



GRANTMAKERS IN THE ARTS

Volume 3. 1

Spring 1992

Special Newsletter Issue Coming this Summer

March 25, 1992

The lead article for the spring 1992 issue of the Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter was originally intended to be an overview of the lobbying positions and strategies of a wide range of arts organizations with national advocacy programs, especially advocacy programs designed to protect first amendment rights in the arts and to preserve and increase federal arts funding. Based on our sense of fragmentation within the field, we planned the article to help arts grantmakers understand what the differences among lobbying positions meant, and why those positions were adopted. The resignation of John Frohnmayer as Chair of the National Endowment for the Arts has caused some arts advocacy organizations to rethink their next steps, making our newsletter publication deadline of April 1 an impossible one.

During the 1990-91 NEA reauthorization proceedings, the "arts community" demonstrated that it was composed of many differing voices, as most healthy communities are. The perspectives of urban vs. rural constituencies, individual artists vs. arts institutions, large-budget organizations vs. newly-formed or smaller-budget groups, artists and organizations willing to sign the NEA's "obscenity oath" vs. those who weren't, and other opposing points of view were exposed and discussed, but never resolved. In his 1991 article (in this newsletter), "Fighting Back/Fighting Among Ourselves," David Mendoza of the National Campaign for Freedom of Expression, after describing in some detail the schisms in the arts community, suggested that "without being aired, these sore spots will fester. We must begin a meaningful dialogue so we can recognize and understand these conflicts among us."

To imagine that these conflicts can or will be resolved in a way that will constitute a unified approach to the NEA's reauthorization in 1992 appears naive at this point. No clear

IN THIS ISSUE

- Musings on the Artist Fellowship Roundtable
- Obedience to the Unenforceable:
Ethics in Arts Grantmaking
- Broadening the Dialogue:
1991 GIA Conference
- News from Arts Grantmakers

signs have yet emerged to indicate whose leadership will be strong enough to prevail. While some groups may decide to lobby for a reauthorized NEA identical in program and distribution methods to the one we now have, others are already putting forward ideas for a reimagined NEA. Merging with the National Endowment for the Humanities, allocating a larger percentage of its budget to the states, eliminating individual artists' support, cutting back the number of categories funded, or eliminating the Arts Endowment altogether are among the proposals being discussed and presented in the media and within differing arts constituencies.

These conversations have caused us to step back and ask some larger questions.

- What kind of NEA would be created if we started from scratch, based on the lessons of the last twenty-five years?
- Since the federal role can be much more broadly understood than simply involving federal funding, what should a comprehensive federal arts policy look like?
- What role does the first amendment and freedom of artistic expression play in arts policy development?
- How should an analysis of private sector strengths affect federal policy? What do private sector funders do well, and what not well?
- Are the differences between public and private roles definable?

We have decided to develop a special edition of the Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter discussing these questions. The special edition will be published in late June, 1992, and will not contain the usual complement

of news and short items. Instead, we will commission and publish several essays responding to these questions. In addition, we think it likely that many of our readers have considered these questions in a thoughtful way. If you would like to contribute to the newsletter special edition, call either Sarah Lutman (612-227-0891) or Anne Focke (206-343-0769) to discuss your ideas, or you may submit an essay of up to 1,500 words. Copy deadline is May 15, 1992. We will read items, circulate them to the Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter Committee, and print as many as space permits. If you know of a previously published article that you think is relevant, please let us know. We also plan to include a list of related readings.

To begin the discussion, we've included below an excerpt from testimony presented at a public hearing of the House Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation, held on October 28, 1991. The hearing was held to help the Subcommittee prepare a report for Congress on the National Endowment for the Arts.

Margaret C. Ayers

I want to take this opportunity to commend the National Endowment and its illustrious history. It is so unfortunate and so unjustified that this agency has been targeted by uncomprehending idealogues who have maligned and besmirched its reputation. It is equally unfortunate and worrisome that a frightened Congress has heeded those voices and has enacted legislation that appears to be aimed at controlling the expression of controversial artistic impulse. This is, after all, the agency that for 25 years has served as the single most important factor in the growth and development of the arts in this country; 25 years during which corporate support has increased from \$20 million to \$634 million (Business Committee for the Arts) and private support has jumped from \$200 million to more than \$6.8 billion (American Association of Fundraising Counsel). Much of this giving has been directly stimulated by the NEA's imprimatur and by the matching requirements implemented as a condition of receiving its support.

Collectively, the expenditure of these funds has resulted in an unparalleled expansion of the nation's arts community. Since 1965, the number of professional arts organizations has grown from 300 to more than 4,000. U.S. census figures indicate that our population of artists has increased from 700,000 in 1970 to some 1.6 million today. And our national appetite for the arts, as reflected in attendance at live performances, has expanded from 14 million in 1965 to 73 million in 1988. And this figure doesn't include museum attendance or the number of people who participate in the arts by tuning in to national public television or radio.

...

When Congress reauthorized the National Endowment last year, it did so in the midst of a bitter debate over the merit and/or the artistic quality of the work of several

artists who had previously received Endowment support. The work was labeled by some as "obscene" and "pornographic," although it was never so determined by a court of law, and having seen this work myself, I don't believe these adjectives apply. The result was that the reauthorization statute came to include a "decency" provision that places responsibility for enforcement in the hands of (the Chairman of the NEA), thereby shifting from reliance on the grant recommendations of expert peer panels to direct intervention and oversight by the Chair. Thus (the Chair) must ...

"ensure that artistic excellence and artistic merit are the criteria by which applications are judged, taking into consideration general standards of decency."

But what are "general standards of decency?" Are they (the Chair's) standards or those of my mother? Or perhaps they're Geraldo Rivera's standards. Because of the vagueness and subjectivity of the statute, NEA staff, panelists, and potential grantees can never be sure that what they are recommending - performing, painting, choreographing, or presenting - will not be in violation of "the standard."

...

The issue of decency language and its use by the Endowment has caused incalculable alarm in both the non-profit and for-profit art worlds. It has been assailed as an infringement on our rights to free expression and is viewed as a direct challenge to our democratic ideals. The very purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts is the protection and promotion of free artistic expression. Reaffirmed during the reauthorization process, the Declaration of Purpose states:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares ...[that] it is necessary and appropriate for government to help create and sustain not only a climate of encouraging freedom of thought, imagination and inquiry, but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent." 20 U.S.C. 951.

The United States Congress would serve this nation well by re-examining the changes in the law governing the National Endowment for the Arts in light of the NEA's Declaration of Purpose.

...

Art, after all is said and done, is freedom.

How sad and ironic it would be if, as artists all over the world begin at long last to win their own battles to be free, America, which inspired them, were to become less free.

Margaret C. Ayers is the Executive Director of the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation.

Musings

on Themes from the Artist Fellowship Roundtable

By Ken Hope

The Artists' Fellowship Roundtable, an informal gathering of persons interested in issues surrounding individual artists, especially grants and fellowships to individual artists, met at the New York Foundation for the Arts on November 6, 1991. Nearly forty participants attended, including funders from the private and public sectors, and artists.

This was the fifth meeting of the group since it was founded in 1988, around a lunch table at the Orcas Conference on "Creative Support for the Creative Artist." The Roundtable, which has been chaired by Penelope Dannenberg since its inception, has met at the Headlands Center for the Arts near Sausalito, California; at the MacArthur Foundation in Chicago; and at the Penland Center for the Arts in Penland, North Carolina (where there were actually round tables). Topics at these various meetings have ranged widely around the central theme of support for individual artists - the hows and the whys - and have included criteria and mechanics of fellowship and grant recipient selection, artistic freedom, and advocacy, among others.

For the purposes of the Roundtable, it is agreed that art must be seen as a whole and that artistic expression should not be subdivided into painting, sculpture, music, film, fiction, poetry, dance, performance, crafts, etc. The focus is on artists as individuals, who may work in any or all of these activities. The Roundtable believes that the number of fellowships in the arts is too small, and that, just as scholarships are essential to academic life, fellowships should be essential to artistic life.

The following notes derive from the latest meeting. However, in summarizing the meeting, now several months after the event, a number of the themes and phrases have become transformed. These notes are intended to convey a sense of the general discourse at the meeting, and do not represent minutes or a transcript. They are primarily informed by later musings of the author (with assistance and memory joggings from Mary Judge, Richard Evans, and Anne Focke) on the theme of support for the individual artist, most of which surfaced as the notes from the meeting took shape on the word-processing screen. This is not, then, a statement from the Roundtable as a whole.

The Difficulty of Supporting Individual Artists

A central theme of interest to the Roundtable is the issue of support for individual artists vs. support for arts organizations. In this dichotomy, the Roundtable comes down on the side of the artist. The purpose of the Roundtable is avowedly to promote support for the arts, in its broadest definition, through support for artists. Too often the needs of individual artists are slighted by arts funders. In an era of diminished resources, the Roundtable voiced worries about the amount and the quality of support for individual artists, and its likely erosion in the current funding climate. The group tried to identify some of the problems associated with funding individual artists.

Artists, through both imitation and creation, present a variety of spectacles through which to view society and the world. One of the problems in the area of arts funding in general concerns the tendency among funders (and others) to link the arts with other issues of social and political relevance. Whenever the arts or artists are linked to another term, it is usually that second term that takes priority, because it grounds the subject matter in a way that is more amenable to discourse than are the arts. Examples include, besides artists and art organizations: the arts in education, the arts and politics, the arts and the community, the arts and freedom of expression, the arts and the environment, the arts and the humanities, the arts and issues of gender, class, and race, and so forth. To the extent that funding patterns reflect current priorities given to education, to politics, to the community, to freedom of expression, to the humanities (or to any other term with which the arts may be paired), artists themselves - and hence their ability to produce art - are likely to suffer. (It should be noted, and not just in passing, however, that much of the reason for linking art and artists with other terms is precisely because art *can and does* allow individuals to make powerful statements about all of them.)

Perhaps the central problem is that it is easier to support art - the finished product - than artists. In the discourse of arts funding, the creative process itself is often elided.

In supporting the arts - as opposed to artists - there are a host of policies, tendencies, directions, structures, rationales, models, and examples to choose from. The non-profit institution, created under the federal tax code, provides a responsible, accountable vehicle through which society (government, in particular) can channel its conscience, without getting its hands dirty with the messy behavior of artists. Often this support lies in areas defined more by the audience, museums, scholarly academic research, or education, than by the lives of individuals who make art in the first place. The work of curators, critics, literary presses, teachers and educators, and scholars is far easier to support because it is usually associated with a particular project - an exhibition, a series of articles, books, reports or monographs, often housed within a non-profit institution.

There are several other reasons why many artists fail to receive support as individuals. Artists work within the marketplace, which makes non-profit dollars a more difficult concept. Also, of course, support for artists is not declarable as a charity by the IRS. Lawyers and accountants tend to view support for individual artists as expensive and difficult, requiring more scrutiny and review, and bearing more risks, than support for organizations.

Many funders who might support individual artists are worried about being harassed by other artists seeking funding, reasoning that it is often easier to say no to an organization than to an individual. It can be problematic to support individual artists in a way that appears both fair and meaningful, since there are thousands of qualified artists, and hundreds of different styles and approaches, to say nothing of the different media that exist. Of course, it is in the nature of art itself to allow for a variety of approaches and styles. However, in this media culture of ours, we can be overwhelmed with images that may debase our understanding of and ability to appreciate in an informed manner the genuine creativity of the artist.

Creativity In Endeavors Outside the Arts

Directly related to the Fellowship Roundtable's view of the arts as a whole and to the Roundtable's emphasis on the artist as the dominant term in the art/artist pair, is the notion that artists represent just one kind of creative individual. There are creative persons in every field of human endeavor. One of our goals is to learn how these creative persons are seen, nurtured, trained, supported, and understood within their own professional communities and within a national context.

One problem with support for artists is that individual artists have a complex and often distorted public identity. Although images of the "mad scientist" are popular in film and fiction, such images have not had a correspondingly negative effect on funding for scientists. Received images of "crazy artists," from Van Gogh or Schumann to Warhol, may have a larger impact on how artists are viewed. The funding consequences may be far-reaching and can be devastating.

It is, generally speaking, easier to find sources of funding for individuals in the sciences than in the arts. Both scientists and artists require encouragement, time, space, and materials for their work, much of which is experimental and theoretical, and all of which requires an enormous concentration on process itself. It was reported at the Fellowship Roundtable that in some scientific laboratories devoted to pure research, a "success" rate of over 30% actually presents a managerial problem because it means the workers are concentrating too much on specific goals, and not enough on the theoretical aspects of their work. Typically, research results are not expected for anywhere from three to ten years.

Although "pure" research in the sciences has suffered enormous cutbacks (in favor of applied research with measurable goals and specific, short-term material benefits), it is nonetheless widely recognized as an essential component of science generally. The same is not true for the arts, however. Members of the scientific communities will bemoan the lack of support for research, claiming, for example, that funding agencies in science are not interested in science as such, but in finding a cure for cancer or some other definable goal. However, members of the arts communities have not, on the whole, echoed this cry. The lack of support for basic research has not become part of the discourse. The very idea of supporting individual artists for their work is alien to most funders in the arts.

In the former Soviet Union, artists who did not serve the ideological goals of the state were regarded as "parasites." Regrettably, much of the same kind of thinking pervades conceptions of artists in this country. The equation between the work of scientists and that of artists is seen to be unequal largely because science is linked to economic and physical well-being and to producing technological advances. The case for supporting artists has not been made as effectively because the understanding and appreciation of art and the creative process is not seen as central to our culture. The point is, of course, that one should not have to choose between, or even to compare, the sciences and the arts. I have actually met many more artists than arts funders (for example) who are conversant with significant aspects of the material world, such as physics, chemistry, and engineering.

The Artist and Society

Discussions of support for the arts often derive from differing conceptions. Considerations of art often involve a kind of philosophical programming associated with canonical works that are seen as part of our common cultural heritage. The canon may be traditional or not, but is commonly associated with the term "masterpiece." There is also a sense that the arts, and artists, demonstrate a special way of examining society and its values, providing a kind of mirror in which the culture itself, and various components of the culture, are represented, analyzed, and held to scrutiny. Art may be seen as a kind of personal language in which individuals express their own thoughts, ideas, emotions, and aspirations - as another mode of perception. Art may be seen as an interaction between highly individualized and culture-bound approaches to things, and the timeless realm of the aesthetic ideal. Art also can involve a special knowledge and connoisseurship of refined sensibilities, which are best experienced individually, but which a few cognoscenti may share with others. Art is often considered to be a realm of meaning in which deeper, hidden meanings are couched. Additionally, art may be seen as involving an indoctrination of ethical values, as a kind of civic religion. Art is seen by some as a site in which competing social and political theories and practices are brought to light, or as a tool for social and political changes. For many people, art is

associated with completed works of the past, rather than with ongoing work of contemporary artists that may not yet have entered into the public consciousness, or museums. These and other ideas are not always mutually compatible and are rarely articulated with much clarity by funders.

There is a need to re-examine the relationships between art and society. Two recent surveys, including one done a few years ago in Washington state for the organization Artist Trust and a more recent one by the New York Foundation for the Arts, indicate that the public has generally positive impressions of artists and their work. However, the work of artists is not a part of public discourse. Much of the art that does enter into the discourse is tied up in fashion, the media, marketing, and values associated with commercial ventures. There is another set of values, however, with which art in the Western world has traditionally been associated. These values are concerned with questions such as what it means to be alive; how we relate to various historical, aesthetic, and ethnic traditions, and to the natural and built environment; and how we negotiate different levels of reality. Such values may no longer form as significant a part of our culture as they once did. There has been a profound split in this century between many artists and the audience, perhaps related to the abandoning of a commitment to classical forms both by artists and arts educators. However, support for audience development is meaningless unless there is a concomitant support for artist development.

The current relationship between artist and society may also be the result of inadequate training of teachers in primary and secondary schools. Also, it may result from approaches to art in the media that ignore central, often deeply personal, questions of art, and tend to focus instead on the glitzy surfaces of sex and scandal. The internal dynamics of media and educational institutions make it unlikely that such issues can be easily addressed, let alone resolved. However, anything that can be done to bring art and the artistic process into the public discourse in a meaningful and sustained manner, is worthwhile, especially if it can be done in a way that accepts and builds on the natural creativity of every human being. (Earlier Roundtable discussions concerned controversies surrounding the work of Robert Mapplethorpe, Andres Serrano, and others. Clearly, in those instances, the public and the media were not sufficiently informed to react to such work in anything but an outraged and hurtful manner.)

The Needs of the Individual Artist

One problem in comparing the work of scientists or academic scholars and researchers with the work of artists is that, while many large institutions have been created for scientific research, institutions that support the artistic process are extremely rare. Large institutions in the arts rarely support living artists, except as low-paid providers of occasional commissioned works. Those institutions that do support living artists, such as studios in academic

establishments, rarely allow artists much freedom to create. When funding agencies make grants to individual artists, the funds are often accompanied by specific expectations that are more likely to reflect values and interests of the granting organization than of the artist recipients.

By contrast, artists' residencies, colonies, and communities do support living artists in their work, but are among the least well-endowed of arts organizations. They are also poorly understood, and often mistakenly portrayed as relics of another age. Several dozen such institutions are now in operation and range widely in scope and focus. Their role is critically important and unique in our society. They, almost alone among the arts organizations, actually support artists solely in their work, with no expectations of specific productions or projects resulting from the residency. They represent the "research and development" wing of arts funding. The MacArthur Foundation's \$2.5 million series of grants to this field last year was not only the largest, but in fact the only expression of interest from a private foundation to the field at large. This field is now organizing into a consortium in order to gain wider visibility and funding for their support of artists. (Two artists' communities on the West Coast, Centrum in Washington and The Highlander Center in California, have taken over former military bases, which provides a nice image of a different future.)

The needs artists have are fundamentally the needs of everyone: housing, health care, financial security, and recognition. Scientists (and others) receive these benefits as a matter of course, since they are usually employed. Artists, who are often minimally and sporadically employed, are put in the same marginal position as other economically disadvantaged groups. Joan Jeffri, Director of the Research Center for Arts and Culture at Columbia University, reported that 4% of the artists surveyed from around the country earned more than \$40,000 from their work as artists, 68% of artists earned under \$7,000 from their art work, and 61% earned a total (from all sources) of under \$20,000.

The Roundtable noted that although artists do serve, abundantly, on selection panels for the few grants programs devoted to individual artists, successful artists who are in a financial position to support younger artists often appear unwilling to give others the kind of support they themselves never received. One of the problems in this area is that artists and other funders are not given the training and encouragement that they would need in order to consider providing such support. It should be the role of professional philanthropic agencies to provide such training. Similar to the way in which many wealthy individuals have learned art collecting, the philanthropic community ought to give professional instruction and advice regarding other ways to support individual artists.

The Role of Grants and Fellowships

The problems of scrutiny and review for artists are similar

to those for any kind of academic researcher. It is essential to ensure that fairness and quality are upheld in judicious selections. The Roundtable has addressed issues relating to selection panels and to the difficulties inherent in reviewing files on artists. Slides and reproductions are problematic in any case, and many times only a few minutes can be allotted per artist. A well-trained and dedicated selection panel is essential.

Questions of quality, of course, can be troublesome in the arts, even though they also bring up the enjoyment, engagement, and resonant excitement of the arts experience. So many different people and groups associate themselves with such different paradigms of quality and, as indicated earlier, with different reasons for their interest in the arts. In fact, the very use of the word "quality" has been attacked by those excluded from mainstream recognition and support structures. However, issues of quality Furthermore, the more fellowship programs for artists there are, the more "fair" they are likely to become, especially if together they adequately cover the many different genres, styles, trends, and techniques. The more that different paradigms of quality are permitted to surface, the more likely we are to address fairly the questions of diversity and ethnicity that have not been framed, for many years at least, within the discourse of arts funding.

The topic of support for individual artists in this country raises disturbing questions about our society. Providing fellowship support to individual artists is just one way of placing a value on their contributions to our culture. Funders are usually interested in seeing an immediate return for their dollars - a *quid pro quo*. Just as collectors receive a form of value from their collecting, the perceived value that funders obtain by supporting individual artists must be better articulated because it is of value to society generally. One of the many sources of that value can be seen by recognizing that artists are an essential component of society; they have much to offer beyond the production of art. Although generalizations are difficult, artists know how to solve problems; they should be included in policy discussions across a broad range of social issues. By ignoring artists, or by failing to recognize that support for artists requires a long-term sense of the social good itself, we are contributing to a dysfunction in our society.

Despite the rhetoric of individual freedom in this country, little of it finds its way into the field of arts funding. The notion of supporting qualified and talented individuals simply to set their minds free so that they can work, on their own, on whatever interests them, is not, in most cases, presented as an option by funders. Not placing a priority on the support of creative individuals and the creative process represents a fear of freedom, and a failure of nerve.

Continued on Page 12

Obedience to the Unenforceable

Independent Sector's Report on Ethics in the Non-profit Sector

In January 1991, the Independent Sector Board of Directors approved the report and recommendations of its Committee on Values and Ethics. The published report of the Committee, titled *Ethics and the Nation's Voluntary and Philanthropic Community*, is now available from Independent Sector for \$30. Contained in it is a description of the essential values and ethical behaviors that the Committee believes are common to all organizations in the Independent Sector, along with examples of ethical dilemmas that show how these values are challenged in real-life situations. These are followed by a set of recommendations for action. The book also contains sample codes and policies from several non-profit organizations as well as a summary of comments the Committee received from several key leaders, including John Gardner and Paul Ylvisaker. The Committee that developed the report was chaired by Ira Hirschfield of the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund and included thirty representatives from philanthropy, non-profit organizations, and the legal profession. Noticeably absent was any representation from the arts or humanities.

...

Following is the Committee's Concluding Summary:

- *The public is demanding greater demonstration of ethical behavior by all of our institutions and leaders.*
- *Our concerns about ethical behavior are not primarily a response to shortcomings or transgressions, but are based on our belief that the ethical behaviors and values we have articulated are the essential values for our society and it is right for us to model them.*
- *There have always been high expectations of philanthropic and voluntary organizations, but because of the illegal and unethical behavior of some and the lack of information about many others, public trust is eroding.*
- *To the extent the public has doubts about us, we shall be less able to fulfill our public service.*
- *Therefore, each of us and all of us have a responsibility to make far clearer to the public that this sector and its organizations practice high standards of ethical behavior.*
- *To do that, we must all move to develop policies and practices that will serve regularly as reminders and check-*

points as to what we must stand for.

• *The Committee recommends that, at a minimum, all organizations in the sector:*

1. *Adopt an organizational credo;*
2. *Conduct an ethical audit or self-evaluation every year;*

and that at least larger organizations expand their efforts to:

3. *Develop a supportive set of codes or standards;*
4. *Involve all of their constituencies in the process;*
5. *Infuse the process and the documents in the culture of the total organization.*

• *The Committee recommends that Independent Sector add to its ongoing functions a role to assist philanthropic and voluntary organizations to be aware of and fulfill the public's appropriately high expectations of all of us and to participate with all other institutions in society for adherence to high standards of ethical behavior.*

Among the more interesting sections of the report is a section on "What Organizations Can Do." In it, the Committee describes the specific values and ethical behaviors shared by all organizations in the sector.

We believe:

• *Commitment beyond self is at the core of a civil society;*

• *Obedience of the laws including those governing tax-exempt philanthropic and voluntary organizations is a fundamental responsibility of stewardship;*

• *Commitment beyond the law, to obedience to the unenforceable, is the higher obligation of leaders of philanthropic and voluntary organizations;*

• *Commitment to the public good requires those who presume to serve the public good to assume a public trust;*

• *Respect for the worth and dignity of individuals is a special leadership responsibility of philanthropic and voluntary organizations;*

• *Tolerance, diversity, and social justice reflect the independent sector's rich heritage and the essential protections afforded to it;*

• *Accountability to the public is a fundamental responsibility of public benefit organizations;*

• *Openness and honesty in reporting, fund-raising, and relationships with all constituencies are essential behaviors for organizations which seek and use public or private funds and which purport to serve public purposes;*

• *Prudent application of resources is a concomitant of public trust.*

Several articles in professional journals have discussed and critiqued the Independent Sector report. In addition to a lengthy article in the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* when the report was issued, the September 1991 issue of *Philanthropy Monthly* contained a probing critique, written by Henry C. Suhrke. Evidently, some organizations have taken the report to heart; the American Symphony Orchestra League's February 1992 Memo to Members described the Independent Sector report and discussed the ethical responsibilities of symphony orchestra boards of directors.

• • •

How Do Arts Grantmakers Measure Up?

Are arts grantmakers operating at the highest ethical standards? What are some of the critical ethics issues in our field? The Grantmakers in the Arts newsletter invites you to join in a discussion of ethics in arts grantmaking. To spark your thoughts, we offer sample ethical dilemmas that we might face in our own work.

1. The foundation you work for funds numerous literary organizations. As a result, you receive free copies of books as they are being published. You:

- a) return the books without reading them
- b) pay for the books and read them, then put them in the Foundation's library
- c) keep the books, read them, then put them in your personal library
- d) keep the books, read them, then donate them to the public library
- e) keep the books, read them, then sell them to a used book store and keep the money
- f) another choice?

2. You work for a family foundation. One of your trustees needs to make a \$2,500 contribution to a major performing arts organization in order to retain his box seats. During a Board meeting, he asks the foundation trustees to approve the contribution. What do you do?

3. You want a ticket to a performance, but learn it is sold out. You:

- a) call earlier next time
- b) call the development office and ask for a ticket
- c) go to the performance and look for people selling tickets

4. The largest museum in town wants your corporation to sponsor an exhibition, and you believe that the show will be important and well attended. The total cost of the exhibition is over \$200,000. Your budget will only allow a \$25,000 grant. You:

- a) make the grant, but don't require the museum to give extensive credit to the corporation
- b) negotiate the most credit for your contribution
- c) decline the applicant

5. A good friend of yours, whom you know to be HIV-positive and healthy, is a candidate for a much better position in a larger, more prestigious arts institution. Your name is given as a reference. When you are called, his potential new boss, also a grantee of your foundation, states that his institution has lost three top staff people to AIDS, and he is not willing to hire a person who is HIV-positive. He wants to know your friend's status. Your comments?

6. You work for a foundation the majority of whose Board is Roman Catholic. The Board has had healthy, vigorous discussions about applicants like Planned Parenthood, some of whose practices are in opposition to Catholic beliefs. You are considering whether to recommend that the Foundation support the upcoming season at a local theater, which you know will include artwork that several members of your Board might find offensive. You:

- a) recommend the grant, and describe the arts activity in a general way;
- b) recommend the grant, describe the arts activity specifically, and state why it is important;
- c) decline the grant.

. . .

Please Write...

The GIA newsletter encourages you to respond to these examples or to submit ethical dilemmas of your own. We also welcome case studies of ethics in arts grantmaking, critiques of unethical practices common in the field, and other submissions you find relevant. Please write to Sarah Lutman, Program Associate, The Bush Foundation, E-900 First Bank Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101; or use e-mail at CompuServe 70233,1246.

Other addresses relevant to this article: Independent Sector, 1929 L Street NW, Suite 1200, Washington DC 20036; (202) 223-8100. *Philanthropy Monthly's* address is P.O. Box 989, New Milford, CT 06776; (203) 354-7132. Subscriptions are \$65/year for charitable organizations.

This summary was written by Sarah Lutman, Chair of the GIA newsletter committee and Program Associate of the Bush Foundation.

Broadening the Dialogue Grantmakers in the Arts 1991 Conference

After visiting El Taller Puertorriqueño in Philadelphia, Nick Rabkin noted, "They make good music, but they measure their success in keeping kids off the street and in getting Puerto Rican culture recognized more broadly. Measuring quality here is more complex than in the case of a symphony orchestra."

A discussion of non-traditional approaches to evaluation, prompted by observations such as Rabkin's, was one of several themes explored at the sixth annual conference of Grantmakers in the Arts. Titled *Broadening the Dialogue*, the conference was held October 9-11, 1991, in Philadelphia. The agenda was designed to explore and challenge basic assumptions of what constitutes effective arts philanthropy, by giving conference participants an extended "hands-on" experience with programs that have tended to fall outside funding guidelines. Rabkin (MacArthur Foundation) and other conferees spent the largest part of the second day on one of twelve field visits that had been carefully organized by cultural organizations in Philadelphia. Like El Taller, many of the organizations visited have a strong community base, some also have artists at their core, and others concentrate on children and education. (A list of the organizations follows this article.) Conference planners intended that the "voices, visions and ideas" encountered on these visits would be the heart of the three-day conference and would provide a basis for "broadening the dialogue."

Field Trips

"We were all overwhelmed by the field trips," said Cindy Gehrig (Jerome Foundation) afterward, "mostly because of the care people took with us. They really tried to help us understand. Spending all day with them meant we gained a fuller understanding." Gehrig was also impressed with her colleagues who "seemed so willing to set aside their own agendas and deal with the issues of the organizations they visited."

A plenary session closed the field visit day and consisted of brief reports that allowed conferees to share their experiences with each other. The reports gave clear proof that the visits were invigorating. John Kreidler (San Francisco Foundation) commented, "The reporting-out session was electric."

The sites visited varied tremendously. At Yellow Springs

Institute, participants learned of the Institute's commitment to and faith in the creativity of individual artists and the value of artists' research and risk-taking. At the Bushfire Theatre (a theater devoted to developing and showing the work of African American playwrights), conference visitors saw the power of artistic energy in an organization that has spread to encompass an entire city block. At Moonstone, conferees participated in children's educational activities led by artists, and were impressed by the children's close attention and great enthusiasm. Conference participants expressed particular surprise at the absence of discipline problems among the children, and attributed this to a committed nurturing of self-esteem. Reporter Ben Snyder (Oregon) recounted, "We saw in action the students' experience of the teachers' expectation."

The meaning of "broadening the dialogue," as articulated in the conference brochure, referred to expanding the dialogue among arts grantmakers to encompass programs that "often fall outside the guidelines of traditional philanthropy and arts activities." Through the field visits, it became apparent that "broadening the dialogue" could also refer to the relationship between arts programs and their various communities. In fact, this relationship became a strong focus of conference discussion. Cindy Gehrig commented that her field trip to Moonstone was a "reminder that artmaking takes place in many places in the community;" it gave her the chance to experience community expression at close range.

Community Connections

El Taller Puertorriqueño and the Asociación de Músicos Latinos Americanos (AMLA) are both strongly connected with their Latino community in North Philadelphia. El Taller was established in 1974 as a community-based organization to promote the arts and culture of the local Puerto Rican and Latino community and to improve its social and educational conditions. AMLA was started in 1982 by thirteen salsa musicians, to promote the appreciation of Latin music and to develop new economic support for it. Both El Taller and AMLA strive to stimulate community empowerment and development. Reporting to the conference, Nick Rabkin commented that with these two groups, "the arts are instrumental in moving people forward." He described the high level of community involvement in these two organizations, and added, "their work has meaning for regular, neighborhood folks." He also stressed that their cultural identity and community connections are the driving force for both groups.

At the Village of Arts and Humanities, conferees experienced "a neighborhood transformed by art." Artist Lily Yeh went to this neighborhood six years ago with a little money in her pocket for a public art project. The result, however, is not something she took to the community, but rather is something that has emerged from the community. Yeh has gradually involved the people of the neighborhood, and together they have built the Village of Art and

Humanities, an imaginative sculpture park/garden in the midst of a destitute neighborhood in North Philadelphia. People in the neighborhood have been invited to participate in making large-scale murals and other art projects. Other activities include the publication of a magazine and free classes in many disciplines for children and adults. Conference participants described the Village as a quieting, domestic place where the lack of private ownership "frees the spirit of community." The gradual evolution of the park has led to both a unique program and to an unconventional organization. Several visitors noted that the program would not fit many funders' guidelines, despite the great energy and power of the place.

Strong community relationships are a natural extension of programs that, like El Taller and the Village, have emerged from particular communities. Other field visits, like one to the Painted Bride Art Center, provided a look at community relationships that have resulted from a group's conscious attempts to reach out to new communities.

The Painted Bride Art Center is a twenty-year old artists' space that presents artists of international renown as well as experimental and emerging artists. Jillian Sandroock (Fund for Folk Culture) reported that the Painted Bride is also actively finding ways to reach out to and include new communities in its programs and in its operations. These energetic community-based programs are stimulated in part by the availability of new grant dollars, Sandroock reported, and resulted from "looking at a social agenda." The Painted Bride revised its mission statement, established a Community Advisory Council, and adopted the stance that community process could be an artistic medium. They began actively bringing in and involving people from diverse Philadelphia communities, and took on the role of broker and catalyst for community groups. Sandroock observed, though, that marrying avant-garde arts presenting with community-based programming is difficult. The Painted Bride has learned that "it takes a lot of time to build trust and alliances in the community." All the same, the site visit raised the hope that experiments like this one can be successful. The community connections developed through these new programs "seem to be comfortable in spite of the fact that their evolution might not have been strictly organic."

Anticipating Trade-offs

Reflecting on the conference several weeks afterward, Bruce Sievers (Walter & Elise Haas Fund) re-emphasized the power of the field trips. He and his colleagues saw impressive operations that succeeded in involving or reaching out into communities more broadly than he had expected. The experience "brought home the real essence of what community-based arts are all about." In this sense, the conference achieved its goal of broadening the dialogue. It didn't, however, resolve the question of what to do about the broadened appreciation and understanding. Sievers asked, "Where do new experiences like these fit into the bigger picture of arts funding? How does my

reaction to these forms relate to my reaction to other, more traditional forms?"

During the plenary session on the last day of the conference, discussion focussed briefly on the fact that addressing a "broadened dialogue" may require a redistribution of resources. A few fragments from the plenary discussion reflect a range of responses to this possibility.

"It's a question of arithmetic. If we have a history of funding major institutions and then we decide to fund elsewhere (education or community-based activities), then there's less for the 'majors.' And, they're already in crisis!"

"The confrontation between the major institutions and the rest of the arts community is a funder's dilemma."

"Why are we accepting this dichotomy? I don't want to have to choose! These groups actually all depend on each other, large and small. Are we each lobbying for larger budgets? How can we make the pie bigger?"

"We must stop looking at arts organizations from a traditional perspective. We have to stop expecting them to keep growing. The non-profit structure is not working any more. We must redefine growth."

During a panel discussion on the first night of the conference, Janet Sarbaugh (Pittsburgh Foundation/Heinz Endowments) described her foundations' shift from more to less traditional funding. They are engaged in re-examining their grantmaking in light of demographic changes in society, and their assessment focuses on questions of fairness and equity. "We are proud of our major institutions," she said, but she sees a collision coming between "mainstream" and "community."

In his post-conference reflections, Sievers defined the challenge as one of remaining open and responsive to the transformation and diversification of our society, while recognizing the tension between these changes and the activities that have historically been in the arts mainstream. "Although it didn't come out too strongly at the conference, the question of 'trade-offs' is looming," he said, "and finding answers is a necessary next step."

For Sievers another concern lay just under the surface of these discussions. "The real crunch," he noted, "may be felt by the 'creative middle,' that is, contemporary arts groups caught between the 'majors' and the many groups reflecting broad ethnic diversity." Although organizations that support contemporary, avant garde artists often struggle for support, "there lies the promise for the future," he suggested. His visit to the Painted Bride provided an example. "It has become a magnet for activities throughout the community. Its program is diverse and fascinating, ranging from an exhibition of modernized, hybrid versions of traditional and contemporary masks, to staff

performances of Brazilian pipe music."

Evaluation and Decision Making

In addition to looking out at the world they serve, participants took the opportunity provided by the conference to look inward at the processes they use in their own work. Early in the conference, Dr. George Otero, who guided and inspired the plenary sessions, suggested that grantmakers are beginning to reconceptualize their work. He likened this effort to the artistic process itself.

Conferees who visited the Philadelphia Folklore Project engaged in a discussion that questioned and challenged notions both of "folklore" and of "grantmaking." The Folklore Project, established in 1987, is a collaborative effort of researchers, folk artists, community activists, and programmers. The Project interviews Philadelphia folk artists, documents their work, and creates programs to interpret and present their traditions to a wider audience. Programs range from palm weaving workshops and double-dutch jump rope competitions to presentations about Khmer traditions of dance and culture in Cambodia.

Suzanne Watkin (Boston Globe Foundation) reported that at the Folklore Project conference goers found themselves within a setting that allowed for meaningful discussion. The Project's director, Deborah Kodish, established an openness that "allowed us to question our own notions of folklore," Watkin said, "and in turn, that allowed us to question our understanding of grantmaking and of art." A discussion of how the Folklore Project makes choices led to a discussion of how grantmakers make choices. Whether arts organization or funder, a key to making good choices is building trust with the community being served. The process of developing that trust, however, is very labor intensive; it requires time, respect, listening, and learning the ways and values of the community. Watkin came away from the visit convinced that grantors "must be part of the circle." Dialogue like that begun with the Folklore Project must continue; new solutions will emerge from such honest exchange. Watkin also observed that funders can learn from the patterns of the community being served. "Artmaking is a messy process," she said, "and foundation giving should also be messy."

Discussion of methods of evaluation filled a large portion of the last conference morning. Sitting in one large circle, the approximately 60 conference participants shared their thoughts on the subject. Many thoughtful comments bounced around to no particular conclusion.

"For some programs, like Moonstone, there is a clear difference between a description on paper and the experience of being there. Judged against their own goals they do very well. Evaluation might best come through the time-consuming process of conversation — talking, questions, and answers."

"Subjective forms of evaluation, like the anecdotal

evaluation parents give, can have value. What is the role of intuition and personal judgment? Subjectivity has its place. Decisions often rest, finally, on the individual commitment of a particular program officer."

"There's a danger in being too subjective. It can mean that whoever gets visited, gets the funds. Equity and predictability are essential. The essence of grantmaking is to be fair."

"Especially in evaluating groups from other cultures, we should ask what the grantees' own criteria are."

"We're the ones who set the rules. The lines are different for each of us, and there isn't just one set of rules. The rules are incremental and they keep moving. We don't need to come to a consensus. There isn't a right way."

Grantmaker Initiatives

As grantmakers "reconceptualize their work," in George Otero's phrase, the question of their own initiative can arise. Do grantmakers lead or follow; do they act or react? References to grantmakers as "pro-active" and as "agents of change" were made from time to time during the plenary session. A specific instance where certain grantmakers have taken the initiative — grant programs that encourage collaborations between large, established arts institutions and smaller, community-based organizations — was a topic of discussion at several field sites.

Community programs at the Painted Bride provided a heartening example of a project initiated in large part because grant funds were available. Everyone seemed to feel the results were good — a diversified board, new energy through multicultural programs, and so on. A concern raised during the field trip, however, centered on the fact that trends in the grantmaking community seem to change from season to season. Can or should a group like the Painted Bride continue to change themselves to fit grantmakers' new goals?

The Painted Bride's experience with a grant-driven collaborative program contrasted with experiences at other sites. More than one community-based group expressed resentment at collaborative projects with "mainstream" organizations. After visiting with the Coalition of African American Cultural Organizations, Neal Cuthbert (McKnight Foundation) reported hearing negative references to projects that paired community-based groups with large arts institutions. (Presumably, these projects, like the community-based program at the Painted Bride, were initiated in response to new granting programs.) Cuthbert reported hearing that "cooperative projects with majors are not quite fair." Most of the money in these programs has gone to the big organizations, whose engagement with the collaborating community groups was

minimal. Nick Rabkin heard similar sentiments from the Latino groups he visited. The groups told of being hired by major institutions to take care of a responsibility to multiculturalism. Rabkin noted that the Latino groups viewed such collaborative projects as "a rip-off." The collaborations took much time and energy, and the groups felt they received little residual benefit for their efforts.

At the last plenary session, conference participants briefly discussed ways to help such collaborations be more effective. Requiring collaboration in making the proposal as well as in the implementation of it can get a project off to a good start. Foundations can help establish a balance of power among all collaborators by being sensitive to who gets the money and how it flows through the project. A feeling of parity is essential to a successful collaboration.

The discussion considered the pros and cons of these collaborations to the grantees, but didn't directly consider broader questions of the overall impact of such "pro-active" funder-driven initiatives. Neal Cuthbert, the conference notetaker for the group visiting the Coalition of African American Cultural Organizations, asked the question in his notes, "Should foundations lead change?"

Miscellaneous Highlights

(A written record of this lively and multi-faceted conference tends to make both more and less of what actually happened: "more" in that the organizing process of writing tends to create an order and a sense of clarity that wasn't actually present in the real-life experience; and "less" in that space constraints and the logic of a written narrative call for serious editing. Following are just a few random highlights from *Broadening the Dialogue* that don't otherwise fit the logic of this report.)

In contrast to major broadcast media, which tends to assume a single "public," media makers at the Neighborhood Film Project assume there are many. These community-based artists struggle to find ways to speak genuinely to and for the specific publics that are their own communities. At the same time, they want the work to be available to others. They challenge themselves to get beyond speaking either to the "mass" or only to themselves.

At the plenary session, John Kreidler reported that the San Francisco Foundation invited two philosophers to be in residence at the Foundation for a year. At the end of the year the philosophers commented on the Foundation's value system, which they termed "instrumental," that is, based on how well something is done. They then made a distinction between this value system and "intrinsic" values that pertain instead to the essential nature of a thing. The Foundation now works to use intrinsic values in its criteria and decision-making.

The conference was the source of a small personal breakthrough for Cindy Gehrig when she realized that in the past she has had a greater tolerance for failure in innova-

tive or experimental artists' work than in community-based, culturally-specific work.

At the conference's closing luncheon, artist Felipe Arenberg encouraged grantmakers to "focus a beam of organized ignorance" on their work, to consult ordinary people, both poets and plumbers.

Time emerged repeatedly as a sub-theme - the importance of finding time to spend in conversation with grantees and community groups, the need to let projects take the time they need to grow and develop, and the often frustrated desire to take time for reflection.

"Stay in Touch"

At the end of their day with the Philadelphia Folklore Project, the visiting grantmakers asked director Deborah Kodish what she'd like from them. Simply asking for money was too obvious, Kodish thought to herself (though it *did* cross her mind). Instead she asked herself what would have an enduring impact. "Stay in touch," she said.

The value of "staying in touch" was a thread that ran through the entire conference. For one thing, GLA annual conferences give arts grantmakers a much needed opportunity to be in touch with each other. Although their experiences were not uniformly positive (a newcomer expressed dismay at certain attitudes discovered among peers, and an old-hand felt the discussion only revisited "the standard woes"), participants frequently acknowledged their need to talk with other funders and exchange ideas with peers. "Grantmakers can easily feel beleaguered today," said Ella King Torrey (Pew Fellowships in the Arts). "We came together this time with a level of enthusiasm that is rare these days."

As the conference planners hoped, the heart of *Broadening the Dialogue* was the time that conferees spent directly in contact with people passionately working in the arts in their communities. "These are regular people," commented Joan Shigekawa (Nathan Cummings Foundation), "doing work that represents all the things the arts are doing that don't get noticed in these days of NEA bashing."

"Our separate worlds came together for a few moments," Deborah Kodish reflected several months after the conference. "How can we find time to keep checking with each other? Being a folklorist teaches me that regular communication is needed to understand the complexities of communities and their arts. A folklorist's approach takes time, over time. When we begin conversations, we assume they don't end."

• • •

Conference field trips included visits with the following organizations:

Asociación de Músicos Latino Americanos
Bushfire Theatre of Performing Arts
Coalition of African American Cultural Organizations
Community Education Center
Moonstone
Neighborhood Film Project
New Freedom Theatre
Painted Bride Art Center
People's Light and Theatre Company
Philadelphia Folklore Project
Philadelphia Independent Film/Video Association
Philadelphia Museum of Art
Prints in Progress
El Taller Puertorriqueño
Village of Arts and Humanities
WYBE/TV 35
Yellow Springs Institute

Broadening the Dialogue was organized by Ella King Torrey, President, Grantmakers in the Arts, and was coordinated by Pamela Carunchio and Associates. Additional assistance was provided by the staff of the Pew Fellowships in the Arts. The conference received critical financial support from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Polaroid Corporation, and the Jerome Foundation, in addition to Grantmakers in the Arts.

This report was written by Anne Focke, free-lance arts consultant and Consulting Editor, Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter.

Artist Fellowship Roundtable

Continued from Page 6

I close with a passage written in 1957 by composer Michael Tippett:

There is no question in our day of the artist receiving a true mandate from society to create. The mandate of society is to entertain, and that mandate is clear and uncomplicated. But the mandate of the artist's own nature, of his special and innate gift, is to reach down into the depths of the human psyche and bring forth the tremendous images of things to come. These images are not yet art. It takes a lifetime's work to mould them into works of art. For this the artist can have no reward but in the joy of doing it. He creates, because without art, in this deep and serious sense, the nation dies. His mandate is inescapable.

Ken Hope has been Director of the MacArthur Fellows Program since 1982, and is leaving this position in June, 1992. He attended all of the Roundtable meetings.

News ...

Arts Forward Fund: Update

The Arts Forward Fund was established by a consortium of private and corporate funders to address long term changes in the economic and social climate facing the arts in New York City. Its purpose is to encourage organizations to reassess their operating assumptions, to look carefully at their existing missions and structures, and to consider new approaches such as partnerships, collaborations, mergers, adoptions, resource sharing, and innovative ideas to meet artists' needs. Over \$1.5 million has been raised to date from 27 private and corporate funders, exceeding the expectations of the initial \$1 million goal. The Fund was set up to operate for approximately three years.

The Arts Forward Fund was officially launched in October 1991 with three town meetings for the arts community in New York City. One purpose of the town meetings was to establish more honest dialogue between arts funders and arts organizations as they address a common crisis.

Based on the discussions at the town meetings last fall, a request for proposals was sent to over 3,000 arts organizations in New York City in early December with a March 15th deadline. Planning grants will be awarded this June, followed by a second cycle of implementation grants in May 1993 to help launch the most promising ideas coming out of the planning phase. The Fund anticipates making 20-30 planning grants in the first stage and then 10-15 implementation grants next year.

Although this "experiment" is currently limited to New York City, contributors to the Arts Forward Fund recognize that the need it addresses is national. They hope the lessons learned will provide new options and ideas for arts organizations, artists, and funders facing similar circumstances. The process and results are being carefully documented and will be avail-

able along the way and at the conclusion of the undertaking.

Bob Crane (Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation) believes that, though modest, the efforts of the Arts Forward Fund are "a beginning of a change process." He adds, "An important assumption in establishing the Fund was that both artists and funders are to some extent trapped in their existing modes of operation and that funders as well as artists need to think in new ways." Crane emphasizes the significance of the fact that 27 very distinct funding organizations have pooled their resources, are willing to relinquish their separate decision-making powers, and plan to work collaboratively to consider actions they might not take independently. "It sends a powerful message across this land," Crane says, "about the philanthropic community's concern for the place of the arts in this country and about our willingness to work together to ensure their future."

For more information, contact Cee Brown at Art Matters, Inc., 131 W. 24th Street, New York, NY 10011.

Supporting and Conducting Lobbying: An Overview for Foundations

The Advocacy Forum of the Alliance for Justice has recently published a nine-page booklet, "Supporting and Conducting Lobbying: An Overview for Foundations." It is designed "to dispel foundation fears about funding lobbying and other advocacy strategies," noted Carolyn Seifert, Deputy Director of the Alliance for Justice. The overview answers basic questions about whether private and community foundations can support lobbying and other public policy initiatives, and takes into account the 1990 IRS lobbying regulations. Although not a comprehensive review of lobbying laws and regulations, the publication gives a definition of lobbying

and answers such questions as: How can foundations make their views known on public policy issues? What are the differences between private and community foundations in this regard? May private foundations make grants to public charities that lobby, and must they require that grants not be spent for lobbying? In a short preface, Seifert writes, "It is important for foundations to understand that they are generally free to support and engage in activities that influence public policy."

Margaret C. Ayers (Robert Sterling Clark Foundation), William L. Bondurant (Mary Reynolds Babcock foundation), Eli N. Evans (Charles H. Revson Foundation), and Charles R. Halpern (The Nathan Cummings Foundation) endorse this publication. "We find that this useful booklet, which was prepared by a tax lawyer, answers questions that we ask ourselves everyday as we consider supporting organizations that use advocacy strategies—including lobbying—to promote their program goals." Its most important message, they add, "is that the IRS has ruled that private foundations may support organizations that lobby if they comply with some straightforward stipulations, which are explained in the booklet."

"Supporting and Conducting Lobbying" by attorney Thomas Ashe, was prepared as a supplement to *Being A Player: A Guide to the IRS Lobbying Regulations for Advocacy Charities*. Also published by the Advocacy Forum, *Being A Player* provides "a plain English roadmap" though the 1990 IRS lobbying regulations and intends to encourage non-profit organizations to participate in improving and initiating government programs and policies through appropriate and legitimate lobbying. It was prepared by the Washington D.C. law firm of Harmon, Curran, Gallagher & Spielberg.

Both publications are available from the Alliance for Justice, 1601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20009. The Alliance for Justice is a national association of environmental, civil rights, mental health, and consumer public interest legal organizations. Its Advocacy Forum

Project seeks to preserve the right of tax-exempt organizations to advocate on behalf of their constituents.

California Arts Facts

The San Francisco Foundation has commissioned a five-year analysis of 800 to 900 arts organizations in California. The study will be based on data collected between 1986 and 1991 by the California Arts Council through its regular application process. The Foundation has hired a team of professional advisors to analyze the information and to publish it and make it available both in print and electronically. The results are due in mid-summer, 1992. For more information, contact John Kreidler, San Francisco Foundation, 685 Market Street, Suite 910, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Arts and Education: A Partnership Agenda

The National Endowment for the Arts, together with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, convened an Arts and Education Partnership Agenda meeting in late March 1992. An advance description of the meeting stated, "The meeting will convene a group of critical thinkers and innovators to develop a plan of action that will make the arts central to positive change in our schools."

Specifically, the goals of the meeting included: 1) to explore and recommend a strategy to put the arts on the national agenda of educational reform; 2) to clarify the contribution the arts make in building an educated, competitive, and creative workforce; 3) to clarify the arts' contribution to the creation of a shared culture in the United States and to recognize the diversity of multicultural expression in U.S. society and schools; and 4) to develop specific tools that relate the arts to national, state, and local reform initiatives.

Participants at the invitational meeting included representatives from the arts, education, government, business,

and non-profit sector. Attendees came from the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, America 2000, the AFI-CIO, private sector philanthropists, and the NEA, among others. Providing guidance for the meeting was the Advisory Council on Arts Education, a citizens' body that was recently established by Congress as part of the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Arts. For information about the outcome of the meeting, contact Susan Houston, Special Projects Coordinator, National Endowment for the Arts, 202-682-5410.

California Compact for Arts Education

In February 1992, California Senator Henry J. Mello introduced a bill into the California State Legislature that would establish a Local Arts Education Partnership Program as part of the state Education Code. The goal of the bill is to develop a locally based approach to improving arts education in the state's public schools by using existing community arts resources. The program would make grant money available to local arts agencies or local education agencies. The program would be designed and administered jointly by the Department of Education and the California Arts Council.

A "compact" of arts education advocates is being organized to support this bill. The opening paragraph of the compact states that the signatories are firmly resolved "to deliver to every child in California that which is their birthright - access to opportunities for their own creative expressions and the many and diverse cultural heritages of our society." As part of the compact, they also agree to "refrain from contentious and destructive turf battles on how and by whom arts education is delivered to our students and instead focus on those elements and principles for which there is general agreement and consensus." For more information contact Paul Minicucci, consultant to the California Legislature Joint Committee on the Arts, (916) 739-3186.

FEDAPT Dissolves: Arts Action Research Founded

In August 1992, Nello McDaniel, former Executive Director of FEDAPT, announced that the FEDAPT organization would be dissolved by its Board of Directors. In a letter to colleagues and funders, McDaniel stated that FEDAPT had taken "a serious, unsentimental, and humane look" at the organization's future prospects.

They considered carefully what type of organizational model would best serve the kind of projects and publishing that McDaniel and FEDAPT lead-consultant George Thorn want to develop. This led to the founding of a new organization, based in Alexandria, Virginia, called Arts Action Research. McDaniel's definition of "action research" is "rather than studying what has been or what is, action research explores ways to effectively intervene to influence and ignite evolution and change." The new organization's plans include "consulting with arts organizations on planning and restructuring; organizing and facilitating special workshops and conferences; initiating special research or laboratory projects to develop, examine, and test new concepts and approaches to structuring and operating arts organizations; and documenting and disseminating the findings of this work through special reports and other publications." Arts Action Research's new address is 205 South Patrick Street, Alexandria, VA 22314; (703) 739-2722.

Audience Development Initiative Enters Final Phase

A three-year pilot project designed to help performing arts groups increase and diversify their audiences is now in its final year. The Audience Development Initiative was launched in 1989 by the Fleishhacker Foundation, with additional support from the Walter & Elise Haas Fund, the Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation, and San Francisco's Grants for the Arts. The premise was that individual support, in its various manifestations including ticket buying,

contributions, and volunteer hours, is key to institutional development.

A panel of national arts/marketing experts was used to select the fifteen mid-sized organizations that are participating. At the time of application, these groups had budgets between \$250,000 and \$1,250,000, and each had identified goals for audience development. The Initiative awarded grants of \$21,000 per year for three years. The grantees represent a range of arts disciplines, and although most produce their own work, a few presenting organizations are included.

Comprehensive technical assistance was also offered to better enhance the groups' organizational effectiveness and ability to implement specific audience development objectives. Nello McDaniel and George Thorn (of Arts Action Research, see article on page 14) conducted the first year's technical assistance program. A second phase of technical assistance included a series of panel presentations, roundtable discussions, and one-to-one consulting. Consultants David Landis, Laurie MacDougall, Jim Royce, Gary Stern, and Nayo Barbara Watkins offered diverse expertise in audience demographics, community outreach, media sponsorship, and creating a marketing plan.

One of the most important aspects of this project has been the opportunity for the grantees to be part of a mutually supportive group. The Initiative created a nucleus that previously did not exist, and from it have grown various ad hoc projects and collaborations. Although the three-year grant period included a major earthquake, a war, a recession, and a huge fire—all of which have affected Bay Area ticket buying patterns—most of the participants have found that the emphasis on audience development has strengthened their audience base and their organizations' mechanisms for building it. The need to fill seats and stabilize earned revenues are of increasing importance in this economic climate. The arts groups participating in the Audience Development Initiative have tried a number of approaches during the project, but perhaps the most fundamental outcome is an energized

focus on community building.

The New Europe Conference

The European Foundation Centre, Fondation de France, and UNESCO's International Fund for the Promotion of Culture are jointly organizing *The New Europe Conference: Opportunities for Foundations, Charities and Corporations*. The conference will be held on July 8-10, 1992, at UNESCO's headquarters in Paris. Conference goals are "the advocacy, visibility and European self-awareness of the non-profit sector." Among others, speakers will include Vaclav Havel, President of Czechoslovakia; François Mitterand, President of France; and Federico Mayor Zaragoza, Director-General of UNESCO.

Over the past two years, representatives of foundations, charities, corporations, and European institutions have worked with the New Europe Programme on issues of socio-cultural, economic, and legal importance to Europeans, and specifically to the European non-profit sector. The New Europe Conference is one result of their work. A *Charter for the European Non-profit Sector* will be presented at the conference. The purpose of this Charter is "to influence policy changes in the specific issue areas which the Programme addresses and to gain recognition and status for the entire non-profit sector from the government and corporate sectors.

Among the conference sessions being developed are "European Cultures, Other Cultures," "Pluralism and Civil Society," "Legal and Fiscal Framework of the Non-Profit Sector," and "Youth, Education and Training." All plenary and individual group sessions will have simultaneous translation into English and French.

The organizers are encouraging the participation of the U.S. philanthropic community. Contact: Ms. Angeles Simon-Dublé, New Europe Programme Coordinator at the European Foundation Centre, 51 rue de la Concorde, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium. Telephone number: 32.2-512.89.38. Fax number: 32.2-512.32.65.

People Changing Jobs ...

Cora Mirikitani and **Doug Bauer** have been hired as Program Officers for Culture by The Pew Charitable Trusts. Prior to accepting this position, Mirikitani was the Director of Performing Arts and Film for the Japan Society. Bauer previously was the Manager of Corporate Contributions for the Scott Paper Company Foundation in Philadelphia.

Mercy B. Pavelić has recently assumed full-time responsibilities as President of the Heathcote Art Foundation in Bronxville, New York. Before this position became a full-time job, Pavelić was an investment banker and managing director at Manufacturers Hanover.

Gretchen Dykstra has left her position as Executive Director of National Video Resources to become President of the Times Square Business Improvement District. She has been replaced at National Video Resources by **Tim Gunn** who was previously Director of Product Marketing at WNET.

Constance Wolf has left her position as Research Associate in the School Reform Division at the Rockefeller Foundation and has taken a job as Curator of Education at the Whitney Museum.

Molly White is the new Executive Director of the Gap Foundation in San Francisco. Before taking this job, White was Development Director of New Langton Arts, an artists' organization in San Francisco.

...

Reading Recommended by ...

• Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (Rockefeller Foundation) recommends **Cultural Studies**, a series of forty essays written predominantly by scholars of color from England and the United States. Authors include Tony Bennett, James Clifford, Douglas Crimp, bell hooks, Michele Wallace, and Cornel West among others. *Cultural Studies* grew out of a large international conference—"Cultural Studies Now and in the Future"—that was organized by the book's editors, Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler through the Unit for Criticism and Interpretive Theory at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Some of the essays were substantially revised after the conference, but the editors attempted to retain a style of public presentation in the final publication. Essays in the book are often accompanied by discussions based on conference sessions transcribed and edited by the three editors. The book was published in 1992 by Routledge.

• Ybarra-Frausto also recommends **YEARNING race gender and cultural politics**, a new book by bell hooks published in 1990 by South End Press in Boston.

• Nick Rabkin (MacArthur Foundation) recommends **Horace's School: Redesigning the American High School** by Theodore R.Sizer. *Horace's School* was published earlier this year (1992) by Houghton Mifflin and is the result of Sizer's work as a consultant to the Essential Schools Network Coalition. "One of his basic findings," Rabkin notes, "is the enormous value of arts education." One of Sizer's principal recommendations is to simplify the curriculum into three basic areas: history and philosophy, science and math, and the arts. Rabkins adds that in Sizer's findings, the arts are not just another subject, but rather are "the

tissue that ties the whole curriculum together."

• Holly Sidford (New England Foundation for the Arts) recommends **The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization** by Peter M. Senge. Senge defines learning organizations as "organizations where people continuously expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together." The book concentrates on how to build strong learning organizations. "The notion of a learning organization, that is, an organization that isn't trapped by tradition, is especially relevant for philanthropy," Sidford comments. "We need to learn to use our money more creatively." *The Fifth Discipline* was published in 1990 and is a Doubleday/Currency book.

• Sidford also recommends **Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector** by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, published earlier this year by Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. The authors argue that the public sector must become more entrepreneurial. "We desperately need government in the 1990s," Osborne writes in a *New York Times Magazine* (March 1, 1992) article. "We don't need more government; we need better government. To be more precise, we need better governance. Governance is the act of collectively solving our problems. Government is the instrument we use. The instrument is outdated, and it is time to remake it."

• The emphasis on the pressures of time that emerged as a sub-theme at

the 1991 GIA conference calls to mind **The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure**, by Juliet B. Schor published by Basic Books in New York. Reviewed by Robert Kuttner in *The New York Times Book Review*, February 2, 1992, Schor's book is not only relevant to arts grantmakers' own lives, but also to the arts community they serve whose efforts are affected by the lack of leisure time in their audience members' lives.

• Bruce Sievers (Walter & Elise Haas Fund) recommends an article by Frank Kermode titled "Whose History Is Bunk?" that appeared in *The New York Times Book Review*, February 23, 1992. Kermode reviewed four publications: **The Disuniting of America** by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. (W.W. Norton & Company); **The Changing Culture of the University**, *Partisan Review*, Volume 58, No. 2 (Spring 1991); **Debating P.C.: The Controversy Over Political Correctness on College Campuses**, edited by Paul Berman (Laurel Books); and **The Politics of Liberal Education** edited by Darryl J. Gless and Barbara Herrnstein Smith (Duke University Press).

Participate in GIA Newsletter

You will notice in this issue of the newsletter an increase in the number of calls for articles, ideas, news, and short items of interest. The GIA Newsletter Committee and Editor's aim is that the GIA newsletter become an interactive forum for discussion among arts grantmakers. Please consider helping this process by participating.

Arts Programming

at the 1992 Council on Foundations Conference

The 1992 Council on Foundations Conference will take place April 27-29 at the Fontainebleau Hilton Hotel in Miami Beach, Florida. For complete conference information contact the Council on Foundations at (202) 466-6512.

Programs of Interest to Arts Grantmakers

Cultural Diversity:

New Voices and Visions

Monday, April 27, 4:00-5:30 p.m.

Using examples of their work, four award winning media producers will explain how they are using the media to transmit information about diverse cultures. In many U.S. cities today,

the richness of a dynamic mix of races, nationalities, languages, and culture is threatened by poverty and by tension and violence along racial and ethnic lines. In this context, film, video, and radio producers are becoming the new "storytellers." One of the featured panelists will be Elisabeth Perez-Luna, who will be hosting the GIA reception at Earmark Inc. studio.

Cultural Survival:

Arts in Education

Wednesday, April 29, 10:30-noon

This session will explore the role of arts education in developing cognitive skills such as problem-solving, decision-making, and fostering an understanding and tolerance of cul-

tural differences. The conference description of this session acknowledges that arts education continues to be absent from plans for education reform, despite powerful and demonstrable success in addressing severe problems of communities and schools.

Maya Angelou

Closing Luncheon Speaker

Wednesday, April 29, 12:30-2:30 p.m.

Distinguished author and professor Maya Angelou will "offer her reflections on the critical need to form new partnerships and reinvigorate old ones with respect, integrity and enthusiasm for the future," according to conference materials. "She promises to challenge our thinking about our individual roles and the role for philanthropic leadership."

Storytelling

Throughout the conference, storytellers will spin their tales for attendees, in the halls of the hotel between sessions as well as in more formal settings. "This will be a whole series of performances around the idea of storytelling, broadly defined," explained Marian A. Godfrey (The Pew Charitable Trusts) who served on the conference program committee. Among others, the program will include Jonathan Feather, hoop dancer; Bernadina Wynmaalen, poet, writer, and teller of African American stories; and Liliane Louis, Haitian storyteller. Judy Baca will tell of her mural projects through slides and talk in a session on Tuesday afternoon; Yroko, an African Cuban dance company, will perform on Wednesday morning; and at least five storytellers will be involved in a longer Storytelling Colloquium on Tuesday evening. Look for a complete playbill in the conference registration packet.

The Dream Catcher Option

Conference goers will be given the option of committing themselves exclusively to this five-session, two and a half day series for the duration of the conference. Using the Native American "dream catcher" as a metaphor, the program will allow participants to "dream through a new vision

Grantmakers in the Arts Hosts Two Events at Council on Foundations Conference

Reception and Program

on Radio and Broadcast Media

On Tuesday evening, April 28 from 6-8 p.m., Grantmakers in the Arts will host a festive reception and participatory program at the studio of Earmark, Inc., Miami-based radio producers. The program will examine the potential of radio and broadcast media as effective tools for cross-cultural communication. Earmark, Inc. is the producer of Crossroads, the nation's only national radio magazine exclusively dedicated to news and culture concerning peoples of color. Representatives from Miami's arts and ethnic communities will attend the reception and participate in the program which will demonstrate radio production and techniques. Further details about this event will be available at the opening session of the conference.

Reception: 1992 Humanitarian Leadership Award

Grantmakers in the Arts will co-sponsor a reception to honor the recipient of the 1992 Humanitarian Leadership Award presented by Funders Concerned About AIDS. The reception will be held on Sunday, April 26, from 5-7 p.m., at the Fontainebleau Hotel. Each year at its Annual Reception, Funders Concerned About AIDS honors an individual or group for work that has resulted in greater public understanding and compassion in response to the AIDS pandemic. This year they will present the award to ABC's *Life Goes On*, for its ongoing and realistic portrayal of an HIV-positive teenager. The reception is also co-sponsored by Grantmakers Concerned About Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse, Grantmakers in Health, Hispanics in Philanthropy, Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, and the Working Group on Funding Lesbian and Gay Issues. Live music and light refreshments will be provided. For more information contact Funders Concerned About AIDS, (212) 840-0707.

Continued on Page 19

News from Grantmakers in the Arts ...

Seventh Annual Conference October 28-30, 1992

The seventh annual conference of Grantmakers in the Arts will be held in Phoenix, October 28-30, 1992. The theme of this year's conference will be "Challenging Assumptions: Anticipating the 21st Century." In this inaugural year of GIA's membership program, paid members will receive preferential registration and reduced registration fees.

Preliminary topics for conference sessions include:

- Feel Good Funding: Whose Agenda, Whose Mission?
- Marketing the Arts: Widgets or Wisdom?
- Indigenous Art, Folk Art, and Fine Art: Toward a Redefinition of Quality;
- The Impact of Technology on Arts Forms and Institutions;
- Grantmakers as Advocates of Public Policy: Too Little, Too Late?
- Institutional Long-term Stability.

In addition, the conference program will include on-site sessions and social events at the Phoenix Art Museum, the Heard Museum, the Scottsdale Center for the Arts, and the new Fine Art Center at Arizona State University.

Pre- and post-conference activities will include:

- Tour of Taliesin West, Frank Lloyd Wright's living laboratory
- Tour of Paolo Soleri's Arcosanti
- Special evening at the Arizona Theatre Company's 1992 opening production at the Herberger Theatre
- Tour of public art in Phoenix
- Special excursion to Santa Fe

Space at these added events is limited and will be available on a pre-registration, first-come, first-served basis.

Additional information and registration forms will be distributed in July. For further details, contact Myra Millinger, Associate Director, The Flinn Foundation, 3300 N. Central Avenue, #1730, Phoenix, Arizona 85012.

Invitation To Join Grantmakers in the Arts

Grantmakers in the Arts is inaugurating a national membership program. Members of GIA will enjoy the following benefits:

- Preferential registration and reduced fees to annual conferences and programs,
- Exclusive access to the GIA news letter,
- Reduced rates for GIA-sponsored publications,
- Access to reports generated by member organizations,
- Membership directory,
- Voting privileges at the GIA annual meeting.

There are two categories of membership: Institutional and Affiliate. All memberships are open to both staff and trustees.

Institutional Membership is open to private foundations, community foundations, corporate giving programs, and non-profit cultural organizations whose primary activity is grantmaking.

Affiliate Membership is open to individuals active in the arts funding field whose organizations are not eligible for Institutional Membership, primarily public sector funders.

Annual fees for Institutional Members are based on a current year arts grants budget, allow up to ten individuals to participate, and range from \$100 to \$500. Annual fees for Affiliate Members are \$50.

Grantmakers in the Arts, an official affinity group of the Council on Foundations, was founded in 1985 to provide a forum for private sector arts grantmakers to address issues of common interest. In 1990, GIA was incorporated as an independent, non-profit organization, and in April 1991, the board made a commitment to become a membership organization. In 1991, GIA retained The Conservation Company with Richard Mittenthal to research and make recommendations that have guided the development of this membership program.

Membership forms will be available at the Council on Foundations meeting and will also be distributed by mail in early May. For more information, contact the Membership Committee Chair, Myra Millinger, at The Flinn Foundation, (602) 274-9000.

The Board of Directors of Grantmakers in the Arts invites you to join!

Benchmark Study of Grantmaking in Arts and Culture

Grantmakers in the Arts is sponsoring a national study of the dimensions and trends in grantmaking in arts, culture and arts-related humanities through the 1980s and into the 1990s. Under the direction of The Foundation Center, the study will include:

- An analysis of arts grants of \$5,000 and above made by private, corporate, and community foundations, for the years 1983, 1986, and 1989;
- A review of opinions, practices, and directions in arts grantmaking;
- Profiles and case studies of selected grantmakers, exploring the dynamics of change in arts funding policies and practices;
- An historical overview of the on going, often controversial issues in arts funding in the United States.

The study is being conducted by Loren Renz, Director of Research at The Foundation Center, and by Nathan Weber, research consultant. The study is guided by an advisory committee established by GIA, and is expected to be completed in 1992.

The Benchmark Study will include a bibliography of books, studies, essays, and other documents relevant to funding issues in the arts, public policy issues in the arts, and resources for grantmaking in the arts. The Foundation Center invites interested parties to send bibliographic information to Renz and Weber at The Foundation Center, 79 Fifth Avenue, 16th Street, New York, NY 10003-3050.

Newsletter Report

A meeting of the Newsletter Committee was held following the GIA Board meeting in October 1991. Present were Sarah Lutman, Chair; Anne Focke, Consulting Editor; and Committee members Jessica Chao, Cynthia Gehrig, Ken Hope, John Orders, Joan Shigekawa, and Bruce Sievers. Holly Sidford and Garth Tate were unable to attend.

The meeting began with people talking about what they liked about the newsletter and adding their suggestions for new things to incorporate into future issues. Those present thought the current format and length are about right. Ideas for new features included the following:

- A "Reading Recommended by..." column to which readers could submit short items;
- Follow-up articles relating to articles previously published;
- Practical information about such topics as PRIs in the arts, funding literary publishing, and arts criticism;
- A column about staff changes among arts grantmakers — new hires, departures, and so on;
- A regular cartoon about arts philanthropy;
- Conference proceedings and reports;
- Letters to the editor;
- "Point-counterpoint" pieces that present several opposing views on a particular topic.

The Committee quickly developed a long list of possible topics for feature articles. The most time was spent discussing articles relating to freedom of expression, articles pertaining to

the idea of "redistribution" of arts dollars, and articles about regionalism.

The Committee agreed to be in contact by telephone and snail mail. Several members are on-line with a computer network, and those who aren't were encouraged to "go on-line" for future communication. The idea of establishing a conference on Arts Wire for arts philanthropy was discussed briefly.

Brief Note

Bruce Sievers (Walter & Elise Haas Fund) reports that as a result of George Otero's success as the plenary session leader at GIA's 1991 Conference in Philadelphia, Otero was invited to play a similar role at the Annual Meeting of Family Foundations held in Charleston in February 1992. Otero was received as enthusiastically by family foundations as he had been by arts grantmakers. In subtle though powerful ways, the arts were introduced into the Charleston meeting through Otero's basic approach which is so firmly grounded in arts and creativity.

Council on Foundations

Continued from Page 17

of philanthropy" through dialogue, presentations, discussions, a creativity exercise, visits to a variety of cultural sites in the Miami area, and the creation of a visual report at the close of the conference. This option will be limited to 100 people, on a first-come first-served pre-registration basis.

Moon Over Miami, Street Festival

Local arts and artists will be highlighted during the Monday night (April 27) street festival. Festivities will include performances by Miami arts organizations and opportunities to visit artists' studios along Lincoln Road.

Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

Spring 1992;
Volume 3, Number 1
© 1992 Grantmakers in the Arts
Consulting Editor, Anne Focke

Grantmakers in the Arts Board of Directors

Jessica Chao,
Lila Wallace Reader's Digest Fund
Patricia Doyle,
Cleveland Foundation
Cynthia Gehrig,
Jerome Foundation, Inc.
John Kreidler,
San Francisco Foundation
Sarah Lutman,
The Bush Foundation
Tim McClimon,
AT&T Foundation
Ruth Mayleas,
Ford Foundation
Myra Millinger,
The Flinn Foundation
John Orders,
James L. Irvine Foundation
Janet Sarbaugh,
Pittsburgh Foundation
Joan Shigekawa,
The Nathan Cummings Foundation
Holly Sidford,
New England Foundation for the Arts
Bruce Sievers,
Walter & Elise Haas Fund
Ella King Torrey,
Pew Fellowships in the Arts
Sam Yanes,
Polaroid Company

The newsletter is published twice a year. The deadline for the Fall issue will be July 15, 1992. News items will be edited and included in the newsletter on a space-available basis. Two copies of each submission should be sent to:

Sarah Lutman, Chair, GIA Newsletter Committee, c/o The Bush Foundation, E-900 First National Bank Bldg., St. Paul, MN 55101

Grantmakers in the Arts (GIA) is a national membership organization of primarily private sector grantmakers interested in the arts and arts-related activities. GIA's purpose is to strengthen arts philanthropy and its role in contributing to a supportive environment for the arts nationwide. GIA is incorporated as a non-profit 501 (c) 3 organization and is an affinity group of the Council on Foundations.

Grantmakers in the Arts, c/o Ella King Torrey, Chair, Pew Fellowships in the Arts, The University of the Arts, 250 S. Broad Street, Suite 400, Philadelphia, PA 19102

Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

c/o Pew Fellowships in the Arts
The University of the Arts
250 South Broad Street, Suite 400
Philadelphia, PA 19102