



Grantmakers in the Arts  
2001 Conference

## Culture Influencing Community Change

Proceedings from the Conference

November 5-7, 2001  
Mohonk Mountain House  
New Paltz, New York

# Member Report: What We've Learned about Arts Marketing Collaboratives

Session Designer: Gary Burger  
The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

Panelists: Thomas E. Backer, Ph.D.  
Human Interaction Research Institute  
Larry C. Coppard  
Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan  
Janet Sarbaugh  
The Heinz Endowments

November 6, 2001, 10:00 a.m.

© 2002 Grantmakers in the Arts



**Burger:** What we're here to talk about today is what I call a quasi-initiative of the Knight Foundation and related projects in Pittsburgh.

The idea behind this session was to go through a process that we have become involved in inadvertently. I call it a quasi-initiative because this was not something we set out to do, saying, "Here is a need in the field that we ought to address," but it has taken on a life of its own.

The two key questions we will be talking about are, "How does arts marketing fit into the larger arena of cultural participation?" and "What would be the most helpful role of funders in that process?"

I'm going to talk about how we got into this, and then we will talk about the theory, practice and transferral of these various ideas, and some of the research that's informing what we're working on now. Then we'll hear from one of the organizations that has worked with us on this project, and then also hear from another project that is related, but not directly involved with anything that Knight Foundation is doing.

I will start by introducing the various panelists today. To my left is Tom Backer, who is president of the Human Interaction Research Institute. I'm not going to give you in-depth bios because you have them all in your packet, and we want to talk about other things as well. To my right is Larry Coppard, who is senior consultant for the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan. To his right is Janet Sarbaugh, who is director of arts and culture programs for the Heinz Endowments.

I will start with a little bit of background about our project. What we'd like to do is to go through the presentations, and we hope to have about forty minutes for you to ask us questions at the end. Obviously, if you have burning questions in the middle, jump in, but we hope we will answer most of your questions in the process.

The history of this initiative for us began in 1990 in Charlotte, North Carolina, which is one of the twenty-six cities we fund in a rather unusual mix of communities around the country ranging from San Jose to Miami, to Philadelphia, to Grand Forks, North Dakota, to Biloxi, to Charlotte.

Under the arrangement we had in the past – which has all changed in the past year, which I will not

get into in any detail – we were reactive grantmakers largely. In other words, people, as I think is the norm, would apply to us. We would work with advisors in the communities to determine whether or not we were interested in supporting that particular project.

In this case, in 1990, the North Carolina Dance Theater had just moved from Winston-Salem to Charlotte and was undergoing the normal kinds of upheavals when an organization goes through a change of that scale. They came to us for stabilization money, but it was clear that marketing in a new geographic area was a key issue of theirs.

At the same time, we were also receiving proposals from the Blumenthal, which is the large performing arts center in Charlotte, and from the Charlotte Rep, which is the largest of the theater organizations there, and one of the resident companies of the Blumenthal, as is the North Carolina Dance Theater. There were the usual range of questions coming in on individual grants about inefficiencies in work, the quality of the marketing effort, and the amount of information and data that they had available to them to make the kind of marketing decisions they wanted to make.

Recognizing that there was a critical mass of need here, we invited the Blumenthal, which was the host organization for these, along with Opera Carolina, which was another of the resident companies at the Blumenthal, to come into us for a planning grant to develop a collaborative marketing project of some sort. We did not specify in any way what this was to look like, but we left it to them to determine that.

The main objectives of the project were to increase collaboration among the organizations, to increase the stability of the organizations, and to increase the quality and effectiveness and impact of their marketing work. This was a hope for efficiency of scale that would be realized, and that duplication of efforts, inefficiencies, redundancies in efforts would be reduced.

We made a planning grant in 1994 for a nine-month pilot study, and this was a fifty-fifty split between our money and the money put in by the applicants. It wasn't specifically a challenge grant, but the budget was set up that way from the beginning. It was made clear to them that if the planning was successful and the parties were still interested that an implementation grant could follow.

Charlotte was a particularly interesting model for this, because there was already a strong history of collaboration among the arts organizations in the community. There was strong arts leadership in the community through the Arts and Sciences Council. The council was also developing a \$30 million United Arts Endowment program for twenty-one of the arts organizations in the community. So the timing was particularly good. Also, they were in a way a national model for collaboration.

The flip side of that was that collaboration has another side to it, too, which is who's doing the pushing and who's doing the pulling and who's doing the receiving. Some people perceived that there was a little more pushing going on, perhaps, than needed. So there was that issue to deal with as well. But these four organizations came into this, I'm happy to say, of their own free will. No one told them they had to accept for us. We said that we are not interested in funding you individually for the same project, but we would be very interested in funding you if you come in for a collaboration.

The other key piece of this which has continued into the other initiatives that have followed, that you'll hear more about from Tom, is that AMS Audience Research had already done a market research project in the community. So we had some baseline data at the beginning of this process. We determined that we also wanted to make sure that at the end, the same kind of market analysis would be done so that we would have some sense of whether the needle had moved, whether anything had happened beyond the specific reporting of the individual organizations. This was more in terms of awareness of organizations and those kinds of things that individual organizations tend not to measure.

With AMS's help, they created a business plan, and their goals were, again, greater communication; a higher level of creativity; better use of limited resources; and much more information available than each organization could determine itself. The interesting pieces of this were that collaboration obviously was part of this, planning was key to it. It also was a capacity-building effort, and made use of leadership that was already in place. It was a step-by-step process that moved them from a position they were in to one they weren't clear about at all at the beginning of the process and were quite clear at the end. We called it a "controlled-risk grant" as a result of those things.

It resulted in an implementation grant, a two-year grant, again fifty percent put in by us, fifty percent put in by the participants. One of the interesting components of that was the marketing budgets of each of the participating organizations were contributed to this process in the sense that they no longer had to spend that money on marketing. Instead of just having a savings, they were asked to put that into the creative programmatic side of the institutions for the next two years. The understanding was, at the end of two years, they would then be responsible for participating at the level of their marketing budget at the beginning of the process. In effect, they didn't save this money over two years, it was just moved to another resource to help them with the programmatic side. That was part of their planning. That was not anything we dictated.

In 1999, we published *Marketing the Arts*, which is the little booklet that's on your chair, and this set in motion a whole series of events that has now led us up to projects of this type in ten of our twenty-six communities. Again, all of these came out of the communities. They were nothing that we dictated.

That leads me to a very brief discussion about how this relates to our new direction in grantmaking. We have moved from discipline-based programs. I used to be the arts and culture person, I'm now the community programs person; we no longer have an arts and culture person, we no longer have an education person, we have all moved into a community-based approach. What we are doing is asking the communities in which we work to tell us what their greatest needs are, to establish between one and three priorities for funding within six areas of interest that our trustees have established. This has become as specific as, for instance, in Long Beach, California, the priority for the next three to five years of funding is school readiness for kids in a single ZIP code. That was not determined by us; again, it was determined by the community.

The correlation between this initiative and the new way we're doing is very much based in allowing this information to come to us from the community, and us responding in a more holistic kind of way, but still using community as the basis, rather than us determining what these are ahead of the organizations or the communities.

One of my concerns in moving into this new system has been that the arts and culture would get lost.

Because if you pick three priorities in any community, the likelihood of the arts being on that list of three may be pretty low. I'm happy to say that in two of the eight communities in which we've now done this – by the end of 2002, we will have all twenty-six done, but we're only up to eight now – two of the communities, Grand Forks, North Dakota, and Fort Wayne, have the arts actually appear on the list of three. In Grand Forks, it's stabilizing the arts and cultural organizations, and in Fort Wayne, it's increasing participation in the arts.

In the other communities, the way the arts will be involved is in terms of responding to the various priorities. For example, an arts organization in Long Beach that's working with pre-K kids would be eligible. But it's a very different approach. There is a very interesting parallel between the evolution of this marketing project and our new system. With that, I'll turn it over to Tom.

**Backer:** My job this morning is to touch fairly lightly, because you have some handout materials that will give you the details, on some of the issues of making change happen in this initiative built from the ground up, or quasi-initiative, as Gary described it. I'm going to be focusing on some of the human issues of change, because that happens to be the hammer that this small boy carries out into the world. I'm a clinical psychologist by training, and that's what my institute does, it helps funders wrestle with some of the issues of change and how to respond to them. At the risk of almost immediately...not contradicting, but adding on to interpretations that my funder has just made, I'm going to give you a slightly different point of view about Charlotte as a way of highlighting some of the human issues of change.

Gary said that the four organizations that came onboard to start the arts marketing collaborative in Charlotte did so voluntarily, and that's true, with respect to the funder. But for those of you who may know Judith Allen, who runs the Blumenthal Performing Arts Center in Charlotte, it was not true for the other three organizations besides the Blumenthal which reside there, because Judith came to them and said, "You are hereby invited to volunteer to become part of this arts marketing collaborative." I say that with a smile, because I like Judith, but it did have some fairly significant effects on the beginning of this collaborative in terms of how the process of change got made. There was a fair amount of, if not kicking and screaming, at least squirming and doubts

and real concerns about another implication which Gary mentioned: giving up my marketing budget, if I'm an arts organization, and turning it over to some entity that didn't exist last week, raises some real fears.

One of the negotiations that happened in the process of making this change take place in Charlotte is that in several of the cases, the organizations that were onboard first in the collaborative did keep part of their marketing budgets, and did do their own marketing activities. That also had an impact, some good, some perhaps not so good, in the way in which the collaborative functioned. Some of its original intention didn't quite get carried out in the way that the architects of this collaborative might have envisioned, because if they had insisted on that absolute fidelity – and I'll come back to that in a moment, talking about other communities – it's likely that this would have collapsed in a storm of resistance.

Think about who the partners were: a performing arts center whose income engine is a Broadway series; a dance company; a repertory theater company; and an opera company. They're looking at joint marketing, thinking, "Well, you know, is my marketing niche going to disappear? Is it going to be bland?" There were all kinds of concerns about that. These are human as well as technical concerns that meant there was a lot of fear and loathing associated with this collaborative operation. At the same time people recognized that this was a great opportunity. Both are true; those contradictions are throughout this process of making change happen.

If you start to look at how the original collaborative took shape in Charlotte, there was a lot of behind-the-scenes wrestling about how to do this that, I suspect, was not communicated to the funder as clearly as it was experienced on the ground level. We had to deal with those issues of concern, and the very real risks that were there. This was a risky enterprise. This meant that four of the largest arts organizations in Charlotte – and a fifth of the big guys, the Symphony, did not and still has not come onboard with this marketing collaborative all these years later. This was a risky operation and people were concerned about that. What would be the impact if it didn't work? My marketing budget is gone, and suddenly I'm dealing with a decline in ticket sales, subscribers, et cetera,, and what do I do, because I don't get to control my own budget anymore? You get the idea.

We come to the reality that, with all the kicking and screaming, the collaborative in Charlotte was a success. That was as seen by some of the evaluation that was done by AMS, the views of the people participating, and the funder. It had problems, but it was successful in accomplishing a number of goals we can get into later if you're interested in hearing what some of the specifics are.

With that success in mind came the potential for Knight Foundation, which, as Gary described, does local giving in twenty-six communities, to replicate this program in other communities. That is another interesting element of how this initiative, from the ground up, unfolded. Because the community of Long Beach came to Knight Foundation, another of the Foundation's twenty-six communities, and said, "Gee, we've been hearing about this operation in Charlotte, and we've seen this little booklet." Actually, I think the initial contact in Long Beach was Sandra Gibson, who was running Public Corporation for the Arts then, and came about before the booklet had come out. But in any event, there was information about what had happened in Charlotte. "Could we do it too?" says Long Beach.

That opened the door for another kind of change process, which is what I want to spend my remaining minutes here talking to you about and highlighting some of the lessons learned. What's happened since then is that nine other communities are at various stages of developing this collaborative. It's actually up and running in Long Beach. It's almost up and running in San Jose, and as you'll hear from Larry Coppard, it's in the advanced planning and early implementation stages in Detroit, where it is linked onto an already ongoing and very vigorous program in cultural participation.

There have been immediate challenges in each of these communities, as they've come on stream, because Charlotte is not like Long Beach is not like Detroit, et cetera. The process of replication has been driven by communities coming to the funder and saying, "We'd like to learn about this program, and we'd like a planning grant, and we'd like an implementation grant," and approaching the funder rather than the other way around. Most initiatives start with the funder saying, "Money's available, and you apply and we have an application process." It didn't quite work that way here. That's opened some doors for the process of replication to happen that also has been

driven by some things that we've done in research, which I will talk to you about a little bit.

If you look at page thirty-nine in this booklet, you will see a summary, and on the following two pages are eight core components. We did a little research study in Charlotte, not to find out the core components of content for marketing – what technically they did in marketing that was innovative – you have to talk to somebody other than me for that, because I don't know diddly about marketing. But what I do know about is how people make change.

We went in and talked to people. We did lots and lots of interviews, and found out that there were some things in the process of change that happened in Charlotte that were very smart, and that we knew could be useful for other communities considering this program.

None of this is going to sound really surprising to you. I've got eight components here. Anybody in this room could come up with the same eight components. The only thing that makes this worth doing as a piece of research is that you all are not Charlotte, you didn't have the actual experience of doing it. But what's in here is pretty much common sense.

For instance, if people are scared about making change they don't want to give up their marketing budgets, they don't know if this whole idea of a collaborative is really going to work, they're not sure what sort of loss of identity, loss of control is going to be involved, one of the ways to quell the fears to a certain extent is to do a pilot study; to have a pilot period so that you can get your foot into the lake before you decide to dive in headfirst. That turned out to be very helpful for the Charlotte project. There are other components there, you can read them for yourselves, but you get the idea.

There were things in the process of making the change so that the collaborative could happen, that were done in Charlotte, that to us, as the researchers, seemed like they provided a good template for thinking about change.

Now here comes Long Beach, and Long Beach is different than Charlotte. So if you read the language in this little guy here, you see the approach to replication was not cookie-cutter, which is the way a lot of funders tend to think, and communities tend to think, about replication. They tend to look at it in the McDonald's model, that what you want to be

able to do is get exactly the same hamburger in Tokyo as you get in Los Angeles, or Mohonk, or New Paltz, or wherever. That's the idea behind replication. That works well for McDonald's most of the time. It doesn't even work for McDonald's all of the time, interestingly enough, and I see some heads nodding, so some of you may have read about this in the media a couple of years ago.

McDonald's started opening up stores in northern Italy. Well, guess what? Unlike people in Britain, where the Brits will line up for anything, they'll queue up for hours and not worry about it, in northern Italy, they don't like to wait on line. So the market share of the McDonald's, very heavily hyped in towns in northern Italy, was dropping, because people did not want to wait on line. They had to alter the whole procedure by which they sold you your burger and fries in order to get the McDonald's model to work there.

So even with the king of replication in the business world, some changes have to be made when you go into a new community. I say that because, in the process of making this model work in other communities, this handy-dandy list of process characteristics to think about, is used as a checklist of how to think about the process of change.

What we've ended up doing, in a kind of complex technical assistance process that Gary can talk about more later from the funder's perspective, is to look at how, initially, someone with an organization development background, which is me, can come into a community and help with the initial issues of change. I can surface that awkward question of, what are the reasons we shouldn't do this? Why should we not make this collaborative happen? Boy, I'll tell you, if you take a bunch of arts agencies and get them into a room and talk about a marketing collaborative, and you ask that question, you learn some *really* interesting things that help you to make the decision about change. Not just to do it, but also how to do it, what are the contents of people's concerns? Why are they concerned? Why do they think it won't work? That helps you to engineer the change in a different way.

The wrestling at the community level with the possibility of change is something that an outsider can help with, because, by definition, I get to go home at the end of that. So I'm presumably a little bit more

objective, and have done it in other communities. That's my role, and a fairly narrow one in that sense.

**Burger:** May I just jump right in here for a second?

**Backer:** Please do.

**Burger:** This issue that Tom was talking about was a key issue. There was this mortal fear in each community that we were going to insist that everything look like Charlotte. The example we kept using was, in Charlotte, there were four organizations. In Long Beach, there were over a hundred. They were just participating in the startup and the planning. There was no way they could look the same.

Tom was our front person on this, to convince them that this wasn't the case. He played a very key role in those initial discussions with the potential participants in bringing them together and helping them to understand that this was their program, not Knight Foundation's.

**Backer:** Great. Good clarification. So my work is done, then, and then I become more of an occasional process observer, because my organization also supports a learning community of the ten communities now that are involved in this initiative. We get together once a year and we have not only the insiders, the folks running the programs, like Larry Coppard, but also knowledgeable outsiders, people like Janet, who can come in and share with us what else is going on in the world of arts marketing and cultural participation. It helps these communities think about these issues amongst themselves and get some input from elsewhere in the world.

The second stage of that, which Gary also alluded to, is to have an organization that does have marketing expertise, which I don't, come in and do some work on strategic planning, to put together a plan that leads to a proposal for an implementation grant, do some audience research. AMS has fulfilled that role in each of the communities so far. So that's a little bit about the process.

I'd like to finish up on my initial time here by walking you through the two other handouts that you have. There's a lot of background about Charlotte, about the core components for replication, and other things, including some evaluative data. We're actually preparing a second edition of this. We're going to be working on that for a good part of this

coming year, and get something together that will reflect, as of mid-2002, the experience of the program to date. So stay tuned; there'll be another edition out a little bit later on.

But in the meantime, you have a handouts labeled, *About Knight Foundation's Arts Marketing Collaborative*, and it's a very quick sketch; a little bit about Charlotte, a little bit about Long Beach, and what's going on in the other communities. It's an overview.

The other handout is a series of lessons learned about arts marketing collaboratives, what we've learned so far. If you look at the lessons there, two of us have already talked about them, and Larry and Janet will say some more, so let's forget about that and move on to the second element there, which I'm just going to mention very briefly.

We got interested in the process of partnership and collaboration through these collaboratives. My institute also works in the public health area where collaborations and partnerships are certainly quite common these days, and we've done some research about what works and what doesn't. We said to Knight Foundation, wouldn't it be interesting to take a look beyond these collaboratives at what's going on out in the world of nonprofit management and funders in the arts with respect to partnerships?

In fact, I think there are a couple of people in this room, and probably about twenty at this conference, whom I'm indebted to because they were kind enough to give me interviews so that we could learn something experientially – nobody's tried to do this before – about the process of partnership at a kind of global level.

We've found some interesting things. We've just finished the data gathering, so it's too early to talk about the results in any detail. But you see the lessons that are there, just a few things that I culled out from our database for this purpose. Some things that people have told us about partnerships, and their observations of them, I think are going to help us to put together what eventually will be a practice guide for the field. Again, some things to think about. Not a recipe for how to do it, but like a Lipton's Spices chest of different spices that you could use in your recipe if you wanted to.

We have a hundred interviews in the sample: funders, intermediary organizations, arts administrators, a variety of people. How partnerships define

what the partnership is turns out to be really important for everything that happens after that.

One definition that we got I thought was intriguing, so I put it in here: "A true partnership involves an agreement by the partners to put something of value at risk." Charlotte certainly meets that definition. You put your marketing budget out there, that's something of value, and it's at risk. If there isn't that risk element, it's more of a committee than it is a real partnership. There have got to be some raw materials, some scarce resources that you think you can do more with in the partnership than you can alone.

You can read the other lessons for yourself. One of the most intriguing ones to me as a psychologist – it wasn't surprising, but it was good to see it represented in this interview sample – is we had the chance to interview people from different perspectives in the same partnership: a funder, several of the arts agencies participated. And wow, did we get a Rashomon effect! The view of what the partnership meant, how it worked, was very different depending upon where you were standing. Whether you were looking at the hind end or the front end of the elephant, you had a really different idea of what the partnership meant.

In another area of Knight Foundation, we've been doing a study about planning grants. When we got the grant to do this work, I expected to have people go into the library and on the Internet and get all the literature that had been written about planning grants and philanthropy. An astonishment to me was, well, guess what? There ain't any. There's almost nothing that's been written on this subject. There's a lot of anecdotal evidence that you can gather from talking with people, but even though there are lots of foundations, as well as government agencies, that give out planning grants, there's very little guidance for how to do it right, and that was really surprising to me.

So we have an article that'll be out in the March issue of *Foundation News* about what we learned. You can look for that if you want to know more. A couple of things we learned are in this handout.

I'm mentioning this because I think the value of the planning grant in these arts marketing collaboratives was disproportionately great in establishing the climate under which change could take place. For not a huge amount of money, you had an opportunity to build something, not just for arts marketing but also, in several of the communities, to really bring

the community together in a way that it hadn't been brought together before. I think that's a value of planning grants that sometimes gets missed, if they really engaged the community, and if the right players are at the table to do the planning work, that's really the key. With that, I think I'll turn it over to Larry.

**Coppard:** Thank you. I want to tell you a story, without too much detail, about how we got involved in this kind of work. I want to start with what Tom has just said about the value of planning and a planning grant. Back in about 1997, we were invited, as a community foundation, to be part of the Lila Wallace Reader's Digest Fund initiative to increase cultural participation. It was a partnership with ten other community foundations. The idea behind it was pretty straightforward: to try to figure out a way in our community that we could increase cultural participation and strengthen the cultural organizations of the community.

The first discussion we had was with a group of cultural leaders, and we asked them, "Do we really want to get involved in this? Do you think this would be of any help to you?" Basically, they thought it would, although most of those people have moved on to other cities and other jobs by now.

The other conversation we had was with our trustees, and said, "This is going to really thrust us into two things. One, we're going to have to provide a lot of leadership. The other thing is, it's likely we're going to have to raise a lot of money. Do we really want to get into this?" That got the whole discussion going about, Is that really the way we want to focus our attention on cultural participation? Is that really going to be helpful to the organizations?

We got over that hurdle, mainly by bringing in a couple of people from the Wallace Funds to explain what their rationale was for it, and they were able to convince our trustees that this was something we ought to do. Then the hard work started.

We did get a planning grant, we applied for it, and then we spent the next sixteen months in an intensive conversation in the community, going out in all kinds of groups, all kinds of venues, and basically asking the same question: If we want to increase cultural participation in our region, seven counties, about five million people, very diverse community, how might we do this? What needs to happen? Over time, with

hundreds of organizations participating, and many, many individuals, we came up with some ideas, which then became the core of a proposal that we submitted to Wallace for some implementation.

Let me tell you what came out of the plan. People said – big surprise – "We need money! We have such great ideas, if we could have some money, we could really show you how to increase cultural participation." Okay. We accepted that fact and built into our plan a grantmaking program.

The other thing they said to us: "You know, if you're going to get us involved in this work, you'd better stay in this work for a long time." So we built into the program an endowment and said okay, we would do that. We'd start with an endowment and then we'd figure out a way to build it, so if good ideas came out of all this work, we would be able to continue to support it over time.

Three other things came out of this, which are more specific. One had to do with information. There was a high degree of consensus that the organizations themselves didn't know what other people were doing in the community. There was a very broad cultural community about the major institutions. All the midsize and small organizations – largely, people didn't know what was going on. We've got to figure out a way to share information about what we're all doing. We've got to get that information to the public, because the public doesn't understand the enormous resources that we have. So we built an information component into our plan.

The other thing they said to us was, "We've got a lot of good ideas, but we don't share them among ourselves. We don't talk among ourselves enough." They felt we needed to build a cultural forum into the plan, which would allow not only people to talk among themselves within the region, but also to bring in national people who would have ideas that might be applicable locally. Although we're from a kind of community – this may not be true in your place – where any idea that comes from the outside can't work. It cannot work here. If it's not hatched in our community, it's not going to work. But they did admit that maybe it would be important to talk to some people around the country.

Finally, there was a consensus that we needed to build into it a thing which we ended up calling "Celebration of Culture," which really was a marketing effort. It was based on the idea that we've

got enormous cultural riches in the community, but we've got to convince the public about the value of this. If they understand the value of it, then they'll participate more.

Those were the components of what we ultimately put into the plan, applied for money, got a seed grant, and ultimately raised \$4.3 million to implement.

I'm not going to explain the program; it's documented other places. The important thing to know is that all of this happened to the point where we ended up with \$4.3 million focused on these particular areas of work because of an intense, disciplined conversation in the community over a sixteen-month period at many different levels. At the grassroots level, at the organizational level, with our trustees, lots of conversation with other funders because we ended up with a group of fifteen funders, most of them local, who contributed to this effort. By the time we launched this effort, we had an enormous number of individuals and organizations that had an investment in that conversation, because they're the ones that, in effect, set the agenda for what we would do for the next four years. And we're almost to the end of this now.

A piece of this was marketing, getting the word out. We did two or three things to move forward on that piece of our commitment. We took this as a commitment to the community, if this is what you need, we will try to put the resources together and help you make it happen.

We got a proposal, or an idea came to us, mainly from the major institutions, for a media campaign that they felt needed to happen, which was called "Enrich Your Life." It was to come out about the same time as a tax referendum they were trying to get through that would support major institutions along with putting together a big pot of money for smaller institutions. We vetted that idea with what we call our cultural partnership, and I thought, That's a good idea, it would get the large institutions and small institutions working together and we could have a united front in the media. We had a *pro bono* commitment from a major ad agency. It just seemed like a deal made in heaven. Well, it was a deal made in hell.

We started down the road, and we actually made the funding commitment to this. The ad agency really didn't understand the cultural community. The communication among the large institutions and the small institutions began to break down as we started

looking at what images to use to share this idea of what the cultural community was really about.

Without going into all the details of that, ultimately the institutions that were taking the lead and making that happen pulled back from it, gave us our dollars back – \$200,000 that we put on the table to help support this. They decided that they were going to do it on their own, mainly because they didn't want to have to deal with all of the questions that the various institutions were raising, and concerns that they were raising, about the campaign. Ultimately, they never even launched the campaign.

I tell you that story because you learn a lot from things that don't work. Often we don't talk about these things, particularly in front of funders. But that taught us a lot about how you need to work together to do marketing, which is far more sensitive than almost any kind of other collaborative work. Because most of what we've funded has been collaborations that have worked very, very well.

We then funded a small project with an African-American organization taking the lead, to do a joint marketing effort with eleven organizations. It was a single event using print media. That worked extremely well. It was focused, it was small-scale, it was very intense relationships among the organizations. That went well, so that was good. We had that success behind us.

The other little story I need to tell you is about information. It relates to marketing. We had said from the beginning, "Don't you think you need to understand your market better if you're going to increase participation?" There was a general consensus from the small and large organizations: "We know the market. We just need to get out there and do things." We kept raising that issue, but do you really know the people that are not attending, the ones who attend off and on? Why do they come once and then they don't come back? And they said, "We don't want to do another market study."

Almost three years into this process, the organizations came back to us and said, "The more we think about this, and the more we talk to each other, we realize we don't know what's going on here. We need to have better information."

So we funded a market study which was ultimately done by Arts Market Consulting. We gave the money to an intermediary organization in the community

and said, "Why don't you see what you can do? See how many organizations will participate in this." Fifty-nine organizations in our community signed on to this, to share data about their mailing lists and their donor lists and so on, and they did a geo-demographic analysis of all of that. And they were blown away.

It was right at that time this document showed up at our foundation. We looked at that and said, "Gee, those people seem to have some ideas about how to do this," because clearly we didn't have the answer. We now had a group of organizations that were convinced they did not have the answer, but they were really interested in doing something cooperatively. And fifty-nine organizations had already demonstrated that they could work together and do some pretty sensitive work of actually sharing their data.

I called Gary and said, is it possible we could get access to some of the people that you've been working with? And to make a long story short, Gary gave us Tom Backer.

Tom came in and told his story, what he had been hearing in Long Beach and Charlotte; we invited Carol May from Charlotte to come up and give a luncheon presentation; and just talked about their work. We got everybody back together and said, "Did you hear anything there that you think made any sense?" They said, "It sounds like there are some other people doing some work around the country that's similar to what we want to do, but we don't think we could duplicate Charlotte, and we certainly don't think we could duplicate Long Beach, but we'd like to do something along that line."

We then did more investigation and ultimately applied for a planning grant. We got permission from the partnership to apply for the planning grant, and then made a grant back to the same organization that had done the market study. They hired AMS Planning and Research to do a feasibility study for creating a cooperative marketing program in southeastern Michigan. That was completed last summer.

We applied for an implementation grant and have matched those dollars with community foundation dollars, and are right at the point now of launching this effort. I've detailed how this has happened, because it's all kind of organic. The organization that did the study has been acting as an incubator for this idea and has been bringing the players, all of the

organizations, together, trying to figure out how to create the right kind of organizational structure for doing this. We have been funding them through this incubation period.

We're just at the point now of launching this thing publicly sometime this fall. The work that they have agreed to do cooperatively, interestingly enough, is in three areas. The first is market research, because they had demonstrated that was a value already. They said this new thing they're calling the Cultural Marketing Network would do market research.

The second thing they would do would be to create a shared mailing list database. Again, they had demonstrated they could do that kind of thing together, and were fascinated by the success in other cities.

Thirdly, they want to do some work on technology, because none of the organizations feel up to speed on the use of technology. They've agreed that will be a third piece of the core business of this marketing endeavor.

I'm going to stop; that gives you an idea of where we are.

**Sarbaugh:** Good morning, everybody. Can you take one more talking head? I'm going to talk about two marketing collaborative examples in Pittsburgh. I'm going to try to do it really fast, so that we have time for questions, and also because there are a whole lot of similarities in the two that I'm going to talk about with what you've already heard. I'm going to focus on the effective side of what we've done. I'm going to talk at the end very briefly about a collaborative for small and midsize arts organizations that is a real interesting win/win.

I'm going to start off with the project that's similar to the ones that have been talked about so far, a major collaborative for large arts organizations on two tracks.

One, an interesting marketing-and-other collaborative came out of it. And two is an object lesson about philanthropic style, which we grapple with all the time. When is one passive, and when does one get more aggressive? When is it appropriate to use a mix of those styles?

This happened to be an occasion where our foundation became fairly aggressive in creating a consortium or a collaborative. The jury is still out on, did we

pick the right philanthropic style? If you'd asked me a year ago, I would have said, "Oh, no! Why did we go this way?" And now a year later, I think I'm now saying, "Hey, it's working!" But ask me in another year, and I'll probably be tearing my hair out.

We as a community in Pittsburgh faced a lot of the issues that you're hearing about from these other cities. We had a great cultural district, a compact, beautiful cultural district. We had a whole bunch of performing and visual arts venues in close proximity to each other, managed by different entities that sometimes talked to each other and sometimes didn't. We had six or seven major cultural institutions in that cultural district, all undercapitalized, all competing, all struggling for audience. And all very fiercely protective of their donor lists, fiercely protective of their subscriber lists, and all of that.

We were, as the major funder in the community, sitting there watching this bifurcation. In nearly twelve years, we had accumulated a stack of studies, probably about that high, funded by us, funded by the organizations themselves, funded by other people. We had the Katz Business School at Pitt. We had McKenzie. We had Deloitte & Touche. We had Shaver and Company. They all came in to tell us how we could work smarter and do our work better and save money. And guess what? They're still collecting dust. None of them worked. None of them took hold. Why? Because of the classic reasons that Tom and Gary describe. There was a lack of will, a terrible fear about loss of control, – and these were not unjustified fears – about loss of jobs, and so nothing ever happened.

The Foundation's position was that we were a major funder of the venues and a major funder of the institutions. My boss at the time and I sat down after the last study, which was done by Deloitte & Touche in the late nineties, and I described how I had come from the last meeting where the groups were fighting over the results of the study. And we agreed, we just have to give up. Because we want this to come from the ground up, and it's not coming. We cannot force it.

About six months later, the board chairmen of two of the biggest organizations made an appointment to see my boss. They came in and they said, "Okay, there's another theater opening. It's going to be managed by another entity. This is crazy! Do something!"

So we pointed to this stack of reports and said, "When you say, Do something, let's hope that you're including yourselves in this, because the lack of will is coming not only from the managers, but it's also coming from the government structure, big time." And we said, "You want us to try again, after twelve years?" And I've been there. I've aged in place there. I've been there longer than God, so I went back to some of these early studies. And we said, "Look, we're willing to try again, but you, the board of directors, have to help us."

So we created this thing called the Joint Facilities Task Force. It had representatives from the staffs, but more importantly, we tried to make sure that high-level people from the board of directors of all the organizations came. We created a process not unlike a planning process that's been described by some of the others here today. We also hired AMS to come in and help us figure out what to do.

We identified the areas that the groups are willing to work in together. We agreed that the marching orders would be, no matter how great we thought certain collaborative ideas were, if everybody didn't want to do them, they were off the table. This is in part why our planning process dragged on – although I see, looking at Tom's work, dragging on is not a bad thing.

Our planning process took about eighteen months. We came up with three ideas we wanted to work on collaboratively. And, most controversially, we figured out a place to park them. Of course, this was a great bone of contention, because we had six or seven organizations, and their suggestion was that maybe we should create a new 501(c)(3) to run this stuff.

They ended up creating a Division of Shared Services that is at the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, which is the entity in our community that is a real estate developer and manages most, but not all, of the venues.

This decision caused some consternation among the other partners, as you can imagine, because they did see this as ceding some control to one of the members of our coalition. I have to say there was a terrific deal of reluctance to that decision. We kept stressing over and over again that we created an oversight committee that approved anything the Shared Services Division did. There was still a lot of worry that the managing entity was going to rush in and be the big bad wolf, and take over all of the program. But that didn't happen.

Let me say a little bit about what the Shared Services Division does now. It's about eighteen months old, and it's evolved from what it started off to do. It started off, purely from the groups' perspective of, "Let's work harder together to save money. Let's just see what economies of scale we can get, so we can decrease our expense sides."

We realized that we're shortsighted if we only focus on decreasing expenses. We want to decrease expenses, we want to increase revenue, and we want to improve customer service. Those were the three things that we kept our eye on.

We're running into problems now because we can measure cost efficiencies pretty well. Increasing revenue for the organizations, and improving customer service, we have not figured out. We're working on this now. How do we measure that? What's the cause and effect there? To what extent is something that the Shared Services Division does increasing your revenue, versus something smart that your own marketing department is doing? The groups are wondering and worrying about that. They are taking control of designing the evaluation process for how that works.

Let me tell you what the three programs are. There is a joint purchasing program, which is by far the most popular and the least controversial. I've learned "purchasing" is a passé word. It's now called "aggressive sourcing," if you can believe that.

The groups have combined office supply purchasing, health insurance purchasing, and now they're studying media buys. They're talking about going to the newspapers and television stations as a big conglomerate and saying, "Together we control this many millions in media buys. Give us a better deal." We're starting to see significant money saved through these efforts, and we're just in the beginning. That's very positive.

The second piece is joint market research, which you've heard most of the other folks talk about. Again, we had six or seven groups terribly undercapitalized, the marketing departments were under pressure to just fill the seats and meet their target for the year. They didn't have any money for more sophisticated market research, and they didn't have time.

So they've started doing some of the same things that the other communities are doing, which is pooling

their data. They combined all the mailing lists of the six or seven organizations. I'm not good on marketing lingo, but they're looking at all of them in the aggregate in terms of households – you know, which households buy which products, and what cross-selling can we do? Can we create sampler products in a better way than we've done before, that will work smarter than what we've tried before?

Now you can see some of the groups that were resistant in the beginning going, "We do have an attendance problem, and we're not sacrificing identity, we're not giving away our major donors, we're learning from this aggregate data."

The third thing, which is by far the most controversial, the slowest, the most difficult, I don't know whether we'll ever get there, is looking at some consolidated ticketing, phone room and sales technology stuff. We have three box offices now within a few blocks of each other. We have the notion of getting the three box offices to talk to each other so that all tickets could be sold at all venues, so that eventually, with a consolidated ticket operation, we can do consolidated out-venues of ticket sales, like what happens in some other communities. We could get people when they're in the grocery store, or the bank out where they live. That is sort of a gleam in our eye. Whether or not we'll ever get to that point, I don't know.

But the good news is, the organizations are working together. Where they were terribly resistant two and a half years ago, they're now actively coming to the table because there's self-interest. They're seeing cost savings, and they're seeing, "Hey, I get better market research." I think they really understand their audiences better.

One of the things that's been most important, though, that they've really brought to our attention, is that you can do the best marketing in the world, you can use the most savvy consumer techniques and for-profit techniques in finding people, but if you're giving them a slick message about the experience that you're going to deliver and then you don't deliver that experience when they come to your event, then you've lost them, and you've missed a huge opportunity. So the parallel work on improving the experience that people have when they come to arts events is just as important, I think, as having really smart marketing techniques. But that's for another session.

That's our experience with this nascent Shared Services Division. It may be a rationalization, but we think at the Heinz Endowments, even though we were pretty heavy-handed in the beginning, we think that now the groups have come along to see that there's something in it for them.

Let me say two minutes on another neat initiative in our community that's targeted specifically to small and midsize arts organizations. Most of our marketing collaboratives deal with major performing arts complexes and major institutions. What about small organizations – very small and midsize arts organizations that are in many of our communities? Talk about the most challenging work, the most out-there work, the most fervent. The most that's happening in neighborhoods and old warehouses and strange venues, and that are really enlivening your communities. Those are the places that really exciting work is happening, and those are the places that it's hardest to get collaboration because, as we all know, a lot of them have no staff. A lot of them have half-time staff. A lot of them, the phone rings at the artistic director's house when you want to buy a ticket to their performance, or something like that. In our community, we've just seen this explosion of small organizations over the last few years.

Our major service provider, ProArts, started a couple of years ago what they call a combined ticket service for small organizations. Ticket services are not new. Most communities have ticket services. What I think is unique about this – it may be extant in other communities – is that it's just for the small and midsize organizations and it's crafted specifically for them. In other words, there's a sliding fee scale to participate in it. If your organization has a budget of \$250,000 or less, you don't pay anything for the setup fee for this ticket service. What you get is specific hours where somebody answers the phone and sells your tickets. You get a database, you get the tickets, the will-call tickets delivered to your performance every night. You get free training for your front-of-house if you want it. I think the sliding fee scale goes all the way up to, if you're a \$999,000 organization, you pay a hundred bucks or something like that.

It's been wonderful for the organizations. Last year, 2000-2001, this service sold over \$600,000 worth of tickets to small and midsize arts organizations in our community. All the way from the Black Sheep Puppet Festival, the Irish and Classical Theater, Chatham Baroque, Kuntu Repertory Theater, Unseam'd Shake-

spere Festival, Srishti Dances of India, all of them tiny organizations and tiny venues, but \$600,000 worth of ticket sales in the aggregate. It's really good for them, and it's just a win/win all the way around the community.

I wanted to add that in terms of something that's great for the very important small organizations in our communities. Now I think we need to turn it over for questions, because we've been talking at you too long.

**Burger:** Thank you, everybody. Any questions?

**Audience:** I just want to mention a resource about planning. But first I want to thank all the panelists. These are remarkable stories, hats off to you all. And of course, thanks for the kind words, Larry, about the Wallace Funds and our relationship with the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan. It's a remarkable story. I'm glad you had a chance to tell it today.

The forthcoming publication that I'm referring to is designed for arts practitioners, but I think could be a value to funders, too. It's going to be called *Planning for Cultural Participation Projects*, written by Paul Connolly and Marcie Hinan Cady of the Conservation Company. It's just going to press now, and will be out before the end of the year and will be distributed through the Arts Presenters Publications catalog. I commend it to you. Thanks.

**Audience:** I had a question about what kind of conflicts came up about individual brandings of organizations, with a group branding. At a session yesterday on corporate support, this issue of branding was very much reinforced, that individual organizations really need to put forth their identity. I wonder how much of that gets diluted when it's just Pittsburgh Arts? Or the Woodstock Arts Scene versus the Woodstock Center for Contemporary Art, and other organizations. If you could speak to that.

**Sarbaugh:** In our community so far, nobody's messing with the individual brands or images of the participating organizations at all. It's all, as much as it can be, identity-protecting, so that the market research is supporting the individual marketing of the institutions, but there's no touching the branding.

There has been some conversation about, if we talk about a cultural district, and in addition to the indi-

vidual organizations extant in the cultural district, let's come downtown and have fun in The Cultural District. The bridge that we haven't crossed yet is, how do you rationalize that with the images of the organizations? Frankly, we haven't gotten there yet, and that's a big debate.

**Backer:** In Charlotte, some of the individual organizations still to this day have their own marketing activities as well as the collaborative venture, and they very closely maintain their own branding. Part of the way in which the collaborative operates is to be like an advertising agency that has a number of clients. The concern was therefore not about, There's only going to be one campaign, but that the same people were doing all the campaigns. And then some disciplinary things started to come up. "Well, how can somebody who knows dance possibly know opera?" That just couldn't be. And experience has helped to deal with that.

The opportunities that have opened up have also helped people to let loose of a little bit of control, both seeing that their brand didn't disappear, and also seeing new things they were able to do. For instance, there is a railroad bridge that virtually everybody who comes into downtown Charlotte has to pass underneath. That bridge is owned by the city. The collaborative came to the city fathers and said, "We'd like to be able to put a banner on that bridge." Because it was a group of agencies rather than just one asking for it, they got it. Something that perhaps no one organization could have achieved. It's accomplishments of that sort that help to quell the fears.

That identity and branding issue constantly comes up and needs to be a part of the discussion so that you can deal with it.

**Audience:** I just wanted to tag onto that. We're starting to develop cooperative marketing issues in Los Angeles.

One of the first steps that we took as a funder that might be applicable for people was to fund an analysis of everyone's mailing lists put into a big pot. Not a cooperative mailing list; this was one time that we were asking for people to merge their mailing list data just for research purposes.

What we found was astonishing to everyone in the community. We found that seventy percent of the people on the list – and these were a million names pooled – only appeared on one list. Seventy percent

of the households only appeared on one list, which exploded the mythology that there was a limited pool of audience that everyone was trying to scramble for.

What we found was just the opposite, that everyone had developed their own audience in their own backyard. That, as you can imagine, shifted the conversation a hundred and eighty degrees. It's the importance of research and knowing what it is that you're talking about. When people realized they were not competing for the same audience, their fears about losing their database disappeared, and we were able to take the next step, which was the creation of a big list for Los Angeles in which everyone pools all of their mailing lists and anyone can pull from it at any time without limit. So I feel like it got us on the road to further conversation.

**Audience:** Now that you've done this, what's next? Now that you're experts on how to get marketing collaboratives going, what is it that you don't know as a result of doing this work that, if you knew it, it would lead to the next breakthrough?

**Coppard:** In our case, it's going to be, now try to do it and make it actually work. It's one thing to get everybody to the table and it's one thing to get everybody agreeing that they want to do this work together, but it's going to be three, four, five years down the road when we see whether we're going to be able to accomplish it. The kind of thing that Alexander was asking about, the identity sensitivities, all those kinds of issues of privacy and not sharing information, maintaining identity of organizations. All of that you've got to be sensitive to at the beginning of this kind of work, and then work through that to the truly cooperative work.

The next challenge is to see how far we can push that, and where we're going to be three and four years from now.

**Backer:** I think of two things. One is how to more fully put arts marketing into the larger context of cultural participation. I think we've just scratched the surface. In a meaningful way, but still it's surface rather than depth. That's an ongoing issue, and certainly your work at Wallace and others are helping to lead the way on that.

The other is the role of technology. Several of our collaboratives, San Jose, as you can imagine, has some interest in technological approaches, but there are

other communities that do, too. The potential and the downside potential of a significant investment in technology as part of a marketing collaborative is really an unknown. There isn't a lot of experience base, and some of the most aggressive efforts that we've been tracking in different parts of the country are kind of at a funny place, just like big commercial Web sites like Levi Strauss closing down because they didn't do it right. There is a real fear that if you invest too heavily and you make the wrong choice, you really can suffer from that. So there's a lot of risk in that unexplored terrain, which clearly we are going to explore.

**Burger:** From the Foundation's perspective, that's frankly not a question that we've asked yet. I think that the answer will lie in the pulling together of all of the information from all of these. Tom mentioned we're planning to do an update of this.

To just tell you how smart I am, I was against this publication. I felt that we didn't know enough yet in Charlotte, that we needed harder data as to whether or not it had actually increased audience participation and that, therefore, it was premature to put out this publication. I turned out to be wrong, I'm happy to say. This has had an enormous impact on generating interest. Larry mentioned that he saw it and realized that there was a connection here with what they were doing.

I think our next publication will have more of an inventory of ideas, promising practices, best practices. That's the role I can see us playing. How specifically it plays out and affects things are really based upon what happens within the individual efforts. They are all so very, very different, that I think ultimately there may be a body of knowledge that will be useful. And, in addition to that, recognizing that it's happening all over the place, not just within our range of vision. The work that Tom's doing in investigating those projects, and the kinds of things that Janet and other foundation program officers are doing I hope will add to the resource. Where we go with it? I'm not sure.

**Audience:** I'm really interested in the potential of Internet marketing and e-mail as a marketing tool. We're funding in Chicago the initial sort of organization, a bunch of organizations of different sizes to explore how they can use e-mail to market their events. We've had some initial success, but I feel like

we're operating in a complete vacuum, and I don't know who else is working on this, particularly.

I'm interested in whether any of you are aware of efforts like this in other cities, or anybody in the audience has any experiences to share with us. So far, we're getting good results because we're after younger audiences, and we've had great results from being able to quickly translate into Spanish when we're going after the Latino market for particular events. It's very low-cost. But we're at the beginning and out there without a net.

**Sarbaugh:** We've got one organization that I know of in Pittsburgh that's doing that, the Pittsburgh Public Theater. It grew out of a funding initiative that they did called The New Economy Challenge, where they were trying to raise money from the high-tech industry in our community who had been notoriously poor givers to the arts. They did very well with the campaign, and decided to carry the communication by building a new economy Internet network to publicize performances and have special events linked to that. That's done very well for them, and I think it behooves the rest of our organizations to look at that as a way of marketing.

**Coppard:** We have an African-American professional theater in Detroit that is using e-mail marketing very effectively. They have a small budget, and they were very uneasy about getting involved with it, because the idea was that somehow Internet technology didn't make a deep penetration into the African-American community. Wrong, wrong. They found that by collecting e-mail addresses and now pushing information about their performances out there has been very, very effective.

The other thing we all need to look at, though, is the demise of CultureFinder, the national program, and what happened with that and why that didn't survive, because it was good. They did what they did very well.

**Burger:** There's one other organization I know of that's doing a lot of work in this area. I can't tell you exactly about the level or quality, but I know it's high-level interest, and that's the Kansas City Symphony. Roland Valliere, who runs it, is very interested in this area, and I know has looked into a lot of the efforts that others have made. So that might be a resource. Within the group that we've worked

with, it's been mentioned in planning, but nothing is far enough along to really give you any sort of lead.

**Backer:** Another resource you might want to consult is Bob Baird, who is vice president for cultural tourism at the Los Angeles Convention and Visitor's Bureau, not because they've had experience – they haven't yet – but he's done some research on that subject and, at least from what little I know about it, I don't think found a lot that was more than at the pilot stages. I think it's still pretty early in the game, but he might have a few ideas.

**Audience:** I'm just curious, Larry, you mentioned that discussions began to disintegrate when it turned to the visual image that would be represented in the ad campaigns. Were there any lessons that any of you learned that are worth sharing as you looked at these comprehensive campaigns, about how to think about visual imaging since that's so powerful?

**Coppard:** That would be a long discussion, but let me just say, where the thing really broke down was that the agency doing the work believed they understood what needed to be done. They were not willing to listen to the range of the focus groups that we put together, at their request, to react to the campaign. I think if there had been more give-and-take, then they could have come up with the visual images. They could have come up with a campaign that would have worked. But it began to break down because of the intransigence of the ad agency, and not wanting to offend the ad agency because they were such a high-profile organization in the community.

What ended up was that the minority organizations that were participating, and the smaller organizations, their voices weren't heard, and some of our trustees started looking at the stuff, and said, "No way. This isn't going to happen."

I really believe it could happen. I think even the creative staff that we had from this agency were excellent people. If they had been allowed to work it through, they could have resolved that.

**Audience:** I work in the Organizational Effectiveness and Philanthropy program at our foundation, and I just wanted to respond more generally with some ideas about resources on the question of Internet and e-mail communications.

It's a huge question that's being explored more deeply, not necessarily specific to arts and culture kinds of marketing efforts, but in terms of external communications for organizations generally. There's a lot of work that's emerging that you might want to look into.

One is a report that Andrew Blau did for the Surdna Foundation, which can be found on their Web site. It's a thought-provoking piece. It's [surdna.org](http://surdna.org), and I think the link is right on their homepage.

Looking at some of the economies of scale, and some of the downsides to that, the implications for moving increasingly onto the Internet, there's a real tension there about scale. One of his points is that if it's going to happen they're going to be fewer, but larger, because as you go into this technology the resources required to maintain it and make it successful really are quite a bit larger.

There's a newsletter that's starting to come out from Michael Stein and Marc Austin. They do a lot of Internet consulting, communications consulting in the area. It's called *Dot Org*, and unfortunately, I don't know how to find them. Marc Austin is [www.summitconsulting.com](http://www.summitconsulting.com), I think, so maybe that's a way to find it. They've started to put out some bulletins to organizations about thinking about using the Internet and communications there.

I know that Michael Gilbert and the Gilbert Center just started to do a nonprofit e-mail study looking at working with consultants who are using e-mail and looking at the leverage. One of the things that will happen is, if all the organizations get onto using e-mail as marketing, you're going to have a deluge and people are not going to be able to absorb it. It all looks the same in your inbox. There are leverage points, and there are points where it really makes sense to do it.

People are just starting to learn something about e-philanthropy and online fundraising. I know eGrants at the Tides Foundation has done research about what works and what doesn't work for them. I don't know what their plans are in terms of sharing some of those lessons, but they've been developing an online fundraising course that tries to address some of those questions more generally.

**Audience:** New York City has not been very fertile ground for early music groups, not like the Music of the Baroque in Chicago or you have Chatham

Baroque in Pittsburgh, or Philharmonia Baroque in Los Angeles, or Boston, that has two baroque orchestras. For some strange reason, even though a lot of wonderful performers live in New York, it just hasn't been a very inviting atmosphere.

Many of us involved in early music are having this conversation about joint marketing and forming some kind of consortium. Can any of you speak to, or have any of you had experience working with, a small subset of the cultural community, such as the early music community, within a very large city?

**Backer:** That's a great question, and from the shaking of heads up here, it looks like there is no answer from this side of the table.

**Audience:** I was very interested to hear that there's been an explosion of new groups in Pittsburgh, and the joint box office service that they're enjoying is probably the closest to what I'm looking for.

**Backer:** The only resource that I could think of offhand, if you've not already talked with them, is the American Composers Forum. They've had some real success with the local chapter structure to bring composers together, and now they're starting to look at some issues of how to do community building for mostly new music rather than baroque music. But they might have an idea.

**Audience:** They're slightly less fragile than we are, so maybe they're a few steps ahead.

**Sarbaugh:** I was going to say that in Pittsburgh, our early music center, the Renaissance and Baroque Society, which is a really successful presenter, just did a marketing study of their audience and how to build audience, and I'm guessing they would be happy to share that.

**Audience:** Oh, that's very helpful. Thank you.

**Burger:** Thank you all very much.

**THIS IS ONE OF A SERIES OF PROCEEDINGS FROM THE GIA 2001 CONFERENCE, CULTURE INFLUENCING COMMUNITY CHANGE.**

Transcriptions of proceedings from GIA's 2001 conference, *Culture Influencing Community Change*, are published as individual papers. These proceedings are also available on GIA's Web site at [www.giarts.org](http://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.

- \_\_\_ Creative Support for Individual Artists Preconference
- \_\_\_ Opening Event: An Evening with Meredith Monk
- \_\_\_ Keynote Address: Kenneth Prewitt
- \_\_\_ Keynote Address: Pepón Osorio
- \_\_\_ After September 11: Dealing with a New Landscape for Arts and Culture (*Monday session*)
- \_\_\_ Beyond "Art:" A Community Perspective
- \_\_\_ Member Report: Crossroads: Art and Religion in American Life
- \_\_\_ The Big Picture: Planning for the Future of Culture in Communities
- \_\_\_ Stabilizing Community-Based Arts Institutions
- \_\_\_ Universities and Communities Mentoring Young Artists
- \_\_\_ Young and Engaged: Youth in Community Arts Programs
- \_\_\_ Digital Workshop
- \_\_\_ Built to Last: Linking Communities of Grantees
- \_\_\_ Member Report: What We've Learned about Arts Marketing Collaboratives
- \_\_\_ Time and Space: Residencies and Retreats for Individual Artists
- \_\_\_ After September 11: Grantmakers in the Arts and the Future of Our Grantees (*Wednesday session*)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Additional sessions requested @ \$5.00 each = \$ \_\_\_\_\_ enclosed.

Enclosed is my check payable to Grantmakers in the Arts.

Charge my bankcard # \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. date \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Visa  MasterCard  American Express Name on card \_\_\_\_\_

Fax to: (206) 624-5568. Mail to: Grantmakers in the Arts, 604 West Galer Street, Seattle, WA 98119-3253, (206) 624-231