



Grantmakers in the Arts
Proceedings from the
1999 Conference

Strengthening the Arts Through Policy, Performance and Practice

November 14-17, 1999 San Francisco

Arts and Philanthropy in the 21st Century

Four diverse foundation leaders discussed the role of the arts as they considered the broader philanthropic landscape. What are some of the major trends and forces that are driving the future work of their foundations? Which arts funding strategies seem the most promising? And what can be done to better connect the work of artists and arts organizations to communities and the public at-large?

Moderator: Dennis Collins, President and CEO,
The James Irvine Foundation

Panelists: Caroline Avery, President,
The Durfee Foundation
Archibald Gillies, President and CEO,
The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts
Anna Faith Jones, President and CEO,
The Boston Foundation

November 15, 1999, 10:00 a.m.

© 2000 Grantmakers in the Arts



**Grantmakers in the Arts
Proceedings from the 1999 Conference**

*Strengthening the Arts through
Policy, Performance and Practice*

In 1999 Grantmakers in the Arts celebrated its fifteenth anniversary and, as organizations periodically do, we took this opportunity to stand back, take stock of our work as grantmakers, and look to the future. As part of this process, we surveyed our membership and also asked a number of you to tell us what you were working on, how you were doing, and what was keeping you awake at night.

In fact, we found very few surprises. You talked about the need to sustain arts organizations and leaders, increase public participation, and support individual artists and their work. You also talked about your desire for more informed arts policy, better evaluation, and new linkages to the for-profit sector. These ideas formed the content of the 1999 conference.

But the spirit of the conference came from another place, another vision, that is equally a part of the essential GIA. John Gardner, the founder of Independent Sector, gave a speech in Oakland in 1998, in which he spoke of the immense promise and possibility of the work of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector. He said of our work:

We are allowed to pursue truth, even if we are going in the wrong direction – allowed to experiment even if we're bound to fail, to map unknown territory even if we get lost. We are committed to alleviate misery and redress grievances, to give reign to the mind's curiosity and the soul's longing, to seek beauty where we can and defend truth where we must, to honor the worthy and smite the rascals with everyone free to define worthiness and rascality, to find cures and to console the incurable, to deal with the ancient impulse to hate and fear the tribe in the next valley, to prepare for tomorrow's crisis and preserve yesterday's wisdom, and to pursue the questions that others won't because they are too busy or too lazy or fearful or jaded. It is a sector for seed planting and path finding, for lost causes and causes that yet may win. This is the vision.

Although he wasn't speaking of our work specifically, I have not encountered a more eloquent expression of what it means to be a grantmaker in the arts. The 1999 conference began with its content firmly in hand and with this vision offered as a guide. Hopefully along the way, we explored each other's best funding efforts, shared lessons from our failures, and drew courage from our commitment to artists, art forms, and community.

Cora Mirikitani

1999 GIA Conference Chair

Mirikitani: *Thanks very much and good morning to all of you. My name is Cora Mirikitani, Senior Program Director of the James Irvine Foundation and Chair of this year's conference of Grantmakers in the Arts.*

It's my pleasure to welcome you to San Francisco on behalf of the GIA board and the many committee members who helped to create this conference, exploring the themes of policy, performance and practice in the arts.

GIA is celebrating its 15th anniversary in 1999, and we took this opportunity to stand back, take stock of our work as grantmakers, and look to the future. As part of this process, we surveyed our membership, and asked a number of you to tell us what you were working on, how you were doing, and frankly, what was keeping you awake at night.

You could say that there were really few surprises. You talked about the need to sustain arts organizations and leaders; increase public participation; and support individual artists and their work. You also talked about your desire for more informed arts policy; better evaluation; and new linkages to the for-profit sector. These ideas, in fact, formed the content of this year's conference. But the spirit of the conference comes from another place, another vision, that is equally a part of the essential GIA.

John Gardner, the founder of Independent Sector, gave a speech in Oakland last year, in which he spoke of the immense promise and possibility of philanthropy in the nonprofit sector. He said of our work, and I'm quoting, "We are allowed to pursue truth, even if we are going in the wrong direction; allowed to experiment, even if we're bound to fail; to map unknown territory, even if we get lost. We are committed to alleviate misery and redress grievances; to give reign to the mind's curiosity and the soul's longing; to seek beauty where we can; and defend truth where we must; to honor the worthy and fight the rascals with everyone free to define worthiness and rascality; to find cures and to console the incurable; to deal with the ancient impulse to hate and fear the tribe in the next valley; to prepare for tomorrow's crisis and preserve yesterday's wisdom; and to pursue the questions that others won't because they are too busy or too lazy or fearful or jaded. It is a sector for seed planting and path finding, for lost causes and causes that yet my win. This is the vision."

Now, although he wasn't speaking of our work specifically, I have not encountered a more eloquent expression of what it means to be a grantmaker in the arts. So with the content of this conference firmly in hand and a vision to guide us, we begin. And hopefully along the way, we will explore each other's best funding efforts; share lessons from our failures; and draw courage from our commitment to artists, art forms and community.

It is my pleasure to introduce the moderator of our opening plenary session on The Arts and Philanthropy in the 21st Century, Dennis Collins. Dennis is someone whom I've got to know quite well over the past several years and is the president and CEO of the James Irvine Foundation. To give you some background, Dennis was appointed president of the foundation in 1985. Before coming to the foundation, he was the founding headmaster of San Francisco University High School. His career has also included other positions in education at Emmett Willard School and Occidental College. He has held many trusteeships over his distinguished career and currently serves as a trustee of the Foundation Center, the American Farmland Trust, and the Humanities and Services Council at Stanford University. It's my pleasure to give you Dennis Collins.

Collins: Thank you, Cora. When Cora tells me to show up, I show up! And I'm delighted to be here today and to see this very filled room. Some of you must be Presbyterians because you're hanging out in the back. There are chairs up here. Please feel free to come on up. We won't be offended as you move forward. In fact, we'll take that as a good sign.

Let me tell you how pleased I am to be here with you this morning in this first session. I have some appreciation of how hard and diligent you all have been on the program committee to put together a program of consequence, and I think I speak for my colleagues on the panel when I say that we are privileged to be able to share some thoughts with you this morning.

Let me identify my partners in crime. I will not provide extensive biographical information; you have that in your packet. But let me identify them by name and association and you'll get to hear from them more in a few minutes.

On the far side is Carrie Avery. Carrie is the president of the Durfee Foundation, headquartered in Los Angeles. Next to Carrie is Arch Gillies, who is president and CEO of the Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts. And immediately to my left is Anna Faith Jones, president and CEO of the Boston Foundation.

I would note, and you probably have already discovered, that we represent four very different kinds of foundations. We have a long-standing, highly-esteemed community foundation, represented by Anna Faith. We have a small family foundation doing very important work in California in the Durfee Foundation. And at the Andy Warhol Foundation, we have a foundation that has become a highly regarded funder of individual artists and other arts programs throughout the country.

Our task that we've been given is to have a conversation, and we intend to do just that. We have sworn off speeches, you'll be pleased to know. So our plan is to have a conversation up here, and soon thereafter to have a conversation out there. So we really do want to engage you in this dialogue that we have been charged to have, to think about the arts and philanthropy, philanthropy and the arts in the 21st Century, which I remind you is now less than two months away. So we don't have to be too terribly good at being futurists to begin to think about where we are going in this field.

Our task this morning is to see if we can think about and talk a bit about connecting some of the major ideas and forces that are affecting philanthropy generally as we approach this new decade. And to see how those forces might connect, link, and identify issues and opportunities for funding in the arts. So it's philanthropy wide-frame, and then connecting those observations with issues and opportunities in the arts.

The idea is for us to have some opportunity to share some of our broader perspectives about our work in philanthropy, all of our work in philanthropy, and then to connect those to our thoughts about our work in the arts. Where the two coincide; where there may be conflicts; where there may be indeed competition; and where indeed there may be huge opportunity to have the arts influence and affect larger philan-

thropic challenges. How we might think about taking promising practices and lessons from our funding in the arts, and connecting those to other foundation strategies and purposes.

The thought was that we ought to start this conference stepping back with this wider lens to reflect a bit about what's going on in philanthropy at the end of this century. And then to see whether or not there are signals there, there are insights, there are thoughts that we would want to raise up for larger consideration that might affect our larger understanding of philanthropy going forward.

So that's our challenge. And the agreement that we've made here amongst us is that we will talk a bit together, and then we'll open it up to the floor. So let's get started and see where this takes us.

I'd really be interested if I could ask my colleagues to reflect upon that broader issue, take the wider lens, and to share with us their thoughts about what they believe to be the most compelling challenges confronting our society at this point. And then to think about how well organized philanthropy is in addressing those challenges.

Gillies: I'd like to introduce this broader context and be reminded that life has been changing rapidly in these United States over the past 15 or 20 years with the introduction of the global economy and all its complexity and all its swiftness. That technology has certainly aided this rapid growth.

The driving force of the global economy has been the success of business, the success of entrepreneurs, the success of the bottom line. This huge force, which is affecting all aspects of our lives in every way, has had profound consequences for philanthropy and for that other part of our life, which we could call the nonprofit world or governmental world or society.

But I think for the consideration of any individual practical question, you have to first lodge our situation in this global economy, which has both good effects on our society and bad effects.

I just point out one bad effect, in my judgment, which is that average family income in the last 20 years has predominantly grown in the top 20 percent of the society. The next quintal has eight percent growth; the middle quintal has been flat; and the bottom two quintals have had a net loss in family income over the last 20 years.

Now this is obviously a profound development and there are all other kinds of ramifications from it. But in order to talk about the arts or philanthropy or the nonprofit sector, we have to recognize this huge force which is all around us, a fourth dimensional force which we experience every day in our lives.

Collins: Any thoughts?

Jones: I work in a community foundation, so that we are looking at the quality of life in our community. Looking at how to nurture the sense of community there, to keep people connected, and to be sure that the community works for all the people who live there. We have seen this come under stress in recent years. Technology has driven the ease of communication and transportation. We are seeing a whole new influx of immigrants; the city becomes more diverse. So that in addition to the economic divide, we see a cultural divide of some dimension opening up, and this triggers a larger question that's often raised by Americans, being the only heterogeneous democracy on the face of the earth. There are many people, thoughtful people, who raise doubts about whether we're going to be able to survive as we watch the chaos in the Balkans and so forth. Are we going to become an increasingly Balkanized society where we are not really able to connect?

And so we have gotten back into the arts, slowly and deliberately, and are now emphasizing this capacity of the arts. Arts come out of the creativity of human beings and so I think they are unusually effective in enabling human beings to communicate on a very different level and to understand one another on a very different level. And we see that really as a critical, increasingly critical factor, if we want to see to it that our community works for all of its residents.

Avery: I come from the perspective of a family foundation that gives about a million dollars in grants a year, mainly in the Los Angeles County area. So I don't feel qualified to speak about organized philanthropy in the large sense.

What we try to do is focus on individuals in our grant making and we found that even though we're rather small in size, we can make an enormous difference by what we do, and have a huge impact in the community that we're working with.

For example, we have a program that gives sabbaticals to nonprofit leaders in LA County, both in the social services and arts sectors. People who've been working in the field for a long time can apply for a grant to be able to take time off from their work. One of the things that we try to do in this program and in many of our programs is not to separate out. We bring social service people and arts people together both in the grant program and then in retreats, where they can get to know one another and see the interconnectedness of the work that they're doing.

And that's just one example of a grant program, but it's something that we're trying to do. We haven't even been that conscious of trying to do it, but it's something that just seems to be part of what we do, not to separate the arts out too much from everything else. And also within the arts, try to bring disciplines together and mix things up, not to simply have a dance program, a music program, a visual arts program, but to bring people together within those disciplines and communicate with one another.

Collins: I want to come back to, I think, Arch, what you were suggesting a moment ago when you were clearly identifying enormous social change that is characterizing all of our lives. And certainly the work that we do within foundations needs to be responsive to all of that, and if we can get out in front of some of it, so much the better.

An issue within the arts funding community and certainly within foundations generally, is this whole notion of the marketization of everything. The market is king; the market drives; the market defines; the market will

ultimately rule. There was a time when those of us who were working in this field thought less of market and more of moral positioning, of ethical dimension to our work. The challenge that so many of us, I think, feel today is that these lines blur. We are constantly being told that if foundations are going to be cutting-edge and responsive to the new economy and the new millennium, we too, are going to have to figure out how to find our way in the marketplace.

Any thoughts about how all of that connects to work in the arts particularly with regard to philanthropy?

Gillies: Just to react; just to rephrase a little bit of what you said, it seems to me that the first task is to understand the market forces. Because it's not like they're going to go away, or it's not like we're going to have a revolution and do without. We're going to deal with the market and participate in the market.

But I think the key issue is not to underestimate its force or its motivation. It's not a conscious conspiracy. Each of the individual actors in the market is out to maximize profits for shareholders, whether they be Dutch shareholders or Indonesian shareholders or Argentine shareholders. I think we need to understand what we're dealing with, even as we may participate in that market to some degree. And then it seems to me a time to consciously say, no, we're not going to do it that way. We're going to do it on some other value face, on some other notions of how society should organize itself.

You know, there's a new book by Gary Wills about the Constitution and it reminds us that the first words are, "We the People". And somehow or another, the founding fathers and mothers decided that the people had to bring forth a Constitution, which in turn brought forth a government that was responsive to the people. Now, "the people" is a very amorphous term, but it does lend itself to what you were talking about, Carrie, which is to try to create coalitions horizontally. To try to have artists and social workers and health workers and environmentalists and business and labor somehow deal with each other on a horizontal basis rather than on a vertical basis.

The market is going to drive things vertically and that's why any common wealth tends to go to the top because it is rewarding the winners and discarding the losers. And in your policies of inclusion, it seem to be a big clue there. It relates to what you were saying about how to maintain any sense of community in the stress of these vertical forces.

Jones: Yes, but how does the market choose winners and losers? It's those that sell. It's fascinating that in the development of our program, we had a series of small brainstorming sessions with artists and performers of various kinds, heads of arts institutions, people who were in the arts as an avocation and so forth. And they really made a plea for us supporting artists, arts and culture as a way to counteract this. Because they were saying that the market forces are cheapening the quality of our life.

If what gets them sold and delivered to the public is what sells, there's no one out there saying that necessarily just what sells is the best, but in fact is speaking to other deeper and more important human values and concerns. They would hope – they were making a plea to us – that the foundation would so set up and characterize its funding as to help counteract that, in a *very* broad way. Supporting artists but also supporting manifestations of art and culture that could have a broad sweep across the community.

They were talking about going from community to community to intensify this counteraction to the cheapening of our society by market forces.

Collins: The issue of marketing and inclusion reminds me of a sign above a storefront down here south of Market where you're going to be going this evening. There's a big sign out. It's a very San Francisco sign. It says, "Veterinarian/Taxidermist." [laughter] Veterinarian, slash, taxidermist, colon, either way, you get your dog back! [laughter] I couldn't resist.

Gillies: Well, that's interesting because we've been posing the market versus, you know, the good guys in Dallas. But for foundations, it's interesting, we are betwixt and between. We are

nonprofit entities and we come into existence because the government enabled us through tax legislation. Our money comes from people who probably made it in the market big time. And yet we have nonprofit values. And so we're in the midst of it.

I was at a panel in New York on the Brooklyn Museum crisis and, I think this pertinent, the discussions going back and forth began to feel a little bit as if the arts people were sounding defensive a little bit, maybe a little touch of whining. And this old curmudgeon, who's a professor at Cooper Union, said, "Hey, you all have to get with it to understand that this is hard ball politics that Guilliani is doing here. And you have to understand what he's doing and combat him and go right back at him. Don't be taken advantage of."

And so for our community, for the foundation world, this is a big mindset change. For those us who have been active in it for 20 or 30 years, we're kind of used to the nice old days, when it was a very kindly profession and genteel and you helped things, just stayed in the background, didn't do much.

I think all of those terms of references are changing. I think the market force doesn't answer to any accountable force. The political system is getting to the point where it's hit-and-run, as in the Guilliani case. And so if we're going to protect some of these values that we're talking about, we're going to have to be more aware and then more combative and more willing to enter the fray.

Collins: As you think about arts within the broader philanthropic repertoire, what are the impediments to positioning this work more centrally and thus making it more crucially important as an element in the broader set of philanthropic strategies that are aimed at meeting societal needs?

In other words, if this is so damned important as we're suggesting, what's getting in the way, or what is in the way that keeps us from having the kind of impact on some of these issues as funders in the arts, than ideally we would like to have?

You indicate for a moment there, Arch, that some of this is mindset. Some of this is how we see these issues and see the world and position ourselves accordingly. What other impediments get in the way of linking the work that we do in the arts to some larger philanthropic strategy?

Jones: Well, I think it's the elitist view of the arts. It certainly is with us. It's very hard to break this down. I mean, you can put your theory out there like I do and then have a board member that will say, this is nice but I can tell you the arts are never going to line up for me with our work for the poor, housing, and so forth. And I keep saying, but this is equally important. We have so long pigeonholed the arts as only for those who have the time and the money to participate in it. And quality and excellence in the arts can be defined only by history or those who have been deeply immersed in being educated to identify excellence.

And we don't force ourselves to depend upon that in other fields. We figure we can go out there and see programs, talk to people, and identify programs that are being effective. People who are doing superb work because we've seen the effect of it and we look at it. And I think we need to learn how to do that in the arts but I'm finding it's an uphill track for us as we try to get into the funding of the arts.

Avery: I agree with Anna Faith in that I think that the real problem is this segment thing and that the arts are looked at as a separate thing. And both in life, in the sense that you have life and then on Saturday you go to the theater, as opposed to looking at arts as something that's integrated in your life, seven days a week all the time. And then that translates into grant-making and thinking that it's a separate area, instead of figuring out how to integrate arts into all of your grantmaking.

Gillies: I think there's a big strategic corollary to that, which is you have a person on your board who says, I have problems, I have to take care of the poor and so forth. Well, the poor are as much artistic or creative as we are. So to recognize that creativity, expression, artistic production, whatever, are central to the human experience, just as much as eating and sleeping

and procreating. That every single person in a sense is an artist.

Bill Ivey has been making some good speeches about this. It is important because over time, it ought to build a base to where every single American says, "Well I do art. Yeah, I may not do art which lasts for a thousand years, or I may." But, the need to express, to think, to talk, to communicate, is central to everybody. Somehow we have to build a broad political strategy and have national institutions that reflect that, and have national leaders who speak that way so that we aren't demonized by the Guillianis and the Helmses of the world.

As long as we are separate and sort of marginal and elitist, we're targets. It's easy, because if you're a politician you can pick out somebody who's vulnerable.

Well, somehow, we've got to build some sort of solidarity with all kinds of interests and all kinds of people and parts of the United States so that politicians can't demonize artists.

Collins: That notion of crossing over and finding our way into the policy arena and in the political arena seems obviously to be what we know to be the case in so many other areas of our grantmaking. You can't do direct service, absent involvement with policy, if you're really looking for larger impact. If you're really trying to address some of the most fundamental pathologies within the social structure, ultimately you're going to have to make connection with government and policy folks to make some of those issues come alive and have impact and sum to something.

What is it – I'm going to push this notion of impediment a little bit more – what is it about how we're structured, who we are, what we represent, how we see the world, that keeps us from creating the kinds of institutions and organizations that you were just suggesting, Arch?

Gillies: Well, there are some initiatives that are very hopeful. There's the Center for Arts and Culture which has been founded. There's the Pew Initiative, which will do good things. Creative Capital, get a plug in for that.

There are some national, young organizations just beginning. And of course, various organizations have been added for many years that are under-supported, like NAAO and the National Campaign for Freedom of Expression and other organizations at that level.

I think foundations have to read carefully what the IRS regulations say. It doesn't say anything in there like, "a foundation president or a foundation program director shall not speak out on public issues." I think it's time for chief executives and chairmen of the boards and staff people who know something to make commentary both spoken and written, and testify in congress and do whatever we have to do to engage. After all, we're so privileged, we have all this information coming at us all day long; we sit there digesting it.

I think it is another form of mindset. We've been a little too fancy over the last several decades. We have to get more into it.

Collins: Let me posit another impediment, and I think it probably is truer in multi-purpose foundations as opposed to single-purpose foundations. I think it's an impediment that ultimately we're going to have to wrestle with. And that is the impediment of silos, and feeling separate and apart from other parts of the foundation's programs, and activities, so that there are a series of missed opportunities.

I think just as program officers who work exclusively in economic development in disinvested communities or program officers who work in children, youth, and family, or program officers who work in higher education, program officers in the arts in multi-purpose foundations, work quite separately. They work quite apart. Those efforts to reach across, those efforts to joint venture, those efforts to collaborate, to build coalition, common purpose and foundations, oftentimes are met with frustrations. The way we are structured in terms of how we put our grant money on the ground, the way we build our budgets, the way we are reviewed in terms of whether or not we've accomplished our goals and objectives, all suggest that we are working in these silos.

I'm quite struck when I look at big foundations that are working across a whole host of big

pathologies in this country and beyond, that you can find program officers who are working in the same zip-code within a foundation and don't really know what the other is doing. So that this isolation notion, this notion of separateness is really going to require foundations to respond much more creatively and probably be more integrated than historically we've been able to do. So I would characterize that as another impediment within those kinds of foundations. Any thoughts on that?

Jones: I would agree. Even as we move forward with the arts, it's interesting that a proposal will come in, and we'll often have a discussion about whether this is more education or art. We have to decide what pigeon hole to put it in. I think for that very reason, we discourage creative combinations of various kinds of programs.

One of the most successful literature programs we supported came from a woman who came to the foundation to open a program in a public housing project with single parents who had so little self-esteem, they wouldn't even come out of the apartments to take advantage of the services that there were. And I sat there and listened to her and she was so wedded to this, excited about this, and in fact, it worked wonderfully!

She got the women to come to a writing program where they sat down and learned how to do creative writing. Wonderful things came out of it. They wrote about themselves and their own experience. They got up and they read these in front of the group. The meetings got larger and larger and these woman began to come out of their apartments. They began to look around and see what other kind of services were out there that could help them and their families. Whereas before, they had too little self-esteem to come out of their apartments. Now, we didn't look at that as an arts program then, we looked at that as social services. But the trigger was the literature.

Someone came into my office and talked about a housing program in England that hired an artist in the maintenance staff. Why not? If you're repairing the buildings, the fence, planting the garden, wouldn't you like to have

someone with a creative, artistic bent. Why not have art and beauty there rather than just someone who knows how to put the pieces back together?

We don't tend to think this way. I hope that those of us, particularly in these multi-purpose foundations, would begin to look at that combination of the arts with many other kinds of things.

Collins: The arts are different, right? How many times have I heard that? The arts are different. Let's talk about impact and effectiveness and evaluation.

As a foundation leader, do you think about effectiveness and impact in the arts differently than you think about effectiveness and impact in other parts of your program?

Avery: Not really. We grant in a lot of different areas, and as I said, we focus on individuals. We're not very big on evaluation. We're small and when we give individual artists grants, we really don't do a lot of follow-up because we just don't see the point of it. If you give someone a grant for \$25,000 one year, maybe the work that year wasn't very good. But maybe five years from now, the impact of that grant will be felt. The chances that we would get any meaningful information are pretty small, for us to spend a lot of time tracking that minutely.

Avery: Our board is so much more concerned about putting money into programs than self-reflecting, because it's much more about reflecting on ourselves than the actual work that we're doing. And so people would much rather take those \$5,000 and say, let's fund another grant or do something else that way. And that goes for really all of our work.

We have a community fund where we give money to start-up organizations in Los Angeles County, usually organizations that are just transitioning from all-volunteer to maybe getting one partially-paid staff person. We're looking for an organization with dynamic leadership. We'll give them what's usually their first foundation grant. We have no application process. We just do it word of mouth. We have people who tell us about organizations. We go

out and visit them and we give them a check. And then we ask them a year later to write us a letter. But no form, no application, nothing. And we've given close to 50 of these grants and we've had one organization that didn't do very well by the money. But the rest of them have done really well and some of them have done extraordinarily well, where they've grown from being an all-volunteer organization to being an organization with a quarter of a million dollar budget in a few years.

And we just don't see the point. I know it's not the thing right now, because everybody's talking about evaluation and it's somewhat sacrilegious.

Gillies: I couldn't agree more with what you're saying. I think there ought to be a mandatory ten years and out, if you work for a foundation, to go on the other side of the table and have to raise money. There's such a disconnect between the real world people who are doing things and the foundation people who think they're watching to see if it's being done. It's just a huge disconnect. So I'm on your side.

Collins: So far I'm hearing that the arts *are* different, okay?

Avery: No, no, I don't think so, no.

Jones: I would apply this to everything. We have to, because we are partnering with other funders. We're going to do some quantity kind of things that have to do with broadening engagement and so forth.

I really feel that in this kind of work and other things that we do, we need to bring the human element into it. Personal testimony is the most powerful evaluation. You are trying to impact people's lives. You can't do that by counting numbers and conditions. People can come in and talk to you and you can see it in their faces. You can see it in their bodies. You can see them and hear them talk about what's changed in their lives and their ability to have more control over their lives.

I think we really need to do more of that than counting widgets and a lot of stuff put down on paper. And I think it's a waste of money to use

the money for evaluation. The organizations are not going to be able to do it unless you give them extra money to do it, and I would rather see the money go into the program that's going to have impact on people's lives.

Collins: Let me do a little informal poll at this point, before we go to the audience, okay?

How many of you are currently in situations where you're spending a lot of time thinking about, worrying about, trying to put in place better evaluations? Alright.

How many of you would align yourselves enthusiastically with Carrie's position, whether or not your boss thinks that's the right position? Okay. The same people! [laughter]

Okay. Let's go to you-all. We've talked for a half-hour.

You have to stand so people can see you, because we're flat here.

Question: I'm Mercy Pavelić from the Heathcote Art Foundation, a small family foundation. Because you represent three distinctly different profiles of foundations active in the arts, I'm interested in your recommendations, your practical suggestions on how in each of those categories of foundation, we can become more practically engaged in the issues of arts advocacy. Because I really do think that's so central to our collective interest here. But really from a practical point of view, not just a philosophical one.

Collins: And focusing on each of the different kinds of institutions that you represent, arts advocacy and the practical engagement with arts advocacy.

Gillies: I'll start out. We're a national foundation and so we want to act nationally, if not internationally. And I think that the practical thing that needs to be done is to create and strengthen existing national institutions, as I said earlier. I know I can't name them all, but I know of them, maybe they ought to merge or something, I don't know. But I know a number at the national level that are dying on the vine for money.

Whether the issue is censorship or arts funding or diversity or whatever, we have to think more consciously about what to do with this at the national level, if we need to engage in the national debate.

Jones: I think funding and advocacy for the arts are joined. So what I'm trying to do – and again this is an uphill fight – is to establish a permanent fund for the arts in the community foundation. And everybody keeps pushing the public sector to fund the arts, and people kind of give me a blank stare when I say this. I mean, I'm beating a drum that's very slowly getting converts.

But I'm saying, then why not a private community-controlled fund in the arts? So that you can hold your community foundation to funding in perpetuity for the arts. And that will provide us a platform for advocacy. Because when we start the advocacy, the first thing people try to do to pull the rug out from under you is ask how long are you going to be doing this? Foundations are trendy. Five years down the road, the Boston Foundation is going to have disappeared from the funding world of the arts. Who are you? Who are you to stand up and tell us that the city ought to be doing more for this, or the state ought to be doing more for this?

So I feel very strongly about the fact that we need to have that base. I feel very strongly – and this is one of the arguments that I'm trying to make – that the permanent fund itself is symbolic. There needs to be stable ongoing funding for the arts, and needs to be a stable, ongoing source of funding for the arts.

The fund itself, is an end in itself. It's symbolic and it's important to say that this community is committed to funding for the arts, into the future.

Collins: Carrie?

Avery: In thinking about this, I think, well, we're not a national funder, we're LA County based. Our executive director sent a survey to all the funders who do some arts funding in LA, to find out exactly how much money is out there in all of these different categories. We found out that one funder who didn't consider

themselves an arts funder was, in fact, the largest arts funder in Los Angeles! And just that in itself is a very interesting thing.

We're just beginning to get our arms around what are we going to do with this information. But just in learning what is and is not out there is so important because it gives us the ability to share it with other funders to find out where is their need. Since we're smaller, we do things on a smaller scale, but we can say, okay, there's so little money out there for individual artists in LA, that's what we're concentrating on right now.

Collins: Regional funders can do a great deal. You don't have to be a national funder to ultimately engage with this issue of arts advocacy. You didn't ask me, but let me tell you anyway.

At the Irvine Foundation two years ago, we took a year to look at the state of the arts in California. We talked to hundreds of people, captured their best thoughts, documented those best thoughts. And these were folks in government; these were folks who were practicing in arts organizations, grassroots, and big, large anchor institutions, other funders, scholars, campus-based people of one sort or another.

And ultimately we came up with a report called *Recommitting to the Arts*, which actually took the place of our annual report that year. We determined that it was such an important issue that this would become our annual report, keeping in mind that we fund across a whole host of other fields.

We then made it a point to see to it that that report ended up on the desks of most CEOs in the state, all of the elected officials throughout the state, editorial boards and the rest, and tried to make the case that funding for the arts and the support of the arts is everybody's business. That was kind of the key phrase that launched this campaign.

It's the sort of thing that I don't need to tell anybody in this audience, it is something you can't do once and forget it and leave it alone, because it ultimately goes away. So you have to stay at it and stay at it and stay at it.

But I do think that the bully-pulpit, particularly with foundations that have standing because they have been working in this field for a number of years and understand the nuances and the subtleties and the complexities of this whole field, can in fact raise up for public consideration and understanding of the arts that most people simply don't get from any other source. They certainly don't get it from the media; they certainly don't get it from single arts organizations themselves. So there's oftentimes, I think, a role for foundations to play in terms of complicating people's thinking about what is this thing called the arts and what role do the arts play in the region? And it's the sort of thing that I think can be done by other foundations as well.

Question: My name is Peter Copin. I'm the president of the Copin Family Fund, a small family foundation in San Diego.

I liked your question at the beginning, which was to look through the wide-angle lens first and get some sense of the context in which funding for the arts exists. However, I noticed that, and for good reason, the context was national or local or regional. But the context responses were not global. And at the same time, Arch mentioned how the profound changes that have to do with a global economy are affecting everything. And one example was the percentage of increase or decrease in family income.

If we look globally and just make a comment, for example, that the population is going to be doubling or going to be ten billion people in 20 or 30 years; the rate of degradation of the planet; most of the people of the world are going to be poor in that ten billion; the potential for terrorism, suffering, and so forth and so on. If that's the context then a question that has not been addressed yet that I would like to open a space to converse about is, what is the role, or what might be the role of funding in the arts within the global context?

Why? Because we haven't defined the term here today, what do we even mean by arts? But let's assume we mean something to the effect of the nurturing of the human spirit, of the human heart, of the quality of life, or something of that

nature. If we live in a global economy, what can we do about that in the domain of funding for the arts?

Jones: I would, first, take us back to the old adage: think globally; act locally. I mean, that is the point I was trying to make. The world is coming to us in Boston. People from all over the world, bringing their cultures, their different ways of doing things. And we need to understand them. And this is happening everywhere. People are moving around and communicating and so forth. If we don't begin to understand one another better, and share our human condition that is more fundamentally the same than it is different, we're not going to be able to get along together.

As it's happening here in the United States, so it is happening in every other place in the world. And in fact, we will understand more about what is going on in human society across the world, if we understand ourselves and the people that we live with. It's not different. And I don't think many of us understand that.

So the more that we fund programs and people in their activities that can project this to us in a way that is immediately understood, and through the arts somehow, it does seem to speak right to people, they get it.

Gillies: Yes, but we live in an economy, we live in a world of technology where we now communicate through the Internet globally. And all I'm suggesting is, as people who are sensitive to the arts, we ought to be more spacious in our thinking and use this technology to have a global, real, human-to-human communication and make the global village real, just as the village or the city of Boston is real. Do you see what I'm saying?

Collins: I think that point is well taken. The problem at a national level is that there's still a great deal of residual, post World War II, egocentric thinking about the United States. We're the smartest, the best. It always comes as a shock when we find out that amongst, "developed" nations, we're at the bottom of child development, the bottom of this, the bottom of that. To be in touch with arts from all over the world, and interchanges, and in addition to

what we get through the immigration process, is tremendously important.

In fact, if you really wanted to think about it strategically and if you're trying to resuscitate the notion of "We the People" you might find that the best way would be to go globally and find out that there are a whole bunch of people out there who do have values that can teach a great deal. And maybe in that way we can cause a renewal of our own sense of a people rather than as a conglomeration of consumers and corporations.

So I think you're on to it. It's an interesting technical and practical problem for foundations who are licensed in the United States to be able to give money overseas, but it's doable. And I think it's a very good point.

Avery: We don't give money overseas, but since 1985, we've had a program to send people to China on what we call an avocation adventure. It's people who want to do something not career-related in China, except we make an exception for the arts. It's run out of Los Angeles in that the people who apply to the program are connected with a variety of colleges and universities in the LA area.

In the last round of the program, two years ago, we added California Institute for the Arts to our group of people who could apply to the program; it's open to staff, students, faculty, and recent alumni. And that just exploded the program in this terrific way. We got an enormous number of applications from Cal Arts and they were fantastic and creative.

We send people to China with the purpose of connecting with people, since we're about individuals, of making person-to-person contact with people in China and sharing with them and learning from them. And so we have people over there who are interested in stone instruments, and creating and playing them and who spend months and months over in China.

And so even though we are small, we run this program on this international level and it's been fantastic!

Collins: Thank you. Let's be sure we have others.

Question: My name is Jeannine Antoine, and I'm on the allocations committee and the board of directors for Vanguard Public Foundation, which is a local foundation in Northern California; and we're tied in with the Funding Exchange.

My question and concern is that I would like to find out what the foundation community is doing in terms of diversifying not only the recipient organizations, but also the staff and where possible, the board composition as well. Because I think it's very important to be able to access those communities that have been excluded traditionally. And you don't really know whereof you speak unless you include the people that need inclusion. I'm curious about the movement or efforts about diversity and inclusion on staffing and board levels for foundations.

Jones: Well, in keeping with the other kind of funding that we do in the community, this has been a central core of our arts funding. In espousing the message, the notion that the arts are central to any healthy community, then the kinds of things that we fund are spread around all over the community, and a part of our objective is to make the arts accessible to groups that haven't had access before.

We fund things in the community that are their own – community folk festivals, and cultural festivals. The only funding that we give to the large institutions are supporting efforts to open themselves up in various kinds of ways. After, I don't know how many years, the Museum of Fine Art in Boston has made a commitment to diversify its staff and board and volunteer cadre and we give them a grant, to help them to do that.

After I don't know how many years, the Boston Symphony Orchestra has finally played a concert in its own backyard, in Roxbury, and is going to do one in the big park that's over near the minority and low-income neighborhood. I mean, this doesn't seem like much, but I'm telling you, I don't know how old these institutions are. They were founded at the last turn of

the century, and they are now just realizing that there's a whole community there that they need to reach out to in different ways.

So this is written into our guidelines, for all of the organizations that we fund, they have to submit data about the makeup of their board and staff and so forth. And this is a part of a conversation that we have with them to encourage them to continue to think to creatively and with commitment to diversifying their organization.

Collins: Other comments?

Gillies: I want to add that this goal has to be constantly pursued. I was struck the other day by the front page of *The New York Times*, where President Clinton was signing the bank modernization legislation and there were 17 white men in attendance. So while we correctly worry about our own institutions, we have to, again, think of ways to comment on that. I thought about writing a letter to *The New York Times*, but I have to be candid with you, I thought well, which fight am I fighting? You have to figure that out. But I wonder if I didn't write the letter because I was a little afraid that my board chairman might say, "What the hell are you doing writing about Bill Clinton?" But that's the tension that we should be working under.

Question: I'm Ed Pauly from the Lila Wallace Reader's Digest Fund, and I wanted to return to the earlier thread about evaluation. I'm an evaluation person... [laughter] and I share your condemnation of evaluations that mindlessly track short-term results and evaluations that foolishly count the wrong things.

The arts are not the only field that have suffered from small-minded and badly conceived efforts to measure and track and assess results. People in education and healthcare, even the military can tell you horror stories that will rival your own about dumb measurements.

So the observation that foolish studies are not worth the money that they cost is absolutely correct and is one that should be a warning to everybody who ventures down the evaluation road.

I guess the question that I struggle with, and I'm interested in learning from others about is, are there things that you would like to learn from the work of your grantees that are difficult to capture through personal testimony? Are there things that you would like to learn and that you would like other people to learn about the accomplishments of your grantees that are difficult to transmit through personal testimony? And if there are, how are you managing to get those lessons captured and to get them out?

Collins: Well, I like the choice of wording that you used because it has to do with learning. And I think we're all in that business in one way or another. And let me step out of my moderator chair for just a minute to suggest that I happen to be one who believes strongly that the arts are not different in the respect that there is opportunity for learning in all that we do in support of the arts.

I think the great challenge for funders in the arts and foundation heads who actually have programs in the arts, is to be clear about what it is that we're trying to achieve in that program. So clarity up front is absolutely crucial.

If we can posit some theory of change, what it is that we hope for, what it is that we aspire to, what it is that we're hoping to accomplish by funding in this arts program, and then agree upon what kinds of milestones and benchmarks we'd be looking for at the end of some specified period, whether it be three years, five years or ten years, yes indeed we have moved this ball down the field a bit. We're not counting widgets in that regard, but we are in fact looking at attitudes, behaviors, understandings within the community that relate especially to what it is that we're trying to achieve in the arts.

I think an awful lot of foundations shy away from that first tack of being clear about what we're doing in the arts in the first instance, and put together a position, if you will, a theory of change, that really undergirds what we're trying to accomplish in that field. Then it becomes if not easy, certainly a good bit easier to be able to understand whether or not we're getting there or not.

So I quite agree with you, and I also would agree that it's going to be tougher in boards of directors and in our boards of trustees in multi-purpose foundations, at least, to be able to have the arts continue to get their fair share. Because this is happening in virtually every other area of domain of funding in the big foundations. And if the arts continue to say we are different, can't do it, we're going to have to depend upon anecdotal support. Frankly, I think those who hold in trust these institutions, have every right to challenge that proposition.

So I've gone on too long, and I'm sorry. But others in that regard?

Question: My name is Rob Hankins. I am at the Public Corporation for the Arts in Long Beach, California.

I'd like to throw out a pretty hard question, and also an easy question. The hard question is: I think we need a new definition for the arts in the 21st century, and since this is one of the most creative and intelligent groups I've ever seen onstage, I would love to have anyone up there either agree or disagree with me and then give me what you think a new definition for the arts in the 21st century might be.

The easier question is, funding sources do go through an awful lot of conniptions trying to give out money. Other than the Durfee Foundation, what are you doing to make the process easier and faster.

Jones: That's hard. The first part, redefining the arts for the 21st century, I hope we are doing that through our work, through the organizations that we fund. That they will be the ones who will redefine it and we can hold that up.

Making the process simpler is difficult, and let me say that it's not entirely the funders' fault. I have this bone to pick with potential grantees who want to know as specifically as possible what it is that you want to fund. And if you're trying to have a creative process where you allow those who are actually doing the work out there to bring you their most creative work, we can't sit in our offices and hope to define that specifically.

But when we say, generally this is what we are about, bring us these creative programs, obviously, we haven't got all the money in the world so you're not all going to get funded. Grantees balk at that. "If you had just been much more specific, you know, we could have gotten the money." And I think we're focusing.

Well, I don't want to go on too long, but I think it's not just about getting the money, it's about your work. I want to hear about your work. What is it that you're committed to? What is it that you're trying to get out there?

I think it ought to be a process that's creative, that joins and gets the money where it should be. I don't know that making it shorter, when there's got to be real human connection and understanding, necessarily ends up in the best grants.

Collins: Arch is now going to redefine the arts in the 21st century.

Gillies: Well it's an important question. In the little group we had at breakfast, we were talking about strategy and this problem defining creativity. So, then you say, well, yes, but then there's the arts and the arts for the ages and quality and excellence.

So I think we have to rethink that old debate. I was reading a book coming out that was talking about Joseph Beuys and Andy Warhol, and they knew each other and painted each other, or at least Andy painted Joseph Beuys. And this writer was talking about how Warhol personified the person who was reflecting this consumer society, this tremendous global economic force that was at work and all of its disconnects and all of its problems. And you can get into a debate, whether he was in favor of it or against it or neutral or whatever, but he was certainly reflecting it and certainly enjoyed part of it, the entertainment part of it.

Of course, Beuys is also reflecting all those forces, but had a more kind of deeper reaction as to life forces and life and death, and tried to create out of his reaction to life, tried to create a politics that he pursued that Warhol wasn't about to get involved in. But if we think of the arts as expression and as political in the small

seed, it's the same book, it's some quote about how art and politics are forever connected and always must be connected, small seed politics.

So I guess I would say in the 21st century that we have to put creativity and expression as central to our experience, and have the confidence to build on that centrality and create political force as a result.

Collins: Here comes a really tough question. This is Peter Pennecamp who always tries to embarrass me publicly.

Question: No, after that last question, I think Rob's got the title, and so this is an easier one.

Earlier you talked about policy, and I'm not knocking policy, but if it's not built on practice, it doesn't have legs, either in Sacramento or Washington or any place else.

Not very long ago, the efforts to try to democratize arts was called Expansion Arts. A.B., I don't know if he's here; he was here last night. A.B. Spellman at the NEA took an amazing amount of crap, first in Congress but even more importantly from the arts organizations and philanthropy in America, for pushing what people saw as affirmative action in the arts. That's how it was always dismissed. I mean, and that went on for years.

I don't know everyone's work, but certainly at Durfee, if you look at the list of artists that Durfee is funding, it's what expansion arts talked about. I don't think anyone can debate the quality of those artists and the backgrounds they come from.

If you look at what Anna is funding in Boston and the list of organizations and the work that they're doing, it's a whole other level that's beginning to see the promise of work that, you know, 15 years ago, was still the toughest work in America.

And I guess the question, since I really believe the policy right now doesn't have legs because there isn't enough practice, is what do you think is transpiring in the boardrooms of the foundations? How ready are boards to go the nine yards, given the fact that a lot of this is

about class and the boards tend not to be expansionist?

Gillies: It's a point of privilege to identify what Emily Platt and Pamela Platt have done over the last ten years at Warhol. We would certainly hope that the list of artists and the exhibitions that we've supported, would fit your criteria.

I think we have to have the courage of our convictions. We'd be surprised how boards, even the most fuddy-duddy bankers, can be persuaded by the courage of one's conviction.

I think we shouldn't be afraid of our boards. I think we should tell it like it is, and support the stuff we want. In some respects, they're as befuddled as we are for sure. They're perfectly aware of all these considerations we've talked about, and it's a matter of leadership, I think. I think it's just a matter of doing it.

Avery: I think there's a huge opportunity – thank you for the nice things that you said about Durfee – but I think there is a huge opportunity for family foundations, especially, to take the lead in things. I feel like we're able to do what we do mainly because most people aren't paying any attention to what we're doing at all! [laughter] And that's a good thing.

And we have so much more freedom than the Irvine Foundation does, in what direction they're taking. Everybody's watching and talking about why they didn't take this direction. And if we start a program, as we have in the past, and it turns out it's not working quite that well, then we take it in a slightly different direction, nobody really cares. It gives us a lot of freedom because we can be flexible; we can take risks and end up with good results and sponsoring interesting projects and fitting in in places where the larger institutions aren't going because it's too small for them.

But I would want to encourage people to take advantage of their ability to fly under the radar and work that way.

Jones: Our strategy as a community foundation is just the opposite. We're very visible and we're a public charity and you can leverage that. If you can document the community

support of what you're doing, you can use that to keep yourself funding this kind of thing. So we, in fact, use our visibility and our mandate to be accountable to the community to leverage support for what we're doing.

Collins: You know, in a funny sort of way, the tougher sell for a board like Irvine is the policy piece, as opposed to the on-the-ground-make-it-happen piece, the practice piece. It's oftentimes a very tough sell for the very reason that I think you were suggesting a moment ago, Peter, that there aren't many legs under that policy work and it's easier, I think, for lay people, even well-informed lay people, to see how you can have impact through practice. There's kind of one remove on the policy side.

That having been said, let me tell you a few years ago, when John Orders was running our program, one of our board members in a moment of some distress, said "John, this docket looks more like social science than the arts." And John reddened a bit, as I recall, and then responded by discussing that theory of change that suggested that this work indeed was the arts, and talked about how we are defining the arts and their role in community. It was not the way that particular board member was comfortable thinking about the arts and it certainly was not the way that person had lived his experience with the arts over time.

Somebody earlier said that the learnings are absolutely essential. The learnings are critical in sharing with board people. And again, I would go back to the earlier position that you've got to be clear about what it is you're trying to achieve and then fighting those battles each step of the way, as you're bringing more supporters and adopters in at the board level.

Question?

Question: [Vanessa Whang] I recently joined the staff of the National Endowment for the Arts. And my question is for the panel or any of my colleagues in the room. It's about leadership transitions and about new people entering the field of the arts. Younger people entering the field of the arts who really aren't particularly looking at the nonprofit paradigm to do their work. And also with developments in new

technology with the streaming audio and video technologies that are being developed for the Web. And artists taking advantage of putting their work out there and really totally taking a curve, not only around nonprofit organizations but also around the for-profit recording industry.

I was just wondering, is there anybody in the room who is starting to try and look at this shift that's going on? Is the nonprofit arts field going to become moribund because the context that it really grew up in has totally changed? And that's my question, whether anybody here, particularly since we're here in northern California, is looking at that work?

Question: I'm Laura Zucker with the LA County Arts Commission and I saw Jack Meyers from the Getty here. The Getty started a fabulous program to pay students to intern with nonprofit visual arts organizations over the summer. It pays them \$3,000 apiece and it pays each of the host organizations \$400. And it's been going on for six years in LA. It's an incredible program. They've done some outside evaluations of the program that showed that well over half the students involved in the program were influenced as to their career choices or changed their majors as a result of the program.

Because that program has been so successful, we in LA County were able to get an equal amount of money to host an equal amount of interns, 155 a year, in the performing arts; the Getty program is for visual arts. They provide an incredible set of educational opportunities for the interns over the course of the summer, from a career day to field trips to arts organizations. And they're going to be providing those same opportunities to our interns as a part of this partnership, an in-kind contribution.

So I think this is one of the best of the public/private partnerships that we all talk about. And we will be turning out 300 young people a year who will have direct experience in nonprofit arts organizations and I think this will have an impact.

Collins: Terrific. An example. A good one.

Your question prompted this thought on my part. A couple of weeks ago, Independent Sector had its annual meeting in Los Angeles. And in a weak moment a year ago, I think Cora and I both had something bad to eat one night because she agreed to be the chairman of this program committee for the year, and I agreed to be the program chairman for the Independent Sector conference in Los Angeles, which is now happily behind me.

But one of the sessions was fascinating, and I'm sure there were many that were fascinating. The one that I saw had three young women, who were not working in the arts, but they were running grassroots, empowerment organizations, largely people of color empowerment organizations, and in the course of their presentation, they made this observation. They said, this organization does not speak to us at all, number one.

Number two, we do not think of ourselves as nonprofit organizations, we think of ourselves as SWAT teams, as task forces, as action-focused to accomplish a particular task. We don't see ourselves as living forever. We don't see ourselves as being 501(c)(3)s and regulating. We see ourselves as responding to a need, and largely all of us has been informed by the way we work with technology.

And it was a stunning – and I'm not doing it justice as I describe it – but it was a stunning statement agreed to by these three young women of color, who basically were talking to a group that looked not dissimilar to this one. And basically saying that, if in fact we're going to find a dance to do together down the road, you all are going to have to figure out where we fit and we're going to have to determine whether or not we do fit in there. And I think this is true in leadership in most for-profit organizations today, not just not-for-profits. I mean, the corporate sector is facing it as well.

Cora has been thinking about this and has convinced me that at least one response one foundation might be willing to launch, is to create something, and we're doing it this fall: innovation fellows. We are going to have a handful of innovation fellows join us at the foundation out of all kinds of walks of life. We happen to believe that they're going to likely

have a very, very strong base in technology. But their challenge and their charge is going to be to come and to think creatively with us to try and see whether or not they can help us make connections and find relationships and re-define, if you will, that world that we're trying to work in, called the not-for-profit sector. So that's another response that at least one other foundation is engaged in.

Question: I'm Janice Shapiro from the Pew Charitable Trusts, and about a month ago, I attended a Delaware Valley Grantmakers conference. And there was a woman there from an organization in Boston called New Profit Inc. You may know her. She was talking about this whole trend regarding venture philanthropy, which is not something I know a lot about. But one of the things I asked her about is, is there a trend that she sees for venture philanthropists to start investing in arts and cultural organizations? And her response was that that will probably come in phase two. Right now, they're much more interested in social service kinds of organizations.

And my question is, is there a role that foundations can play in leveraging this kind of support from this new wave of venture philanthropy to support arts and cultural organizations?

Gillies: Someone told me the other day that one of the characteristics – and he was in a position to know some of these people – that one of the characteristics of the men and women who started these highly successful companies and now themselves are high net worth individuals, is that they like to control things. I mean, they, you know, dropped out of Harvard in order to start this company which became Microsoft and they're not going to give up control of anything that they do. So I think it's a big job. I hate to use the word, but to confront, educate, get into a conversation with those individuals. I'm not sure it's as easy pickings as one might think, because of this sense of control that they have.

Jones: On the other hand, I think it would be a mistake even getting back to the previous question, to think that the nonprofit arena is the only venue for this kind of work. I think you're

committed to what you want to see happen and then you explore everything. I mean, I think what's happening on the Internet is exciting, but I don't necessarily think it's going to take over completely any kind of person-to-person contact and work on the arts just because it is now so hot. I think people are exploring its uses and some of them will be discarded over time because they're not effective, but I think we have to push every button we can!

Collins: Two thoughts on venture philanthropy. First of all, I don't know what it is. [laughter] And secondly, we practice it. [laughter] Thirdly, I would say that I think the arts are absolutely *hot* for venture philanthropy! Why do I say that? Because most of the folks who indeed would like to say that they are venture philanthropists, and I think there are some who are trying very, very hard to try and carve out that territory and lend meaning to the term, are keenly interested in innovation; are keenly interested in creativity; are keenly interested in the linkages and the connections between and among boundaries of disciplines. These are very, very thoughtful, creative folks. And as I have opportunity to look at the full range of folks who are on the receiving end of philanthropy, there's no more creative group than the folks in the arts.

So my guess is that once again the challenge is to craft the position; define the case; make it; help folks understand how all of this relates to larger social purposes, and there would be a tremendous opportunity for the arts and venture philanthropy.

Question: I'm Bill Ivey. I work with Vanessa at the National Endowment for the Arts. [laughter] I have a question, but before I ask the question, I must comment that I think the intersection between the for-profit and the not-for-profit sector is a very important area for all us to be, perhaps not working in yet, but at least exploring. And that the sense of locating mission-driven organizations so that we're not necessarily talking about the virtuous not-for-profit and the venal for-profit. But looking for those quality mission-driven organizations that tend to be around the intersections, I think can be of great value. I don't think we have the

mechanisms in place yet to engage them, but I think it's something that's out there that can work very well for us. The small presses and small record labels that are very similar whether they're for-profit or not-for-profit. But that's not my question.

The question is, and I'd love to have those of you who are engaged in the work of multi-purpose foundations comment on this. Whether you feel the arts within the context of overall giving is a growth industry, something that's flat, holding its own; or as new wealth comes into the foundation world, are the arts (because we haven't perhaps established value the way some of you were suggesting we should) are we actually in a sense falling behind? And I think this is a question that could be addressed to many in this room, but I'd love to hear those of you who are either observers or participants in the work of multi-mission foundations, talk about how the arts are faring in that context.

Jones: I don't have hard data, but my sense is that it's a growth industry. And my concern is that the arts have tended to be a growth industry in up-economic cycles. And then when it's down, they get swept aside. And my concern is that we not allow that to happen this time. I mean, there will be a down cycle. So I mean, people feel more flush now and so they feel they can indulge themselves to some extent. And that's the way I'm reading it, and I'm really playing it for all it's worth, to try to get as much out of it now as it's up, so then we'll have something to hold on to, to keep being the bully-pulpit, if you will, and to keep the funding up when the cycle turns down. Because that's what I've seen.

This is what happened in Massachusetts, where we had an arts advocate par excellence that over 15 or 20 years made the case to the state, and got the budget up almost to 30 million dollars or so, and then when the economic downturn came in Massachusetts, the legislature just swept us all entirely aside. So you have to start from ground zero again. I don't think we can keep doing that and hope to make any real progress in the arts. So we've got to do something to hold on to the gains, and I think we need to really think creatively about that.

Gillies: I put a big, heavy caveat on this optimism about the upturn. I think as in the case of average family income, I think there's very much a haves and a have-nots going on here. I think the Metropolitan Museum is probably doing better than ever. I think the downtown Manhattan alternative organizations are not doing well. I'm not quite sure of my data either but I bet you some of the mainstream national organizations – the American Red Cross or something – is doing fine. I think the National Campaign for Freedom of Expression is not doing well.

So I think you have a very mixed situation and it doesn't take much class orientation to see, when you analyze it, that those arts organizations that were "mainstream" and hook into rich patronage, are probably doing pretty well and they have political allies.

Those arts organizations that are a little more edgy, that are a little more connected to communities, that are a little bit more willing to show artists that are challenging some of our politics in one way or another, I don't think they're doing as well. So I think that's an issue that it behooves us all to look at very carefully.

Avery: In arts, I think it's growing in the sense that we're trying to figure out more ways to bring art into everything that we do. And I would hope that that wouldn't drop off because we're trying not to just do separate arts programming.

Question: [Alberta Arthurs] I wanted to respond to Bill Ivey's question in much the same way that you did. I think the growth we're seeing is a growth in attention in the settling of the arts into many different places, and you've all spoken to that. And I think in that sense, it is a growth industry, although it may be hard to demonstrate in some other ways. We can hope it is and we can see the signs of that, I think.

But I also wanted to throw out a thought back to the question of evaluation and learning, and related to the question of policy. Evaluation is on all of our minds and I'm sympathetic to the people who are kind of impatient with evaluation assessment, benchmarks, accountability, all

those terms we have borrowed from outside, though I recognize their relevance and the fact that we need them. But the learning aspect of this is extremely important. And I believe that this is an area in which foundations are really in their silos. When we do do these things, we do them for the program we've designed to meet a guideline or an objective or a goal within our own foundation, and we turn it back on ourselves.

If this is going to be a really valuable exercise, it seems to me we need to know a lot more about what each other are assessing, evaluating, or more importantly, learning. Because out of that could come some of the information that we know we're lacking and which is why the Center for Arts and Culture, and Pew's new initiative are so important. We don't have information; we don't have data; we don't have evidence. We don't even have good anecdotes. We don't even have good tales that have been told to us.

So to the extent that we are doing evaluation and trying to do it carefully, instead of boring ourselves with it, perhaps we can find a way of getting it lifted to a point where it's meaningful to the field.

Collins: Well said. Good.

Comment: [Cynthia Gehrig] I'm interested in that topic myself because I think that opportunities are whizzing past us at the speed of light and we're missing them. Media is not just a transmission of arts and cultural information, it's also a site for creativity. Just as choreographers make dancers, media artists are going to make interactive programming for us that will become just as absorbing.

One thing I would mention as an example of something that's whizzing by us is that the FCC gave direct broadcast satellite channels to DIRECTV and EchoStar. DIRECTV allowed nonprofits in the U.S. to apply for public access DBS channels. Those nine channels were awarded last week primarily to news and information, religious, and learning channels. And only one, at the most two, of those are being controlled by people who would see

independent artistic voices as having a place on that interactive satellite broadcast.

So most of us are old, but the artists that we're going to be supporting from this point forward are going to have such amazing abilities in these areas of media that I would urge us to think about exactly what Vanessa has raised.

Collins: Well done. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for being a responsive audience. Thanks to our panel.

**THIS IS ONE OF A SERIES OF PROCEEDINGS FROM THE GIA 1999 CONFERENCE,
STRENGTHENING THE ARTS THROUGH POLICY, PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE**

Transcriptions of proceedings from GIA's 1999 conference, *Strengthening the Arts Through Policy, Performance and Practice*, are published as individual papers. These proceedings are also available on the GIA website at www.giarts.org.

ORDER FORM

Please indicate the number of copies requested for each individual sessions. Each GIA member organization may request one set of proceedings at no cost. For additional copies, please include a postage and handling fee of \$2.00 per session requested.

- ___ Arts and Philanthropy in the 21st Century
- ___ An Artist's View: Ann Chamberlain
- ___ Building An Arts Policy Community
- ___ Supporting Individual Artists – Models That Work
- ___ Getting Value From Evaluations
- ___ Audience Participation in the Arts
- ___ Arts and Youth Development Getting Down to Business
- ___ Myths and Models of Collaboration: Creating Strategic Alliances That Work
- ___ Address by William Ivey, Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts
- ___ Working in the Profit-Nonprofit Intersection
- ___ Leadership Development and Transition in the Arts
- ___ General Operating Support Programs
- ___ What's Next: Going Off-Road with the Arts as Venture Philanthropy

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

Email _____

___ Additional sessions requested @ \$2.00 each = \$_____ enclosed.

Charge my bankcard # _____ Name on card _____ Expiration date _____

Make check payable to Grantmakers in the Arts

Fax to: (206) 624-5568, or

Mail to: Grantmakers in the Arts 604 West Galer, Seattle, WA 98119-3253