Grantmakers in the Arts
2001 Conference

Culture Influencing Community Change

Proceedings from the Conference

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

Built to Last:
Linking Communities of Grantees

Session Designers:	Adam Bernstein Arts International
	Bethany Wall Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation
Moderator:	John Kreidler Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley
Panelists:	Beth Kanter New York Foundation for the Arts
	David White Dance Theatre Workshop

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

Bernstein: Welcome to the session this morning. Before I introduce John Kreidler, who is going to moderate today's session, I want to acknowledge and thank Bethany Wall of the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, who co-designed this session with me and, truth be told, did the bulk of the work in organizing. Once again I am able to "piggy-back" to get some credit and use this for my resume.

After a career in government for twenty years, John Kreidler worked at the San Francisco Foundation as senior program executive for Arts and Humanities and later as acting director. In 2000, he became the executive director of Culture Initiatives Silicon Valley, supporting the holy trinity of arts education, public participation in the arts, and organizational development of not-for-profit cultural organizations.

As well as being a funder, John is also a student of philanthropy. In 1993, his thoughtful analysis of the evolution of institutional private philanthropy, called "Leverage Lost," led many in the foundation community to reexamine their own patterns of support.

I believe his most important legacy has been as a dean not only to the Bay Area funding community but as a mentor to many of us. Always willing to give his time and share his insights, which he has graciously agreed to do today as moderator of this panel. John?

Kreidler: Thank you, Adam. All of us who know Adam know that his resume needs lots of work. Of course, that's not true.

Let's talk a little bit about the purpose of the panel today. A lot of us who have been in grantmaking are accustomed to working with cultural organizations individually and having concern about their advancement as long-lasting institutions. There are a lot of us who have tried to, in certain ways, canonize that process of developing cultural organizations over periods of time. Perhaps most notably in this country, it is the legacy of the Ford Foundation National Arts Stabilization Fund. Now there are a variety of national and regional organizations for which that is the principal purpose, to try to advance individual organizations.

I think a lot of us, as well, have had the experience over the years of seeing times – from the perspective of being a funder in a community foundation, this is certainly true – when supporting individual organizations just isn't going to get the job done when there is some larger need to be undertaken that affects a whole community's worth of arts organizations, or a whole discipline, or some cohort of organizations, or individual artists, or even unincorporated arts groups.

That is what this panel is all about today. We'll discuss two very fine examples of programs ongoing at this moment that are dealing with whole sets of individuals and organizations and trying to understand the inception of these programs, how they fared over the years and what the role of funding has been throughout their evolutions.

One of the two programs that we're going to be addressing here is called Knowledge in Technology, also known as KIT, which is a program represented here by Beth Kanter, and deals with the matter of access to technology. Not just access to technology from the standpoint of experts providing service to individual organizations, but trying to empower individual cultural groups to be able to use technology.

To my far right is David White, who is representing Dance Force, also known as New York Dance Force, which is working with individual dancers, choreographers, dance ensembles throughout the state of New York. That is a project that has been going for eight years. Beth's project has been going for three years.

Kanter: It's a program of the New York Foundation.

Kreidler: Yes. We have very anxious panelists here. We're going to spend some time describing what these programs are and how they got going, and my job is to give a lot of credit to the two people who are going to be speaking here and then stand back and mostly moderate this.

First is Beth Kanter. What I want you to know about Beth is that – because I was delighted to hear this – she is professionally trained and for a brief time in her career was a professional flautist. I found it very compelling that she is a founding member of an organization called FAMCAM, which is an organization of families with adopted children from Cambodia.

But on the side of her resume that's dealing with her current work, she is an independent nonprofit technology consultant working primarily with arts organizations. Since 1994, she has worked with the New York Foundation for the Arts on a range of technology projects, though her specific reason for appearing on today's panel is to discuss the past three

years of her work with NYFA's KIT program, Knowledge in Technology program.

Beth has also worked with the Alliance of New York State Arts Organizations on their "e-Leadership" program and has served on the faculty of the Empire State Partnership's summer seminar.

David R. White, to my far right, is certainly, in my estimation, one of the great icons on the contemporary performing arts landscape. Oh, I didn't mean that as a joke. He thinks and acts on a very grand scale and has done so for a long time and certainly shows no sign of slowing his pace after more than a quarter-century as the executive director and producer at New York City's famed Dance Theater Workshop, DTW.

David conceived and directed for thirteen years DTW's National Performance Network, NPN, which now continues to thrive as an autonomous organization, and he continues to serve as executive director of the Suitcase Fund.

David is the recipient of numerous awards, including an Obie and New York State Governor's Arts Award. His role on today's panel is to discuss his eight years of experience with New York State's Dance Force, a peer network of dancers, choreographers, and presenters that is based on many of the operating principles that guided the National Performance Network throughout its history.

I'd like to turn now to a series of questions. Over about the next fifty minutes we hope to engage David and Beth in some discussion about the nature of their programs and then we will have at least half an hour to engage everyone in the audience to get into this further about the role of funding in conceiving, implementing, and helping to mature these two very notable programs.

Here's the question I'd like to start with and perhaps Beth could lead off on this. Can you describe the original need and concept that led to the formation of Knowledge in Technology? In other words, what were the founding ideas and needs that you were trying to serve with that program?

Kanter: As many of you may know, NYFA has been an early adopter of technology capacity-building and getting these tools to artists and small/midsize arts organizations to incorporate into their work. Initially starting with ArtsWire, at least ten years ago, that's

where my institutional memory started but it may even be further back.

ArtsWire was an online network for the arts community to communicate with one another. One of the things that we kept experiencing, I don't want to use the word "failure" but I will say "difficulty," in getting the organizations and the individuals to use the tools. There are a whole variety of reasons. There are human issues. The Internet was new at the time.

Underneath, when we dug further, we took a look into the technology infrastructure of the small and midsize organizations and it was horrible. Ancient computers or manual systems. Filing cards. Here we were expecting them to be able to plug in a modem and use a UNIX system and use e-mail when some of them didn't even have a computer in the office, or if they did, they didn't know how to use it or they were afraid to use it.

The idea evolved that we need to look at everything. We need to look at technology as a capacity-building tool, not just the tool. So we need to take a holistic approach. That idea was percolating in '96, '97. ArtsWire was started in the late '80s, early '90s so that idea was in the air.

Within the arts community in New York State, NYSCA and NYFA collaborated around a series of initiatives known as Circuits NYS which was essentially a conference and other programs that addressed this arts and technology thing. Through some initial funding from that program, we were able to design some of our workshops and online resources to gear them towards providing technology planning for small to midsize arts organizations.

In the larger picture, thinking that we don't work in isolation, the nonprofit technology movement was also getting started through organizations like Enpower. There was the National Technology Enterprise Network, at that time called the Nonprofit Sustainability Technology Network. They were looking at things such as benchmarks for effective use of nonprofit technology. And there were conferences going on. That was the genesis.

Kreidler: Was there a specific organization or specific person that formed those ideas?

Kanter: I think it was part of a movement that was happening. I give credit to Ted Berger, his leadership in seeing this need and making a lot of it happen.

Kreidler: David? The inception of Dance Force?

White: Yes. I recall a combination of aspiration and frustration. The aspiration, in part, grew out of what was already over a decade's worth of work with both the National Performance Network and the Suitcase Fund, which is an international program we run which has major concentrations right now in Eastern Europe and along the Mekong River in the countries that share that as a border.

But really about an idea of trying to manage scarce resources. In other words, creative, artistically, leadership, and finally the more pragmatic and prosaic resources, funding or other revenues that might support those things.

The aspiration for the Dance Force, and I can go back later on NPN stuff, and I think M. K. Wegman who runs the NPN now is here, too, and who runs it extremely well.

The aspiration in the state was to bring some of that thinking to a statewide canvas. New York State, like many states or nation-states, is a kind of series of paradoxes. It is New York City, with its huge concentration of creative forces, and then it is a largely rural, tourist-driven economy or Rust Belt economy. Enormous distances that are not well served by transportation, et cetera, et cetera. For years, the New York State Council on the Arts has tried a variety of projects in New Music, theatre, blah, blah, blah to engender a kind of statewide activism.

From the point of view of being somebody who worked in New York City, there were not enough opportunities in the city to feed artists who were indeed New York-based. We might well also not know about artists who were choosing to make bases in other places outside of New York City. Hence there wasn't necessarily a kind of vital community between those people and people downstate.

So, at an open meeting of the dance community with the NYSCA program, I said that I would be willing to try and structure a project. Now, having been through thirteen years of running the NPN as a program area funding sixty organizations in forty states, I didn't really want to go through that again.

So, I said I would like to do this with another organization. In creating it, we approached Pentacle Management, which is a not-for-profit cluster management that, coincidentally, I co-founded in 1975, to

see if we could divide up responsibilities and create a cooperative approach to administering the statewide project, assuming we could put it together.

Ultimately, Pentacle dropped out and the Dance Space Project, which like DTW, is another producing organization in New York, came in and the same division of labor exists. They provide administrative financial underpinnings; we deal with the content, information and technology issues.

In that first year, I approached the New York State Council about putting together a small group that would meet at a midpoint – in this case it was at Skidmore College in Saratoga – and set up a series of year-long discussions about what there were in terms of needs.

The idea here was, can you deepen the relationships between artists and communities? Can you further enhance those relationships between sets of artists and sets of communities?

One of the things that had begun to evolve in my mind over the years from the NPN is an idea that we have all been hearing in various places, but we are all focused on the wrong paradigms about what constitutes institutions and what constitutes other kinds of work, what are the fundamental characteristics of fields as work is created.

If you want dysfunction, you look at Lincoln Center. That's dysfunction, but the issue is that that may not be the most appropriate approach and, for a long time, it had begun "if it walks like a duck and it quacks like a duck…"

Is there another kind of thing that accomplishes institutional ends? Institutional ends, it seems to me, are time-based, these are investments over time in evolutionary behavior. The indicators here are not how many projects you get in a year out of something, but whether you get to a moment of transformation.

The way we wanted to start this was to put a group of people together to just talk. Which is what we did in the NPN. We went to NYSCA, we went to various places trying to ferret out people. Artists, organizations, we felt there had to be an upstate/downstate connection, so a variety of communities from New York City, whether it was H.T. Chan in Chinatown, or myself and the Dance Space Project, which at the time came in as a member but was not formally running it.

There were a variety of centers, from educational institutions to community-based, like Kumba in Hudson, New York, not too far away, which is a community-based dance and drum organization. Also, existing partnerships like the Partners in Dance, so-called, in the Capitol Region, Albany and Schenectady.

We put them down and we said, "What will enlighten your self-interest? What will accomplish your task?" As I said last night, as a kind of failed Marxist scholar of structuralism in the late sixties, I've been fascinated by my own warped version of this kind of structuralism. Which is to try to figure out, as we have done in the NPN, what are the structural common denominators that allow all these agendas to move forward simultaneously without people having to make excuses to others or feel they are being overwhelmed by others.

With that, we made a proposal to the New York State Council which put in a significant amount of money to set up something. We just said to people, okay, do it. We are guaranteeing you money. You tell us what you are going to do.

In return for this, we will meet twice a year, we will do showcases upstate and downstate of artists. We will bring up issues from all of these other places. You will have to do this too.

We now have a group of seventeen organizations from Munson-Proctor-Williams in Utica, to the Huntington Arts Council on Long Island, to the downstate organizations I mentioned, to Kumba, to individual artists in the Albany area, to Garth Fagan's company in Rochester.

And over time now, six years into this, we have funded 116 projects, all independently determined by these people. We have raised $1.25 million, a lot of which has been matched. We support thirty residencies, these are longer-term involvements in these communities, the semi-annual meetings, and an information infrastructure. We have a Web site and what I think is the "killer app" which is LISTSERVs to provide ongoing running documentation of what people's questions and interests and problems are as they go, as opposed to waiting for the fairly useless final reports and documentation which nobody ever shares or reads.

I want to give you an image, and this is the image of a bridled anarchy. Coming up with this kind of

structure that allows a lot of the diversity of activity to take place at the same time that it creates a kind of coherence of form around this stuff and is predicated on an ongoing, deeply invested mutual education process among the participants.

Kreidler: Let me just follow on with that and ask you the question in the way I was asking Beth as well, or I will ask Beth. You were mentioning that early on in the process there was a conference that pulled the dance community together that was, I think, organized by NYSCA.

White: An open meeting.

Kreidler: An open meeting. That is where the idea came up. What I am trying to get at here is what was the influence of the funder in the inception of Dance Force?

White: The dance program at NYSCA wanted this to happen in response. They sat with us throughout this process. We have now also brought in other funding, Phillip Morris, J.P. Morgan Chase, and Culpepper, and some other things that are imminent.

They were at the table the whole time. This wasn't an internal program to NYSCA, which is what other programs had been. This was an external program, but we considered the self-interest of the funder as well. At a legislative level, New York has a per capita restriction on funding so every county has to have a certain amount of money spent relative to population.

If you go from Wyoming County to Kings County, the disparities are huge and there is in some counties, not a lot, or anything really, to spend it on. So the idea of activating work that could benefit counties where work is not indigenous has been an ongoing important concern and it exacerbates the typical political divisions in this state between upstate rural and downstate New York City.

There was a vested interest on the part of the funder, there was a vested interest on the part of the community of artists and the people who loved them, to come up with kind of folkways of proceeding, and at the same time learning to depend not on external decision-makers but through this idea of face-to-face, constantly enforced peer-to-peer at-the-table kind of relationship that people would begin to trust and understand one another, even if they didn't share their agenda. We would depend on them for best-

practices, in terms of solving their own internal problems. Not that in New York we have a prescription for solving something in Buffalo, but Buffalo might look at Rochester or Rochester might look at something on Long Island and see a natural correspondence. That – I think M.K. would agree – has been really the lifeblood of the National Performance Network, that very diverse communities can find in their counterparts a kind of chaos theory in which you have these kind of fractal organizations which enable the whole to move forward.

Kreidler: So the agenda here of the State Council was a political one of, you might say, dispersion. Of getting around the state.

White: Let's be clear here. It wasn't really the State Council, it was really Beverly D'Anne of the dance program who wanted to make dance more important in the state, and perhaps within the State Council, too, I can't address that.

The other thing I want to mention is that this is about people. In these discussions it's all about organizations becoming institutions. This is *all* about people. This is *all* about leadership. When we put the NPN together with groups and when we looked at people, we looked at the level of existing commitment and their ability to have satisfied whatever promises they made in the past, and we said, those are the people that we build this around. This isn't rocket science, that's how you get these kinds of sustainable working relationships, which again manage the kind of scarce and sporadic resources that we all try to go after.

Kreidler: Going back to Beth now, but following the same kind of question. You were saying early on that the New York Foundation for the Arts' leadership was very important. I am assuming also funding came through NYFA. Do you want to talk about the early impetus of NYFA's investment, both in leadership and money in getting this going? How would you describe their motivation for doing that?

Kanter: We were focussed on solving a very specific problem. Initially it wasn't to start a network, as David has described, it was really to solve a real-life problem. How do we help small and midsize non-profit arts organizations harness the power of technology to deliver their programs and services with greater impact?

The answer to that is through strategic technology planning. To effectively do that with limited time and resources within this community that we're helping: how can they efficiently research, evaluate, acquire, and use the technology tools? They can't do it in isolation.

It comes down to what I call the issue of "cranial containment." There is not even one technology consultant who knows everything. You need more than one person to deal with this technology issue.

So our formulation of the network was a tool in a suite of tools that helped organizations solve this issue. There is a "what's in it for me" aspect that is really important. Individuals are getting value out of it but at the same time creating value to the group.

The way it works is, there are four components in addition to the network. It's based on a concept of just-in-time support. People need to know the information when they need to know it, and they need to make sure that they are going to ask it and get a good answer or collection of answers. We have the LISTSERV based on that.

Then we have peer workshops where they are meeting face to face. This is where organizations going through the experience of developing a technology plan have an opportunity to share their celebrations, their frustrations, ideas, resources, because they are going through the program together.

We diagnose readiness. Not all organizations are ready to take this approach. So organizations apply to it; we've developed a set of indicators where we can start to forecast who can benefit from this program. We have learned that over this last three years.

The curriculum includes a greater emphasis on planning, research, how you do lessons-learned research, getting stakeholder input, outcome-based thinking, how you embed that into the technology planning process. Change. Leadership issues.

And, of course, the box and wires. Not so much that we are teaching people to go in with screwdrivers and fix their computers, but we are teaching them the vocabulary and the concepts, so they can effectively ask the right questions of vendors or volunteers, and of their peers.

That's one component, the peer workshops. So it's face-to-face, there is the LISTSERV that goes along

while they are going through the process of developing a plan.

Then we have what we call "one-on-one accessible experts," and this is now a team of technology consultants. The definition of an "accessible expert" in terms of technology is one who can speak plain English and balance the role of providing answers and asking questions. In setting up this environment and culture of peer learning, and the balance between everybody solving their problem and the group creating value for itself, the dynamic of the expert consultant can destroy peer learning.

So we very much work on our methodology of "accessible experts" who can give an answer when it's needed, at the right time, or they will direct them to the right people to ask, or ask the participant the right questions.

It's really important, especially when you are dealing with small or midsize organizations, to be flexible and scalable. The whole balance between a planning process, which requires research and reflection time, and stepping away from the tasks when the organizations have limited resources and they are thinking about what has to be done for tomorrow.

The third area is the products that come out of this work, our print and resource materials. A lot of this is on the NYFA Web site, in the KIT area. We publish onto the Web the lessons learned, the examples, the anecdotes. We capture the experiential that's happening, and how these arts organizations are using technology. That's out there and getting out to a broader group of people.

We have developed print materials, so we have a methodology that started out as a two-page outline in 1998, and is now a notebook.

I also wanted to drill a little bit deeper in the enabling network and how that works and what it is. Because I know it's different from David's project.

Initially, maybe because of some of our earlier experience with ArtsWire, we were a bit afraid of the "N" word and the "Internet" word. I said, "Do we even have to use technology to deliver this program? Can't we just stay away from it for awhile, please?"

So that component came in towards the end, after we had gotten our methodology in terms of planning done; we had the one-on-one and our materials.

The way it works is we have a lifecycle in the network. A set of organizations apply. We work with about eight to fifteen organizations, depending on how many are ready. They come in; there is a grant panel process. Participants are selected based on readiness.

The next six months they go through the program using these various resources – the one-on-one, the print materials, and the LISTSERV – and they write a plan. In our latest iteration, we are working with a partner where there is some money at the end, so…implementation money.

An example of how this might work would be that a KIT participant might decide they are going to deal with this database issue. You know, how we're using and processing our information, it's a mess, we've got to do something about it.

So, the KIT consultant may work with them one-on-one to help them define what their information needs are, what questions they might need to ask of a vendor, go through and provide possible options for software and names of other users within our Network that they might want to ask.

If an organization was working in isolation on this, where would they turn? Would they go to the Yellow Pages? Would they call some colleagues? Where would they go? There is the network. They can post out to the network and say "Has anybody used this software versus that software? And what has your experience been?" Within minutes, they'll get an answer.

Let me talk a little bit about who is answering their questions. Right now we have about a hundred thirty people on the LISTSERV. And the alumni have stayed. I was holding my breath when the first program cycle was over saying, okay, now is everyone going to mass unsubscribe and leave? The only ones that have left are those that changed jobs or changed e-mail addresses and want to re-subscribe with a new e-mail address.

So, we have the current cycle of KIT, the new inductees into the program. We have the KIT alumni, those who have been through the program. We have KIT consultants who we encourage not to answer the questions right away. Not to be the first one to respond. And, while they are working with an organization, to encourage the organization to post onto the LISTSERV.

We also have a collection of what I call other non-profit arts techies, people who are interested in this topic, and the Web master from the National Endowment for the Arts. People we know who work in here and who can answer questions.

With each cycle we're generally working in a local area; we try to get local mentors. Not an organization that is being served, but – for example, in Buffalo we have the head of IT for the large museum there. We're working in Washington, D.C. now, we have a collection of people from larger institutions, arts institutions but also representatives from the different nonprofit technology assistance providers that work with all nonprofits. So this is the collection of people that are on the lists.

There are also what I call – and I've been experimenting with this – proxy relationships. This happens because, again, we tend to work in isolation. We presume originality, that arts technology issues are going to be completely different from any other nonprofit technology issues. To a certain extent that is true, but there are some similarities and there is something to be learned from a different experience.

In setting up this enabling network, we did a lot of research. What are the different networks out there? How do other nonprofit technology assistance providers do this? There's a list of maybe fifteen or twenty LISTSERVs and, like an idiot, I subscribed myself to them. I learned information management skills, just to see, What's the flow, what's out there?

The proxy relationship happens now where someone may post a question. I'll give an example: someone recently asked "What financial software are those of you on Macintosh platforms using, and how does it work for you?"

So within a day, from people on our initial list, we got the four software options, their price, where to get them, where to find out more information, how it integrates with their other software, whether they're happy with the software or not happy with the software, and it's a list of suggestions.

Then I, as the proxy moderator, posted that same question onto these other LISTSERVs. We found that another organization had researched these particular software programs, which were geared for small businesses and you have to make some alterations to make it work for nonprofits. They had a whole curriculum on how to do this, and they were willing to

share it. Someone else said, "Oh, I know the representative of the software company and they're nonprofit friendly and if you can get five or six people on your list to do a group purchase, we can get you a discount."

So five or six people decided to purchase that software and they got a discount. We were able to summarize this information and put it in our curriculum so that the new group that's coming in starts there. They don't end there, because things change.

Kreidler: You both began with dealing with pretty broad needs, covering, in your case, organizations in various states; David's program in New York state.

You both began with leadership, if I'm following correctly, from single funding sources. And now these projects have been going on for, in your case, Beth, for three years. David's case, is it six or eight years now, David?

White: Since '94.

Kreidler: So, say seven years. I'm assuming that there have been a lot of lessons learned along the way. That you've needed to evolve. I may be incorrect in assuming that you've needed to involve other funders along the way in order to keep the programs moving.

Also, as I'm hearing both of you speak, it's not as though either of you represent programs that are capital-intensive, that is, where you need lots of equipment or you need large sums of money, but in both cases they're very relationship-intensive. And meant to be empowering as opposed to simply providing a service to folks.

Talk a bit about how these programs have evolved. Let's start with you, Beth, how the program has evolved, and whether funders have been falling in line behind it or if they have been influencing the directions in which you have been moving. David was using this wonderful term – by the way, I hope everybody is picking up the poetry of our speakers here – "bridled anarchy." What a great term.

Have the funders been standing in the way of that? Have they been influencing that? Or have you been able to take these programs and evolve them according to the needs in the field? Want to start with you, Beth?

Kanter: I think for us, the latter. But I also want to say, when we got started doing this, and I think it happens with all programs, we had a patchwork of funding that came in. It wasn't like a whole package dropped and said, "Design a program." What I just described is three years later, that's not where it started.

We had an idea that we wanted to do, we didn't have all the funding to do it, but we had a small amount to get started. The patchwork of funding came in and the design of the program reflected that. Sometimes we had to retrofit components so it matched the funding, and maybe do things that initially we might not have done that way. Or we learned that wasn't necessarily the best way or most effective way to do it. I think also we were really ambitious starting out. We thought we could change the world with a six-pack.

Also, the different strands that I talked about, they weren't interwoven. We were going for a lot of width, not depth. We had the strands going on separately, serving different audience.

For the workshops, we had forty one-day workshops in New York state, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey. This allowed us to develop a rich curriculum, test the curriculum, develop some trainers that we worked with.

For the one-on-one technical assistance, we used what's known as the "circuit rider" model, where you go onsite in a geographically dispersed area. So, we're working nationally. There were two consultants doing this and they were going everywhere.

We were able to work out a methodology, and develop tools for working one-on-one with organizations to go through this process. In terms of the network piece of it, we were initially looking at a Web site discussion area, sort of a separate entity, which was going to come in at the end and then as we're getting into it, realizing this is just not the right fit.

So what I say is, thank God for program evaluation and outcome-based thinking. We're big fans of logic models. We teach the use of those in technology planning so we thought we should practice what we preach. Let's take a look, how are we doing? How can we make it better? What's working, what's not working, what are the results? Do we need to tweak something or change it to get a better result?

We were getting results with individuals. There was an attitude shift in the way they were approaching technology planning. One-day workshops constantly on the evaluations were getting high marks. Materials were great. We introduced a hell of a lot people to the concept of technology planning. On the one-to-one, we developed our methodology.

On the downside, what we were losing was the opportunity of this information being shared and mined between the groups. In the one-day workshops we kept on hearing from people, "This is a great introduction but I take this notebook, or half the notebook at that point, and I go back to my work and I just forget about it. I don't get it started. You need to break it in half and I need to work with a consultant."

So mid-course correction, what we did was we had another source of funding that allowed us to take the curriculum and deliver it in two half-day workshops with an assignment in between and start the LISTSERV.

Kreidler: Were the funders, as this evolution was taking place, would you describe them as activist or were they relatively passive? In other words, were they in there looking at the results you'd been achieving and saying "Have you thought about this?"

Kanter: Not all of them. Some of them, yes.

Kreidler: So in some cases, they were interacting with you on this. In other cases, they had guidelines, you filed applications according to the guidelines and they were relatively passive.

Kanter: We were looking at the results and coming back and saying, "Initially, we asked to do this but we think we can do it better if we do it this way. Just based on what we learned from the evaluation."

We did the research on different LISTSERVs. And then the other thing we decided was that we were going to consolidate the one-on-one technical assistance with the workshop piece, and that we are going to work in one geographic area.

Kreidler: David? The matter of the evolution of Dance Force and the role of funders and all of that?

White: From my stock of cliches, I would say "It takes a village" to do this stuff. I will say, while NYSCA is involved here, actually when we put

together the National Performance Network, it was the Ford Foundation that actually made a big commitment which ultimately turned into a ten-year commitment. I just want to say, this kind of thinking is not limited to public funders.

The Dance Force has evolved from what was a lot of talk and people getting to know one another and fleshing out a group that we felt was representative of various tendencies in the state, to people really actively engaging in projects. Amazing projects given where some of these people were relative to their geographic place and even their psychological place, given their inexperience.

I think of Pat Glover at Way Upstate Dance. She renamed her organization because she always came to the meetings and she pointed to Potsdam which is at the top of New York and said "way upstate." So she renamed her organization to fit that.

We allowed people to go ahead, to record out on what they were doing, to critique one another's projects. Slowly but surely we began to evolve an idea which, again, was a response to my thoughts about things like NPN which, in the national project… You have to reach to embrace a lot of organizations in order to create something that's truly national – if it's diverse culturally, diverse in terms of region, diverse whatever.

Here we felt that that wasn't the right way to go because there is no assurance that there is funding at the state level to do anything other than at the State Arts Council or, more problematically, in the stew that is the State Legislature.

Going back to Beth's idea of mentors, this idea that as people are there, they become more experienced, they understand these kinds of folkways of how this operates, new people come in. Slowly but surely we developed the idea of a satellite system which this year was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts as a model state project. It surprised us, because the NEA had moved out of a lot of the state project business.

Three sets of organizations worked on this – the Munson-Proctor-Williams Institute in Utica created a Mohawk Valley satellite; the Huntington Arts Council began to take more control of something called the Long Island Dance Consortium which extended in cities all over Long Island; and the Capitol Region, the Albany-Schenectady area, the Partners In Dance,

which was a consortium that had already existed throughout the history and might have been seen as a mentoring consortium for other consortiums.

We created funds where those can be autonomously driven in the local region. We have provided money for them to help hire facilitators to drive their own discussions. There is nothing that says that each region has to act like any other region or report or document, in the same way the projects are different.

Our feeling is that this is a little like smashing the atom. I want to be clear, the idea here isn't about dance, the idea here is about these relationships between artists and communities and creating cultural citizenship.

Let's just face it, the voice that people are speaking with in this project is dance, or sometimes dance dovetailing into theater. But what we're talking about is a kind of cultural citizenship where we raise the bar of behavior inside of communities, which is a bar that I think, quite frankly, nobody has raised as an institutional issue over the years.

What we've found is, since the '80s – I may be wrong about this – but that a lot of grassroots activity which somehow, like weeds, took hold and became tenaciously rooted in the '80s during a period of increasing conservatism, and developed, in fact, these kind of "weed networks" that linked them up with others who were equally tenacious in their missions, all the while being enormously fragile and vulnerable to whatever the weather might be out there of external affairs. As people got buffeted, people could be buffeted by AIDS, people could be buffeted by the culture wars of the early '90s, people could be buffeted by a variety of phenomena – September 11th is an example – that nobody could anticipate and nobody had automatic answers for.

But this idea that it doesn't just "take a village." You have to create a village. I mean in the sense that you have to re-communitize communities, and have to exercise the practice of communities within a hermetic community. In many cases, historically – not of every artist, too, because community-based arts have always been very different – but there has been this sense, and part of it is a lack of self-awareness and self-consciousness in American culture historically. But just a sense of being separate and of not being participatory, but of also having people enforce identities of participation and engagement on you that are not self-derived.

So the idea here is, as you say, you used the logic idea. My feeling is that we use a kind of headlong momentum approach to this, which… I am really not interested in the logical documentation of events as they happen. Because I feel that logical documentation is not, in fact, the material of learning that happens. If we did, we have tons of learned behavior since the early sixties on everything we've done in public and private philanthropy, and in the support system for the arts.

We don't have that, for the most part. The place where we have it is where we have really significant, ongoing oral histories that evolve over time, and that take new forms, but that are that idea of reinforcement, of editorial reinforcement of points of view and of saying "This is what works. This is here. I cannot relate to you unless I sit in front of you."

If I can have tools – and we're just as concerned with technology – in our case dance presents a lot of problems because you have to present it in real time and you need a level of visual detail. That's the hardest thing to provide, particularly the access to those things in current technologies.

But part of this is also that as DTW has grown, for example, DTW has a major digital initiative called DTW Digital which is being funded by the City of New York and a variety of others. DTW itself, through what we learn about digital stuff, will begin to subsidize part of the technology issues for the Dance Force. In other words, it won't be an obligation of the Dance Force, it will be more because we… Again, it's the connection, it's creating the village of villages. You know, how you connect a piece of this puzzle to another puzzle, to the benefit of both. That's one of the things that we're talking about here.

We're talking about topography, we're talking about shaping a landscape, we're talking not about – and we have to get over this – the leadership in this country is in smaller organizations now. We are no longer building giant performing arts centers, except maybe in Phoenix. I mean, we are not just doing that.

What we are seeing is different ways of leading cultural behavior. A lot of that doesn't involve, as I was talking to somebody today… It's not communes because communes break down over who does the dishes. It is about cooperative activity that serves mutual interests, in service to the larger interest.

I sound like I'm pontificating and I apologize to those who already know about it. I say this from deep and precise personal experience, and from my own survivalist mode in this.

I don't want to criticize the funding community as funders in that sense, but I think sometimes we are looking at apples and oranges as what we think of as being result-based. I mean as what we think of as documenting the process that has taken place. That we're looking at outcomes of processes that are like seventeen-year cicadas, they only come around in that cycle. We have to start thinking about seventeen-year cicadas, or not. You have to start thinking about those kinds of ideas.

I want to say, this is about investment in time. Time is as much a factor as money. In the Dance Force, we give grants up to $10,000 a year. These are small grants. Occasionally, some of the people get together and they conglomerate some of that money.

In the NPN, we gave grants from $4,000 to $5,000 to $10,000. This is not about huge sums of money. This is about what that money mortars together, which is the bricks of mutual education, the requirements to practice citizenship within a community of peers, many of whom have very different agendas, just as your neighbors and cohorts in life would have. Then process that and move back out into the community with something that helps to trigger the tools, and for you to then practice.

Just like Tomász Ivarafrowcza who's here has talked about, that really it's the practitioners now who are the new theoreticians, not the academics, not – I hate to say it – the consultants, not the people who are simply facilitating everybody into the pool, but it's about selective and subjective practice that then shows that it is going to affect more people than where it originated from.

I'll stop here.

Kreidler: That was terrific. A couple of things that are true of both of these programs is that if we were sitting here twenty years ago and thinking about the needs that you're both trying to address, we might have thought of founding independent non-profit organizations that would be staffed, that would have sites, and that would acquire equipment. In other words, we might approach it in that mode.

I'm going to use a term that David threw out there: weed networks. The environment in which you exist is not going to support that very institutionalized approach. The more effective and more practical approach is to see if you can set in motion this weed network. It's going to grow, it's not going to be precise. It will have profound effects, nevertheless. It takes time is a point that you're driving at.

Let me just end with a quick question to both of you. Do you find that the funding environment that you're facing right now, after the years that you've been doing this work, is open to that idea of "weed networks?" Just in a few words each. David?

White: Well, I'd have to say yes, because some of those weed networks have moved into funding communities where they are blossoming or doing whatever weeds do in that environment.

Over time there has been a major shift in policy. I'm not a member of the funding community so I'm not sure about the relationship between boards and staff. That's a big dynamic that I think cannot be addressed by this.

But in terms of staffing, there is a real understanding that we are at a point now of conceptualizing differently what the infrastructure of U.S. culture is. And there are people there, and they're beginning to do it. I can cite the Duke Foundation which almost single-handedly has done this relative to presenters and service organizations, trying to reach to artists but also understanding what has happened in past years. Beth?

Kanter: The original question was…open to weed networks?

Kreidler: Yes, well first of all, you're welcome to disagree with the characterization.

Kanter: I like that petri dish analogy. It's a spore, it's not anthrax.

I think that what we have found, going back to previous projects, when you try to put that structure in to build a garden, it even stifles the weeds. There has to be some modeling of behavior, a modeling of what peer learning is. There has to be some building of trust. There have to be certain things there to let the weeds go wild, such as, modeling what peer learning is, establishing trust, building relationships. The network is viewed and actually used as a

shortcut to solving a real world problem. It doesn't exist in and of itself.

White: In a lot of this work, too, we've always said exactly the same thing. We establish a standard of behavior. If people fall beneath that standard in how they treat people, and that conduct, they either drop out or they are dropped out of this. There is a bar of behavior that has to be met in terms of fulfilling these kinds of things.

In the NPN, when we were there, we dispensed about $11 million, so this was centralized money that was just spent out there. It has never mattered to me in the implementation or the success of these programs; whether they had a board that cared about what they did, everything was basically metered by the commitment of individuals to get the job done. That is what has shaped that progress over time. I realize people have to contend with that sometimes, but it is just part of the weather.

A lot of the people – and I can say this also of Eastern Europe – when we started working there in '88 and just before the fall of the governments, the people that we began to identify, to work with, were people who were basically out in the street. They weren't connected with the academies, they weren't connected to the national theaters, they weren't connected to hidebound bureaucracies. They were people who just had an idea.

When we held a meeting of all of those partners in Bratislava a year ago with the board of the Trust for Mutual Understanding, the reality is that many of those original people were still there. A number of them had built buildings and institutions. Others were simply heads of alliances that were pulling off festivals or pulling off this engagement. Single-handedly these people had built an entire map of relationships up and down the East European region.

Now, I would argue that that has more effect than just about any individual institution I can think of. If I had more time, I could think of institutions that have had an impact, but this is institutional impact! This is, walks like a duck and it quacks like a duck.

So it is institutional, and regardless of whether those people could be annihilated by an economic downturn at any given moment, the ultimate outcome is institutional. That's where we have to go if we're going to see achievement in terms of the landscape.

Kanter: Or adopting the idea that we're okay by ourselves but we're brilliant together.

Audience: I haven't heard you speak a lot, David, so I could be misinterpreting code here. I heard you mention "learned models of participation" that are not actually organic. Were you saying that there was a funder intervention into your projects? Like some people were dropping down expectations of what participation looked like which was different than participation you actually saw?

White: In general, our funders, which over the history of the NPN included Ford, Pew, MacArthur, and Lila Wallace, were very open to our methods of trying to figure things out. We weren't interested in formulaic evaluation. Some people wanted more formula out of those evaluations than we wanted to give because we were much more interested in anecdotal histories.

I don't think funders per se influence that. I don't think many of these funders thought that they would be involved with something like this for as long as they were involved. We have to understand that there has to be an environment of fluid resources so people can opt in and out of the process. Foundations, they can change their missions. Boards can get up on the wrong side of bed and decide they want to do something else. Or September 11th happens and other things happen to those organizations. But there has to be this kind of fluid resource base.

The reality is that a lot of funders suddenly saw what had happened over the period of time that they had supported something. In fact, while it might not have been what they automatically expected, there was clearly a dramatic new behavior that had come out that was supporting artists, supporting communities, supporting a breakdown of isolation among the variety of public and cultural communities around the country. That was a desirable outcome by most of the foundations' guidelines.

Audience: Was this a different model than the learned model or something else that was expected? This was an unexpected kind of participation?

White: No, I'm just saying that it isn't a model enforced by the foundations. In other words, this stuff has grown up organically, sometimes with whatever kind of crisis that goes on within the group, but has grown up out of the group's activity. I mean, the

idea is you're letting groups make the policy that best suits them to move their work forward. They get a peer critique.

One of the most important things is that NYSCA has been at the table. The issue is that funders may remove their resources from something, but funders should never remove themselves from the table of engagement with their constituents.

It isn't about receiving a project and deciding whether to fund it. It's about building these things from the ground up together so you see where there is mutuality of interest or not.

Kanter: I want to talk about learned models of participation from the point of view of the participant and the network, and some of the hurdles we've seen. It's always this sort of squeezed-out reflection time.

Whatever you're doing, there's something built into the process where participants are learning how to ask others for advice. That is the part where, once it happens, the weed network takes off. There is this part in the beginning that has to be modeled and nurtured and encouraged.

Audience: I just wanted to ask Beth, when you referred earlier to the readiness on the part of applicants, that those who were ready you took into the program and worked with. Can you characterize, briefly, what the aspects of readiness are for small and midsize arts organizations?

Kanter: This is something that we obsess over because there are certain organizations that are ready, but then what about these others? Generally they have some sort of program plan or strategic plan, whether they've worked with a consultant to develop that, or it's on paper, but they have a sense of what they're doing.

That there's leadership within the organization. There's a willingness to step back and look at the way they're doing their work and consider changing it. They're not facing another distraction or another major project that doesn't leave them the time to do the planning work. It's not just a single person writing the plan, it's a group. They're willing to ask questions of their peers.

We have a complete mix of organizations. We have anywhere from a $100,000 budget up to under a million. So we have a mix.

White: In the history of the NPN, that was multi-disciplinary, and reflected a range of organizations, many, many of which were small and sort of very fly-by-the-seat-of-the-pants. Others were like the Walker Arts Center, et cetera, which were either larger institutions or part of larger institutions like the Institute for the Arts at Duke University.

Audience: There were certain things that both of you laid out as features of learning networks, and they were things like setting up some kind of virtual dialog tool and peer mentoring, and some of that was online and some of it was face-to-face from periodic convenings. That there's technical assistance involved in different ways and sometimes that's with peers and sometimes that's with outside people. Also these little pots of maybe re-granting funding opportunities, whether it's around travel or specific projects. Small amounts of money that go a long way.

Are there certain kinds of structures or certain kinds of practices that give us, as funders, sort of value-added, that we know if we invest in something, there are certain bits of it that are sustainable and certain bits that will always need a certain level of cash infusion because that's just what it takes to keep it going?

I appreciate what you're saying about oral history and about how people make up these things as you go along and that you invent them and it really depends on who you are working with. But it seems like there should be some way to codify this, not to make it rigid and say, "This is the answer. This is the model. Everybody needs to do it this way." But that we can get to the point where you can almost put together, like, an investment plan for knowing that funders have different priorities and boards to answer to, and ways that they do funding and say, "Look, these are the things that we need to have this thing work. This is the value-added, and this is what you can invest in. This is how long this takes, and this is how long that takes."

Is there a way to do that, or is that really not very realistic?

Kanter: I've been fooling around with an enabling network rubric. It's not ready for prime time, yet. Just trying to take from our experience and looking at others, and determining what are the best practices? What are the benchmarks? How do they develop over time?

What does an enabling network look like at one year old? Two years? Three years? Four years? Five years? What are some of the criteria or indicators that need to be in place so that you know it's going to be successful?

I don't have the answer for that yet. There are some things that we've talked about, and I think there needs to be a pretty good germination time before it can take a life of its own. Things like creating value? They're really hard things to measure, like the value of the people that are in the network and what they know? The relationships, how those are managed and how those are built and how they are sustained over time. The portability of it?

We have a natural advantage because technology is this *big* topic, but how does this translate to other content areas that may not have the fear factor attached?

And program scale. Can this enabling network exist by itself without the one-on-one technical assistance, without the mentors, without a moderator? All those questions. I don't have any hard answers yet.

White: I'm not ruling those things out; what I'm trying to say is that we have tried in these processes both to discover and then to validate other ways that are equally important in reporting. I realize that these things still have to be quantified and I don't want to say that we don't quantify. We do quantify. If people need to know not only where people are based in the counties but which counties are affected by all the activity, we have to do that.

There are ways to do that and I feel fairly safe in saying that you can pretty much measure a certain kind of community evolution. Maybe that's a better thing than network, because network means a lot of different things.

I also think that once there is enough of a history, that begins to show you what the full picture is. You cannot just say whether this stuff is working but whether it matters! I think that's what we're saying, does this stuff matter?

There are ways to do that. I don't think it's up to us automatically to have to always be the persuader of last resort to the boards, who of course we never meet or see. The only people we deal with are the great, forward-looking people on the staff, those people who have all these ideas.

Then there's us, the wild and crazy, disorganized bunch of people who are trying to develop these practices.

Audience: I want to pick up on some earlier comments, because it's interesting to hear a presentation that deals with individual artists, and small and midsize organizations in the light of the effects of 9-11. If there is any constituency that is in jeopardy – everybody is in jeopardy – I think the idea of looking at best practices very, very quickly is going to be critically important. Not only these models but there are other models.

Particularly the role intermediaries have played in that, especially as artist-centered intermediaries throughout the country are feeling the effects of this very badly and may not be in as good a shape as some other organizations. We, as funders, need to look at this very, very seriously before we see further erosion.

What are the best practices? How quickly can we get those models because they're part of our strategy for thinking through the next stage of all of this.

Audience: I just wanted to mention a project that we were working on and then ask a question.

We're putting together a Web site called Minnesota Artists Online and it's going to consist of Web pages for any individual artists or arts organization in Minnesota that's interested in having a page on it. We're doing it in conjunction with the Walker Arts Center, which you mentioned before. It's a very exciting project and I think it's going to be a great networking tool and a great community-building tool for the state and beyond.

I'm interested in hearing about whether you've used the online environment to build community among the groups that you're working with? I know in particular, Beth, you've been talking about *ArtsWire* and ways of using technology and I'm interested in knowing if there are any parallels to what we're trying to do in Minnesota and what kind of things worked.

Kanter: I can tell you a lot about what doesn't work.

Audience: Well, that would be interesting!

Kanter: The first thing isn't the online community. That's the vehicle. So what's the end result? What's it going to do? Is that compelling for the people who are going to use it? Is that compelling enough for them to get them online and to get over whatever those layers of difficulty we face in getting artists and small to midsize arts organizations that may be falling in the organizational digital divide.

Keep the technology as simple as possible. It's okay to say no to certain things. Bells and whistles don't matter. Again, it's making it easy for them to use the tools. Giving them the training. Face-to-face relationships. Virtual alone doesn't necessarily work, it has to be a hybrid. There has to be some face and relationship-building before you see it online. There has to be critical mass. The community has to be refreshing itself if you're talking about people talking to one another.

There's a paper from an academic in Amsterdam on the lifecycle of a LISTSERV and when the community burns itself out. I think it needs to have refreshing views coming into it. You have to think in terms of spiral development.

If you're looking at it for the long term, the same people initially that were in it may graduate from the community but you're going to have to bring others in or the community will die.

I think that's all I'm going to say. At the moment.

White: I've produced a number of Minnesota artists so I feel I can say this. I'm not sure I would go online to search for Minnesota artists *per se*. I might go online to search for artists in general. I would probably be much more likely talk to people I know in Minneapolis about artists there as opposed to going online. That's a reality.

I know I can't get the degree of information about live performing arts that maybe I could get about visual arts or even about music for that matter. It's not a reliable mechanism because it's not giving me – and this is one of the posits of DTW Digital – the right kind of information.

There is also the distance-learning thing, what is it? Beyond Broadcast, what is the organization? Rick Hauser and Nancy Mason Hauser in Minneapolis, they've got a big technology grant where they're doing distance learning and all of the stuff with dance, with the ballet company there.

Those things point a direction to how you might want to engage with those things. The idea that a photo-

graph of a dancer doesn't do me any good but being able to see a showcase or a couple of things over time begins to give me vestiges of a profile. That's what I need to get in whatever kind of medium I'm working through.

If that piece helps on top of this videotape and that concert and whatever I hear from somebody I trust, that may result in a decision that affects the life of that artist, right? I'm just one in that way, and I'm not talking about the community, I'm just talking about this one-on-one.

The thing that I've been interested in, relative to technology, is this idea of marketplaces of one, where every artist essentially drives a marketplace. We've looked at marketplaces, got to be famous locally, then nationally, then internationally. All marketplaces are horizontal. My feeling is that opportunities run horizontally. In other words, anybody who understands what they do, and what they do well, might be able to connect somewhere else to create another opportunity that enhances their ability to keep working.

Now that's something we need to do. Whether it's home or the road, for a lot of performing artists, there's some relationship between that. In something like dance, there's been a lot of that.

Touring, historically, was the nurturing force for contemporary dance. Maybe for the ballet, too. This idea of the road, this nomadic existence was really important. How we create a way of allowing people to reach these opportunities and then to support them.

I'm less interested in whether we can turn out more mediocre inter-media work in a new technology than I am in figuring out if we can give people better research tools – again, user-friendly – and whether people can convey the content of their work to people who are collaborators on a regular basis.

So, if a choreographer in Minneapolis says I want to sit down and talk with Ella Bath at Jacob's Pillow, with Delores Bradley at Diverse Works in Houston, a couple of our collaborators and a composer. I want to give you my basic, ten-minute "sing for your supper" kind of thing.

This is something that, years ago, Brenda Way asked for at some pithily-named dance leadership conference in Philadelphia. There are always dance leadership conferences, never follower-ship or runner-up conferences. But this particular dance leadership

thing disappeared into the mist. But she said, if I could do that, if I could bring the people to me to sit down, I'd have a good shot at getting a project off the ground with the kind of basic commitments – forget the money, forget what is done – but the commitments, like the band, the commitments that allow me to have enough hope and confidence and trust that I can do this. This is part of the currency.

John did a paper which maybe some people saw, which for me was an important bringing together of strands, "Leverage Lost," this idea that a lot of people in the arts community work for a quotient of gratification, not just for the money.

Gratification of the process remains a workable currency in the way we conduct the cultural life of this country. This isn't just about the philanthropy, this isn't just about the funding piece, this isn't just about endless dependence on a funder who has a hard time with separation. This is really about what that money triggers. Part of that is the gratification, the value-added to be able to do your work and be satisfied in it, no matter how poor you are. That's what we're trying to get at with some of these things.

This idea of a marketplace of one, of horizontal things. Maybe online resources will be useful. Slide registries always were for visual artists. But is that useful to me for dance or theater? I don't think so. Not for the foreseeable future.

Kreidler: We have time for one last question.

Audience: We work primarily with small and mid-size organizations. One of the things we continually grapple with is trying to acknowledge the reality that these organizations are individuals, that the elemental building block is an impassioned and driven individual, and how do you incorporate them into these networks? We've thrown money at organizations and seen great stuff happen and then the individual who's really the person who's doing it leaves. We can't let the money follow them where they're going, it has to stay with the organization because of the restrictions frequently placed on us by our funders.

I'm curious how you all deal with that elemental building block, how they're incorporated into networks, and how you deal with that? Because those are really the people that make our work happen.

White: That is another criterion of these things, people. When a person changes in the NPN, or even if they change in the Dance Force, we very carefully analyze what that change means.

For example, when a theatre in Arizona early on in the National Performance Network lost a gifted programmer and they turned the control back to a city bureaucrat, they were dropped. There was just too big a divide. It wasn't an automatic decision, but it was clear that they just weren't committed to that program. That's too bad, because that meant Albuquerque was out of it. It was just a reality that that couldn't be there.

I'm not sure about whether money funding follows individuals, but the change in individual can be important. We want organizations to know that it *is* important to us. There are whole bunches of organizations that have had these transformations of key personnel and have managed to sustain a very high level.

If we are part of the barter system that helps to get that done, and keep it within the larger web of agendas, then we're helping those organizations satisfy their mission, too. But I do think this *is* about people. You can talk about institutional issues but the characteristic of these fields that we're talking about, or at least what I'm talking about, is individually driven.

This is the magnificent men and their flying machines. You always see those films of early attempts at flight where everybody's wrapped up in boxes. They look great running across the ground until they reach the lip of the cliff and then they go straight down right to the bottom. And that's it!

These are the trappings of something that in a lot of ways are imposed. They are not organic solutions to what are the roles, responsibilities, or entitlements of artists at various stages of their lives and in an evolving community.

Until we begin to address those things as criteria, that the organization, or the institutional… The quantification is not dependent on one set of criteria as to whether this is more or less valid as an institutional structure.

Cultural life isn't about institutions, cultural life is about dynamics. Maybe they're shaped by institutions or conveyed by institutions. DTW is in the middle of a $14 million capital campaign building a whole new facility. I'm sorry, I shouldn't plug that, but we've raised $11.5.

Some of the grassroots organizations do have to take on some of those institutional-centric qualities. We serve nine hundred member-artists, we produce fifty artists in a year, we have networks of individual artists. Some places, somewhere, probably have to go through that excruciating process of institutionalization on behalf of others. It is utterly worthless to us if we do it and then everybody else is required to do it too. It eviscerates why we're going through this, which is to provide a buffer.

Kanter: I'll be brief. A couple of things. This is for small to midsize arts organizations. Knowledge in Technology is talking about institutionalizing the knowledge about technology. That was one of the early things we saw, when a person leaves an organization. The most dramatic example is that that was the person who knew how to use the database and they were flying them in from another state every time the organization needed to run another report.

The whole philosophical design of this program is how do you build organizational knowledge around technology so it's not dependent on that one person? Now that's small to midsize organizations, but when you get to where it's one person or individual artist, we don't have an answer yet. How do we solve that problem?

Some of it is also around within using the network piece. This new part of our program is information overload. There are too many messages on LISTSERV, I can't keep up with it. Now we've incorporated into our curriculum information-coping skills. As an artist, how do you manage electronic information in the information age, because that is part of the way you're going to have to function.

Kreidler: Beth earlier characterized "cranial containment" and I think we've reached that point here as well. I want to thank first of all our two panelists for their poetry, David and Beth, and thank also Adam and Bethany for the work that you put into organizing this.

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

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

ORDER FORM

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

____   Creative Support for Individual Artists Preconference

____   Opening Event: An Evening with Meredith Monk

____   Keynote Address: Kenneth Prewitt

____   Keynote Address: Pepón Osorio

____   After September 11: Dealing with a New Landscape for Arts and Culture *(Monday session)*

____   Beyond "Art:" A Community Perspective

____   Member Report: Crossroads: Art and Religion in American Life

____   The Big Picture: Planning for the Future of Culture in Communities

____   Stabilizing Community-Based Arts Institutions

____   Universities and Communities Mentoring Young Artists

____   Young and Engaged: Youth in Community Arts Programs

____   Digital Workshop

____   Built to Last: Linking Communities of Grantees

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

____   Time and Space: Residencies and Retreats for Individual Artists

____   After September 11: Grantmakers in the Arts and the Future of Our Grantees *(Wednesday session)*

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

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

❏ Enclosed is my check payable to Grantmakers in the Arts.

Charge my bankcard # _____ Exp. date ____ /____

❏ Visa ❏ MasterCard ❏ American Express   Name on card _____

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