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

"Make the Pie Higher:" Corporate America and Support for Arts and Culture

Moderator: Arlene Shuler
The Howard Gilman Foundation

Panelists: Doug Bauer
Goldman, Sachs

Karen Brooks Hopkins
Brooklyn Academy of Music

Timothy J. McClimon
AT&T Foundation

November 5, 2001, 10:00 a.m.

Suzanne Sato: Before I turn the panel over to Arlene Shuler, who is moderating today, I wanted to explain a bit the genesis of this session and its title. At the time when we started to think about this session a year ago at GIA, there was what seemed to be a very different climate in the corporate sector. We were talking about venture philanthropy, we were talking about new technology funding, and those of you who were in San Francisco and Minneapolis will remember that there's been an ongoing conversation about the growth in public funding and earnings from corporate profits.

Part of the interest in this discussion is, can the arts make an effective case for a piece of the larger pie. And, referencing our president, "making the pie higher."

A lot has changed since that time. I don't think that we're withdrawing from that mission; nevertheless, I think the nature of the conversation has probably changed for our participants and for all of us.

I want to thank you for coming. I'm really looking forward to the discussion.

I'm very, very proud to introduce Arlene Shuler, who will be leading the discussion today. She will introduce the rest of our guests. For eleven years Arlene was the senior vice president of Planning and External Affairs for the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. Now she is the executive director of the Howard Gilman Foundation.

Shuler: Thank you, Suzanne. I'm very pleased to be here as a grantmaker after eleven years of raising money, especially from the corporate sector. One of the reasons I think Suzanne invited me to moderate this panel is that I have the perspective of a fund-raiser who raised a lot of money from the corporate sector, and now I'm on the other side of the desk, which is, in these times, a better place to be. So I'm very pleased to be here.

Before I introduce our speakers, one of the things we talked about was that we wanted to change the name of this panel from "Making the Pie Higher" to "Keeping the Pie." So, that's a little bit about how we're going to gear the discussion.

I had asked, and we all talked about our roles on the panel. One of the things I had asked the panelists to discuss was what they would have talked about pre-9-11, and now how does that change, if at all, post-9-11? All of the panelists are going to weave that in to their remarks.

Before I introduce the panelists, we wanted to find out who was in the audience. So, how many in the audience are corporate grantmakers? Quite a lot. How many are private foundation grantmakers? Then how many of you raise money, either as in operating foundations, or on the boards of not-for-profits? Good. So that gives us a sense of who's here.

McClimon: What about community foundations? Just checking.

Shuler: Is there anything I missed?

Audience: Government.

Shuler: Yes, yes.

McClimon: Government.

Hopkins: Career fundraisers.

Shuler: Any service organization members? So we have a really broad gamut of people, and many who do raise money from the corporate sector.

We're very fortunate to have on our panel today Tim McClimon, who is the executive director of the AT&T Foundation, where he has been for…

McClimon: Too long.

Shuler: …too long. Many, many years.

Next to him is Doug Bauer, who is the vice president and philanthropic advisor at Goldman Sachs and Company. Doug has an illustrious career in philanthropy, but he's been at Goldman Sachs now for just about a year, in this new venture that Goldman began to bring in private individuals and help them in their philanthropy, sort of like a community foundation might do.

Next to me is my good friend and mentor, Karen Hopkins, the greatest fundraiser of all time, who is the president of the Brooklyn Academy of Music, who brought her own propaganda, as one would expect from Karen. So, anyhow, we're going to turn it over to Tim. Thanks.

McClimon: Thank you very much. Good morning. On September 11th, as my staff and I watched the twin towers at the World Trade Center collapse just a few blocks from our offices, a colleague turned to me and said, "It's the end of the world as we know it." In many ways, that's very true. We are a nation in mourning and at war. We have a new National Director of Homeland Security, and a President with a ninety percent approval rating. Many of us are afraid to travel. Some won't open their mail, like my wife. People are fleeing the cities, or at least some. Others are hoarding Cipro and flu vaccines. Certainly it is a different world.

But some things are remaining the same. People still go to work in the morning, some of us even by subway or over bridges. Children go to school. Babies are born. People are going back to the theater and the opera. Oprah is still in the news, and the Yankees were in the World Series.

Shuler: A moment of silence for the Yankees!

McClimon: It was sad, but they were there, anyway. They were there. We have to keep that in mind.

So, anyway, life for most of us does go on. So this morning, I wanted to highlight some aspects of corporate life that have remained the same, and some aspects that have changed since September 11th. It's not an exhaustive list, but it's really my attempt to highlight some things that are happening in the corporations right now.

First of all, what hasn't changed? There are three things that I think have not changed since September 11th.

First of all, most companies that were good corporate citizens will continue to be good corporate citizens. It's just good business. The reasons that they want to be good corporate citizens haven't changed: the value of a good reputation; the quality of life in the communities where their employees live and work; the relationships with their customers. The huge outpouring of corporate donations to the various relief funds is testimony to a desire that most companies have to do the right thing. Will there be exceptions to this rule? Sure, there'll be exceptions. But I really think that they'll be few and far between.

Number two. Most companies will continue to view their corporate philanthropy as part of their overall corporate social responsibility. Corporate social responsibility encompasses a large number of other issues, like the quality and safety of their products and services, how they treat their employees, whether they're environmentally friendly, whether they encourage and respect diversity, and whether or not they engage in ethical business and governance practices. Corporate philanthropy must be viewed in this larger context. It's only one of the many ways that companies are responsible to their various stakeholders.

And number three. Most companies that have strong relationships with arts organizations will continue to maintain them. The strategic reasons for being associated with the arts – fostering diversity and creativity; improving the quality of life in key communities; supporting economic development – haven't changed. Will the level of support be the same? Maybe not. Will some companies look elsewhere for ways of achieving these same goals? Perhaps. But some churning, I think, would have happened anyway. I really don't think that September 11th necessarily exacerbated the situation, except for the impact that the attacks had on the economy. Which brings me to what has changed.

Number one, the economy has really taken a turn for the worse. Call it a recession or call it the aftermath of September 11th, but the economic news contains one grim account after another. When companies are fighting for their own survival, they may have fewer resources and less enthusiasm for investing in the not-for-profit community. But I think this is a short-term problem. As the economy gets better in the years ahead, corporations will rebound and resources that can be devoted to philanthropic and community involvement activities will grow again.

Number two, employees are concerned about their safety and their jobs. Like you and me, corporate employees are concerned about the safety of themselves and their families. They want to know what their employers are doing to ensure that when they come to work in the morning, they won't be subjected to anthrax or to terrorist attacks. They want to know that their jobs will exist tomorrow. Surely companies will need to spend more money protecting their own people and property, and in the case of companies that were located in lower Manhattan, just rebuilding their infrastructures. This may mean that the competition for financial resources for other activities, like community relations and corporate philanthropy, may be fiercer. But companies will eventually achieve the right balance.

And third, not-for-profit organizations will be under more pressure to show results for companies. If companies are supporting schools in order to train the high-tech workers of tomorrow, how are schools doing in preparing their students for these careers? If companies are supporting the local health and human service organizations to help the less advantaged in their communities, how are these agencies doing in delivering these services? If companies are supporting arts organizations because of the audiences that they attract and the visibility that they offer, how are these arts organizations doing at retaining and attracting audiences, and on getting media attention for what they do? These questions will require some hard, quantitative answers more than just anecdotes and good intentions.

So that's what I think. Yes, the world has changed, but some things remain the same. Corporations will continue their support of the not-for-profit sector in general and the arts in particular, but they will do it with more scrutiny and perhaps fewer resources. It's not the end of the world as we know it, but at least for a while, the world will be a tougher place. No doubt about it. Whatever we can do to soften the blow for individuals and organizations should be seriously considered and thoughtfully executed.

But I'm not sure that corporations will be able to be the knights in shining armor for everyone. It's just not possible. They will do what they can according to their own schedules and their own strategies. So will they make the pie higher? I don't know. Will they help save the pie? I'm not sure. Will they turn from making apple pie to making cherry pie? It's possible. Only time will tell. But we can be sure of one thing, and that's that whatever we predict today is going to change tomorrow.

Shuler: Thank you, Tim. Doug?

Doug's going to come at it a from little bit different perspective, from dealing with individuals through a corporate environment, and as well as his background in various industries. Doug?

Bauer: Thank you, Arlene. Thank you for inviting me back to Grantmakers in the Arts. It's been about five years since I've been here, and it's been great to see a bunch of people I haven't seen in quite a while. Leave it to GIA to provide a terrific cultural experience last night. I had iceberg lettuce with Green Goddess dressing, Meredith Monk, and game seven of the World Series. So it was a special evening, and I thank you for that.

I want to talk about corporate funding, and I'm going to talk about what we're up to at Goldman Sachs. I have a lot of optimism because of what I've seen at Goldman Sachs, and at the other financial services firms. And yes, dare I even say it, on Wall Street. I want to spend a little time on what I have seen, from my two different corporate funding jobs prior to Goldman, and my experience at Pew. I want to comment on those corporate funding experiences a little bit.

Tim provided the big picture; I think I'll go a little more tactical on corporate funding. There are traditionally four places that corporate funding in the arts happens.

There is, number one, just your basic good old corporate philanthropy or corporate giving. I don't think it's an oxymoron.

Number two, there are the expectations around fulfilling senior management obligations, sitting on boards.

Number three, there is corporate marketing and sponsorship money.

And number four, there's employee benefit.

What's going on with these four in the last couple of years? Corporate philanthropy for the arts is and has been a thing of the past. The right thing to do, or the corporate version of noblesse oblige, I don't think really exists anymore. It's hard to justify those dollars to management. It's hard to justify those dollars to shareholders.

I'll be quite honest with you, in my last few years at SmithKline Beecham, we had an arts giving program. It's basically something that I did with the discretion that I had in my job. If senior management actually asked why we're supporting the Painted Brides Art Center in Philadelphia, they'd probably be scratching their heads. Yet, I'll tell you that I had a lot of employees who were very proud of the fact that we did that. But it was really in a clandestine way. Now, that may be a very singular experience, but I think it speaks to the fact that a lot of senior management these days is very interested in corporate philanthropy and ties it directly to the mission or the focus of the company.

Senior management obligations. Number two. Corporate contributions tied to senior management's board participation still exists. It will become less of a force. Senior management at this point, especially in the current economic situation, with today's pressures, cannot be away from the office or the boardroom too long. There are still people sitting on nonprofit boards, but I don't think it holds the cachet it once did. That's a shame, because I can attest to many experiences of placing upcoming management on nonprofit boards, and the experiences they gained were very valuable to them, both as people and as professionals. That's going to be less and less an expectation.

Corporate marketing and sponsorship dollars are probably perhaps the brightest spot for nonprofits, and for the arts especially. The dollars still exist, and – depending on the company and the product, and I emphasize *product* – can be quite plentiful. The arts are especially important to certain companies, because of the demographics that they have in their audience makeup. The people that are showing up at zoos or events or performances or exhibits, in particular older, wealthier people, are very important, in particular to financial services companies. Families are a very, very key audience to target.

Speaking of Target – or Tar-zhay, as people like to call it – they've done a masterful job on a community-by-community basis of investing money in family-oriented entertainment, and in particular into performing arts. And they want that.

Corporations are going to be much more exacting in their requirements for placement of logo, product placement. I'll never forget, it was a breakthrough when I saw a Lexus parked in front of the Academy of Music in Philadelphia for the opening night of the Philadelphia Orchestra. And I think Lexus is a proud sponsor of the Lincoln Center.

Those kinds of things are very crucial. But if you can negotiate that with a corporation, the dollars that flow from that can be very, very important.

Number four, the employee benefit. Despite economic conditions companies work very hard to retain talented employees. And arts are a perk. They really, really see it as a perk. Corporations will spend money to make sure that they are part of the benefit package. I can flash my Goldman Sachs I.D. at approximately twenty museums in the city of New York and get in for free. Let me tell you, when movies are ten bucks, The Producers is $100, opera is…

Shuler: $480.

Bauer: …$480, if you're willing to pay it. Opera is $75. You know, saving ten bucks at the Met is a nice thing that Goldman's doing. That's the same with a lot of major corporations in cities across the country.

They also use arts and culture as a recruitment tool. It's very important, especially with the so-called "knowledge workers" out there, and those are very important to corporations. If you want to read more about that, Peter Drucker's current survey in *The Economist* talks a lot about the future of the corporation and knowledge workers' role in it. It's very important to recruit those people and retain them, and the one way that they do that is to ensure that the communities they're a part of have a strong cultural component.

So, there are important perspectives from a human resources place that corporations see the arts as valuable. They're getting more and more smart about that, and that's something to pay attention to.

Finally, matching gift programs. Employees love matching gift programs. It's very hard to get rid of them. They usually get cut back in economic times, but they're a very important source for arts and cultural institutions to maximize. I just put in a little pitch about that.

Let me move on to what I see is an optimistic situation, and move on beyond these traditional sources. Because what else is there? There is a lot that's out there that the corporations can do. The key thing for everyone in this room is to think beyond the usual suspects. That means thinking beyond the traditional Fortune 500.

The question in my mind right now is, how can corporate America provide access to individuals and their philanthropy? The answer exists in the financial services industry, as well as the legal community and the accounting community. Now, why is that?

I want to share with you two sets of numbers, and I'm terrified to do this, because Loren Renz is in the room, and she's the Keeper of All Numbers at the

Foundation Center. From *Giving USA*, last year, in the year 2000, which was a banner year in philanthropy in this country, $203 billion was given to charity. $150 billion of that was from individuals. $50 billion came from the top one percent of households, in terms of income, which is $172,000 or higher.

By the way, fifty percent of that money is moving in the next eight weeks because of year-end tax planning. So serious money is out there.

Believe me that the financial services community has not overlooked serious money. When you tie that with what is becoming a firmer and firmer theory, which is the intergenerational transfer of wealth, the financial services industry has really started to pay attention to this. If you have not looked at the work of Paul Schervish, out of Boston College, I really encourage you to do that. His work is very thorough, thanks in part to Bankers Trust, who has underwritten a large part of it. He's written on what the wealthy are thinking about. He's also done the numbers and it's impressive. He's got a hard number anywhere between $20 to $41 trillion passing in the next twenty to thirty years, of which he thinks $6 to $10 trillion could be going to charity. And that's not insignificant.

So, what's going on? The financial services community has recognized these two trends, and they've developed a range of advisory services to help what we call "high net worth individuals" think about their philanthropy, and think about their financial health and wealth. Goldman Sachs and others have created a range of products and services to help these high net worth individuals manage and/or advance – and that's important – manage and/or advance their philanthropy. This includes donor-advised funds – and I won't talk about the competition between the financial service industry and community foundations, I hope we can talk about that during the Q and A – and supporting organizations, and/or administering private foundations.

The legal and accounting communities have always provided advice to high net worth individuals. They're now needed more than ever. This is borne out in some very good work that's been done by the Regional Association of Grantmakers, in looking at what the legal and accounting communities are doing to help high net worth individuals.

What's very interesting is that the accountants and lawyers are very reluctant to bring up philanthropy, because they feel it is a far too personal issue to raise with their clients. Yet, going back to Paul Schervish and the work that he's done with high net worth individuals, he's found out that these individuals want that assistance. They want that help. They want to be talking about philanthropy, because they're very concerned about legacy and other things, and they want that discussion to take place. It's very important that we engage the legal and accounting community to start thinking about philanthropy, and being bolstered in a way that they can talk about it thoughtfully and competently.

That leads me into my final couple of comments. Why should you care about this? Either if you're raising money or giving money away, why should you care?

Number one, in this post-September 11th situation where a lot of arts nonprofits in particular are really, really scrambling, you need to arm your nonprofits with the knowledge that there is some hope out there. There is money out there, but the way that they're going to have to unlock it or unleash it is to become more savvy about what exists in the way of funding streams. That means working with some nontraditional individuals, investment professionals at financial services companies, lawyers, CPAs, and getting them up to speed on what you do, so that they can be ready to suggest certain places to place philanthropic dollars.

That means you also need to work with the CPAs and lawyers themselves. It may sound strange to start cultivating them, but I can assure you, they are key, key gatekeepers in this flow of money that's out there.

You need to start engaging investment firms and investment professionals. It's been very interesting to work on the inside, on the Street, with very savvy investment professionals, whose heads tend to be filled with numbers, and to get them to start thinking about nonprofits. I can tell you, every time that I've fostered a discussion about philanthropy with an investment professional and their client, that investment professional has walked away with more knowledge about what that client thinks about money and how they value money than they did before, because of the discussion about philanthropy. The only way they're going to learn that is if you and others start to engage them about what they do.

I'm optimistic for two reasons, and I'll share two stories with you.

I have one client who shall remain nameless, who is on the board of an $80 million family foundation. People think, well, the arts are not important, September 11th has obliterated interest in the arts and a lot of other nonprofit stuff. This guy is still just as strong as ever on trying to preserve the American crafts movement. He'll continue to do that, and he'll place major money behind it.

Finally, I leave you with a nonprofit executive friend of mine in Philadelphia who, post-9-11, went out and started to talk with every individual who had given him a check of $250 or more, and he runs a $5 million nonprofit. That has been an absolutely uplifting experience for him. By going out and talking one-on-one with each donor, he has not only increased the amount of money he's raised, but has built better relationships. Those donors have been thrilled that an executive director of a nonprofit they care about has followed up with them to ensure support.

There's a lot of hard work ahead, and it requires a lot of you to be more open and willing to work with people outside of the normal sphere that you usually work with. If we do that, we can make money for the arts more bountiful and plentiful than it is now. Thanks.

Shuler: Thank you, Doug. Now Karen is going to give us a perspective of the not-for-profit institution, and also the perspective of a very experienced fundraiser. So I think that's a great balance to the grantmaker perspective. Karen?

Hopkins: I have titled this session, "Looking for a Pie and Finding a Cupcake." What I want to do is divide my talk into three parts: Before, Then, and Now.

In talking about Before, I want to begin with about a year and a half ago, when Bill Clinton was our President and New York was our party town. We were in a very expansive environment for fundraising; it was a great time to build endowments, initiate new programs, and really put a lot of innovative and new ideas on the table and find that corporations and others were receptive to funding them.

An example of this at BAM would be our project with the Lucent Corporation, and the height of the whole new technology thing also factored into this particular grant. We had a great idea about trying to partner artists with scientists in the new technology area. Putting them together, letting them propose various projects, and then presenting the projects in some context of the Next Wave Festival.

The grant was $1 million over two years, and included $500,000 in cash each year, and another $500,000 in various equipment and software in each year. The first three projects were commissioned and were on their way to some incredible success. We hit Year Two and Lucent decided that it could no longer continue with the grant. This was a devastating situation, because we had already gone so far with it.

The first inclination is to start screaming and yelling, be upset that they pulled out on their obligation. A contract was in place. But truth be told, that company was not in good shape. We ended up, rather than coming to a legal solution, sitting down and talking to our partners at the corporation to figure out what we could do. It was really a great partnership, and one that we were very excited about. We drove out there, and what we realized was, as depressed as we were about the situation, they were even more depressed about what was happening. Rather than it being confrontational, we sat down and worked together to try and come up with a positive solution where everybody could come out of the project without losing that much.

In the end, while we weren't able to go forward with the second year, the Rockefeller Foundation very generously stepped in with a grant to allow us to present the three projects that we had done with the first part of the money and the equipment. That was a great thing, because the worst part of it would have been to let down the artists and the scientists who had worked so hard to create the project. So, those three projects will happen in this season's Next Wave Festival. But it's an example of how things have changed.

Another example is a major project that we had with Deutsche Bank in which they provided significant funding of an opera called *The Eternal Road*. It was a collaboration about a town that had decided to resurrect a Kurt Weill opera that had been lost, and that was about the Bible. It was a very powerful decision for Deutsche Bank to step up and fund this, and to fund not only the presentation at BAM, but a series of humanities activities that backed up this work. It was a very large project, and they came to it because of compassionate reasons of wanting to make a statement about the funding of this particular piece. It was a courageous decision on their part, and a very successful collaboration.

We also gave birth to a project called, *Next Wave Down Under*, that included four main stage shows, thirty days of film, and a series of humanities discussions and projects from Australia, and bringing a hundred and fifty-four artists. That project was born two years ago, in the height of the bull market. Things were moving at a very fast pace, and it was a very strong moment for our institution in terms of corporate funding, collaborative funding, and opportunities to bring corporations to the table to respond to innovative and interesting projects.

Then we hit the economic downturn, and what we found was that the projects started to get smaller very quickly. We proposed another project to Deutsche Bank, this time involving a series of German programs, including work from Hamburg, Pina Bausch's company from Wuppertal, and a Fritz Lang film retrospective – a variety of German projects that stretched across several different art forms and that included several important cities where Deutsche Bank has bank locations. This time we found that the company was absolutely still willing to work with us, but at a much smaller level, and in a much more careful and focused way. We began to see that corporations were really tightening up on what they want for their money – more specifics on tickets, credits, events, et cetera.

We were responding to a rash of bank mergers that were happening so fast that we couldn't tell who was working for what bank on what particular day. Companies were breaking up, reforming, merging. New technology was coming apart, and things were moving at a very fast pace.

We began to retool our effort in corporate giving to push for smaller but more focused sponsorships and more opportunities to present corporations with government, foundation, and corporate collaborative partnerships. This would allow corporations to see that they were in good company with other funders, and that substantial projects could be put on where they were not shouldering all of the financial burden.

In the height of this change from the bull market to the economic downturn, we saw what I was calling the "footprint syndrome," or, "sprawl gone crazy." What would happen is that corporations were funding things that had to look exactly alike, no matter where they went. Whether it was Maine, Brooklyn, or Florida, the project needed to be able to move from place to place with the same branding, the same setup, the same everything. This situation reached a peak about a year and a half ago.

As I get to post-September 11th, I'm hoping that that situation has changed, because I think there's a lot more in it for corporations to really identify with specific communities and allow Brooklyn to look different from Florida or Maine or even New Jersey. The best projects are the ones where the corporations can focus on whatever the climate and situation are within a local community, rather than everything having to look the same in every place. I'm hopeful that this will benefit specific arts institutions, rather than the way that it was.

As we hit the post-September 11th situation, we see that that there is funding available, but I think there is less funding available. We see that things need to have a very specific project focus. I would agree with both Tim and Doug that general corporate philanthropy and general operating support, except at a very low level, has departed our midst for awhile, no matter how desperately we may need it.

I'll give you an example of a current project we put together. We are doing a twelve-film John Houseman retrospective at BAM this spring, and obviously, there was only one funder that could step up for this. That funder is Smith Barney. We are calling this little retrospective, *John Houseman: He Earned It*. The concept was that we would show some of these vintage commercials that were created for Smith Barney before we showed the films, so that we would screen them and really try to focus on the corporate relationship, as well as show some great films.

At first, post-September 11th, Smith Barney, as a downtown-located company, said no. We went back and forth and back and forth, and had some very enlightened leadership from people at that company who understood that this was a great idea. They ended up coming forward and supporting the project, but at a much lower level than we went in with. And truth be told, we were grateful to have their support. We're always grateful to have support at any level, but particularly in this environment. The fact that they went forward with it meant a lot to us.

Another situation where we have had major sponsorship is from AT&T for our Dance Africa Festival for ten years. This would be the tenth anniversary, and we realized that AT&T is a company under a lot of pressure. Because this relationship has been so strong for so long, AT&T, as far as we know now, is planning to work with us again this year. Suzanne, Tim, sign here.

McClimon: Lots of witnesses. You're always working.

Shuler: Who invited her?

Hopkins: I might as well use the time I have here to sign up a few commitments.

But the point is that we're coming up to the tenth anniversary, and we'll use whatever means we can to persuade them to hang in for another year.

A lot of this is about long-term relationships. Another situation we have is with a funder that has funded a project locally. This project had a lot of potential impact for the rest of the country, for young people, particularly in the post-September 11th environment. The funder has now asked us for a proposal to roll out this project on a national basis, with several cities across the country. We think it can be done for a very reasonable amount of money. Here is a case where we're looking at how it can be retooled locally in every area, rather than just in the "footprint" context. We're trying to work with them where we can provide a skeleton, and then local arts institutions in those cities can pick it up and really make it their own. So these are some different strategies that are underway.

Finally, I am advising our staff and our board in the post-September 11th environment: Keep your family very close. That means just what Doug was saying. Get out to your board, get out to your members, get out to your funders, and make the point that you need them, why you need them, and what your plan is in terms of reacting to the situation, how you are pulling things in, cutting back. It's not a time for marginal decisions. You can't make any stupid mistakes at this point, or try not to, and really try to push forth a very specific program that reassures your funders that you are coping with the situation, and that you are on top of it. A very focused program.

Secondly, the collaborations become more essential than ever. In all of our "destination-BAM" concepts we are putting forward, we are looking at where government support, and I don't mean American government for the most part, since it's not much to speak of at this point, but where there is a case for international support. We are being very strong in terms of the foreign government support and encouragement, the corporate sponsorship, the foundation sponsorship, and in certain cases individuals, all coming together and trying to go out to our donors and showing them that we have a plan for how several participants are going to make these things happen.

Giving great service and making sure that donors feel connected to the institution, that they have a sense of ownership, and that they really feel that we are providing a terrific package of corporate benefits, are also part of what we're attempting to do right now. More extensive research. People say when you buy a house, there are three important things to look for: location, location, location. In this case, research, research, and research are important in terms of making sure that the ask is very targeted. Again, moving from the footprint to a sense of connection to the individual institution.

Finally, what I would call the Great Repackaging Effort, where we take a layered approach to how we raise money for BAM. We begin with the institution, then we work on, say, Next Wave Festival, BAM Opera, BAM Dance, the specific initiative. Then we look at each project within that initiative, so that there are, say, three German productions within the Next Wave Festival, and we repackage them and try to have that funded. Then the individual productions, the opening night, and all international work, all dance, all opera, all this, all that. The idea is taking the same productions and trying to repackage them four or five different ways in order to come up with the maximum amount of money and give each donor its own profile in terms of how it is recognized for the work that it supports. These are all strategies we are using to deal with a pretty depressing situation that has come upon us, and with the goal of survival.

Shuler: Thank you. Thank you, all the panelists. We have heard a little bit more optimism than I would have had myself, and I'm glad to hear that. I think that I still have the grant-seeker hat on, and so I share a lot of Karen's concerns. When you look at the economic downturn that we are not only in now, and that will continue for the short term, and I hope not that much beyond that, the signs aren't great.

Doug was quite optimistic, and Tim a little bit, and Karen a slight bit. It's a long, hard row in getting into the corporate sector now, it's harder than it has ever been before.

I'm going to open up to questions. I have a question first, to start off this part of the panel. In light of everyone's comments and their various perspectives, I'm wondering, do you see a role for private foundation grantmakers to work with their grantees and their boards to help them reposition themselves, to become more effective in raising funds from the corporate sector in this tighter, more difficult environment?

McClimon: I'll take a stab at that. I think that one of the reasons that I always like listening to Karen in these kinds of situations is…

Hopkins: Because it costs you money.

McClimon: …because it costs me money. No. The reason Karen is a terrific fundraiser is that she always takes the long-term view. But yes, there are short-term concerns. You've got to raise the money for this project or for this year, but she's really into long-term relationships and what this means, not just this year, but next year, in five years, or ten years out. Not everyone has that kind of outlook or that kind of skill to bring to their jobs. We should help organizations acquire the right skills, either by allowing them to hire really good, experienced people, or bring on consultants, or tap into the expertise that's out there in helping to package things and repackage things, and really develop a keen fundraising plan. That's something organizations desperately need, particularly medium-sized organizations that can't afford to hire a Karen Hopkins. They really, really need that kind of expertise.

Also there's a certain look that comes with BAM materials. They've done a very good job over the years of having a particular look and feel to what they do, and that's helpful not only to audiences, but it's also helpful to funders, particularly corporate funders, who are interested in visibility and in attaching themselves to highly visible institutions. Allowing and helping organizations acquire the kind of expertise that you can get from a good graphic design firm or firms that deal with branding issues – because it's really a branding issue that we're talking about here – could be really, really helpful to medium-sized organizations who don't have the resources to do what BAM can do.

Bauer: In the smaller picture in terms of our jobs, becoming a better citizen requires us to be more active about the things that we care about. I would encourage you to be more active with your Regional Associations of Grantmakers that are trying to do a lot of work around promoting philanthropy beyond the usual suspects, i.e., everyone in the room here. Encourage other people to get involved, whether they're wealthy individuals, whether they're CPAs, whether they're trust and estate lawyers. You need to be part of that discussion, because if you care about expanding the pie, or making the pie bigger, you need to get in there and make your pitch for arts as a vital part of any community. That means being part of and making time for discussions that encourage others to think about this.

That work is happening right now is two places. One is Regional Associations of Grantmakers, and the other is community foundations. If you want to make the pie bigger for arts organizations, you need to sit down and say, "Well, who do I need to be? Do I need to be part of a panel? Do I need to be part of a small discussion? What do I need to do to engender conversation about some of the important institutions or community-based organizations that focus on the arts in my community? How am I going to get more support for them?"

You need to turn back to your RAG or to your community foundation, and say, "What do we need to do?" That's not necessarily a grant or a monetary investment. Frankly, what's more important – not that money isn't important – but as important is for you to be active in providing some of your mental capacity to try and to solve this equation. That's what I would suggest.

Hopkins: I'd like to talk about guidelines for a minute. This is the moment to let a little light and air get into some of those guidelines. What I mean is not that everybody should fund everything that comes in off the block, but I think that we risk tightening things up too much in an environment where we need creativity, we need inspiration, we need great ideas. Where the private foundations can partner with corporations and individuals and everybody working together, is to allow in a set of guidelines where there is enough latitude for ideas and creativity to get through.

Many foundations do this already. They have a general area where they fund *x* amount in the arts.

But they let the institutions come forward with ideas and work with them to come up with the most creative project – that suits the guidelines, but also lets the institution do what it needs to do. In this environment, we need to promote that, where we work together so that the best of what we have to offer as institutions and as funders comes to the fore.

The second thing is that the board membership is a critical issue to discuss. What are we looking for from members at this point? What are we delivering back to members at this point? What are the expectations of that relationship? It is very important for the foundations, the corporate funders, and all funders to be asking institutions where they are in terms of board development and how their boards are working with them to take charge of the situation, because that's where the real, interesting issues in terms of leadership and how to go forward in a critical situation are being played out.

Shuler: Thank you. Questions from the floor?

Audience: Two questions, one to Karen, and then one to Doug.

The strategies that you outlined for operation in today's climate are almost impossible for midsize organizations and downright impossible for the smaller organizations. Tim touched a little bit on what some of the remedies are, but small organizations certainly can't afford that kind of board positioning, and often don't have boards that are very powerful at all. What can they do to help themselves in a climate where their survival in the next three months or so is actually threatened?

The other question you alluded to before: How has the community foundation positioned itself in appealing to this large transfer of wealth, when it looks like the financial institution is sort of the supplanting intermediary on the agenda?

Hopkins: Okay, let me answer. First of all, I'm not sure that smaller organizations cannot do what I've proposed, just at a different level. They have boards. They may not be the most powerful boards in the world, but my board is not powerful compared to Lincoln Center or the Metropolitan Opera, and yet we work as best we can with what we have.

Before I came to BAM, so many million years ago, I worked for a small theater in Washington, D.C. called The New Playwright's Theater, and the budget for that theater was less than a quarter of a million dollars for the whole institution. Yet, we still had donors. We still had a board. We were managers as opposed to specifically fundraisers.

What you need to do is to retool these concepts on a smaller level and try to set up reasonable expectations within what you can accomplish. That's part of it.

The second thing is, it's another difficulty, but one that's interesting. Partnerships between smaller and larger organizations could be spectacular right now. Some guidelines that promoted that would be terrific. If BAM can partner with 651 Arts and the Brooklyn Philharmonic, then wouldn't it be incredible for two constituent institutions, or X, Y, and Z companies, to go forward with a project.

The challenge here is, how does the big organization not completely subsume the smaller one? The smaller ones are always concerned that we'll take up all the space and all the energy. With some careful thought, maybe there'd be room for everybody and the largers could help the smallers and the smallers could help the largers by always putting forth new ideas and things that our scope may not allow us to do because we're too unwieldy. Some of those kinds of partnerships, if they could be encouraged, would go a long way toward strengthening everyone's solvency at this point.

Bauer: On your second question about financial services firms supplanting community foundations: good word. It was Word Weekend here at Mohonk, in case you got here earlier, so it would have been a good word to use. Let me give you the sound-bite answer, then let me digress for a minute.

I think the smarter financial services firms are interested in collaborating with community foundations, not competing with community foundations. What do I mean by that? Good financial services firms with thoughtful investment professionals who are guiding their clients on philanthropy are trying to ultimately make sure that their client is satisfied in their philanthropic action. If their philanthropic actions are to be local in behavior and intent, I think the only answer is to go with a community foundation.

Now, there may be a quid pro quo, and I'll be very honest about that. If it is a significant investment that's going to be made into that local community foundation, there will be a very clear expectation that the financial services firm will have a say in managing that money.

As all the community foundation people in this room know, there are over six hundred community foundations in this country. All of them have different investment policies, and all of them have different ways of executing the way they manage their endowments. There is a lot of room to work together and to negotiate how we can build relationships to make sure that our client, your donor, is best served with their philanthropy. I've talked with investment professionals across the country that I work with at Goldman Sachs, and we work with individuals that tend to be $25 million and north in terms of assets. These folks want to do this work well, and they want to do it the right way.

We talked both about the hardware of philanthropy and the software of philanthropy. The hardware is the tax and legal aspects of philanthropy. The software is the values, mission, and purpose of what they want to do. We can't do anything with that client until we understand what is driving and motivating their philanthropy. If we figure that out, then the next step is pretty easy.

If the intent of their philanthropy is local, in my mind, you have to turn to the community foundation, especially if that community foundation and that particular community is solid and outstanding in what they do. If they are, then to me, it's a pretty easy answer. If they're not, then we need to be a little bit more thoughtful, or creative.

There's a lot of room there. We're starting to demonstrate that at Goldman Sachs. But as some of the community foundation people know, it's not been an easy path. There have been some real disasters with some of the other financial services firms in this country trying to foster those relationships. But it's very, very important to do this.

There's been a lot of tension between the community foundations and in particular the firms that have donor-advised funds. You hear a lot of conversation about the Fidelity Charitable Gift Fund who, by the way, do very, very good work. It's a very impressive model, and they are well on their way to becoming the largest charity in this country.

McClimon: They're number two now.

Bauer: They're number two now. There's a lot of room for the donor-advised funds fostered by the financial services firms and the community foundation community to work together to foster philanthropy in total. The initial discussions have begun around that topic, and I'm very encouraged by that. There's a lot of discussion that has to happen to figure out, What does that mean? But I'm hopeful that that first step has been taken, and I think in a sense détente has broken out between the two parties. Where we go from here is really up to those two parties.

Shuler: I'd just like to add something from my experience at Lincoln Center that addresses the concerns from two points. This may be a role that community foundations could take, or other foundations within a community.

What we did at Lincoln Center – and many large institutions do this – they have investment professional advisory committees. They put together a committee with bankers, trust advisors, lawyers, accountants, who meet once or twice a year and they help the institution identify private foundations that are not otherwise available or their high net worth individuals who might be looking for someplace to put their money.

This was an extremely successful vehicle for us, and for other institutions. A lot of times, it would be to a foundation that the trust advisor controlled and they needed to give away some money at the end of the year. Or else, we would bring in a lot of high net worth individuals and cultivate them over a long period of time. The investment professionals had a great time getting involved with the institution, and it led to a lot of both operating support and planned gifts.

One could conceivably take this model and set it up in a community for some of the smaller midsize organizations, so that you've got these groups of professionals. Introduce them to some of the arts groups within their community, and maybe help to direct some resources to a variety of either smaller and larger groups.

That's another way of helping those smaller groups and midsize groups gain access to the investment professionals that they wouldn't otherwise. That's a role that maybe you could take to be helpful, or some private foundations might be able to take within some communities. Question?

Audience: I think this question is for Doug.

There's a lot of discussion about long-term relationships, but we find professional people like Doug going from corporation to corporation, and so we'll set up a relationship with somebody and then they'll go away. I'm wondering if you can address how the relationships that you've formed all the way back to Pew have continued, and whether you would prefer to work on a project-by-project basis. How can we develop those kinds of relationships, and is it more important to do work with individuals than companies?

Bauer: Thanks for pointing out the weak link in my career. I like to think I've been presented several challenges in my life, and have tried to rise up to the opportunities that have been presented, but anyway, I digress.

Interesting question. It's funny, I have a lot of people calling me from Philadelphia these days asking who I have had relationships with for a long time, and asking, "What's going on at Goldman Sachs? What's going on at Merrill Lynch? What's going on at all these firms?" I'm happy to get those phone calls, because (a) it's good to connect with people, and (b) there's some interesting stuff going on, and they need to know about that.

It's actually a combination of both. I've continued relationships with all of the institutions, organizations that I've had a hand in supporting over the years with being a facilitator of funds from Pew or other institutions. We continue those relationships, and if there's an opportunity to support them, I'll try and make that happen, if it fits the client's interest or the donor's interest.

What I've also had the luxury of doing is, although I've spent some time in a couple of different places… relationships have been created with those institutions, and the relationships in many cases, thankfully, have continued. That's a good thing. I hope some of the relationships that have been established at Goldman Sachs – and I hope I stay there for awhile, but in Wall Street, who knows these days – they will continue. It's a combination of sustaining and nurturing the long-term relationships, and at the same time building new relationships within the institution or firm you work with, and fostering those as well.

McClimon: Could I jump in here, too?

Bauer: Yes. Because you've been around, too.

McClimon: Well, yes. I met Karen in 1980. And since 1980, I've had six jobs at three different institutions, and I can tell you that Karen has invited me to events at BAM throughout that entire twenty-one-year history. I can't say that for very many institutions, because some of those jobs were less important to Karen's short-term interest than others. But again, I think she takes a long term view about these things.

I think that you *only* have relationships with individuals. I think there is no such thing as a relationship with an institution. You have to put your eggs in each individual's basket. It's all about long-term relationships and keeping those long-term relationships, even if people come in and out of particular jobs that you think are important to you at that time. So I'd really encourage that.

Hopkins: Let me just also jump in here, too. For me, the bottom line was always that people who supported us loved BAM. If they did, and if they got connected to it, then I always believed that these people were going to end up in other places where they would interact with our institution one way or another. I've also known Arlene, I think, through five or six different positions. I'm the only one who never goes anywhere.

In each case these relationships find new directions. It always works out over the long term. The best thing for BAM is to have people who believe in the institution from whatever vantage point they currently have. That's what ultimately builds a great institution.

A development director's job is more or less the same as a president's job, which is the same as everybody's job who works there, which is institution-building. It's really simple and it's really clear, and the question of how to make the marketing, the fundraising, the programming, and everything speak in one voice, so that that institution-building can go on in all these different incarnations of the institution's life, is the challenge when you're trying to make something happen.

Bauer: Can I just say two more things, very quickly? First of all, Tim's had more jobs than I've had in this similar time period.

Number two, going back to Peter Drucker and reading this really excellent survey in the current issue of *The Economist*, he talks about the knowledge worker. We are, in his definition, all knowledge workers. He's amazing; if you've not read Drucker, you need to read Drucker; he's a real touchstone on a lot of organizational thinking. He talks about knowledge workers being committed to a field, not so much committed to a particular institution or organization. Our parents were committed to institutions or organizations. My father worked at the same firm, God bless him, for thirty-five years. I just couldn't do it.

Our generation and the way that we think and operate are very much committed to a field of knowledge, not necessarily an institution. That's what you see going on, in this room in particular, in how we all tend to operate and move in and out of certain jobs and positions. Also, frankly, I think our generation has been given much more interesting opportunities than previous generations, and that triggers this mobility as well.

Audience: I represent a small arts fund in southern Vermont, but in the interest of full disclosure, I work for a community development organization in Connecticut, and just retired from twenty years at Smith Barney in their asset management division.

The thing that struck me about your comments was that there's this funny little tension between the for-profit and the nonprofit business models. I worked in the area of socially responsible investing, so I had that interface every day.

One of the things that I struggle with now in my new role as I try to teach the grantees how to be more effective, and also on the community development side of things, is how to get people to really celebrate the good part of business that is useful to the nonprofit.

I think, Doug, it was you who mentioned the idea of marketing a more strategic thinking on the parts of the nonprofits or the grantees. Even the little teeny tiny ones. Or how you, as corporate folks, make marketing less frightening to the arts organizations? Even Meredith Monk alluded to not being a good businessperson. Could you speak to how you make that connection?

McClimon: Some people have heard me say this before, but I teach in the Arts Administration Program at NYU, and have been teaching there for twelve years in a course that's required for students. So I've seen twelve years of classes of students that have come through there. There has been a huge difference in the students that have come through that program in twelve years.

Twelve years ago, students came into that program thinking that they were going to be an arts administrator in a not-for-profit organization, and that's all they were interested in, and that's all they were concerned about. They only wanted to know how nonprofits operate.

Students today couldn't care less about whether they're in a not-for-profit, or a for-profit, or in a not-for-profit one day and a for-profit the next. Many of them expect in their careers to go back and forth between those types of institutions. So the interests that they have as students are, "Don't tell me just about the not-for-profit, I also want to know about the entertainment world and the way that operates, and how the for-profit world operates." Because of that, their thinking is substantially different in thinking about their careers.

I'm teaching a course right now called "Principals and Practices," where they have to establish a not-for-profit arts organization. It's interesting to see the ideas that they're coming up with, that are kind of not-for-profit, and sort of for-profit, and they don't want to be boxed into just a not-for-profit environment. Younger people and students are thinking about these things very differently than perhaps some of us who have been around for awhile.

Audience: There's no question that 9-11 has affected everybody but in the region I come from, New York, and New Jersey, or Connecticut, or New York City, the impact is dramatic. And NYFA is in the process of working with others to create the New York Arts Recovery Fund.

But I am interested in the response in terms of the corporate giving that has gone into the 9-11 funds. The sense is that we're part of the hidden victims, and have not been identified in that. Yet corporations and foundations have been very supportive of the arts. Why are we not getting our fair share of the pie? What do we have to do to get our fair share?

McClimon: Yes, I think that's a correct perception of where a lot of institutions are.

Corporations really did just dive into disaster relief funding, but it was about the disaster. It was really about the emotional and physical and national part of that disaster, and it was an attempt to do something and say something, in the days, literally days, and in some cases just hours immediately after that disaster. To a lesser degree, an attempt to tell their employees that they were doing something as a company. All of those funds that were established, and all the money the corporations poured into those funds should be viewed pretty much as disaster relief.

Now we're in recovery, or rebuilding, and that's going to be viewed very differently by companies, and there are going to be all kinds of pressures that come to bear on companies. The mayor's office is pressuring companies to do certain things; the New York City Partnership is pressuring companies to do certain things; the school chancellor's pressuring people. There are a lot of pressures being applied to corporations.

Each corporation now will approach its participation in recovery and rebuilding the way it approaches its grantmaking, or its corporate social responsibility. It's going to be very much a case-by-case, what makes most sense for us as a corporation because of where we are physically located, or because of the interests of our employees, or because of our strategies. They're going to take a look at, "Where can we participate in the recovery in a way that makes sense to us as a company?"

That's not the way that we gave money to those disaster relief funds. That was after-the-disaster-lets-do-something, there are a lot of victims, we need to do something. But I wouldn't equate the two, and wouldn't assume that corporations that gave to disaster relief will necessarily give to recovery relief, and definitely wouldn't assume that those that gave to disaster relief will give to recovery in the same way. Because they won't.

Shuler: But where are the arts, Tim? Where do the arts fit in that? You haven't really totally addressed the question.

McClimon: What I mean to say by that, and I was being a little obtuse, purposely obtuse, is that I don't think that recovery funds are the way to go. I don't think that corporations are going to want to put their money into a recovery fund, because they have no control over where the money actually goes then. They're going to want to look at, "How do I support the individual organizations that I'm connected with, that are part of the family, that I have long-term relationships with, or that are in my community?" They're going to approach it very much in a strategic way and not as part of an overall fund.

Bauer: In the aftermath of 9-11, a lot of firms and foundations and individuals gave from the heart. For firms downtown, such as Goldman Sachs, who committed $10 million to these efforts, it was an emotional decision. No question about that. And you know what? That's okay. Because we were literally blocks away from that, and you don't have to turn too far. It's not six degrees of separation to know someone who's been deeply affected, if not lost somebody, as a result of that.

But that's the heart decision, and that money that's been collected in the various funds will now have to be allocated. It's now time for decisions to come from the head. It's incumbent upon you and the others in the New York grantmaking community to be very, very thoughtful about what's going on with that allocation. There are a lot of people watching this, and you know it as well as I do.

I'm a new New Yorker, I've been here now just under a year, and it's been a great experience. The thing that's important is that the arts are in a stronger position than you probably think, and it was evident in what Guiliani and others were saying. What did they say? To return to normal. Go see a show. This is about economics. The arts are a huge, huge, powerful piston in the economic engine of New York. That is the justification right there for support. Maybe it doesn't come from private dollars. Maybe it is public allocation coming out of Washington. Maybe it's federal money. If they're serious about rebuilding New York, a key component is the cultural fabric, and the institutions that support that fabric. To me, that is a very powerful argument. Whoever is elected mayor tomorrow will understand that, one way or the other.

Hopkins: I think that the story is just beginning to be told. That's another part of it. The Brooklyn Academy of Music stands to lose a million dollars, which is an enormous amount of money for us, between the city cuts, the state cuts, parking lot revenues that are off, this, that, and the other. There are a million different things that have the fallout. Part of what we're experiencing is that we don't know yet what the extent of the cuts are going to be, but I can promise you that both jobs and programs will be lost.

So, the first part of it is, we can't whine about it because everybody is taking it hard right now and we have to be part of that. With that understanding, then we start to do the tough job of making the cuts.

But the second thing we can do is make sure that we do join together and are very clear about the message of the total of what's being lost, how it's being lost, and what the implications of the loss will be. Again, I think it gets back to the family, that various foundations and corporate supporters will help their grantees, and maybe some others that have a point of view that they support. Cultural relief will come in that form. The way that we deliver this message and stand together as a community of not-for-profits is critical if we expect foundations and corporations to support us in a way that doesn't seem divisive.

Yesterday, watching the cops and the firemen fight with each other was just awful. If we see institutions fighting with each other – I'm not going to even bring up Lincoln Center at the moment – it doesn't help. It doesn't help, and what we need to do is find a way to stand for what we stand for, and to try to come out with a unified message.

Shuler: We talk about keeping the pie, and I think it's really staying the course. It's incumbent upon grantmakers and institutions to stay the course.

Bauer: Two other words, too. We have to be surgical about this work, and it has to be data-driven. That's the only way you're going to win these arguments, because there are a lot of folks lining up for support. If the arts are going to make this case, they've got to drive it with data and be very, very clear about where the money's going and why.

Shuler: I agree with that. Yes sir?

Audience: I'm with a very small foundation with limited funds, and we wanted to know how to respond to the aftermath of 9-11. What we decided to do was put some money into another nonprofit group that has a publication for words and images. We picked a subject called, "The Artist Responds to War and the Aftermath." We are going to have that, plus they're going to do another event, and we're helping them fund that as well. A major national event elsewhere. We're small, and we work together with another small foundation to accomplish this response to 9-11, in answer to some of your questions.

Shuler: Thank you. We have time for one more question. Sir?

Audience: I'm here from a family foundation. Community Foundations had a series of meetings to decide what we can do to help. A wonderful group of people came together. Everybody was talking about what they were doing. One of the conclusions that came out of it emphasized the marketing of your own programs to the local audience through an interactive Web site which would be supported by the foundation.

Hopkins: Let me just respond to that for a minute. The Web part notwithstanding, one of the important suggestions of our board – and our executive committee has been meeting regularly to monitor how we're dealing with everything – was to also double up our marketing efforts right into Brooklyn to make sure that everybody knew that the home team was there and needed their support, and, not to stay out of Manhattan or anything weird like that, but that we want people to come to the institution, that we are in the neighborhood, and that it's easy to get there, and in many ways trying to go right into our home community and double up our efforts there, while we still do everything we always do.

Shuler: I want to thank our panelists, who were fantastic. I want to thank you all for coming, and for your wonderful questions. Thank you.

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