



Grantmakers in the Arts
Proceedings from the
1999 Conference

Strengthening the Arts Through Policy, Performance and Practice

November 14-17, 1999 San Francisco

Myths and Models of Collaboration: Creating Strategic Alliances That Work

Partnership veterans dissected living and dying strategic partnerships in the arts and the role philanthropy plays in success and failure. Big, small; artistic, political; financial, social; youth-focused, discipline-based; ego-centered, humanitarian; non-profit, for-profit, no profit; local, national, regional, global; private or public; long-term relationships and one-night stands. This session took a playful look at partnership pitfalls of the 20th century and promise in the 21st.

Moderator: Robert Lynch,
Americans for the Arts

Panelists: Liz Lerman,
Liz Lerman Dance Exchange;
Meryl Marshall,
Academy of Television Arts and Sciences

November 16, 1999, 10:00 a.m.

© 2000 Grantmakers in the Arts



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

*Strengthening the Arts through
Policy, Performance and Practice*

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

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

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

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

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

Cora Mirikitani

1999 GIA Conference Chair

Cervený: *Good morning, everybody. I know it's really difficult to come off of very exciting roundtables which, I assume you all were meeting around this morning, and settle in on this beautiful San Francisco morning. It was beautiful this morning when I was walking out.*

I'm Kathleen Cervený. I'm secretary of the Board of Trustees of Grantmakers in the Arts. I'm also head of the Communications and Publications Committee for Grantmakers in the Arts. And it's really my privilege to be able to introduce your moderator for this session this morning, Bob Lynch. Bob has lived his life at the intersection between arts and education, and arts and advocacy, and arts and public service. And he's uniquely qualified to talk about the issues of collaboration and partnership because he's been in them most of his life. So I'm really pleased to be able to be here to introduce him to you.

I should give you some specifics about his background because it's quite a distinguished one. Bob is the president and CEO of Americans for the Arts which is located in Washington, D.C. Americans for the Arts is dedicated to increasing private and public support for the arts and culture. Prior to this position, Bob was the President and CEO of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies for 12 years. And for more than 20 years – he doesn't look that old – he's been a speaker and a trainer on leadership, management, creativity, and community cultural planning.

Before his work with NALAA, Bob spent ten years as the executive director of the Arts Extension Service of the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Massachusetts. He's the founder and the chair of the Cultural Advocacy Group, which is a consortium of more than 60 national organizations dedicated to raising the awareness about the role and value of the arts and federal funding for the arts in building strong communities. He's also served on the boards of the Ireland America Arts Exchange, the Craft Emergency Relief Fund, and the State Arts Advocacy League of America. He served on the board of the Kennedy Center's Alliance for Arts Education, the Education Advisory Council of the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Coalition for Education and the Arts.

And all of that sounds very weighty and very heavy and very distinguished, but I'm told you're going to have a lot of fun this morning. So without further ado, I turn it over to Bob Lynch.

Lynch: Thank you, very much. And what we're talking about here in this session is "Myths and Models of Collaboration: Creating Strategic Alliances that Work." And that list of alliances that you just heard that I'm part of, some of them work and some of them don't work. And that's one of the things that I think we're going to talk about today. There's an awful lot of meeting going on out there, and sometimes it's good and sometimes it just a lot of talk.

I am going to start off by introducing my two panelists, co-panelists here. And I want to start first with Liz Lerman.

Liz, as many of you know because many of you have had a chance to work with Liz, is the artistic director of the Liz Lerman Dance Exchange in Maryland. She founded the Dance Exchange in 1976. And a lot of you have seen the incredibly broad range of work that Liz and her company have been able to do in communities, touching on community participation as a key strategy, cross-generational ensemble work, and exploring how people live in today's society and how the arts and how dance in particular can be part of that celebration and that life.

She has won seven choreographic fellowships from the national Endowment for the Arts, the American Choreographer Award, many other awards, which I won't go into, advises two national forums, the Synagogue 2000 Forum and Harvard University's Sequoia Seminar. For me, Liz Lerman is a... I think of her as a creativity power generator. If you need creativity generated, you need a power generator to do it, that's what Liz does.

She helps people like me rethink the way I think and work, and for a couple of years we've had Liz come and be the artist in residence at our own Americans for the Arts National Conference, popping up in unexpected places to help people rethink how they interact at a conference.

To my immediate right, is Meryl Marshall. Meryl Marshall is the Chair and CEO of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences down in Los Angeles. She has just been unanimously re-elected to her second term as chair of the Academy, quite a large organization – the last

thing I read said 10,000 members, and just last year, I read 8,000 members, so something's happening. She has dedicated her tenure there to trying to change things, promoting creativity, promoting diversity, promoting innovation, promoting excellence in the advancement of telecommunication arts. She oversaw the 50th anniversary of the *Emmy Awards*, probably the most visible thing that most of us are familiar with.

But she is creating many other programs, for example a program called *Through the Eyes of Children*, with the chairman of the FCC. She has done a variety of artwork herself as the president of her own company, Two Oceans Entertainment Group. And in this capacity, won the cable Ace Award. A lot of work, her media work, is on improving or changing the way we look at media images of race and class. She's an instructor at UCLA. And if that's not enough, she started off her career as a trial attorney and then went on to be counsel at NBC.

I hear a lot of people out there talking about collaboration cross sector. There are very few people who are doing anything about it and trying to create partnerships between nonprofit and for-profit arts. Meryl Marshall is one of those people.

So those are our two guests today. We've tried to do a variety of approaches here to present, which is a kind of a creative chaos that we've undertaken here. We'll see how it works. And my job is to start us off with a quick review at my last count of about 34,000 years of arts history. And I have about 15 minutes to do this.

But first what I want to say is that Liz, in partnership, was not able to get here earlier and asked me to... she gave me an artistic assignment in the spirit of partnership. Her artistic assignment to me was to send me out as a designated conference choreography/vocabulary scout. Now, what does that mean?

Well, that means that at our conference, one of the things that happened that I found fascinating is that Liz looked at the way, just as I'm doing here, people use gesture, people use movement in the context of communication in our everyday lives in a conference setting like this. She took that movement and in our case

created a piece, a modern dance piece with that movement, showing those difference gestures. So yesterday at the opening session, I watched a number of our colleagues in the opening session. Now, it was a tough assignment because they were all sitting down. They were sitting down, so this the opposite of Irish dance where, you know, the legs only move in Irish dance.

[The following paragraphs refer to some tongue-in-cheek visual demonstrations of movement and gestures illustrated by Bob Lynch, followed by a tongue-in-cheek 34,000 year history of art collaboration via overheads.]

But Cora, is Cora here? I saw Cora a second ago. Cora's approach was a very straightforward approach. She did gestures like this *[demonstration by Bob]*. And it was very effective, that's the way she would punctuate, like this. And Dennis, immediately, was a counterpoint to Cora. His gestures were like this, immediately, this, and then he did one of these things for several points.

Now, we were lucky in that we had audience participation. And Ken was called up from the audience to demonstrate his orange sock and his blue sock. And the next person, Arch Gillies, came up and Arch immediately did this, to illustrate his points and every once in a while, if he got excited, he would do this and then he would go back to this again. Faith... Faith's work was a combination of this, this, this. Several time she'd say, I think this, we should do this, that's what... And finally, Caroline, our last speaker, brought us back to the ballet simplicity and dealt with us like this.

So these are my choreography notations. And what I thought I would do for the history is to bring us, first, to some fairly primitive collaborations.

[overhead of cave art]

Thirty-four thousand years ago, the cave collaborations were nonetheless, collaborations. In fact, what I find interesting is that you can't see this very well, but that is an elephant, bison/elephant combination, interestingly we're still dealing with that same image today in Brooklyn. But the interesting thing about

collaboration there was that according to the articles that I've read, the collaboration was between the toolmakers and then the other members of the community who got to see the new tools and were able to use those new tools to create something that was artistic.

[overhead of Pyramids]

We skip several thousand years and we see the first public art project, the pyramids. Interestingly, a thing about the pyramids, it wasn't actually the most fun collaboration for all of the people involved, but it was a collaboration. Now, the thing about the pyramids that a lot of people don't know is that it actually was a public works project – or many of them were – to try to use laborers and pay those laborers and pay those artisans and keep them working. So that ended up being a part of our partnership history.

[overhead of Phoenician ship]

Bringing us then to the Phoenicians, about 1000 B.C. What I love about the Phoenicians is – and I tried to get this in color – besides all of their ship building and besides all of their conquest and fisher skills, they also invented the color purple. Before the Phoenicians, there was no color purple. And it was invented via partnership. The fisher people found mollusks that had the purple dye, and the arts people were able to create the new color, and the Phoenicians went down in history.

And if you think about it, interestingly enough, when we think about technology today, that was technology then and that technology, the invention of that color, reshaped art for the rest of mankind, the use of that color. So the Phoenicians played a role.

[overhead of Parthenon]

Now, the first arts council that we're aware of occurred in Athens 500 BC. In 500 BC, the concept of the arts as part of everyday life, as part of community expression, was something that was being talked about there and the partnership between the people who were involved in the evolution of theater and evolution of dance was at the same time, connected to the evolution of politics and thinking and

policy. We had a session on policy yesterday. These folks started off early, involved the arts, and then they ran into some trouble, but we won't go into that.

[overhead of Medieval armor]

Another thousand years goes along and you see medieval arts. But again, partnerships throughout the history of the known world were a combination of the arts and military, for example; the arts and church for example; the arts and the monarchy; the arts and the Vatican. In all of these instances, the funders of the day, whichever form they took, were part of a leveraging motivation that led to different kinds of partnerships that led to outcomes. Again, some not pretty; some wonderful.

Now we come to the story of the arts in America, which I see as a story of surges forward and setbacks. It started early, the first major setback here 1492, Columbus. Before Columbus, the Native American community had it together. The arts were integrated in every part of culture: food, dwelling, clothing, religion. Many Native American cultures today still have no word for art because it's just part of everything. It was the ultimate arts collaboration. It was just embedded. However, if you think about the people who came after 1492: conquistadors, treasure-seekers, westward expansionists, people fleeing religious persecution, slaves, indentured servants, prisoners, not an artsy crowd. Interaction survival was what it was all about.

But as we continue to look at the history here in America, we continue to see setbacks. The next big setback, 1620, pilgrims, followed by Puritans. Many of you have seen the pictures. This was a very grim group. They outlawed dance, Liz. They outlawed theater. They outlawed certain colors, including the color purple. This backdrop, however, led to, and I think is part of what we deal with when we're dealing with collaborations to overcome obstacles of the past, even today in the New England landscape, you see that same influence, I think, of 500, 400 years ago, and what those early decisions meant for the way people involve taste today.

In the early part of our country, we had an imported art partnership: royal elite, followed by a plantation elite, followed by a shipping elite; followed by an industrial elite primarily looking to bring things from the outside in. And that concept, I think, laid the groundwork for the way a lot of arts business is done today.

You see not until the 1800s, the first arts organizations coming into being, private, primarily, and very few of them. In 1850... I have an overhead here that Jim Smith also uses, and so whoever gets to the overhead projector first gets to use this overhead. But it's an interesting concept of what we're still dealing with in America today.

[overhead of 1848 Shakespeare Riot in New York]

A hundred and fifty years ago in New York, seat of the current controversy, there were two competing productions of *Macbeth*. One, an English-related production; one an American production. And the debate over quality was so heated, that a riot, several riots broke out. Fanned, interestingly, by the press again, similarly to what happens today.

The difference is that 150 years ago, 23 people were shot and killed in this riot over *Macbeth* by the army, which was called out. So we see this backdrop and we see the need for creative partnerships, dialogue coming together, to overcome some of these kinds of problems.

We can't go into all of the partnerships and all of the comings together that have happened in history. But let's just say that in this very fertile 1850 to the early 1900s period, they came and went and they made a lot of impact. The Village Improvement movement; the City Beautiful movement; the American Lyceum Association. In 1850, there were 3000 lyceums across America, bringing art and lecturers. The Chautauqua movement in 1874; the Western Opera House movement; the Community Concert Series movement; the Little Theater movement. And on and on.

Each one of these clusters, these partnerships, came together, created something for its time, had an impact, and then went away. Interesting. Something to think about as we try to establish

permanence. Something for us to look at and think about.

Then as we go further, you take a look at the turn of this century at some big changes that happened. In the early 1900s, the Tax Code change that created a new opportunity for partnership in the growth of individual donors. In the 1950s, the Foundation influence, and its creation of new sources of revenue. The Arts Council movement in 1949, 50 years ago this year. In 1965, the real advent of government as a partner with the National Endowment for the Arts. Overnight, 50 state arts agencies. There were four in '64, there were 50 in '66. And this kind of an evolution of different partnership components, brings me for my 34,000 year roundabout way to the situation in New York right now.

[overhead of cartoon]

I loved this *Speed Bump* cartoon. "Impressive dung, Bob, but is it art?" 34,000 years ago we were dealing with elephant dung and we still are today. And we will be having an entire forum on that subject tonight.

This look at the way we connect, the way we work, up until this point is a backdrop for some comments that we want to make about partnerships that have worked and partnerships that haven't worked. Bill Gates recently in *Entrepreneur* magazine and in his book, talked about the future from here. And he said, business is going to change more in the next ten years than it has in the last 50, which I've just talked about. If the 1980s were about quality and the 1990s were about reengineering, then the 2000s will be about velocity, speed, change.

Now, my 34,000 year history shows that there's been a lot of change. And I think the velocity of that change is something that we as a funding community really need to look at. So let me put a few caveats up there before I turn to Meryl.

Pitfalls. These are different problems that I see with partnerships. Partnership pitfalls.

The shot heard round the room. A lot of people coming together, big noise, nothing happens. A lot of partnerships are like that.

Roman candle partnerships. Big splash, four or five big colorful bursts, and then they go away. A partnership that I was very much a part of and you were very much a part of, the National Cultural Alliance, was a Roman candle partnership. Too much money and effort front-loaded, not enough sustainability. It made a splash; I think it did good work; and then it left because it was not sustainable.

Drowning in consensus partnerships. That, I think, is for me an example of when we pull groups together and we think that we're going to agree on everything. Impossible. So we have to carve out the areas of agreement and work on that.

Exploitative partnerships. It's not really a partnership. Somebody's pulling the strings and they're using the other members of the names on the list to pretend that it's a partnership.

My favorite, the arts firing squad, form a circle. For me, what happens very often is that the arts will come together and instead of focusing on an outside objective, start nitpicking inside. And that ends up often, you know, to our detriment, particularly in political battles, where people who are more savvy, understand about keeping their eye on the ball.

Control partnership, similar to the exploitative partnership.

The Peter partnership, like the Peter Principle, people rising to a level of incompetence in the partnership but then being very happy with the dinners and coming together for the lunches.

Steal this partnership, the Abby Hoffman approach. But often this happens when somebody new comes into a tired situation and regenerates it. But sometimes that takes away the consensus leadership that you have to have.

Chaos partnerships, I think, speak for themselves, and most of them I find are that.

The Lone Ranger syndrome, which is when somebody basically misuses a partnership situation to make a lot of one-person decisions either to the benefit of that organization, or to the benefit of that person in the guise of it being partnership.

Catharsis partnerships, great come together, commiserate, don't expect a lot of work to be done. And believing in short-term objectives, for me what that means is that every partnership that I have been involved with took twice to three times as long as anybody said it was going to take, and so that's one of the things that I see as a problem.

I'm going to throw a quick video on that illustrates a partnership that we've been doing with CBS Television. These PSAs are running right now on prime time for the month of October/November.

[video]

Okay. So the quick thing on that is simply that we have a partnership there that involves the media, involves the entertainment industry, involves all of those artists giving their time, involves the head of CBS television who just retired, Mike Jordon, who is the chairman of our board. And the ability to put all of those things together and to create something that is specifically aimed at a certain audience. That's not for everybody, that PSA, that's for those people who watch prime time CBS television at 8 o'clock at night and the message is geared to those people. So those are some... that's one example of a partnership.

Here are some strategies that I want to think about. Is the partnership a marriage or a date? If you get into it for the long term, you're going to be disappointed as the Chautauqua movement, the Lyceum movement, and a lot of other things were. Usually, partnerships come together around specifically taking care of something. One-minute partnerships. We're hearing, in fact, in a couple of sessions, we were talking about ad hoc groups coming together and creating effective work and then going on to something else.

Stealth partnerships. We don't have to always when we're trying to effect change put all of our laundry out for everybody to see. Sometimes we need to be a little more quiet and behind the scenes. This is a line from *The Thomas Crown Affair* movie. "Do you want to dance or do you want to dance?" Are we fooling around or are we going to come to-

gether in this partnership and really try to make something happen?

Back to the one-minute partnerships, SWAT teams, task forces, *ad hoc*-racies as a way to come together. And the Kenny Rogers syndrome, you've got to know when to hold them, know when to fold them, is one of the things that I think is really important.

The next quick one for me a second PSA campaign that we have going that illustrates a partnership with Bravo. And what I want to show here expanding the voices in the partnership.

[video]

So a second example of a partnership, and in this case, the voices are expanded from arts voices to sports voices like Kareem Abdul Jabar; political voices, Hilary Clinton was part of this although she's not in that particular one.

So what are some of the payoffs of partnership? Effectiveness. Impact. Credibility. I feel a good partnership, stronger ideas. We come together and collectively can come up with stronger ideas.

I have an illustration of something – we may not be able to get it – but in Newark, New Jersey, the Performing Arts Center downtown, all of the individuals involved said that separately, they would never have come to the conclusion of moving the Center downtown, but collectively when they started talking, they had the concept that that was the only place that the Center could go. Stronger savings and expanded knowledge base; creativity and innovation, sometimes people work really, really well in these kinds of situations; and side benefits like cool T-shirts and other kinds of ancillary opportunities. So I'd like to end this first part here with some principles; good partnerships for me.

One plus one equals three; you get more. Collaboration is hell, it just takes longer, it's a lot of work, don't fool yourself. It's a coalition, not necessarily a lifetime commitment. The law of flux; things change. Often I see this: revolution, let's change everything; and evolution, we come together into a coalition and it goes

through various changes; and devolution, back out again. And that cycle seems to continually repeat itself.

A mutual decision-making process needs to be at the center of this. Early on, you have to define what success is so that you know when you get there. And it takes a long time so wear comfortable clothing. And I'm going to stop at this point with these principles up there and turn to Meryl Marshall.

Marshall: Thank you, Bob. Quite dynamic and a great background for all of that.

I'm going to try and come at this subject from two different directions. One as a person who's in an industry, television, which is a collaborative medium and requires strategic partnerships on an ongoing basis in order to create all of the product which you see. And depending on how much time we have, I'll also identify a couple of key partnerships that the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences has identified. And then when I come back again, hopefully we'll dissect a couple of those, at least briefly.

The main thing to know is that I don't know that all of us think of television as a partnership, which is what it is. It really is the coming together of an individual idea, an artist with an idea, a story that they want to tell, who immediately has to engage a buyer, a network, to decide that that idea is something worth pursuing. And unless that buyer's idea is in sync with the anticipation of the artists from the time the idea is generated, there's absolutely no way that the idea will ever see the light of day.

So it means creating a piece of expression, a personal expression identifying a story, a subject matter, which someone else will want. And then going to that individual and persuading them that the vision that you have which doesn't exist in any way, shape, or form, is something that they could, should, and want to invest in financially. And together, you will gather a team that will actually execute that idea.

And the other piece of it is that you know that in 90 percent of those ideas, should they ever make it all the way through to being executed and on television, they will fail. It is a business of failure. That every original idea that is

created is likely to end, if it ever makes it to the light of day, that most of them will never see a second showing and will never make it to a second year. And yet continually through that process, you are required to bring people into this vision to have them commit their personal vision, to see your vision, and to anticipate something that doesn't exist in any way, shape, or form.

That is quite, as you can imagine, a challenging arena to work in. And when we talk about the reason why the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences was constructed... the reason it was created was to give each of the artists that participate in that process some other place to go to get some sense of community, some sense of support. Some sense of respect for the work that they do, so that they could continually engage in this enormous, risk-taking adventure.

Now, as a producer, let me give you two examples.

One is a program called *Happily Ever After, Fairy Tales for Every Child*, which many of you may have seen. Many of you may not. It's the retelling of the classic fairy tales but this time with multi-ethnic images. So it's an African American version of "Jack and the Beanstalk." It's a Latino version of "Hansel and Gretel." This idea really came from the existence of books that were being published, Robert and Donna Guillaume were publishing books in which kids' voices were being heard on tapes acting as if they were a community theatre group. And they were playing out the fairy tale in this tape. The tape was brought to me along with a little child's book, which really showed very small drawings of these characters playing these characters in the fairy tale. And I must say, for the first time, I realized that here we've heard these fairy tales for years and years and years and never ever seen them interpreted in anything other than European or Anglo interpretation.

Those books became the basis for a sale to HBO. HBO immediately took the children out of the concept. I mean, instantly upon seeing it. And the idea that children would be playing children or would be acting out these characters was not at all intriguing to them. They were intrigued by literature, the fairy tale, something that would

be easily known. And they were intrigued by the idea of bringing stars, people of color, to this idea, which would get them enormous amounts of promotion and recognition.

And so the idea that we had that was wondrous, became wondrous in a new fashion, and had to be of course, wondrous in this transformation otherwise one couldn't motivate oneself to work very hard and to get it done.

And immediately we brought in an animation team. And what we did was really, I must say, extraordinary in this circumstance. We got everybody invested in the fact that one could not bring images of color to the screen without going to unique creators that had never worked before in the television medium. Because as you still read today in the papers, the volume of people who are in fact allowed to work have credit, established credit, in the television environment, who come from diverse backgrounds, is minuscule. And so we reached out to people who had fine work in theater, in literature, and we brought them into this creative process to begin to develop these half hours.

We immediately met with a home video distributor – bringing in another partner, of course, to help finance this project – and immediately had a conversation that reflected the following.

But how will my daughter know that it's Cinderella if she's not blond and wearing the same dress, the fancy big dress that I've always seen? My daughter won't know that Cinderella. She knows who Cinderella is.

That conversation was a very difficult one. My partner in this project is Donna Brown Guillaume. It was hard enough for me to hear, but for someone like Donna who has a daughter, Rachel, who has beautiful dreadlocks, and is an adorable six year old that wanted... at the time, wanted to grow up to be Cinderella. The fact that someone felt that her daughter couldn't be Cinderella unless she imaged herself as a blond was intolerable. But together we took the partners forward and we did in fact make the series and the series is on the air.

The other thing that we had to do, and it's something that one would think of but not think of, is that painting the characters a different color is not what diversity is about or reflecting a diverse culture is about. It's about really going to the essence of the story that you're trying to tell and now place it in a new environment. And figure out a way to create an environment that in fact reflects that diversity. So you might set "Hansel and Gretel" in a Cuban Rain Forest, or you might set "Princess and the Pea" in Korea. And that then gives you a cultural context within which you can start to define the terms of diversity. This was not an easy sale but we did make it all the way through and we did several seasons.

In the course of such an adventure, however, by year two, it didn't become as important because the sales hook of such an idea no longer became the fact that it was fresh voices or diverse images. And so to keep that concept alive required the constant belief and potential use of shame and other elements to keep really alive what was a very, very important idea.

To this day, we've done 40 episodes and I think we've probably hit the end of it. But keeping such an idea alive and vibrant means taking a strategic partnership, one of necessity, in order to get a program made. And fighting for the underlying ideal and understanding that compromise is going to be necessary.

Another example I want to give you is just one involving an international alliance that we made. Two Oceans Entertainment Group was originally financed with funding out of Belgium. Now, one might say, why would you find European funding in Belgium, and particularly in the Benelux? And the reason is because we imaged that we have most in common with England, but in fact, if one is going to find a real-world partnership, there are English-speakers that don't necessarily have a culture that is as distinct as the British. And if you really want to have an international flavor to it and yet work with people who know your own language, Benelux is a place where people speak Dutch, German, French, and English quite fluently.

Together, we decided it would be a good idea if we could create product for the world market, still in English because it was the language that travels the best, but one that could reflect this diversity of culture. That could reflect values and ideas that came out of some other part of the world.

It was a very challenging adventure, and one of the things that we discovered that was so important is that when people learn English as a second language or another language, particularly in business, their use of those terms may not mean the same thing. So we did a pilot for a game show in America. A pilot is a sales tool. It means that when it's finished you will take it into the market and try and find people who will want to buy it. So we are producing a pilot, which we want to be the most attractive and wonderful example we can come up with, to persuade people that it is a brilliant idea.

And midway through the process, actually in editing, when I am asking for minute changes because I think that the timing is not quite right and the laugh is not going to work, I discover that the word "pilot" when used in a European context is a sample. It means you have a commitment from a buyer. You know the program is going on the air. But now you have a sample, which of course, will be improved when you go finally to the series and deliver the program. So we have an example of using the same vocabulary and having very significant differences of meaning.

In order to form meaningful collaborative partnerships, one has to really understand and define one's terms and keep them alive throughout this creative process, to conclusion. At the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, what we do is try and bring all of these varying disciplines and ideas to bear.

As an organization we represent, we have in and among our 10,000 members, camera people, hairdressers, costume designers, executives, animators, writer, directors, every category that you can imagine. And in each one of these distinct areas, this need for understanding what the relationship is, what the power structure is, what the artistry is, is of critical importance. And one of the things that

we've learned is that we think again that we understand one another's functions and roles and what we do, and continuously, we discover that the depth of our knowledge is rather insignificant and inadequate for the depth of appreciation of one another's work. That it requires an enormous amount of time and attention to actually be able to dissect and understand what are the different skill sets and disciplines that are coming together to make a program. And what are the creative instincts that one must draw on in order to develop the ideas that one does.

One of the programs that we've created is called *The Archive of American Television*, which does nothing at this point except memorialize the people who created this medium, who brought theater into television, and who brought radio to television, and had to discover what this new medium of television would be and how it would draw from all of those disciplines.

When we come back, I will talk about how we're working with children in these areas. But you can see it's a rich area, and when looking for strategic alliances with people in either the arts in television, or in the businesses of the television industry, there are endless opportunities if one takes apart the pieces that they contribute and relates to the pieces, as opposed to just considers the product when it is completed and finished and on the screen. Thank you.

Lynch: Just by way of clarification, what we're going to do is one round and then a very, very brief second round to give ourselves the opportunity to comment on things that we forgot and then open it up to questions. So, Liz.

Lerman: Hi, everybody. Nice to see you. I was thinking this morning when I woke up that a question for me with this panel is, so why all of this partnership stuff now? What's happening?

And I thought it might be interesting if I could spend a little time theoretically and then a little time very personally, and then later when we come back, take one project and look at the way in which all the levels of partnerships actually work out.

But I think at least this morning my thought was that one reason there is so much partnership now is actually the failure of integration. And I mean by the failure of integration on a large social scale, the idea somewhere we must have had that we were somehow all going to get together and be this consensus, or be the same, or share our common ground. And that it turned out we really can't do that. And in lieu of that, we had to look at our differences differently and begin to understand other ways that we might come together.

But when I think about the failure of integration, I actually think on a very personal level as well, because I was sort of musing about why do I like partnerships so much, and I think that a lot of it is because on a personal level, depending on who we're partnering with, I get to partner with a different part of myself. That it allows a tremendous range of possibility in terms of human encounters.

In a way, when Bob was talking about, on the one hand this idyllic version of art embedded in cultural so much that there isn't a word for it, one end of the spectrum and the other end of the spectrum, art and religion, art and technology, art and, art and, art and, that I think what we're doing is sort of moving on that spectrum and trying to understand that.

For me, it isn't that I mind these fragmented cells. And I certainly don't mind the differences I find in our world. I kind of love it. What I don't like is when they get boxed in, put in a cement box so that it's very hard to cross between them, I don't like that. I don't like when there are no windows or no doors in these distinctions so that we cannot see each other, which is something that I think Meryl was talking to. How it is that we come to break open and understand each other.

So I like to think of it as more like permeable membranes, whether I'm talking about myself as a Jew, a woman, an artist, a mom, a choreographer, a business person, a fund raiser, whatever of those roles I'm talking about, or whether I'm talking about the communities to which the Dance Exchange is invited or which we come and enter.

When I think about what I get out of partnerships or collaborations, I would start with this rather contradictory notion: One thing I get is completely new information, particularly these unexpected partnerships which I want to talk about because they're my favorites. As I said, it opens a door on who you really are! Who you really are. On the other hand, what I also get out of partnerships is a complete affirmation and confirmation of my own thinking. The more I spend time in non-arts circles, and do my work, the more convinced I am of the work that we're doing and of what's happened, the sort of shared common ground we have in the world. Some of those things are this:

One is the idea of relationships. That it turns out what really matters right now to lots of people is our connections in our relationships. I know that feeds into the process/product argument and I want to just say right now, I'm in favor of both. I will say that again. It's impossible to have one without the other. I'm in favor of both. However, the nature of partnerships, as we saw from Bob's list, causes a tremendous amount of effort in the nature of relationship. And lo and behold, that's what a lot of people want! They want an opportunity to come together and spend time with people that they wouldn't otherwise get to spend time with. Or sometimes they just need to spend time with their own tribe. But I think most of this is about coming across our differences. For me... that's a little bit of the theory part.

I want to talk a little bit more now about my sort of personal evolution to this. I was trained as a classical ballerina. In my training, I came into sort of the beginning of my artistic prime with some ideas, when I began to choreograph in particular. And this was one of the ideas. I would think of the movement. I would find the exact right movement for the exact right idea, and there was only one such movement that could possibly be an expression of the particular idea I was working on. Just one. And I would find it out. That got me very stuck, very fast.

I did labor under that principle for awhile. I would say two things dramatically altered it for me and sent me into a tailspin, which I'm still – I guess that's not really a good metaphor right

now with the airplane – sent me into a discovery mode.

One is, we were getting ready for our first Kennedy Center appearance, really big deal, local artist makes good. And one of the wonderful dancers in my company injured herself and she could not bring this arm up. Much of the choreography was that kind of choreography, arms all over the place. And we had exactly 24 hours to fix this.

And we began to explore how she could possibly get through the performance. And it turned out that she if kept her arm here, she didn't hurt herself and she could do it. It was much better choreography. It was much better. And I began to realize that there is a dialogue to be had that in my individualized, completely internal perfect, perfect world I was trying to create, there was no room for that.

So it strikes me, first of all, that what happens in the glorious possibility of collaboration is dialogue...listening...someone else's input.

Here's another thing. I was laboring under the impression that my job as a choreographer was to create a new movement form that only my dancers could perform, and that that would catapult me into the public eye. When I tried to do that, even the most professional dancers I found could not replicate me, not unless they studied me for about ten years, which is what Martha Graham said it would take. Can you imagine how boring that would be? Studying me for ten years, the way I move this way? But when I found out that when the dancers contributed their own movement – and again I'm not talking about people in community right now, I am talking about professional arts – they were so much more invested in what happened between us. That was pretty significant.

The third thing was that my work with older people, which had been stimulated because of my mother's death and my wanting to make a piece about her, and my entering this incredibly weird world of older adults. I like to remind people that this was 1975. Pre-jogging, pre... nobody was moving in the streets. If you want to think about the amount of change that we have gone through only in 25 years, at that

time, when I began to work with older people, how incredibly much bigger my world got.

So speaking of unexpected partnerships, here comes a dancer into the Senior Center in 1975 and says "Let's move together." And the result after my being there for ten years, was that really in fact I was trained by my students how to do the work that I now do with a lot of great pleasure.

So incredible learning, breaking out of stereotypes, seeing each other in a fresh way, and investment by the people I'm working with to create something that is so much, so much better than I would have made on my own.

In the early days of the Dance Exchange this was pretty simple. We didn't, we didn't cross so many boundaries. We crossed age; we crossed race; and class in small ways. And began to discover the complexities of this world.

Now, I'm just going to move a little bit into the present just to give you one little idea about how this functions for us. And then we'll go into some details, I think. How's my time, Bob? Okay.

I worked on a piece for three years called *Hallelujah*. In this piece... Let me just preface this by saying one thing. I mentioned briefly about listening, and I mentioned about knowledge opening up. The other thing that is incredible to me about partnerships is the relationship of the individual to the whole. People, everybody in it, needs to feel something exciting on a personal level. Something has to happen to them personally. It cannot only just be about, "this will be good for my community" or something like that.

In *Hallelujah* we took a very hard, long look at the nature of history and how it works itself out in our present-day lives. That was kind of a very difficult piece. At the conclusion of this piece, we had a panel. A woman from the African Museum in Washington, D.C. was on our panel, a wonderful woman, and she said, you know, she responded to the piece and then she said, "I'm tired of holding my breath. I want to celebrate right now."

That was like a door, window, fresh breath, everything happened to me in that moment. The idea, could we look at celebration as a way of bringing people together?

Later I went to a conference of rabbis, 300 of them. Sitting, they were all sitting, and one of them got up and taught this *Hallelujah*. And within 30 seconds, all of the rabbis were up dancing! Which is a sight to behold. It turned out that this *Hallelujah* was actually a Sufi melody which had gone to... this rabbi was from Chile, so he had learned it in South America, brought it back up, added the Hebrew text, given it back. And I'm telling you when you hear it, you have to stand up. You have to start moving.

That became as the second little point of how a project like *Hallelujah* begins. I began to think, all right, every culture has a praise tradition. Let's go find out what they are.

Now, I just want to give you a really fast vision. The first *Hallelujah* project is premiering the morning of January 1st in Eastport, Maine, which is the most east you can get in this country. They get the first light of dawn. And we're going to be there with the town, out on the dock, greeting the dawn. Actually, I have to be honest – full disclosure – they're the most eastern city. Lubec is more east, and the two towns are fighting over first light rights. So Lubec is sending out... they're working out some battle between them.

But just in terms of figuring out how a partnership works. There's no arts presenter up in that town. So there's not like I can go to the Washington Performing Arts Society or many of the people who we are used to partnering with. In this case, it's the Community Council, the Chamber of Commerce, excuse me, the Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce, only, even the town of Eastport, only serves a certain group of people, the business owners.

So our task was to try to figure out where else we could find community. There is an incredibly longstanding history there between the native community and the white community. It's also very complex, which we are currently trying to navigate.

There is a school system that hasn't seen an arts program in over 15 years, begging for us to come in and do something with the kids. There are several nursing homes in a town that once had 22 sardine factories, and now has none.

Into that mix, comes this little dance company. And these ideas about engaging people in stories. And I will just leave this one possibility of thought. Even with that list, it turns out as we begin to do our work that of course more and more people begin to come out of the woodwork. It turns out this is one of the largest places for Vietnam vets in the country. So when we discovered that, we don't have any Vietnam vets in the company, but I'm married to a man who is a storyteller and has a full evening of stories about Vietnam, spent a lot of time in that world. And so he's now on the Eastport team. They had a meeting. It turns out the World War II vets also want to be included now, so it's kind of spreading.

If we have time to, I will go into some of the details about both the conflicts in that community and the way I think it will come out. But what I want to say is that the outcome will not be a singular event. I start where I live. I'll end where I began. It isn't really about integration. It is impossible to integrate that little tiny community, impossible! There isn't common ground. There's some common ground and we will find the sum of that. And we will do lots of little projects during the 24-hour period that we're there, to try to embrace as many people as we can. And we will try to have them hear each other's stories and see each other in a fresh way. But they will not, even in Eastport, Maine, all come together.

Lynch: I am going to go to something practical, a very practical application, something that a partnership helped me do, that I was not able to do alone and that's a personality change. And sometimes we can learn from other components of a coalition. I am going to show in this little segment, which I was hoping was now irrelevant, but as Brooklyn and the museum issue start to come back, these things become relevant. This is a two-minute snippet from a *Crossfire* show, where the normal Bob Lynch becomes a different Bob Lynch.

[video]

Harry Truman once said if you want a friend in Washington, get a dog. I have seen that to some extent.

I would like to add to some of the things that have been talked about here, why the arts in America right now? And why partnership right now?

Twenty years ago, the first conference of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, the organization I ran before we became Americans for the Arts, had Harry Chapin, the folk singer, as the keynote speaker. And his speech was entitled, "The Arts: Don't Be the Dance Band on the Titanic." And his concept was, when the dance band played on the Titanic, that was wonderful, it entertained. When the ship went down, they went down with the ship. His point was, throw out lines of partnership and collaboration to all the other aspects of community and become broader, become more connected.

So I think that we have seen, in the last 25 years, increasing use of the arts for things like addressing values clarification and understanding. Whether it's cultural equity, as we have been talking about here. Whether it is emotion and feeling and values as is being used with gang work in Los Angeles and New York; whether it's economic viability, downtown revitalization. I won't show the Newark tape, but that's what that's all about. Whether it's tourism or jobs. Whether it is social problem solving, like crime or drugs or other problems in the American city. Each one of these issues are one part of the whole puzzle, and each one of these issues, I think, have led to on the one hand, partnerships, and on the other hand, more money for the arts.

[Series of overheads accompanies comments.]

The nonprofit arts organizations in America from 1965 to 1998 have grown to 40,000. There's a lot more competition out there and there's a lot more partnerships to be had out there.

That competition is largely around money. Where does the money come from? In that order, in the aggregate in America, not for every organization but in general, that's where the

money comes from. The biggest piece, earned income, then individual donors, then governments when you take federal, state, and local together, with local being at a billion dollars right now and federal being at 98 million, and states being at about 400 million. Then foundations, then corporations. Each an important piece of this puzzle.

But in order to achieve this, the arts organization of today – and I'll take a look at my own arts organization – has to put itself into a partnership context. In this case a policy swirl of different kinds of partners. And the central partners at the center for us are the organizations that make the arts happen in locales across America and the private sector interest at that level. But then in each one of these other pieces, there is a partnership opportunity.

If you look at the entertainment industry for example, and as Meryl's been talking about, there are money opportunities there, but other opportunities as well. In simply gross terms, money terms, a lot of dollars are flowing in that industry. How can there be partnership connections there? What does that industry want back from the nonprofit industry?

When you take a look at local government as I've spent the last 15 years doing, you ask them what they care about. Well, they don't care about the arts at first. They care about these things. This is the results of a survey of every elected official in America through the League of Cities.

Number One, the city fiscal condition. Number Two, overall economics, and then drugs and unemployment and violent crime, quality of education, race and ethnic relations. Where the arts show that they are a partner in that, connect to that, those partnerships, those strategic alliances, impress those elected officials.

And I tested the theory again. I had a chance this past weekend to speak at the Harvard Government Center's *Forum for New Mayors*; fifty newly-elected mayors. And without showing them this, we did a little brainstorm in the room, what's the most important thing on your minds, on your docket, right in this order? How can the arts play in? The arts are important. Across the board, there was recogni-

tion of that. But how the arts can help make my community better was particularly key.

This, for the local arts agency world, led over the last years, ten years, to this huge increase of those kinds of connections. Community development issues as part of the 50 largest city arts councils in America, half a billion dollars worth of funding. And you see that a hundred percent of them in '97 were dealing with those kinds of issues. And these are the partners that we are primarily finding ourselves working with.

They found themselves partnering with school districts as the biggest one. But also neighborhood organizations, chambers of commerce, parks and recreation, convention and tourism bureaus and so on. Lots of different partnership opportunities that we see there.

I have one other take that is a local story of partnership. And I think I'm not going to show it but I'm going to tell you what it's about, because it's an interesting one. It's five minutes and if anyone wants to see it later, I can show it to them.

It's a five-minute tape on the Charlotte, North Carolina Arts and Science Council. And the problem that it went through when *Angels in America* came. And the first half of the tape shows how, using all kinds of arguments related to growth, they built the budget from the county government for this arts council up to \$2.8 million over a number of years. And then how, with one vote of the county commissioners, that money was eliminated.

And then the second half of the tape shows how, through a coalition of building and connecting business, corporate leadership, foundations, individuals, and the arts community, they organized politically and were able in the next election to defeat all of the county commissioners who had voted the arts council out, the money came back, and there was a huge growth.

So the interesting thing for me is that when executed properly, coalitions and partnerships can be extremely powerful. The first part of my discussion was theoretical, but now I'm talking very practically, the actual effect that you can have, whether you're talking about a change

that needs to take place in the private sector or the public sector.

So I'll stop there and I'll turn to Meryl.

Marshall: I want to give you an example of a new environment that we created at the Academy which has resulted in a series of partnerships.

First of all as I was saying, the experience of being alone, a creator in this very competitive environment in which 90 percent of the time you're going to fail, is of course, very tough. And the fact that you are invisible most of the time. The choreographer, the camera person, the director, the animator, the hairdresser, the costume designer, production designer, none of those people have much visibility. In fact, as you know, when the credits run at the end of the program, they're getting smaller and smaller and crunched over further to the side. So the idea that anybody would know what you do or how you do it or where it exists or that you are the person, has become almost impossible to discern. And at the same time, there's this incredible criticism going on about television and a very enormous concern that it no longer reflects quality and that it's deteriorating.

I will tell you just as someone who cares a lot about it, I think there's an enormous amount of quality and our expectation is much higher than when we walk into a bookstore. We expect much more from our television sets than we expect in a bookstore. Most of what we find in a bookstore, we don't expect to like or enjoy, and I think that's true a lot for television. If you find a few things there that are wonderful each time, you've found a lot.

But seeing this incredible sense of isolation and this lack of appreciation, the question is, what could I as a leader of an organization, a non-profit organization that was really geared at creating... rewarding and promoting excellence and providing a leadership role somehow in the larger world. What could I do that would change that perception and maybe actually move the dynamics forward and improve the relationship between the television industry and its creators and the larger community?

We created a program called Start. Start Communications. And what its role is was to say that in the public schools, we had had, particularly in Los Angeles, for a long period of time a lack of art education, a lack of art appreciation, any art work going on at all, almost nothing.

We also know and brought together a group of teachers who said to us, you know, kids love television. They are drawn like magnets to it. And when they sit in a classroom and they learn that they have to do reading, writing, and arithmetic, we don't see the kind of enthusiasm that we see when they're watching a television set and compelled to absorb all this information.

On the first hand they're saying the information we think they're absorbing is terrible, and on the other hand, we're competing with it. And we're also finding that in the classroom we can't replicate that kind of enthusiasm. When I started to meet with these teachers and talk to them, what we found we could do, when we thought about what kind of artistry went into what it is that they do, and we thought about the process of television and that it's the sequence of storytelling, and we thought about the fact that you have to be able to read, write, and do arithmetic in order to make these visual images. And we thought about the fact that after 50 years that we have generations now of people who've grown up with more visual imagery than any other generation that came before it, and that in the century to come, being able to access, dissect, understand, recreate in this arena is going to be of critical importance.

We realized there was an opportunity for us that nobody had really anticipated, which was to work with schoolteachers together to create a way to use television as a window into all of the different arts. To understand that you could use the window into television to talk about storytelling. And to take the pieces of storytelling and put them in the hands of children.

And so we actually worked with three elementary schools. We brought in six teachers who came and sat down with our costume designers and our art directors and our animators and our sound mixers. And together they started to

take television programs apart. And together they started to develop curriculum that could actually be used in the classroom to help kids see what they were seeing, to understand how they were being influenced, to understand how the stories were being put together to make them feel happy or sad, angry or joyful, to have them really start to use that to then draw back.

One of the best examples, one of the science fiction series, *Stargate*, the costume designer in describing what she does, how do you create 22 future worlds a year? And her answer was "easy". She goes to the encyclopedia, she goes to the museum, she looks for Roman designs, for Greek designs, for Masai tribe clothing, and she draws on her inspiration from that and she futurizes past designs.

The idea that we could take children and get them to look back and look forward at the same time. To start to understand that there's this enormous breadth of ideas. That this is only a starting point. That if they start to understand this starting point, they can take these tools as their own and create with them, was a very rich area.

And the next piece that we took of that, the second project that we developed, was something called the Family Screening Event, where we decided to add one more level. We brought parents, teachers, and kids together to the Academy to watch a program together and to realize that the discussion of an episode of a series can be the stepping-off point, both for sharing this creative analysis of what goes on, but also to talk about public discourse, to get engaged in civil discourse. If you're talking with kids old enough to watch law programs, you can talk about capital punishment, you can talk about managed healthcare. You can almost talk about any issue that currently confronts American public, or world public, actually, if you just use these as stepping-off points as opposed to end-points.

This is a way in which we've kind of exemplified the idea that you can take artists and educators together and create something fresh, a unique strategic partnership that serves all of their purposes and roles and enriches everyone who participates in it.

Lerman: I think what I'd like to do is look at two videos to give an example of a very small partnership and then a really big one, and you can get a little bit of feeling. And I'll sort of talk as they go.

The first one was a planning visit for *Hallelujah* to Connecticut. Where were we, Peter? Thank you. New London. And they were rebuilding their arts center. We got to know the construction workers. And this is what ensued. This is a ballet school from the area. And I got to work with the construction workers.

[video]

We had a truck playing the music live, well, out of the radio. The rose petals, these were rose petals coming out of the... These are middle school and high school dancers in the back. The audience is...they're kind of back here. And what you can't see is, I'm madly directing the guys in, because they can't hear anything. We had only an hour to work the machines between the company and me – this part. But in preparation for the dance the guys showed me everything that these machines could do. Everything.

The guys who are driving are inside, you can't see them. But they're doing this little thing like this. And I told them that we were going to do this dance in other cities and that I would teach this to other construction workers and they said no, no, they were wanting to tour. So...

The kids were terrific because they only had one rehearsal on the street. It's a company member, Giselle Mason, leading them in front.

It's very beautiful, isn't it?

I was intrigued working with them because clearly these people wanted to dance and they needed a partner to do it. And I think that's true for many of us. It's true for me, although I like doing my solo work, in which case the lens is my partner. But the enormous number of people who can come to this when they feel like they're with the people or the things they love.

The other tape I'm going to put on is much more complex, the Portsmouth one. Just a bit of background. We'd been in Portsmouth, New Hampshire on a tour working with older

people for a week. And then several years later, the shipyard, which is a 200-year old federal facility in that community, was on the shut-down list of the federal government. And they called us to see if we would like to come. And here's why I think some of this partnering is just so amazing.

When we were talking earlier and you think about commissions, the church is a commissioner. Can you stop for just a second? The church is a commissioner. I mean, I don't know where the individual artists were with their commissions in terms let's say of their relationship to God, but I can tell you I had not thought about the military much except in the '80s I had made a piece called *Nine Short Dances About the Defense Budget and Other Military Matters*. So I had not that positive a view. Nor did I have a positive view of the fact that this shipyard is on the toxic... it's on the Superfund list. And like many of the more recent people who moved to Portsmouth, New Hampshire, I was inclined to see it as ugly at the beginning.

But when I got involved and when we met people who, say, had many generations of families working at the shipyard, when we spent over 18 months going back and forth. And when we were able, I think, in that project to finally look at this question of difference that I posed earlier, I'll just briefly talk about that, because it's not on the tape, the environmental one.

We did a lot of listening to the environmentalists who were furious at the shipyard! And a lot of listening to people on the yard who were trying to make changes around that. Ultimately, we had a day-long event called *Cross Currents to Common Ground: Reconciliation*. We did it in a church. It was a site-specific event.

In one place in it we said... we had a whole text on "people say" and we at least were able to put out the different pieces of information that people had about it. And I really think the dancing, because the dancing is so off the shipyard's radar. Who would have ever thought that anybody there would participate, dance, or be interested? It somehow made it safe. Like it made it a safe ground for people to come together.

Now, this video has got a ton of really quick little clips. I'll just say this particular one, the culminating event was a week-long festival, two performances a day, one on the yard, one off the yard. And then a big final event out in a park with maybe a thousand or so people. We kept accumulating a dance. Eventually, everybody learned the dance which unfortunately is not on this tape. It was a nice little dance.

This is... one thing we did was on the bowling alley at the shipyard we did a fashion show with all of the stuff they have to wear for nuclear safety. And that's what we're picking up. And you'll see a retired rigger who joins the show at one point. So now you can play it.

[video]

There he is. He got so involved in this project. This is on the submarine in the shipyard. It was a sub that had gone down and they'd brought it back up and it was a local tap dance company with the retired WACs behind them, and some of the company singing. So you see we cover a lot of artistic ground in a project like this. Right?

This was at Mo's on the Mall, a day when they give free sandwiches. Commissioned Wayne Horvitz, a wonderful composer, to write music for the local band, high school band. There's a real challenge. They really came through.

This is where the Thresher went down, the shipyard. This is a women's chorus, we commissioned, again, the composer to write a piece of music to a prayer that had been said at the 25th memorial to the Thresher, which I was surprised to find in the union prayer book. This is the mayor on the bridge. Between the shipyard and the town, there's a bridge. We shut the bridge down and had a naval guard on hand and we tied the two things together.

Someone said to me, "You've been talking about the power of art for two years, Liz, but now I know it, because you're the only person to ever shut the bridge to traffic." Bob is... I think we can... let's, we'll look at this little image and then we'll close down.

This is a dance we performed with many people from the community. Do you recognize

the text? It's from the Bible. It's Noah building his ship.

If we have time, we can talk in more detail about some of the issues that, again, that residency raised. I think that the main thing I want to pose just as an image, is multiple products for these kinds of extended partnerships. There isn't one. There are a thousand ways, a multitude of ways in which people do the interaction, and which the performance happens. Again, the performance is critical but it's part of a many layered set of activities.

Lynch: We're going to... actually it's fascinating working with these people because what we're not going to be able to tell you... I mean, I've got tapes here, dancing dog tapes. We've got fabulous tapes of "Cinderella" and other products that collectively we've worked on.

But we want to open it up to some questions and we have about maybe 10 or 15 minutes of questions and then a final grand statement that we want to make. So yes?

Question: I'm a strong believer in collaborations, but what do you do when they don't work? When partners have different visions and they find themselves clashing?

Lynch: As an artistic collaboration or any kind of collaboration?

Question: Well, specifically, artistic but it's really in theory could be anything?

Marshall: Well from our standpoint, I mean, my experience would be try and find the most graceful way to conclude them, is what you try and do. But often, I think, that part of the reason that they fail is that we can't find in them something that we haven't seen, or some grander vision that's further out in front of us that we may both be able to work to separately. That will give us an opportunity in some ways to claim some success from it, but be able to move forward without being tied to one another's destiny, and I think that is required. I think it's as important that we get out as gracefully as we get in.

Lerman: I find that the ones about artistic difference are actually really interesting. And the nature of how we handle both compromise and what we might describe as a mistake. To me, actually, I wish we had a different word for mistake, because the incredible amount of learning that happens in moments of discomfort is really where some of the best action is. It does mean sometimes compromise, and I go back to my original thing about my original version of the classical artist that I was raised to be, with the singular idea only my idea can work. And I'm just struck, I wish compromise didn't have a bad name because actually the nature of compromise is where again, amazing things unfold.

The part of partnerships that I don't like are when roles aren't clear, expectations aren't clear. And where people go away feeling they've been "had." And that again, Bob raised that with the exploitative one. And I think there, you have to, that's a lot front-ending of it more than the other.

Lynch: Someone else? Yes?

Question: Years ago there was a consortium called the Fund for Artists' Colonies. I was a trustee of it. And it had an ill-fated existence. And the reason that it did – and this is something I'd love for you all to comment on – was the ambivalence and the motivation of bringing the consortium together to begin with. And just quickly, the major artists' colonies, like McDowell, didn't need it. The smaller, more modest ones desperately needed it. Everybody was thrilled that they wanted to work in consortium to strengthen the entire movement of artists' colonies and their residencies. But the real thing that killed it was that there really wasn't a uniformity of motivation and commitment behind the thing at all. And it took years for this thing to finally fall apart in disarray and quietly die.

Lynch: I'll take one shot at it and then see if anyone else wants to. I think one of the big problems you actually alluded to is, are you coming together to talk? Or are you coming together to do? If a group comes together to talk, that's okay as long as you know that that's

what it's going to do and the outcomes are not necessarily going to be action outcomes.

If you're going to come together to do, I'll go back to your question before, I think... I love John Carver and his work related to boards of directors. And he has a concept called "nested policy." And the nested policy concept for boards is start with the very most important thing and work your way down.

And that's what you have to do, I think, with a coalition like that. Figure out what the one or two big things that you want to try to achieve are, and not take on too much.

Marshall: I think also understanding that you were bringing a variety of cultures, very different cultures together. In this new market, you know, we talk about mergers and acquisitions. One of the toughest things about bringing companies together is that they have in them very distinct corporate cultures. And that process of bringing together cannot be underestimated. And the amount of investment that has to occur before you create at least some shared culture from which you can make decisions and create policy or vision, is absolutely critical. And it's very tough to create it afterwards, but I think as Liz was describing, if in fact you can use that moment when the problem emerges, to then use that as a shared dilemma, then it may be even at that point that a shared culture can be created.

Lerman: I was going to say almost the opposite in the sense that, for me it's the unexpected partnerships that work better. If you look at modern dance associations around the country, they're really depressed. And it just doesn't seem like it's fruitful to bring like groups, like people together, necessarily, unless there's a crisis or something. Whereas if everybody found that... If there was a different way you could bring those people together with other kinds of partnerships, I think that life blood might have flowed a little more easily.

Lynch: One other thing, too, that I would throw into this, these different ways of looking at this. When a funder is involved, grantmaker or an individual, whatever, I think that it's very often helpful to have a discussion facilitated by

an outsider. Because very often people are afraid to tell the fundraiser that they don't like the funder's idea.

So a funder is a partner in one of these coalitions. The funder thinks that X should happen. And people are very dainty often about dealing with that. So a facilitator for people who maybe aren't quite as used to those kinds of coalition discussions, I think could be really helpful in terms of funding. Yes?

Question: I'm observing a situation in Seattle where I'm from, where a young foundation is using funding as a leverage for collaboration. So this funder is coming in and saying to literary arts groups around the area, why don't you all get together and collaborate and then we'll give you X dollars. What advice would you give this young foundation?

Marshall: Oh, that's quite... I mean, I think this idea of the facilitator that Bob was talking about is not a bad one. I think the group itself that's coming and looking for money needs to find its common purpose aside from the source of funding.

The problem is that those dollar signs can create a kind of desperate need to think you share values that you don't. And therefore it can be easily destined to fail. Whereas if, in fact, shared values can be negotiated or discussed or discerned so that distinct expectations and roles can be identified, then when the funder is engaged in that process, I think there's a stronger likelihood of success.

Lerman: I don't know what the time frame is for this. It strikes me that over the long haul, you could develop an environment in which people got more organically involved in such a thing. And to also front-end it for a long period of time before there was an expectation of success or of actual projects.

There may already however be, and this would be the other thing I would suggest is, what are the already interests that people naturally have going for them that you might... it's like being a good listener, and try to support what may be already there.

Lynch: You know, one other thing, just on that, is that this is where a body like this can be really helpful, peer-to-peer help often is one of the key things. Another funder in a community, if it's a bad kind of intervention. Another funder in a community, you can go to that funder to ask that funder to have a conversation that you as a recipient couldn't, if that's the situation. Yes?

Question: Yeah, I wanted to sort of connect to what Liz said about, you know, mistakes or difficulties. And I think it brings up an interesting set of issues for evaluation for funders, it's a lot easier to say let's define success by coherence.

And I think that, you know there's a whole other sort of set of measures that deal with how people deal with complexity when it comes up and not ignore difficult issues in partnerships, but engage them even if it makes them look messier. And then how do you confront that, name that, deal with it, and come out of it with a new vision, rather than make everything look like we decided to do this and we did it, and we pulled it off and it was successful.

And I think it makes it difficult to evaluate partnerships, because if you want to go deeper, you need to look at something so they don't look messy.

Lynch: Yes?

Question: Looking at it in a positive way, looking at something, encouraging collaborations from the funders' point of views, I would imagine rewarding collaboration would be a most positive way of doing this, and can you collectively suggest a few ways of rewarding collaboration? And I'm thinking in terms of giving base funding, but how then do you recognize and reward?

Lynch: Anyone?

Lerman: Well I really feel strongly about multi-year support. As we've just indicated, the... sort of seeding the bed, it's... and we've all talked about one way to avoid some of the problems is the amount of planning that goes into it, active, interesting, curious planning,

which may not show any results whatsoever. Projects. And then what happens when they're over, if they are? How are they concluded and what then are next steps?

We're finding in our work that we're trying now, for example to find a pot of money to fund all the projects for *Debrief* the next year, because there are all kinds of things that start cooking that we might be able to help with, if we're not going to do it any more. But how to end it? So I would clearly look for long-term support.

Lynch: One thing that I would add to it that I, in my observation of great partnerships and how they've been rewarded, they've been rewarded with the time involvement of the funder. The funder will actually get involved and come to sessions that are not about the funding, but are actually about, you know, the nitty-gritty of the work. And that usually is enlightening for the funder, but it's really uplifting for the organizations, I think. So when one works, I think, investing a little more personal time in it really goes a long way, too. In the way back, yes?

Question: Hi. I work here in San Francisco for the Grants for the Arts Program which is the City's municipal funding entity. We are doing a breakfast roundtable tomorrow.

It actually involves three partnerships or collaborations that we put together. One is neighborhood based; one is culturally or ethnically based; and one is artist based. Plugging collaborations instead of partnerships has gotten a bad name because of some sort of shotgun weddings that have resulted from those things which didn't stop us from sort of sailing out there. And we'll tell you just how we did it. The jury's still out. They're in about midterm of a three-year process, all three of them.

The goal was to help small and fragile organizations and individual artists without creating large and fragile organizations.

Lynch: That actually was my grand finale announcement that I referenced earlier. But, no. Any other questions that anyone has?

One of the things... is that a hand going up? One of the things that happened to me in thinking about this process and this discussion is that I got very excited about collaboration. And then I had a Mickey Rooney moment where I thought, my god, okay, we've got this great film maker here and we have this fabulous dance person here and, you know, we can participate and we'll do a show. And then of course, now, it's time for the show. And part of that is going to involve movement. And one piece of it is, we do have to save room for special guest political statement that Marion Godfrey wants to make, which will happen right after the movement.

Lerman: Well this is what I think, we should have done it halfway through. But Bob, you need to come out and demonstrate. All we're going to do is step-aerobics. So what's the first movement Bob?

Lynch: Well, you've got my notes. Okay. Well, okay. This was Cora's very, very solid movement.

Lerman: *[to audience]* I actually think you should stand now. And actually, I think you should just stretch a second. And why don't you just do a little pirouette once around like this so you can see... Very good, very good. Excellent! And I didn't have to give my thing about you're in charge of your body and you don't have to do this if you don't want to. Okay! Bob, your first person was?

[audience stands and participates]

Lynch: My first person was Cora. And Cora dealt with the audience very straightforwardly and strongly like this...

Lerman: This is lovely way really to develop empathy with people. That's Cora. Okay.

Lynch: Then Dennis came and in counterpoint went...

Lerman: This is, I think you got it. He's like this, and then she's like this on the other side. So you've got to get the specificity. There it is. I don't care if you're right or left-handed on this, but all right.

Lynch: He went like this. And then he went like this. Then he went...

Lerman: Okay. So da da da da. We'll simplify it a little bit. No, no, do it again. Let me watch you do it again.

Lynch: Okay.

Lerman: Okay. There's this little adjustment.

Lynch: Then, Ken was brought up onstage.

Lerman: You can be very dainty about it or you can be very big about it. Beautiful! Very good.

Lynch: Then Arch.

Lerman: This is... just practice for a minute. Leg, leg, hand, up, down. Ready? And... leg, leg, hand, up, down.

Lynch: Then Faith.

Lerman: Okay. Very good. So we're going to put all that together. Someone's going to sing?

Lynch: And then Caroline.

Lerman: Oh, I forgot.

Lynch: Back to a modified Cora.

Lerman: The way to do this, because Bob is the only one who knows the sequence, is follow Bob. Or a little improvisation. This is a little post-modern technique now, which is think for a minute, which movement can you remember? Everybody do one movement you can remember. Ready? Go. Good! Very good. So you can always do that one. Okay.

Now do one more thing. Do that movement again and look around, and you'll pick up one more that you didn't remember. Okay so do your own and while you're doing that, look around. Very good. Learning, and watching, and doing. It's great. So Bob will kind of accompany on piano.

Lynch: *[piano playing, "Nobody loves you when you're down and out."]*

Lerman: Okay. Here we go. I'm waiting for the introduction and okay and we're turning and Marion Godfrey, why don't you come back up... Perfect.

Lynch: Marion has this political statement which she will do in song.

Godfrey: This is something every grantmaker should think about every once in a while.

[singing "Nobody loves you when you're down and out."]

The collaboration between a piano player and a singer is a great one.

All: Whole audience is dancing, Lynch playing piano, Godfrey singing, Lerman leading group in movement, Marshall showing video in background.

Lynch: With video accompaniment – Meryl Marshall, Liz Lerman, Marion. Thank you all very much. Appreciate it.

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

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

ORDER FORM

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

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

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

Email _____

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

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

Make check payable to Grantmakers in the Arts

Fax to: (206) 624-5568, or

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