



Grantmakers in the Arts
2004 Conference

DANCING WITH DIFFERENT PARTNERS

Proceedings from the Conference

October 17-20, 2004
Renaissance Cleveland Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR ARTISTS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Artists embody the freedom, independence, and creativity of our nation. They are the lifeblood of our culture and of the artistic institutions we treasure. Although artists have always been an important cultural resource offering a lens through which we recall our past, perceive the present, and envision the future, field-wide support for individual artists has remained underdeveloped. This session will present a new philanthropic initiative, the Partnership for Artists in the 21st Century. With lead gifts of \$15 million each from the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, "PA21" seeks to substantially increase the funding and support systems for individual artists and their work. Once established, the Partnership will work through art service organizations and others to fund individual artists whose creative expression is so important to the health of society.

Session Organizer: Joan Shigekawa, *associate director*
Creativity & Culture, Rockefeller Foundation

Panelists: Joan Shigekawa
Roberta Uno, *program officer*
Media, Arts and Culture, The Ford Foundation
James Pickman, *consultant*
Susan Kenny Stevens, *Ph.D., executive principal*
LarsonAllen Public Service Group

October 18, 2003, ??:00 p.m.

STEVENS: Thanks so much for coming to our session. This is a session where we are going to explain – as much as we can, because it’s still in formation somewhat – what we’re calling the Partnership for Artists in the 21st Century. I’d like to introduce the people on the panel. Then the idea is that we will spend no more than 30 minutes with a presentation on the key concepts of the partnership and its evolution. That is one of the big questions, how did this thing come about and why did it come about? That will be one of the major things that we will talk about. We’re hoping that this could also be a listening session for us. We have already had a listening session in the field. We’d like to hear input from those of you who are funders in the room. Many of you are already funding individual artists programs, and we’d like to hear how you see this fitting in with what you’re doing, how you might be a part of this, what advice you might give to us. We’re here to listen to you; we’ll answer any questions that we can as well. But our intent is to get more than we give in this session. I’m Susan Stevens, I’m a consultant, I work for a company called LarsonAllen out of Minneapolis. We do a lot of work in the arts and in other areas, with nonprofits and foundations. And I’m a consultant right now to the Partnership and to the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Maybe we could have each of us introduce ourselves.

SHIGEKAWA: I’m Joan Shigekawa, Associate Director of Creativity and Culture at the Rockefeller Foundation.

UNO: I’m Roberta Uno, I’m a Program Officer for Arts and Culture at the Ford Foundation.

PICKMAN: I’m Jim Pickman. I’m a consultant to the foundations and to the Partnership.

STEVENS: We’re going to begin with Roberta and Joan giving us the history, the evolution, the impetus, of this project. If by any chance we don’t have enough handouts for you, be sure to leave us your business cards and we will email them to you.

Okay, Joan and Roberta.

UNO: This session is a follow-up on other member reports that many of you have attended. Last year we did one here, a report out on the Urban Institute study. I want to acknowledge the visionary work of Holly Sidford, and the incredible work that Maria-Rosario Jackson and her team have done on that study. We don’t have time to go through all of that study, so I’m going to make an assumption that most of you are very much aware of it. But for those of us who are funding the arts, it confirms and gave

us useable data around many things that we knew already. In other words, that artists are a significant part of the American workforce; that artists are contributing to the health and well-being of society in many, many different roles; that artists are underfunded; that they are the most vulnerable sector of our entire ecology of the arts. It’s abundantly obvious, but we don’t think about artists in terms of the environment in which they work. We think about supporting the work in terms of dollars. But really what is it like to make a living as an artist? And how very, very difficult that is. So that study, in the way that it frames the lack of a system, and the need for somebody to address the really critical needs *and* interlocking needs, not just award programs, and the making of work. Then the ecology of making a life, whether that’s insurance needs, pension, training, live and work space. And the large issue of why is it that artists are not really appreciated? The issue of validation. One of the recommendations that came out from that study, is that given the variety of these needs, it would require a number of type of intermediaries, that this couldn’t be solved with just one big master plan through one particular service organization. We needed to look at a strategy for addressing all of these needs. I arrived at Ford two years ago now, just at the time when the study was being concluded. For me it was particularly exciting. Many of you have heard Susan Berresford give her speech in Los Angeles, and for me to be working with a president who was willing to take up this issue, and champion this issue, especially at a time when resources have declined. When the study was originally commissioned, I think was a much more hopeful era. For Susan to be willing to put herself out there as a voice of this particular issue was very, very hopeful to us. Unlike some foundations, for example Rockefeller, our foundation really did not have programs that addressed individual artists directly. The Ford approach has been to fund institutions. There is of course, an assumed benefit to artists through strong institutions. A lot of times that does become kind of a trickle-down kind of diminishing amount of support. Artists are often not part of the institutions, or are not receiving institutional benefits, etc. So for us internally we started to think about, well if we’re going to do something about this, what is the mechanism, what are the possibilities? We took the case for artists to our trustees. I got there in September so that was January that Sam, and Holly and I, along with Margaret Wilkerson my director, made our presentation to our trustees. It was really terrific, because they agreed to give \$20 million over 10 years above our program budget. So protecting the existing program budget, this was \$20 million in new money to



work on this issue. Our original concept was to establish a new organization called Leveraging Investments in Creativity, LINC, and we saw that as a model that could both aggregate funds and program funds. In the evolution of LINC, we decided that it would actually not be a good idea for one entity to do both functions. In many ways being a programming entity, it needed to be a peer with its other parallel organizations that were addressing other aspects of this ecology. It became quickly obvious to us that the idea of peer organizations competing with each other for funds and dispersing those funds to others and to intermediaries was not going to be a practical approach in the long run. We were first allocated \$20 million that we didn't spend all at once, thank goodness, it was rolling out at that point \$5 million every two years. So with the first \$5 million, along with the program funds, we did several things. Number one, we decided that over the life of this initiative 60% of our funds needed to go to artists and the making of their work. That was really important because we didn't want to build the kind of cynicism in the field among artists, and not be able to say there was an immediate benefit to them.

We wanted to be able to say that, right up front the majority of our money was going to go towards award programs, programs for professional development, through existing intermediaries and service organizations that are doing an excellent job and know their constituencies. That was another philosophical decision for us, that we have for example our Leadership for Changing the World program. We could have created a Ford signature program on individual artists, but we decided that we want to be part of the ecology not an add-on to it. So our decision was to support organizations – some are represented in this room, Creative Capital, Peter Communications Group, The First Peoples Fund, Alternate Roots – there are 15 organizations in that cohort. The second thing we did was to launch Leveraging Investments in Creativity. Sam Miller, the Executive Director or President, is here. We hope to launch that organization to work on those environment issues, those larger issues of knowledge across the field, to go back to the original sites of the Urban Institute study. We gave money for challenge grants, so that there could be creative communities, initiative could be launched.

We also put money towards NIFA, specifically so that the data from the Urban Institute study, which again when I say the work of Holly and Maria was really visionary, it was conceptualized to become usable data to the field. The building and the enhancement of that database is

something we are very, very committed to. You can talk to Ted more extensively about that if you're not already aware of it. In going on to the partnership, I'm giving all of this context because usually one of the first questions I get is, what is the role of LINC? How obviously are the mediaries working? And it's all very relevant to the partnership. At the point that we programmed that first \$5 million plus our additional program funds, and we still have \$15 million and eight more years, the thought occurred that these are all exemplarily, wonderful, completely competent people. So everyone will meet their benchmarks. What does that mean? That means with our funds, for example that these intermediaries with their new works programs that that \$15 million would be set for four to 10 years, and that our funding towards LINC could never expand. We could never add either to enhance anybody's work, nor could we add anybody else to this picture, given existing funds. We then seriously began to revisit this idea of how could we use our funds to leverage greater resources in the field. The concept behind it was to do what we have done. Not take somebody's program budget and say, what do you do for individual artists? Well let's count that part of it. That's kind of a shell game, or smoke and mirrors. We really wanted to look for other foundations that are strongly committed to the arts, but also look for foundations and individuals who maybe are not working in the arts but are working in some of the parallel concerns, whether it's in health, for example, or insurance, etc. We started a conversation with the Rockefeller Foundation. They're close by. So part of it for me has to do with the fact that they do have these programs that were so committed to individual artists and had a lot to share with us. At this point I'm going to turn to Joan, because Rockefeller presented us with a model that we hadn't considered and that would be great if you would talk about that.

SHIGEKAWA: Two things happened, one is that Susan Berresford's L.A. speech struck a chord at Rockefeller. Our support for individual artists has been via the Multi-Arts Production Fund for creation and performance of new work in the performing arts which we execute through a grant to Creative Capital and via our Media Arts Fellowships which we execute through a grant to National Media Resources. Each of these grantmaking programs in support of individual artists has been supported by the Rockefeller Foundation for more than a decade and we could have gone on and will go on happily doing those. But the question on the table was, so what? How do you go to scale? How do you make a difference at another level? Susan Berresford's



vision about what it would take to really create a meaningful change, a national initiative in support of individual artists, really captured our imagination. So we began to talk seriously to Ford. Now Roberta and I had already been talking, but we began to work together with a new focus. The Rockefeller side had a slightly different model. Ten years ago the foundation established a partnership called the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI). It is now called Living Cities, but it was looking at the community development space from the perspective of a national funding partnership - a collaborative coming together to aggregate funds to build a national effort rooted in local development initiatives. Jim Pickman, who is sitting at the end of our table here, was the prime consultant for NCDI. One of the outstanding characteristics of that partnership is that the top-level leadership of the foundations, the presidents, are part of the governance structure. Jim can answer any questions about NCDI later. But that partnership has been extremely successful and has aggregated considerable money over time on behalf of community development.

PICKMAN: Over a quarter of a billion dollars.

SHIGEKAWA: The presidents meet and they set policy. But the work is done through intermediaries. NCDI does not do the on-the-ground grantmaking, it's working through intermediaries. The idea of working through intermediaries in this funding partnership came to the table. We've been doing research to see how this idea might work for the arts and culture field, which is an entirely different field of course, related but entirely different from Community Development. Another goal has to be also to reach out to folks who are not currently funding in the arts. I can't tell you what a pleasure it is for me to have Gordon Conway, our foundation's president, out there, talking about the arts to other foundations. The two presidents, Susan and Gordon, are taking the lead to try to raise the issue of support for individual artists at the highest levels of multiple foundations, and also with corporations, insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies, and other potential funders. Quite honestly they can get a hearing at offices where I cannot. If the president of the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation would like to talk to your senior executive, usually they can get the meeting. If the program officer in the Arts Department calls, usually you can't get the meeting, at the level where the checks are written, right? That's been going on very quietly up till now. The planning is in the very emergent stages, because it's truly

envisioned as a partnership. The people who come on as the founding board members will have a lot to say about the shape of this. We've laid down certain principles which Susan Stevens and Jim Pickman are going to talk about. But a lot of where the rubber meets the road, how it's going to work, will be decided by the leadership group which joins the partnership in the first phase. At first we were reluctant to have an organization of any kind. We said, we'll just have a funding collaborative and then we'll work with the intermediaries and have the national conversation. But Jim, having worked with NCDI for ten years, quickly educated us on the fact that doing this work without a key grantee would double our work on the program end and convinced us that we needed to have a lean but targeted 501(c)(3) to lead the effort. We also came to understand that there would be a real advantage to building a national table so that the presidents of the foundations and the other members of the leadership group, some of whom will be artists, some of whom will be heads of arts organizations will be able to talk about support for individual artists and potentially speak with a national voice around the issues. That could be significant because support for individual artists is not yet well understood in this country. To have Susan Berresford make a statement in an op-ed piece, and have this signed on to by all the other leaders, or to have the group speak to an issue in support of individual artists will be a part of PA21's work. To do, in other words, a national advocacy effort working in collaboration with the field. Those are the two components. The main part is to aggregate more support and more creative thinking in support of individual artists. The other will be a national leadership role, we hope. I have to say that it hasn't happened yet, because the partnership is still in the process of formation. Film and video and the performing arts will go forward as they always have. We're not taking our program money, and putting it in a new box with a new ribbon and saying, here. We're taking new money to put on the table to help support the partnership. So that was key. The trustees supported the appropriation. So we have that money set aside and we're rarin' to go, but we need friends and partners at the table before we can launch it. Thank you.

STEVENS: I'd like to spend about ten minutes telling you how this thing will work. You've heard the history, you've heard the evolution of the idea, and here is how we think it will work. I'm going to use the qualifying work of "think," because as both Roberta and Joan said, we have a concept, we have some parameters, we have a few guidelines. But like anything in its



infancy or idea stage, it will be shaped by those who first come to the table. So where we're at is, number one, the vision. The grand vision of this is that it's a ten-year initiative – not to say that it couldn't be longer – it's not an endowment, it's ten years of funding that will be spent out in ten years. Secondly it's a \$100 million initiative. Of which Ford and Rockefeller have committed \$30 million. Our goal is to raise another \$20 million very shortly. But overall we're looking at a minimum of \$100 million. The idea is that in this, as they say the quiet phase of funding, before we go public, we're looking to bring in at least \$20 million in founding funders. We make the pitch here for a couple of reasons. It's important, as I said in an earlier session, that we get people to the table initially who understand individual artists, who understand the arts. There will be other mechanisms to get your voices into this, whether you've contributed to this fund or not. It's really important that the founding funders will set the parameters for this fund, and how the money is ultimately distributed. Content knowledge, in addition to money, becomes very important in the beginning stages of this partnership. It is truly a partnership. Ford and Rockefeller's monies are meant to leverage other funders, not to be the whole cheese in the thing. To that end we're very proud to say we already have an initial third partner, which is the Prudential Foundation, which has contributed a \$1 million dollars. We're very, very excited about that. It's the third funder in. This will be a 501(c)(3) status. It will act as a public charity. Somebody in an earlier session this morning likened it to a community foundation. In many ways that's true. We can't really call it a community foundation, but there is an opportunity for both unrestricted funds into the partnership, and restricted funds, what a community foundation would call donor-advised funds. For those of you who are funders in this room who might want to make a gift, but it would need to be restricted to the Bay Area, to Philadelphia, to Minneapolis, that's perfectly all right. Likewise, some of you might want to make a gift but restrict it to dance, a specific discipline. Or you might want to make a gift restricted to a certain organization. You could make your gift through the partnership, you would count as a partner, and it could be given back to whatever geography, organization, and discipline that you would want it to be a part of. But one caveat on restricted gifts. We're asking that 5% of the restricted gift become unrestricted, and go to the overall workings of the organization, not necessarily the administration because we're really hoping this will be a very lean machine, but it would go to the unrestricted components of the programming. That's for groups that aren't on

the national radar screen or that would get more opportunity to be able to fund some of those underserved voices. That's my value judgment, that doesn't mean that the new executive director and the board might not have a different take on it.

That's why Jim and I said, we've got to get an executive director pretty soon, because we're starting to get down to making some discussions, but we don't feel we should be the ones making it. We are just advisors to get this thing up and running. Another idea – think high concept – of this is that this is really meant to be something that the public would engage in funding. Both Roberta and Joan alluded to, although this is first and foremost a funder collaborative and won't really have its own programming, except for as it supports other programmers, intermediaries and art service organizations, there will be this public ambassadorship that will go with the whole idea of this fund. There will be an attempt to make a really major statement about the importance of creativity and democracy, and how individual artists are at the root of that creativity. Borrowing from Howard Dean, who had the Internet philanthropy and all, we're hoping we can set up a lot of mechanisms where the common people, people who are parents of artists, as I am, or sisters or brothers of artists, artists who've made a living, who want to give back, would have a way to contribute to this fund. We've got to start with foundations because we've got to start some place, we have to meet public support tests, we've got to get something off the ground here. The real goal is to get the public involved in this, which to me is one of the most exciting parts of all of this. In the back of your handout there's a diagram that shows everything I just said. It shows that first of all this is meant to be a fundraising collaborative where donors become partners. Then there will be a board of directors. Basically the founding funders will become the initial board. Now by a founding funder, I can't tell you an exact timeframe, but I am going to say anything for sure up through March or April or spring of next year, would be a founding funder. It might go a little longer than that. We're trying not to be arbitrary about things. In the idea stage, you have to let things evolve and roll. But I'm thinking people who come in before the middle of 2005, something like that, will be founding funders. They will be the ones that set the directives for the fund. There will be co-chairs, one will be a very prominent artist and somebody that everybody in this room will have heard of. We are in active conversations right now with a couple of people. There will be an institutional co-chair, which will be either one of the presidents of a foundation, or maybe



one of the corporate leaders that will be involved. These will be people who will be able to leverage off their name and will be willing to bring other people to the table that we would not necessarily be able to get. They will serve as co-chairs of the fund. There will be an executive director, if anybody in this room has any ideas for somebody who would be a really high profile, very credible, executive director, who wants to raise money and who wants to be the voice of public advocacy, I'd ask you to tell Jim or me afterwards, because we are right now in an active recruitment phase. So you can see the fundraising, advocacy, donor education, convening, coordination, and then some policy and strategic direction, which wouldn't necessarily all be done by the partnership, but we would be working through many of you in this room on this. The money that is aggregated here goes out to arts service organizations, to intermediaries and to other contractors. It would go out in two forms, grants and loans. The grants are listed here for you. We believe that there are opportunities for loans to individual artists. Some of this I heard in the 8 o'clock session, in terms of artists' needs of cash flow or mortgages, etc. Some of those could go out in the way of loans and some of you might be interested in that. Obviously LINC is a major player on this distribution side, as are many of the arts intermediaries and service organizations in this room. There are too many to mention, so I don't want to get into everybody's name here. That's the general framework of how this would work. This is not meant to take money away from the field. This is not meant to kind of rob Peter and pay Paul. This is meant to enhance the donations, the contributions to the field, to people who already get this kind of money and who already give this kind of money. As in how Ford and Rockefeller took the money from their assets. It is also meant to bring other people to the table, and to create a public awareness about the importance of individual artists to society, let alone to a creative society. With that I'm, going to stop. Jim and I, Roberta and Joan are all available to you for questions. We also would like your input, things you want us to consider, you want to be sure are on the table here. I should say one quick thing; we did have a session very similar to this with a group of arts intermediaries and service organizations, at Sundance in July. So we've had the benefit of some of you in the room's thinking, and it was very, very helpful in helping us go back to the drawing-board and add in nuances, some of what we had thought about earlier. We'd like that same kind of feedback from you all that are funders in this room, so that we can check our assumptions, as well as add to what you think would be important for this fund. In the end, if this works, and whether even you're

a part of it or not, it will be a part of a public voice and a public conversation which you will hopefully be proud to be a part of.

PICKMAN: Can I just say two things?

STEVENS: Yes please, Jim?

PICKMAN: I thought that I was only here for gender diversity, but I think I can say something. [Laughter] Just two points. Susan mentioned that this is a ten-year initiative, and that's true. I mean it's long-term, we hope it's even longer. But we are seeking funding right now over a four-year period, just because when funders fund, they can't think out ten years. So four years at least has been in my experience a more manageable timeframe. In the back of my mind, if this is successful after four years, you can go back to those funders to say well, what about round two, as opposed to saying, Well we already gave for ten years. The ten-year point is that we're not looking at just a short-term thing, we hope this is going to work and this is going to have a long-term durability. The other point I want to make and everyone's made it, but it's really important, and it's this concept of new money. We really have to make sure that we're making the pie bigger, that we're not just taking from one pot which is supporting individual artists, or organizations that work with and support individual artists, and just move it to the partnership. We cannot allow that to happen! We have to insist on new money. We have talked to some possible potential grantors and they are really troubled by this, and we said if you can't do it with new money, then just continue to do your own thing. We just can't have you here because we would be hurting the field, not helping the field. In one of our first meetings with Sam Miller, he raised an excellent point. As it is now it's going to get harder over the long-term to get new money. We've got to be disciplined and very vigilant on this. We're very serious on this issue, and Ford and Rockefeller are prime examples of this concept of new money, over and above their regular program budgets. That's really important to us and we're going to hang tough on it. We're going to turn down money if it isn't new money.

STEVENS: Okay, your comments. Yes?

MILLINGER: I'm Myra Millinger, formerly of the Flinn Foundation and as of several weeks ago president of the Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture.

Two questions, one is how are you going to link, if at all, with the local and state arts commissions that do have commitments to individual artists,



either through public arts programs or through programs of their own in support of artists. They are limited in their funding perhaps, and certainly couldn't put the money on your table because of the constraints on their own budget, and yet have the knowledge base that you're talking about and the linkages in their community. Secondly, given the obvious linkage that some of us working regionally now, see between building livable communities, where are you going in your reach for contributions to those leaders in economic development that are beginning to see the linkage between individual artists and community vitality? In your call, are you moving to other than the traditional avenues?

SHIGEKAWA: For the second part, leaders in economic development, we hope that some of the funders who come to the table will be banks, and will be other players in this arena, so that is one connection. But remember we're not a programming organization. We will be looking to folks like LINC, who's working on the work space and insurance; other folks that are working on community cultural development. We'll be looking to see what the strength of the intermediary field is. This is clearly a trend that many of us are looking at very closely. For example, within the unincorporated sector, we're looking at community cultural participation and community cultural vitality within our core programs. If that emerges as something that the leadership or the partnership thinks is really important to do, the partnership will then look to the field to see what is the best way to make that happen on the ground. It will not be designing programs to have PA21 do it. We hope to identify issues and then to seek the best thinking in the field to move those issues forward. If there is no intermediary, if something comes up where there's not an intermediary who wants to engage, then that's a challenge for PA21 to figure out what to do about that. It might support a new service organization, but PA21 is not itself going to take on the delivery of services. In terms of state and local arts agencies, at the local level, you can engage immediately in the conversation about community cultural development, about different ways to make that happen and different budget lines to make that happen, whether it's justice, whether it's health, whether it's social services. For the partnership, it's hoped that some of those leaders will be at the table. But also in the convening part and the advocacy part of the budget on your chart, there's a section for leadership. It's meant to aggregate some of the best thinking, to inform the board, to have conversations around these issues where the partnership brings the folks who are working on a day-to-day level in that local knowledge

to harvest that knowledge and to then come up with new thinking that can be shared with foundations and other funders throughout the country. That's more of a knowledge building, information convening, advocacy role, or partnership; less a direct money-to-money type of thing.

PICKMAN: On the second part of your question Myra, on this. Susan Berresford has often talked about the ability, if we can, to get crossover funders. This is funders that are not traditionally funding individual artists, that have had nothing to do with it, and how do we bring them to the field to support individual artists? Let me give you a couple of examples. For example health insurance, which is one of the ecological needs that Roberta mentioned, that was certainly in the Urban Institute study. Can we bring some of the big players to provide affordable health insurance that's targeted to individual artists? We're doing some work now with LINC on this and we think that we can really expand upon this. Everywhere we talk it seems to be a pressing need. So that's an example of how we really can. Joan mentioned the banks and doing things to build communities, we certainly hope we can do that. Perhaps the clout of the partnership can attract some major players so we can come up with some very attractive financing for artist housing and workspace. It's those kinds of things, the answer is absolutely yes!

CUTHBERT: Neal Cuthbert, McKnight Foundation in Minnesota. Our foundation is really active in Living Cities, and one of the rationales with Living Cities is that we put in a certain amount of money into this national pool, it leverages three or four times that amount of money back into our community. That becomes part of the motivation for a local regional funder to get involved in this national pool. You cited Living Cities, so I'm curious if that leveraging multiplier kind of thing would at all come to bear? It sounds like it goes through this distribution with the artist service organizations, and other than the donor-advice fund, which seems like money out, money back, I'm not sure, that doesn't seem to be part of the equation. I guess that's my question.

UNO(?): I'd like to address that because this has been such an interesting negotiation between Rockefeller and Ford around many questions like that. For us, what I described was how we programmed our thoughts in the first \$5 million over those first two years. But the principle of going to our next \$15 million becoming unrestricted, to go into the partnership, is precisely so that it could leverage other type of funding. We have also moved up our funding



schedule so that that original \$20 million which was to go out over ten years, is now going out over four years. We're putting that unrestricted in for the first four years, because we hope that this will be a success and we will go back for additional funds to our trustees. So we really understand that issue, we've had other regional funders who have said how can the fund match or help leverage or bring new resources if we commit to it with new money.

END

