dance Theatre, where I am managing director. I'm going to say a few things about her experience as an example of what I think foundations can do to better our community and better experiences for the Asian American community. Again, I apologize for the specificity of this, but hopefully it translates.

Shen Pei came to the United States on a fluke. She wasn't thinking about coming to Minnesota. When one looks back now at the last six years, at how much impact she has had here in Minnesota as a master artist, one questions what if this fluke never happened. What if she never came to Minnesota? We would not benefit. Hundreds and hundreds and thousands of people have seen her work and have experienced her teaching, and have worked with her. I would love for foundations to think about how do we more purposefully attract these people here? Again, I'm talking about Minnesota but it gravitates to the East and the West Coast.

She came to the U.S. because she was visiting her newly-born grandson. We heard about her, made some phone calls. She said, where's Minnesota? I have no idea where Minnesota is. We said, come visit. She liked it; we shackled her; she had to stay. She said, I'll try it for a year or two. Now it's the seventh year, so unlike someone like Tyrone Guthrie, coming here some thirty years ago, it was completely different. I think her artistry is no less visionary and she has no less capabilities to pull off like what Tyrone Guthrie did, but of course, he was coming from a different tradition, and he could rely on artists trained in the technique of acting. Whereas, Shen Pei can't because

Chinese dancers are few and far between. The whole system that would support that is completely different.

Administrative support. I'm sure when Guthrie was here – and I don't know the specifics of the history – the whole community mobilized to sell season tickets, and there was a managing director right there, hand-in-hand in support of the administration with the artist. We don't have that. I am the managing director, and I always say that she runs miles ahead of me and much, much faster than me. I can't catch up with her. This is a 63-year-old woman and I am administrating as fast as I can, but it's only half her speed and we've only run half her distance.

Material. As a choreographer, she needs dancers. She has no dancers so it's like paint without a painter. So how do foundations address this difficulty and this lack?

Finally, funding. I look at the traditional businesses that we have, like a very large fortune cookie company in this town. Because they are also an immigrant generation, they don't think of arts funding when they think of what to do with their money. We are in constant dialogue with them to help them understand this philanthropic process, but that's tough. But then we look at other large corporations who have assimilated into corporate philanthropy, and they give to the orchestra and they give to mainstream arts organizations. We are without on both ends, and I think that's a new idea for me – a new revelation – and I don't know what the solution is. I wish that we would all consider that when we understand why Asian American arts organizations, and possibly many more arts organizations, are underfunded. We fall into this gap.

So I'll save some time for questions.

Snipper: Thank you.

I had asked the three panelists to just send me a very brief bio, and Abel and I were playing email tag because he was on the East Coast and I was in San Francisco. He emailed it to me – this full bio, and we don't have the time, so I pulled it together and Abel hasn't seen it yet, so forgive me if I've omitted something really important.

Lopez: No problem.

Snippet: What I can tell you is that Abel is very, very, very passionate about the arts. His degree from Harvard Law was the springboard to his life's activities in the arts. He is a director and a producer; currently, the associate producing director of GALA Hispanic Theatre in Washington, D.C. He also works as a consultant, primarily in organizational development areas. He has directed productions across the country and in most of Latin America. His past and current professional and volunteer activities really are too numerous to mention in the time. Suffice it to say that he doesn't seem to require sleep; thus, he's on schedule.

Currently, he is the president of these boards: the National Association of Latino Arts & Culture; and the Non-Traditional Casting Project in the Mid-Atlantic Arts Foundation. He is a regular board member of the National Assembly of State Arts and the Association of American Cultures, the Smithsonian Center for Latino Initiatives, to name a few, Maru Montero Dance Company, and the Washington AIDS Partnership.

He is on the advisory boards of many organizations, including the Kennedy Center, the Benton Foundation, the NEA, and Hispanics & Philanthropy. He has been on many panels, from the NEA to numerous theaterized agencies. He is active in D.C. politics and news issues.

He has won many awards and recognitions, starting in 1998 as an Emerging Artist for the Hispanic Institute. Then he was elevated to Washingtonian of the Year, and then kind of demoted to Latino of the Week, all within a 5-year span of time.

And he has won a community service award, which I thought very appropriate, from the Department of Energy.

Lopez: Thank you. Now I spend most of my time outside of Washington because nobody knows me anymore. But anyway, thank you for being here.

I wanted to talk a little about the context of philanthropy and giving in the Latino community, and give a brief glimpse of what that

community looks like and how it either jives with our perception of the communities that exist within our own areas or what we perceive through the media, or what we read. Specifically, a more recent interest by the Latino community as well as the world of philanthropy on the issue of philanthropy in the Hispanic community.

There is a perception that we are perhaps a new community, as was labeled for this particular session. For many Latinos in many parts of the country, we are not new communities. For many, there is still a strong belief that they didn't cross the border to this country, the border crossed to them, particularly in the areas of the Southwest and the West. Instead of New England and changes of transfer of land and the Western expansion of the United States, what is known as the West could have been New Spain. New communities is a term not necessarily appropriate or accurate in many areas of the country.

Nevertheless, the issue of philanthropy and the traditions of giving, whether the Latino population actually participates in philanthropy is also a question for many. It is, of course, a question for many Latino arts organizations, whether it's in the arts or whether it's social services or advocacy, and whether our support does or does not come primarily from the Latino community.

Traditionally, we have not been seen as great givers, either within our community or without. However, in recent studies, if you look at the amount of money that goes back to countries of origin, if the Salvadorians stop sending money back, the economy of El Salvador would collapse. What the Mexicans send back to Mexico for families is the third largest contribution to their GNP.

Therefore, there is a history of giving within the community, not only to family and religion, but it is put in primarily through unorganized channels, primarily tied to family and friends and their needs, and through religion or their particular church – in most cases, the Catholic Church. However, most of these have not necessarily been measured or acknowledged and recognized, and so the perception of a

community unable to give or unwilling to give has arisen, or the perception is that we don't contribute and we don't give. That doesn't necessarily mean, even if we do give, that we are necessarily giving to arts organizations, of which I will touch on a little.

If you are interested in looking at some of the literature, there is a book called *New Pathways – Reflections On Hispanics and Philanthropy*, which was edited by Diana Campoamor, William A. Diaz and Henry A.J. Ramos. You can get it through Hispanics and Philanthropy, which is based in the Bay Area, and is a focus group of philanthropists, not dedicated to the arts, but nevertheless incorporates and encompasses some of the Latinos or Hispanics within the philanthropic community and giving in the arts.

I know I will be repeating a lot of information that you know, and that is we are, like the Asian community, very culturally diverse. It does play out in how the giving also occurs. As an example, my particular theatre, GALA, which is an acronym for a group of Latin American artists, was founded by an Argentine and his American wife. Most of all, work is about and written by Latinos from all over Latin America and Spain.

Our work is not specific as to any one particular country, or any one particular group. Our giving therefore reflects what we present on our stages. Giving within this particular community in Washington is very nationalistic. The Argentines will give toward a production from the Argentine community, and would not necessarily give toward a Mexican play. The Mexicans will perhaps give to a play again by Mexico or perhaps Central America, but not necessarily to a Chicano play, and so forth.

In approaching our giving, we have had to look very specifically at the nationalities of these particular groups. For us to approach any idea of giving or increased participation based on the term of Hispanic or Latino would make our jobs very, very difficult. We are addressing which groups make up our community and who are actually those from that community who are participating in civic life.

As we all know, the economic and educational political status of Latinos and/or Hispanics

across the country varies. The first wave of immigrants that were perceived to be immigrants in certain areas of the country, specifically focusing on the Southeast or the East Coast, were the Cubans after the Revolution. They were primarily people from a higher class who came with very high educational levels, and therefore became very quickly incorporated within the American mainstream as far as the economic and political life of the Southeast.

The new wave of immigrants, however, from Cuba, were not of that class, and therefore represent a totally different sector of the Cuban community or Latino community in those cities on the East Coast and the Southeast.

We've heard that the Latino population will be the largest community of color in the next four to five years, but it doesn't again recognize the diversity of that community. The Mexican-American or the Chicano population will be the largest from that group, and Cubans and Puerto Ricans follow. The greatest growth in the Latino community is from the Central American community as probably you're a witness, not only on the Southeast and the West Coast, but in states such as Arkansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and other states in which we have not been accustomed to seeing Latinos in our communities.

With labor coming into Midwestern communities, we're changing what the communities look like nine months after their arrival, in which they were actually meeting people from those communities and marrying or establishing relationships. And nine months later, we see the product of that work. However, as to identity and how they are perceived as Latinos in our community, that will certainly be a challenge for many foundations or community organizations dealing with what those communities look like and what their needs are.

As I mentioned earlier, giving in the Latino community has been unrecognized by most people who recognize or look at the issues of philanthropy. Again, most of the giving in the Latino community is centered around family or friends and their needs, and most of that, at least from immigrant populations, still goes back to their country of origin.

You see the demographics changing and you perceive that our populations are growing so rapidly that we may be a majority in numbers – however, we still are outside when it comes to the social, economic or political power of the communities in which we exist. How it impacts not only on foundation giving and corporate giving, but also to patterns and opportunities for us to learn about philanthropy, are limited.

Many Latinos who are beginning to go into positions in the corporate world where they have access to either their community giving money or their marketing money still are not comfortable enough or secure enough to feel that they can specifically give to Latino causes, even though they may be Latino. There is the perception that they are going to start giving to their own community. But the accountability that they face and the challenges they face within their corporate structure make it not as easy for them to just as quickly turn around and support our organizations.

The issues of new wealth which we all talk about – the dot-com generation and the fast money that they are making and the wealth that they are acquiring – Latinos are participating, particularly in the Silicon Valley, East or West. However, most of those Latinos, like their fellow dot-commers, have little traditions, even though they have been born here, of giving. Their wealth is too new, has been too quick. They don't have a history of giving. If they do give, they are going to tend to give as your new example to those larger mainstream organizations in which recognition and validity is quick, public visibility is very rapid, and not necessarily tied to either passion or causes in which they believe. Even though we are maybe part of that new wealth, it doesn't necessarily mean that there will be a direct connection to the causes or the issues which many community-based organizations are involved in.

Therefore, the challenge for both the Latino community and those outside the Latino community is that you have a large demographic sector of our country that is getting larger, and there needs to be a continual process of education about philanthropy, and how to set up foundations and how to participate in community foundations. The challenge is to

provide an education to participate in philanthropy in an organized fashion.

It is ironic and interesting that as the Latino population is growing, and we see that there is very little tradition of giving through organized mechanisms in the Latino community, that Latin America and Eastern Europe are looking at the whole issue of foundations and setting up the nonprofit world. Latino population in this country is looking at the very same issues. Therefore, the issue of education about participating in organized fashion – such as working through funds in community foundations as opposed to acquiring a whole structure of a foundation, or setting up small family foundations – is both not only feasible, but possible for them to do.

Hispanics in Philanthropy has been working with community foundations across the country to provide educational opportunities in the Latino community about how to participate in philanthropy through community funds. It has been helpful, although certainly has not been at the level that I and others would welcome, as we have begun to see some Latinos on the boards of community and corporate foundations, we have begun to see that we can have models from whom we can learn about how to set up foundations or how to participate in the foundation board room. We can, therefore, begin to leverage these positions to disseminate that information as well as to serve as examples as to how to do that in our communities.

For small arts organizations, whether you're from the Latino community or not from the Latino community, it will be very important as we see this growing population, and even this wealth, that we get to learn and get beyond the stereotypes and perceptions of what giving is.

I had the good fortune of going to a regional theatre to direct a few years ago, and was very interested in seeing how they were going to promote this particular production to the large Latino population in that community, as well as how they would get people to attend the theatre. Of course, the perception is that in reaching out to the Latino community, you have to offer discount tickets, and you first start with that.

What they failed to do was actually to look at the statistics of what made up that community and where wealth was. In looking at statistics, one could really determine how many families within that particular community had annual incomes of \$100,000 or \$50,000 to \$100,000. A significant portion of Latino individuals within those communities had that, but because of the normal tendency for most organizations that are not culturally specific to assume that there is no wealth in the Latino population, most community outreach is seen as free tickets, discounts, special access programs, as opposed to getting to know what the real wealth of the organization of that community really is and, therefore, identify who those individuals are.

So if we are to encourage participation of the Latino community in our activities, whether it's in community foundations or as patrons of our arts organizations, or if we believe that we can work to create philanthropy in the Latino community, it is important for us to get to know what that community is: what their history is, but, more importantly, what they are doing now, where they live, what they earn. That information is out there, but because of our general perception that communities of color or disenfranchised communities have no wealth or no experience, we don't find out that information. So if we are truly to make inroads about these new communities which are not new and engaging them in philanthropy, we must get beyond our own perceptions and stereotypes.

The last thing I will say is that the challenge for many of us again will be that we still, with respect to the Latino arts organizations, are not a priority even for Latinos. Social services, political causes, advocacy are the primary issues in the Latino communities. Even though we recognize that the arts in the Latino communities, and in particular theatre, have been very key players in the civil rights movement of the Latino population, still the arts groups within the community have not received the same kind of support that some of these other issues have. So the struggle that non-Latino organizations face with respect to their acceptance and recognition of artists and arts organizations – it's no different.

Snipper: Thank you.

Before I open it up for questions and answers, as I was listening to the three panelists, it struck me, the commonality of the issues within the different cultural background. At the recent White House conference on philanthropy, Emmett Carson, who is the president of the Minneapolis Foundation, and is one of the leading historians of African American philanthropy, remarked that the old view has it that philanthropists are wealthy, usually male, often of European heritage, and they practice rich-to-poor giving.

In the African American culture, as in the Latino, as in the Asian communities, it hasn't been recognized; it doesn't have a face; it hasn't been organized, as Abel says. In the Asian community, if all the Filipinos in the States stop sending money back home, the Filipino economy would also collapse. So there are a lot of similarities.

Rebecca Adamson, who is a wonderful woman, is a member of the Cherokee Tribe, and the founder and president of the First Nation Development Institute, also describes how Native traditions of giving and sharing and reciprocity are taking modern forms, and tribes now have giving programs. There are some emerging funds, such as the Eagle Staff Fund, where they pooled the resources from about fifty foundations nationwide to combine the Native culture of giving with strategic techniques for effective grantmaking.

And as Kit says, women too are building on a tradition of giving. Currently, women control over 51 percent of personal wealth and will continue to assume economic and professional prominence, so our philanthropic power will only continue to grow.

Just think about some of the demographic changes. In my generation, 59 percent of us will give more in the next five years. Within the next five to ten years, there is going to be the largest transfer of wealth. We have heard this talked about, but in real terms it's \$12 trillion. So how do we harness and access this from our communities? How can I get my rich cousin in Mill Valley, San Francisco, to give to Asian Americans, to the new immigrants in my community rather than to the San Francisco orchestra? I

think we should talk about this. We would like to hear from you. What your thoughts are, comments? Yes, Bob.

Question: I'd like to thank the panelists because I think their comments were brilliant. That to me hits it right on the head. How do you get individual donors to value their own culture as well as those of other people? That is the dilemma in all of this, and especially when you add to the fact that we need to grow younger givers. We need to grow givers in their 20s and 30s. Kit, when you mentioned the Freedom Band, to me there is no greater joy than seeing them march. For me, it is a moment of pride.

At the same time, if you look at my personal donation history, it's to many more established arts organizations or emerging arts organizations, and not necessarily cultural arts organizations. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Waickman: I'll take on the first piece, not the younger piece.

The argument is still down to assimilation versus social change and how people want to see themselves. What I try to do is engage donors in those conversations.

If I want assimilation in the GBLT world, I'm going to align myself with a human rights campaign fund because I get to run around with what looks normative. I want my name at the Art Institute; I'm in the in-crowd; I'm safe, finally. No one can take my money away; I am secure. I think all of our communities are dealing with insecurity and fear. I'm stable now, but what's going to happen when I get fired? Minnesota is unique in terms of our employment protections. Very few other communities can say that.

If we can get into a dialogue about social change, well, where do you want your money to be speaking? How far can you push yourself? Get that dialogue up on the table. I think it moves people and at least brings to their awareness where their money is channeling.

Philanthrofund is a very young organization. I'm it in terms of staff. We work with the Gill foundation on a program called Outgiving, and

it's strictly a discussion about GLBT philanthropy. What does it look like? What does it mean? I see that as the core of the problem, as the fear that we all hold.

I'm not going to touch the younger ones. Does anyone else has any ideas on that one?

Young: I just want to say something about individual donors for the Asian American community.

Art is our identity. I mean, that's just obvious for us. In some ways, we're petrified of the politics. During the whole issue of Wen Ho Lee, it was difficult to get money out of the Asian American community to raise for his defense and his justice. They were scared. Who's going to have files on them, and all that kind of stuff? But I think the fruit of giving to arts is completely ripe.

What is the ability of the arts organization? It's usually a fledgling organization; usually a small-staffed organization. What is our ability to get the message across – say that this is something very important and that we will be responsible with your money; and we have a vision and we have the capability, and the mechanism to continue that ask over a period of time, and do it responsibly?

I speak very highly of the Metropolitan Regional Arts Council, who has a new program called Organizational Development, which is just a great program for small and mid-sized organizations, to have some money to do administrative work, so it's not just all arts-project oriented, but it's administrative-project oriented. It allowed us this year to set up for the first time our first official annual donor campaign. We've found that they are ready to give. We just had to have it all lined up and make them feel secure that they are giving to something that is going to really contribute – and they did it. I've been extremely happy with that, but up until that moment we really didn't make a good ask, and we didn't have the system that would be responsible with their money. So, for me it's a no-brainer – they're ready. They kept saying when there is a cause that we see clearly, we'll give. We just weren't ready, as an arts organization, until now.

Lopez: In my case, Latinos giving to Latinos; it really is the same issue – the whole question of education and understanding of the arts. I agree with Kit. It's much easier to get. The product of Latinos my age, and even younger, who now have access to resources with respect to their knowledge of the Latino arts world and Latino arts history was very limited in this country. Most people in this country, when they study art, whether it's art history or their exposure to any type of artistic and cultural creation, very little in this country ever included the contributions or the work of Latino artists.

So, when you get to the point that you're going to give, if you have no connection with that arts product or arts history, even though you may be Latino but your exposure has been to Western European or European artists, therefore there can be no assumption that therefore they're going to turn, all of a sudden, to give to Latino organizations. They have no history; they have no knowledge of it.

So the role of arts education – not arts in education but arts education in this country – has a great impact even in our community with respect to the knowledge of that creation. I think it's true probably of other groups as well. When you study theatre here in this country, or painting or music, unless you're taking a World Culture class or an Ethnic Studies class or a specific study of a particular school, you're not going to have access to these artists and their histories.

So, as a young Mexican American who became a Chicano, who became a Latino by moving through my world experiences, it's through my own journey that I've been exposed and have acquired a knowledge of what the history of the Latino culture is. It's true of the African American, and I think it's true of the Asians, where if we don't have a sense of that history, of culture, we can't assume that when we are adults, we therefore know what our own community-based organizations have been providing.

Because of that lack of educational foundation, not just for Latinos but for non-Latinos, to therefore also contribute to our cause, we tend to associate the product of our work as arts in culture in our communities as primarily being

political statements, as opposed to the broader expression of culture. One will tend to think, if you're producing a Latino play, if it's not political, then why are you doing it?

I think that's the same issue we face with the dot-commers and anyone else who is not a giver to arts in culture. If there is no relationship, they're not going to give. That's what we learn as individual organizations, is how do we establish that relationship? I think, as Latinos, we're facing that within the arts world and arts communities, here you have generations that have no knowledge of the basis of our work, other than political movements, and it's not based on political movements. Political movements became an expression of art culture and perhaps of our history through the arts.

What I find with the Latin Americans who move here is that they are much more knowledgeable about the culture of their countries and the cultural history of their countries when they move here. What we need to give them is the U.S. Latino perspective in that history, which they don't have. And that's why when they give, they tend to give only in a very nationalistic way, because that's the history they know. That's why they give to plays that I produce from Argentina, but not necessarily to a Chicano play.

Waickman: Homosexuals have a sense of their role in the arts.

Lopez: And I'll tell you one more thing.

I think that an interesting case study about Latinos, and in this case Mexican Americans, as I was corrected – not Chicanos, because of who made the decisions – is what happened with the San Antonio Arts Council and what they did to the Esperanza and the funding in the arts.

The decision from that public body to cut funding for the arts in San Antonio was done by a predominantly Mexican American Council that de-funded the arts, and they de-funded Esperanza, but they de-funded across the board. So, here you had a situation now where, politically speaking, the Mexican American community had elected the majority of the council. They made no different determination,

had they not been Latino, with respect to the arts. The Latino community organization suffered just as much as the non-arts organization, and that was because those individuals had no understanding of the role of the arts in culture, and in particular, the Latino community, even in San Antonio.

So it's an interesting case study about a group moving into positions of making political determinations about arts funding, where you have one that now looks like you, and they make the same determinations as the people who don't look like you.

Question: I'm curious as to what the three of you see as important issues in the work that you do in your individual communities, bringing that to a broader context of the communities that you're in. Given all the work that you're already needing to do and the strains that you're under to provide to your own internal communities, how important do you feel it is to be reaching out in the work that you do to the broader communities? Also, do you see that as something reasonable with funders, to be asking and looking at?

Lopez: I'm sorry, reasonable for funders to be looking at?

Brendon: The degree to which you are reaching out to a broader community, bringing the context of your work to say, your GALA Theatre stuff in the context of the Washington establishment?

Young: I believe that the arts organizations – the artists – know what their goals are. They set their own agenda, and they have to see if they jive with the criteria of the foundation, so it varies, I would say. It's whether they themselves feel, to what degree they want to reach and to whom. I mean, I think there is outreach all the time. Is it specific within the Asian American community, which is another label that so defies definition, or is it to maybe what you were referring to – to the mainstream?

Question: I guess that's one of the issues I'm facing, is the idea of mainstreaming. In some communities there is no race majority. Caucasians are less than 50 percent now, so there's a

lot of dialogue between different communities, and I wondered if any of you see that as an important element in the work that you're doing within the context of your communities? It seems like a lot of funders are asking for that dialogue.

Lopez: I'll tell you what my experience is. This is our 25th season. We started by doing all of our productions in both English and Spanish. Again, the mission of the organization is not only to provide our work for the Latino community, but also to the non-Latino community. We are going to address this gap, this lack of knowledge by providing them access. So for us, it's consistent with our mission. We do that all the time with respect to the organization.

Now we do it with simultaneous interpretation with individual audio headsets. We don't do each production in both languages; we'll just go back and forth. The primary reason for that was not just because of cost, although it was very expensive to do a production in both languages because in most cases we couldn't find bilingual actors who could do the roles. So there was that need. We also changed it because when we produced our plays in English, the people who we wanted to see Latino artists were not seeing them, because most of them weren't bilingual so they didn't speak English, and so therefore, we couldn't present them in the English-language production. So, we were defeating our own purpose of trying to provide opportunities to see Latino artists. So we went to the headsets, where you do hear an English interpretation, but you see the Latino actor performing in Spanish.

Part of our work is also to explore the diversity of the Latino community. So within that, we've done projects that explore the Latino Jew – the contributions of the Jewish community within the Latino culture; the Afro Latino – the African roots in our culture.

Last year, we did a collaborative project with Ping Chong using Ping Chong to focus on the Asian influence and Asian community that exists in Latin American when they were brought as workers to Argentina, to Chile, to Costa Rica, to Central America, to work in all those countries as laborers. We used that work

to reach out beyond what is perceived to be our own Latino community.

With respect to the funder who asks that we do this outreach also, I see that as an opportunity when we get into discussions about why we do that, particularly with respect to leadership. I've had many a conversation when they look at my group and ask why you don't have the leaders of the community in your organization. My discussion with them is how do you define leadership? Are you defining leadership in the context of leadership and who takes an active role in my community versus your definition of status and equating status with leadership?

I use any opportunity in discussing outreach to ask, are you trying to impose and give us a definition of what you consider outreach because of your needs as opposed to your lack of understanding of the kind of work we do? It doesn't mean that we walk away from each other; it just means that it's an opportunity to engage in discussion about definitions, about leadership, about outreach. What are you trying to do? Are you trying to provide culturally diverse experiences for others or are you trying to reach a culturally diverse community, and then if you're trying to do that, then you have to recognize the diversity within my own community, and sometimes outreach is within my own community.

Dialogue sometimes has to occur within my community before I can go outside that community if we're going to get away from the stereotypes that I speak of for the entire Latino community. Engagement about cross-cultural exchange, about outreach, are perfectly great opportunities to engage in with any funder about definitions and purposes and intent and understanding of my role and your role and the role of an arts organization and community.

Question: I just wanted to add something from my perspective as a funder. In New York City, we have a few theatre companies that provide simultaneous translation. From my perspective, a lot of what they have been able to accomplish is to bring generations together. The older generation doesn't speak English and the younger generation, they're actually the mainstream. They're all part of the mainstream, so

that is, as you say, an outreach within the community. I think that's a very important role for that kind of organization.

Lopez: I'll give you an example in San Jose also that's coming up, just for your information. There is a project that MOCA-LA has just started, which is looking at the intermarriages between the Latino community and the Asian community as a reflection of the changes in Silicon Valley, not only with respect to population, but what does it mean to be Asian or Latino when you are children of both, and where both cultures have looked at each other very differently? I think that that project will be a really interesting question about identity, about culture, about dialogue.

Waickman: No matter what the numbers are in the current community, all of our communities have grown up in the dominant culture. So existence plus excellence means we're being out there, and I would probably have a different message to a predominantly GLBT activist audience. To you, oh funders, I would really caution you to support the organizations that are nurturing and creating spaces of autonomy for whatever the emerging group is. Don't force the small organizations to trot out the whatever.

For some of the points that Abel was making, if we are reaching our communities and doing it well and having dialogues about the diversity within our communities, let us do that well and fund that piece. There might be some other missions – separate organizations – but please encourage that. It's all too easy to pull those organizations too many which ways.

Question: I probably won't ask this question right, but it seems to me that there's more and more disenfranchisement. In theory, your organization could be four different organizations, and you talk about Asian American, but you're specifically Chinese. I don't know how many Asian cultures there are. When you talk about Latino, how many different Hispanic countries would fall under that? At what point do we stop the fragmentation? You can take it one step further; you could have a gay Hispanic or a gay Latino fund at some point in time. I

just wonder if at some level, there won't be enough funding for all of these different things.

To fund the arts is one thing, but to fund different sections within the arts, it's almost like the whole United Way thing now. I mean, well-run organizations don't want to be part of United Way because that's their hook to get in front of the companies now because there is such a menu there. I'm really concerned that as a funder, at some point in time we may have too many choices. You revert back to the mainstream, just because it's easier to do that than to offend any of the other groups. You all three seem like you have great organizations, but I just see this trend where it just continues to multiply, so I wonder how you respond to that or how you consider that within your organizations.

Lopez: I don't know. I can tell you why this organization was founded. It wasn't founded because some Latinos got together one day and said oh, let's do an arts organization. It was because my community wasn't being served by the arts groups in Washington D.C. There was a growing population that had a history of participating in the arts that had nowhere to go.

So, to the extent that my organization exists, it is not because we said, Well let's just segment ourselves to be different. It was trying to serve a need that continues to be unmet. So if the situation were to be that I no longer needed to exist, then that's a valid question. But I would pose that same question to every other organization in the city. Do they need to exist, regardless of what their age is? Are they being responsive and relevant, and inclusive of the people who make up that community?

I think that as wonderful as cultural diversity initiatives have been, they have been primarily as audience development for organizations that had no connections to sectors in communities. Organizations that are community-based that are really a reflection and responsive to unmet needs in that community were created to serve if we were to truly have a participatory community.

So now the question is when you have organizations that still have no relationships or direct

connections to these communities, we continue to say how much more outreach can you do? How much more support can we give you to reach communities that you still don't have as part of your participation?

Your question is very valid, but it is not about segmentation. It is about meeting needs that continue to be unmet by, predominantly, organizations that have histories over long periods of time, from inception until today, that continue to be supported merely because they are now institutions and have buildings that they need to support, but that the relevance of their programs is still not inclusive, not responsive, and not representative.

Question: Are you an artist first, or a Latino first?

Lopez: Am I an artist first or a Latino first? I'm an advocate.

Snipper: Maybe I could respond to a part of your question. I'm also on the board of the Asian Pacific Endowment for Community Development, which is a fund of the St. Paul Foundation here in the Twin Cities. It was created five years ago; one donor said, what can we do? She put aside \$5 million and created these four funds. Now, of the four funds, there are representatives from each of the culturally specific funds that forms a council, and I'm on that council.

One of the first acts was to create funding for multicultural projects, working across the communities. When we did an assessment of our grantmaking over the first four years, we found that predominantly our grants went to the arts and cultural organizations. We have taken that and said, okay, how can we pool the Chinese, the Hmong, the Cambodian, the Japanese, the Koreans, where the ancient political history is very current now because of renewed efforts for countries to apologize and reconcile.

It's very treacherous, difficult ground to walk on. We are using as a strategy the fact that in our community, we value the arts in culture, the traditional as well as the new; and so taking our grantee docket and saying here's our focus on

the arts. This is what we're going to do to pull in the corporate employees from General Mills, from Pillsbury, where there are Asian corporate employee networks. This is how we're going to get the young thirty-year-olds to give to our fund.

In this way, it takes you out of the position of saying, oh my God, there are all these Asian groups who are disenfranchised. I can't make a decision on who to fund. So we're working towards that type of a solution.

Question: Well, and I appreciate that, but Abel's comment earlier about something being done in San Jose, where now you have a study being done on Asian and Latino fringes. It just seems, where does it end? I'm not saying it's a bad thing, but if every different group has to go out and get an administrative staff to go out and piece together how they're going to get their piece of the pie, then it seems like everybody, at some level, loses because there just will never be that much money to go around and support each of those groups. I'm not putting down any of the groups; I think all of the causes are great. It's just that it seems like the less we focus on, like artists for example, and the more that we focus on culture, I just don't see how it can be done and how it can be supported on a long-term basis.

Waickman: I think your question is very good. It also elicits shame from me because it is so new to be at the table. So if you ask this question and get defensive responses, keep that in context. I'm trying not to respond from that place.

What I can say about the GLBT community in the upper Midwest is they police themselves more on non-duplication of services than any other community I know. It's that women moving into the workforce in the 70s philosophy. We must be perfect – to neurosis – to the point where there is a slight perception that youth groups are duplicating in the Twin Cities, maybe major executive directors from all the GLBT communities sitting down and discussing this because we can't afford those sorts of alienating situations.

I can't comment on cross cultures, but where does it end? Well, when does the diversity in the United States end? We're the ones marrying one another; we're the ones pushing the boundaries, and the tapestry is getting more and more interesting. I think where we need to be courageous, and I would look to dominant culture even to be more courageous, is when do we dismantle? When does that organization that emerged really no longer serve? It's sweet; it's nice; the numbers show up, but is it really where the hunger is? Is it really where we are uncomfortable in dialogue?

Young: This is more of a meta-answer than a real answer.

It's amazing because your question is a reality check for me. I'm not saying this in any way as a putdown. It's just confusion, because all I can do is sort of shake my head.

America is changing so fast, it just seems natural for me to assume that the frontier of art is moving as quickly as the frontier of human behavior and existence changing in America. And I also, in my heart, don't believe in the lessening that you're talking about; that the more we divide, the less there is to go around. I think that's not really what America's about; that the more variety is just purely more. So if it's a pot of money, it's not just a pie that is bound by a certain size. It is actually ever-growing and ever-changing, so I'm trying to be positive that way.

But I'm also having difficulty articulating because I know my response should be as articulate as Abel's, and I don't have the words right now. I don't have the thoughts, so I'm talking from my feelings. I'll ask for your email and when I figure it out, I'll write you.

Question: We've been talking about distinct communities here, and yet I also see some of the strength of the arts as bringing disparate communities together. The challenge of any funder is to make the broadest possible use of their dollar, and I think it is true that no one can fund a hundred different cultural entities adequately. I do think that our country is becoming more of a tapestry – a quilt – and I think the more that arts can bring these things

together, the better off we will all be. That doesn't, of course, mitigate the need for individual cultures to celebrate who they are.

I also have trouble saying the word culture because, Kit, you're up there and I don't see the GLBT community as a culture. The GLBT community has been well served throughout history; it's just never been named. But I do think that we have an obligation as funders to try and bring communities together. That is who we are as a people. So rather than focus on shall I contribute to the Latinos or the Asian community or the GLBT community, what can we do to bring that together?

I'm just offering that as a way that we could think, instead of trying to segment.

Question: The unfortunate part about the past is that there hasn't been enough support perhaps, and I think it's our responsibility as funders to be sure that it's spread throughout all areas. And as I see it, there are a lot of threads that haven't been woven into the quilt, although they have very significant stories to add to that quilt.

Snippet: One of the questions that comes to my mind is that as grantmakers, what can we be doing? One of the things that I'm thinking of is several years ago here – and this was not specifically arts related – there was a collaboration between Headwaters Fund and the Social Change Fund, the Minnesota Women's Foundation, and the Minneapolis Foundation called Allies for Justice. This strategy was an effective one because it allowed other family foundations or corporate foundations, particularly, who were not able to fund Philanthrofund or the Minnesota AIDS Project because of feedback from conservative shareholders, to give to the Minneapolis Foundation or Headwaters or the Women's Foundation with some safety, and yet they were able to provide resources for these causes. Are there other types of collaborations or other effective strategies that you can think of that we could do our jobs better, or how we should look at things?

Waickman: Re-granting to culturally specific organizations, be it Asian American Renaissance or Philanthrofund, if you have a lot of

money and you're not connected into one of those niche markets, let go of some of the money and see what happens, and see what autonomy arises. Chin up, chin up, chin up and be kind to the emerging culture's applications.

When I worked at the Wisconsin Arts Board, one of the members took the courageous step to say, the Native American who is teaching his grandchildren how to bead and work with the porcupine quills but who didn't have English writing skills could submit on a tape. You would have thought he was just proposing something radical. This was what Tommy Thompson was saying. Why can't a bird look like a bird? It seemed radical.

I do the same thing. We just got our grants in and there is an arts organization that applied to GLBT, and their application is horrible. I'm going to do everything I can; I'm going to show some favoritism to them and not play on even ground because what they do is important, and if I can get better materials in front of the grant reviewers, they'll be able to see more of the whole picture. So, play in an uneven game. You know, what some of the emerging organizations are submitting should not look like what someone who has three paid grant writers looks like.

Young: I'm just going to talk very briefly about the granting process as it's known through grant writing. I think the grant-writing submission of an application is a refined process of understanding on both parts, the applicant and the reviewer, the intricacies of the structure of the whole process. So the application, this document that is submitted, easily navigates through all of this stuff. The application itself is a clear articulation of the needs of the organization and the desires of the criteria of the foundation.

In emerging communities, we don't benefit from any of that clarity, and that submission of the application is in troubled waters. So I would say what the foundations can do is to help clarify that in whatever way they think helpful, possibly increasing the amount of contact you have directly with the people, whether it's going on a site visit, whether it's more phone calls, whether it's giving it a second chance,

giving it more attention than you might normally give to an application.

That sense of communication I think would be very important because that puts you at the front of what they're doing. It puts you where they're doing their work as opposed to relying on their articulation of what they're doing. So I think the communication, really going out to see what they're doing, and speaking with as many people as possible so that you do your homework to fully understand what the community is about. Be ready to have your definitions changed – the definition of art, the definition of community art – and to see the impact of art in that community and how deep it can be without the preconceptions that we bring from a high art Western standpoint.

Waickman: Pride is the community foundation in Seattle – huge, nice staff – they take five or so of the applications that were rejected and work with them in-depth in the following year and ask them, will you submit a draft? We'll work with you. The grant folks work with them; their development staff works with them. So pick three, work with them; play favorites.

Lopez: On the national level, the Hispanics in Philanthropy has a collaborative initiative project in which they are soliciting funds to create a large fund from various funding sources, to be able to re-grant which then is looking specifically at Latino projects. So that's one project.

On a local level in D.C., and the value here, in my view, has been not so much about the dollars but about other aspects of the collaborative effort. One is the Washington AIDS Partnership, in which some funders have pooled together just like in other cities, and the second is an intercultural neighborhood group which is similar to the AIDS Partnership in which various funders have pooled their funds together to do work in very specific neighborhoods that reflect particular groups.

The most important part in these collaborations is – not so much in the AIDS Partnership one, but in the other one – that the grant committees will be made up of representatives from those communities. It's not just the funder; it actually

includes community representation. The benefit of doing that is providing information that would not normally be available to the funding community who makes their traditional funding decisions in their own bureaucracy and the fear of not being able to bring in other voices because they don't sit on the board or they're not staff.

So this has been a way to really inform the process, not only that collaborative process, but I think the foundation's process itself in the D.C. area, by bringing in community leaders. That's where it gets back to the definition of who is a leader in the community. Who can contribute to the picture and the information that one uses in order to make determinations about funding, not just with respect to this collaboration but eventually in the other foundations.

So the lack of diverse representation on foundation staffs as well as boards has somewhat been addressed by bringing in some of that information from those communities about what is happening in those communities. What is working, and what is not working through this other channel. That collaboration through this other kind of education and outreach of information to these has been of great benefit.

Waickman: Ron McKinley at the St. Paul Companies Foundation did a very good job. Instead of hiring one full-time staff person, he took that money and hired community advisors. So there was much more like talking to like. He had folks on contract from various segments of the community because they didn't have a big grant review process; it was ongoing and flowing.

Snipper: It still is; I'm one of them.

Waickman: Thank you. And another thing that I don't know is still happening.

The NEA used to fund a mentorship program where a larger museum executive director would mentor a similar collection in a smaller community. We're out here doing this, and some funding towards those mentorship type programs. We can learn from all of you; we need your support, and that sort of money is hard to come by. I'm trying to get dollars to

Seattle because they are doing things so right there. To find those mystery dollars is hard.

Snipper: Before I close I want to thank the three of you very, very much. This was enjoyable as well as very educational.

For those of you who attended, there are just a couple of key words that jumped out at me as I listened to these three people. One is "courage" and another is "challenge." The other piece, and Abel just touched on it, is about staff and boards. I have worked for two corporate foundations. One is large, the largest foundation in the state of Minnesota, and it is always a challenge for those of us who have gotten inside as we talk to our peers in the foundation. I would challenge you to look at your staffing and your board and at every opportunity hire, provide dollars for mentorship or whatever because it does get very difficult; it does get very lonely. There are a lot of expectations that we have to carry as we're the only staff of color in the foundation.

Thank you very much. I hope you got what you needed from this session.

THIS IS ONE OF A SERIES OF PROCEEDINGS FROM THE GIA 2000 CONFERENCE, THE SOURCE.

Transcriptions of proceedings from GIA's 2000 conference, *The Source*, are published as individual papers. These proceedings are also available on the GIA website at www.giarts.org.

ORDER FORM

Please indicate the number of copies requested for each individual sessions. Each GIA member organization may request one set of proceedings at no cost. For additional copies, please include a postage and handling fee of \$5.00 per session requested.

- ___ The Digital Revolution and the Arts Pre-conference
- ___ Opening Plenary: Garrison Keillor
- ___ The Independent Creative Voice in Media Arts
- ___ Arts-Giving in Minnesota – Past, Present, and Future
- ___ Myths About the Suburbs
- ___ Arts in Suburban Communities – The Need for Strategic Partnership
- ___ Artist Service Organizations: from Technical Assistance to Tactical Advancement
- ___ Building Connections through the Arts
- ___ Family Foundations: Where They Focus and Why
- ___ Keynote Luncheon: Bill T. Jones
- ___ Highlighting the Development of Giving in New Communities
- ___ Artists and the Natural World – Urban Wildlife
- ___ The Emerging Role and Potential of Community Foundations in Arts Funding
- ___ Generation X and Beyond
- ___ Closing Session

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

Email _____

___ Additional sessions requested @ \$5.00 each = \$_____ enclosed.

Charge my bankcard # _____ Name on card _____ Exp. date _____

Make check payable to Grantmakers in the Arts.

Fax to: (206) 624-5568.

Mail to: Grantmakers in the Arts, 604 West Galer, Seattle, WA 98119-3253, (206) 624-2312.