



PARTNERSHIP AS AN ART FORM:

What Works and What Doesn't in Nonprofit Arts Partnerships

Thomas E. Backer, PhD

A Working Paper Reporting a Study Conducted for

John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

November 2002

Preview

This working paper is about the art of partnership. It offers ways to think about partnerships among nonprofit arts organizations and other groups in communities, examples of these partnerships, and strategies for partnering.

The information presented comes from an “environmental scan” study of nonprofit arts partnerships - 91 interviews with thought leaders in the arts and a literature review. The result is called a “working paper” because it is intended to stimulate further discussion and debate about all this information, and to further refine the analysis presented here.

Partnership as an Art Form is a place to begin when thinking about starting (or funding) a partnership, about actually implementing one, then evaluating it, and keeping it going. It also addresses a tough question for a time when there's much pressure to partner in the nonprofit arts world - when is partnership *not* a good idea, or at least not the best solution for a particular set of challenges a community or group of arts organizations faces?

The publication begins with an introductory section, ***What This Working Paper's About***, offering examples from the more than 60 partnerships the scan identified, and then some of the lessons learned from them. Next the purposes and intended audiences of the publication are discussed, followed by an initial analysis both of reasons why partnerships are so popular now... and reasons to be cautious about starting one.

After this opening section there are four chapters:

I. How to Think about Partnerships, offering some definitions of the word “partnership,” a larger structural framework into which partnerships fit, a list of main objectives partnerships typically serve, and a typical life cycle for them. The chapter ends with a brief overview of the knowledge base on this subject, for the arts and more generally for nonprofit organizations

II. Roster of Arts Partnerships presents partnerships involving nonprofit arts organizations, through brief capsule descriptions that are organized under the partnership objectives defined in Chapter I.

III. Lessons Learned about What Works and What Doesn't synthesizes what emerged from both the literature review and the interviews conducted for this study, organized under the life cycle stages for partnerships identified in Chapter I.

IV. What Does This All Mean - for Arts Organizations, Communities, Funders, Evaluators and Researchers? offers some conclusions from this study that may stimulate further debate, study and action regarding partnerships in the arts - this small project is just one step in ongoing efforts to help the nonprofit arts community make good choices about whether and how to partner. One section is focused on *arts marketing partnerships*, a particular interest of Knight Foundation, which has funded a number of projects in this area.

A Resources section of literature citations, and two Appendices - one listing the 91 interviewees, and the other listing the more than 60 partnerships described in Chapter II (plus website contact information for each one) - conclude the working paper.

What This Working Paper's About

- ▶ In Pasadena, California, a group of art museums and galleries, a chamber music ensemble, and several major scientific institutions created a year-long partnership called the *Universe Project*, which blended visual arts, music and science together on the common theme of “the Universe.” For instance, a chamber music concert was given at the Norton Simon Museum, which also had a gallery exhibit of art from its large collection - both on the theme of the partnership. Despite some tensions among the partners and challenges in its creation, the Universe Project brought in new audiences to all of the institutions involved, and built a platform on which future collaborations can be explored.
- ▶ The *Heart of Brooklyn Cultural Consortium* in Brooklyn, New York brings together five major cultural institutions for ongoing joint activities designed to cross-promote their programs, and to reach out to the New York community and beyond. The Consortium's message is that Brooklyn is a first-class cultural district, with many riches to share with visitors.
- ▶ *Cornerstone Theater*, based in Los Angeles, brings together diverse communities to participate directly in the process of making plays. They include nonprofessional community members as actors and technical personnel on their projects, which often are presented in community environments. Current projects include theatre-making with the Muslim and Catholic communities in Los Angeles. At the center of each of these projects is a partnership with institutions in the community where the work is being done, including new and emerging theatres Cornerstone has helped to create with its work (and helped endow with some of the proceeds from its performances).
- ▶ The *Detroit Metro Area Cultural Marketing Network* was created in January 2002. Supported by the John S. & James L. Knight Foundation and the Community Foundation of Southeast Michigan, this arts marketing collaborative (one of ten such efforts in various stages of development with Knight Foundation support) will provide services to both large and small arts organizations in the Detroit area to help them meet marketing challenges. The Network is planning two major initial activities: (1) a database cooperative, in which arts organizations will share their mailing lists through a computerized service, and (2) a media partnership with WWJ Radio/Infinity Broadcasting with support from the Detroit Free Press (the Knight newspaper in this community). A planned e-mail newsletter is at the core of the media partnership's current plans.

* * * *

What do these diverse efforts have in common? All created *partnerships* to bring nonprofit arts groups and other organizations in a community together to work on some common purpose - to do something better conjointly than any of them might have done alone. They range in age from 15 years to less than one year, and from a permanent cultural institution with its own headquarters building to a one-year project that no longer exists. All have successful elements as well as activities that the partners agree have been troublesome or challenging.

For instance, the Universe Project's partners generally regarded it as a success. Some 1,300 people came to the Armory Center's opening during a five-hour period, a very high turnout for this

institution; and there was increased attendance at all the participating institutions. There was good publicity, such as a *Los Angeles Times* newspaper article entitled "Simply Heavenly." Also, banners advertising the Universe Project were displayed in Pasadena, and in neighboring Los Angeles.

What made the Universe Project work? The Armory's Jay Belloli said one important feature was that "the arrangement was NOT a dictatorship. We had to trust everyone to be creative and smart, and come out with something interesting." But he also made it clear that a large investment in "partnering time" was necessary - including monthly meetings for almost 18 months, at which he set the agenda and took notes.

What didn't work? Some local scientific institutions in Pasadena, such as the Planetary Society and the Mount Wilson Institute, were not approached and should have been. There were large differences in both the size of the institutions and the amount of resources they contributed to the partnerships. Cultural differences were "smack down the middle of *Rashomon*," according to former Armory Director Elisa Callow, because the cultural differences were great among these institutions. And there was some distrust of the partner organizations by the funders, which brought in an independent consulting firm to help with this project - a move which was felt to be unnecessary and unfortunate by the partners, since it led to a duplication of effort. Finally, there was considerable turnover in the partner institutions that led to partner representatives departing the project mid-stream, with the resulting effort in bringing their replacements up to date.

Several of the partner organizations also reflected that the success of the Universe Project will make it easier for them to collaborate again in the future - and particularly to bring Caltech to the table for arts collaborations, which it had not done in the past. Since Caltech is a high-profile academic institution which also has its own art gallery and major concert hall, this has significant potential.

So what can we learn about "what works and what doesn't" in nonprofit arts partnerships from these four experiences? Among the conclusions, which are supported also by many of the other 60-plus partnerships reviewed in this paper:

*1 - **Systematic planning** is critical to the ultimate success of partnerships, leading to a set of objectives and activities that the partnership's members can support.*

*2 - **Psychological challenges**, such as power differences among the partners or resistances based upon previous bad experiences with other partnerships, can seriously jeopardize the chances for success; the partnership must focus both on identifying potential challenges such as these, and then taking active steps to resolve them.*

*3 - A strong **core idea** or intervention strategy lies at the heart of most successful partnerships - they're "about something" that is concrete and relatively easy for the partners to identify.*

*4 - Partnerships are **not cost-free**; they require financial and human resources to be successful.*

*5 - Strategies learned from **other successful partnerships** can be incorporated usefully into a new partnering activity, especially if these are available at the critical early planning stages.*

*6 - Partnerships that succeed over time also **evolve over time**, as they learn from their successes and failures, and maintain responsiveness to their community environments.*

7 - Good partnerships begin with a **due diligence** process to look at the pros and cons of partnering, including an estimate of needed start-up costs, done before the initial decision to partner is made.

8 - If a partnership is intended to survive over a longer period of time, planning ahead for **sustainability** is needed at the outset, including creation of a revenue model that will provide financial support beyond initial funding (e.g., a time-limited foundation or government grant).

In this publication a number of other partnerships will be reviewed, leading to a more comprehensive set of lessons learned that will echo these eight core learnings.

Purpose of this Working Paper Partnerships have become common in all areas of organizational life in recent years. In the business community, they're called "strategic alliances," and sometimes bring direct competitors together to serve interests of mutual profitability (think of Macy's and Gimbel's in the 1940's film *Miracle on 42nd Street!*). They're also increasingly common in the nonprofit world. Nonprofits and community groups want to partner to save money, have more impact, and grow in new areas. Their funders (especially foundations) increasingly require grantees to build partnerships, as evidence both of diverse community involvement in a project, and efficiency in combining resources.

Partnership is arguably more important than ever in these uncertain times post-September 11, and with the current downturn in the economy. Both audiences and donations are down for many arts organizations, for instance. Moreover, there are many transformations brought about by changing audience demographics, changing leadership (especially for multicultural and culturally specific organizations, which are in a major "generational transition"), changing technology and so forth. Coping with both the challenges and opportunities brought about by these transformations is often more likely to succeed in group efforts ... if they are created and operated effectively!

As mentioned in the Preview section, the purpose of this study is to explore "what works and what doesn't" in creating and sustaining partnerships involving nonprofit arts organizations. Partnerships between arts groups, and those with funders, other types of community groups, and (more infrequently) with the private sector are included in this analysis. The purposes these partnerships serve for the participating organizations range from collaborative marketing (a special focus of this investigation), to achieving economic efficiency, to pursuing community goals such as bridging divides between cultural groups.

The study involved 91 interviews with national leaders in the arts (see Appendix A for a listing of them), and a literature review in the arts and specifically in arts marketing (the Resources section lists the most useful publications and websites that interested readers might wish to consult in taking further action on what's presented here).

A word about what this study is, and what it isn't. This is an *environmental scan*, not a comprehensive inventory of nonprofit arts partnerships in the U.S. The arts partnerships reviewed were identified through interviews with key leaders and exploring the fairly limited literature on arts partnerships. No attempt was made to identify every existing partnership, for there are many thousands of them. The goal of an environmental scan is to do a kind of rough, initial survey of

“what’s out there” and what can be learned from it, for guiding further action. Both current and completed partnerships were studied, though most of the partnerships described were still in operation when this review was published. Only nonprofit arts partnerships were included, though for-profit arts organizations (such as commercial theatres) obviously engage in partnering activities as well.

Also, the main emphasis is on partnerships between and among nonprofit organizations. While several of the partnerships discussed involve business sector partners, the dynamics of nonprofit-business collaborations constitute a whole separate subject for discussion. James Austin’s recent book, *The Collaboration Challenge*, and the supporting website created by the Drucker Foundation to support it, are key resources in that regard (described further below).

Finally, the partnerships described here are institutional in nature. Individual people are “members” of many of these partnerships, but the emphasis is on organizational membership. Partnerships of individuals - for instance, between artists and educators in arts education - are again a subject requiring separate discussion.

Audiences The main audiences for which this publication is intended are the following:

* *boards and staff of nonprofit arts agencies* - particularly as they contemplate whether to get involved in a partnership, and then later when participating in a partnership at various points in its life cycle

* *community leaders* - both representing non-arts organizations that might participate in an arts partnership, or community advocates who can either support or question whether an arts partnership is right to meet a particular challenge in their community

* *funders of nonprofit arts* - the foundations, government agencies, corporate sponsors and individual donors supporting the arts in the nonprofit sector, especially in their roles mandating or encouraging partnerships in this arena

* *evaluators and researchers* - looking at nonprofit arts partnerships to determine their impact, make suggestions for improvement, or understand how the partnership process works

The last chapter will present some recommendations for further action directed to each of these audiences, along with a special section focused on arts marketing partnerships.

Reasons for Partnerships Now There have always been good reasons for nonprofit organizations, in the arts or in other fields, to partner: for instance, to leverage limited resources and increase their impact, to cut costs, to coordinate strategy to address a specific problem, or to increase their visibility in the community. In the 21st century, some motivations for nonprofit arts organizations to engage in partnerships have come to the forefront:

1 - Funders are paying increased attention to projects or programs that have the potential to benefit multiple organizations or whole communities, and as a result may mandate their grantees to

participate in partnerships, sometimes even creating “arranged marriages” to bring these partnerships into being.

2 - Because of the rapid growth of the nonprofit field in recent years, there simply are more nonprofits around (this is particularly true for arts nonprofits, due to the trends towards increased foundation and public funding in the last half of the 20th century), and they often have overlapping missions, constituencies and activities which make partnerships essential to improved efficiency.

3 - These are times of great economic hardship (post-September 11 and the recent economic downturn), for nonprofits in general and arts groups in particular. Bankruptcies and programming cuts are common, and decreased tax revenues and diminished stock portfolios mean that public and foundation funders (as well as individual donors) also have less to give. This makes it all the more imperative to undertake any kinds of leverage or efficiency strategies that seem feasible.

4 - In an increasingly multicultural, special interest world, partnerships can be a useful strategy to increase the legitimacy of an activity or cause - a strategy which applies whether the outcome is military action against Iraq or a community initiative in the arts which can benefit a number of diverse audiences.

5 - There is increased attention to the need for systems-level change in the nonprofit arts world. To improve the quality of programming, facilities and audience development, the whole community rather than just an individual arts institution may need to change. This is more likely to require a partnership rather than individual actions.

6 - When a crisis strikes, such as the bankruptcy of a major community arts institution or the withdrawal of a major local funder from support for the arts, a partnership can help to mobilize resources for addressing the crisis quickly, on a level that no one arts institution could manage.

7 - Finally, partnerships are more desirable today because there is more science and practice wisdom available to guide their formation and operation.

Reasons to Be Cautious about Partnerships At the same time, there are also compelling reasons to consider carefully whether an arts partnership is the right move for a given arts organization or community:

1 - Not all partnerships work, and in fact the science about the effectiveness of partnerships is still limited (relatively few partnerships have even been evaluated to determine whether they really have impact, though there is considerable more informal evidence of success).

2 - Not all problems can be solved by partnerships - so that caution is required even about making the initial decision to set up a partnership, much less about whether it will be likely to succeed if it is created. So, sometimes the right decision is *not* to partner.

3 - People are tired of the rather limited success of some partnerships their organizations participate in, and of the resources they take up despite this poor payoff (endless meetings without any noticeable results is probably the most frequent complaint). In such an environment of negative

experience, new partnerships need to be contemplated very carefully, lest even a good opportunity founder because there is resistance coming from past failures.

4 - Partnerships can sometimes be a tactic for delaying action or obscuring responsibility so that change doesn't happen - but no one individual or organization can be blamed for this outcome. Thus arts organizations may need to proceed cautiously about becoming identified with a partnership, lest they be tarred with that brush later on.

This is also why this publication has value - if not all partnerships are effective and not all efforts to partner are even a good idea, there is a need to have some standards for judging and then for implementing them well when they do go forward.

I. How to Think About Partnerships

The title of this report is also a way of setting forth how to think about the process of building and sustaining nonprofit arts partnerships. By referring to partnership as an “art form,” attention is being drawn to several factors:

- * the creative synthesis of disparate elements required for success in a nonprofit arts partnership - much as is needed for the artistic products these partnerships promote
- * the need for these partnerships, as a “delivery system” for art or arts education, to keep the latter clearly in focus as the partnership’s ultimate objectives - without high-quality art or high-quality education, the most successful partnership in the world is meaningless (or “garbage in, garbage out,” as they say in the computer world!)

As for the rest of the title - the focus on “what works and what doesn’t” means that this work is primarily practical and not academic, though it does encompass a lot of information and some ways of interpreting it. But its main purpose is to scan the environment for case examples, principles and conclusions that can be *used* in practical ways by arts organizations, community leaders, funders and others - to design and implement partnerships and keep them going over time.

Defining the Word “Partnership” Partnerships are more or less formal structures, some temporary and some permanent, which bring together a group of organizations in a community to implement a new program, to change something that already exists, or to address a specific problem or crisis. They involve the sharing of goals, activities, responsibilities and resources.

The relationship can be temporary or permanent, informal or structured through contracts or other legal agreements, and can be very limited or quite broad in scope. However, partnerships maintain the basic legal and fiscal independence of the member organizations. They also are usually *voluntary*, at least in principle (though that may not be in practice due to requirements of funders, pressure from other key leaders in a community to join up, etc.).

The *organizational members* of partnerships may include nonprofit organizations (e.g., local arts groups), grassroots groups, intermediary organizations (such as technical assistance organizations that support or provide training for nonprofits), funders (foundation, corporate or government), policymaking bodies (City Councils, County Boards of Supervisors, etc.), businesses, public schools, colleges and universities, or professional and trade organizations. The life of the partnership is often facilitated by meetings of representatives from these various member organizations.

“Collaboration” is a term which is often used in both the literature and community experience, to mean essentially the same thing as partnership. For purposes of this discussion, we do in fact see these two terms as equivalent, but we will use the term partnership exclusively here.

There is a potential for trouble if a group uses one term but really means another. A group using the term “partnership,” for example, but really meaning “coalition” may be surprised to find that some of its members (and others in the community) may well expect such things as financial

disclosure, due diligence, written agreement documents, joint evaluations, and a seat at the board table. One very troubling reason for the failure of mutual efforts is simply this: the parties don't agree on the meaning of the words they use. More specific definitions are given in the next section.

Structure of Partnerships and Related Community Organizations Two structural dimensions on which partnerships differ are in the *degree of formality or informality* of their organization, and the *degree of mutual accountability vs separate accountability* in how the partnership's members relate to each other. Whatever the purpose of the partnership (11 kinds are defined below), and wherever the partnership is in its life cycle (ten life cycle stages are defined below), where a partnership falls on these two dimensions plays an important part in determining how it will operate.

Moreover, the formality/informality and mutual/separate accountability dimensions also provide a relatively simple way of distinguishing between what's defined here as a partnership and six other types of organizations often found in communities as mechanisms for accomplishing different types of change:



The boundaries between a partnership and a coalition, or between other types of organizations in this array, are not fixed precisely. However, for the most part these seven classes of social organizations are relatively easy to distinguish, as the following definitions make clear:

informal network - a deliberately unstructured activity jointly supported by a group of arts organizations. For instance, a leadership group of directors of the largest performing arts centers in the U.S. meets once a year. Membership is by invitation only, and AMS consultant Steve Wolff facilitates these meetings. These informal networks are often powerful institutions despite their informal nature - and in part because of it, especially if they are composed of powerful individuals.

committee - a structured but unincorporated and usually time-limited activity, of a group of people getting together for regular meetings to take action on particular issues together. An example is Arts for LA, which is composed of the leadership of the 15 largest arts organizations in Los Angeles. This is more than an informal network; it is a formally constituted committee with funding support and administrative direction, which has brought together the leaders of the Los Angeles arts community for a number of years, pursuing projects like the "LA Big List," described in the partnership activities below.

coalition - such community-based groups, often focused on policy change or community development goals, are more structured than a committee, but less formal than a partnership/collaboration. They often come from the grassroots actions of a community to address a problem seen by community members more than by the organized leadership of the community. They often are organized to give more power to groups seen as under-represented or at least underserved by a public body.

strategic alliance - a structured, contractual relationship between two or more arts organizations to accomplish some particular goal, while maintaining the separateness of their individual organizations. These approaches have been increasingly common in the nonprofit world, as they have been for years in the business arena; David LaPiana of Strategic Solutions has written extensively about strategic alliances (see www.lapiana.org for more details).

joint venture - a more formally structured legal relationship between the partners, in which there is a commitment of capital resources to accomplish a certain task. Usually joint ventures are time-limited, and they are always focused on specific activities. However, sometimes they can have an ongoing life as well, especially if they are very successful.

merger - legally bringing together two or more organizations with overlapping missions and target audiences, to increase efficiency and mission accomplishment.

There is also a time dimension tied to degree of formality, in that mergers at least in theory are permanent arrangements for groups to work together, while informal networks or committees are typically not intended to last.

What is most critical for people working in a partnership (or studying it from the outside!) is to understand what assumptions members of a particular partnership are working on in defining their values and operations. How structured is the organization of the partnership? To what extent is there mutual accountability? Do the members of the collaboration understand the use of this term in somewhat the same way?

Purpose of Partnerships Some of the main objectives behind arts partnerships are as follows (the list is not intended to be comprehensive, but it does cover the 60-plus partnerships identified by this environmental scan study):

- 1 - artistic collaboration/joint programming*
- 2 - arts education, outreach and audience development*
- 3 - facility development*
- 4 - creation of cultural district*
- 5 - consolidated fund drive*
- 6 - advocacy*

7 - arts marketing

8 - training and professional development

9 - shared services and joint business operations

10 - third party support and services

11 - business/nonprofit relationship

These 11 categories will be used to organize the case examples identified in this study, in Chapter II.

Life Cycle of Partnerships Following are ten main stages in the natural life cycle of a partnership:

1 - Deciding to Partner

2 - Planning

3 - Setting Objectives

4 - Defining Leadership

5 - Defining Membership

6 - Mobilizing Resources

7 - Integrating with the Community Environment

8 - Implementing the Partnership

9 - Evaluating the Partnership

10 - Promoting Sustainability

These ten stages will be used to organize the lessons learned presented in Chapter III.

The Successes and Challenges of Partnerships Some partnerships in the arts clearly have had real impact in guiding the process of change. This is their basic reason for existence - as already described, to design a program or implement it, or to change a policy or procedure. What is being changed is almost always at the *systems* level within a single organization, a group of them, or an entire community - which is a main part of the reason why a group of community entities have to come together to make the change happen!

In other cases, partnerships fail to have as much impact as was hoped for. Many get created without first conducting an appropriate *assessment* - asking questions like: is a partnership the right step at

this time, in this community, to address this particular problem? Moreover, few partnerships are created with appropriate attention to the *behavioral and management science* that has accumulated over the last few years - both about how to create them and about how to sustain them over time (see below for a quick synopsis of some of this knowledge). As a result, even when partnership is the right step to take, it may not be realized well, so it doesn't work or doesn't last.

The dysfunction and mortality rates among partnerships in the arts is high - not unlike the high divorce rate in American society! More about cautions that arise from systematic evaluations of partnerships follows. Although the types of partnerships highlighted in this paper have important differences from the individual counterpart of marriage (e.g., they typically do not involve comingling of funds), they are similar in that they involve deeply shared values, common missions that may spread out over a period of time, and emotionally complex relationships that spring from the first two features.

As Marian Godfrey of the Pew Charitable Trusts put it: "People tend to collaborate because they can get something by doing it, but they need to be clear about what it can really provide. Take an analogous example: many times I've seen cultural organizations propose mergers, wanting to save themselves - but they end up with twice as much debt and twice the structural problems. The result is a larger frail organization."

Funders, community leaders and others helping to create partnerships would do well to heed the relevant French proverb, "Marry in haste, repent at leisure." And in some cases "pre-marital counseling" in the form of training about how to engage in successful partnerships prior to embarking on one can be essential to success. Funders can often be a deciding force in these early stages by insisting on attention to process in forming the partnership.

The simple coordination of activities related to arts partnerships, using as examples the community-wide efforts already being mounted in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and other communities, can ultimately help to increase the impact of individual partnerships, just by tying together in more efficient ways the many sources of information, energy and community spirit they draw upon. Making this happen is the day to day work of partnerships in the arts - an "art form" not unlike bringing together all of the resources needed to stage a play or put on an orchestral concert.

Practice Wisdom about Partnerships Training and technical assistance about how to create and sustain partnerships are offered all over the country by nonprofit associations, university management training programs, and management assistance organizations. Numerous journal articles and book chapters on this subject have appeared in the nonprofit management literature over the last ten years (key references about the general process of creating and implementing a partnership, plus literature focused specifically on partnerships in the arts, are given in the Resources section at the end of this paper).

For instance, in 2001 David LaPiana, whose organization coordinates the "Strategic Solutions" initiative, a foundation-funded program to help nonprofit organizations consider and implement mergers and joint ventures, published *Real Collaboration: A Guide for Grant-Makers*. This brief manual highlights an approach to partnerships which encourages greater attention to identifying up-front the possible synergies involved in nonprofits working together, and to more closely coordinate the joint work of the collaboration or partnership (see Resources section for citation).

Christopher Walker and his colleagues at The Urban Institute, under funding support from the Wallace Reader's Digest Funds, published in 1999 *Partnerships for Parks*, part of an evaluation of the Wallace Funds' four-year, \$16 million initiative to help create, restore or improve 20 parks and greenways, and to enable five major metropolitan parks to improve their grounds and programming, using a partnership approach. The publication asserts that making a clear distinction between "general" and "limited" partners in a partnership can increase the chances for success (e.g., involvement of limited partners in management changes in the Urban Parks Initiative generally has declined once the design is set and day-to-day implementation begins). It also argues for close examination of the assets and liabilities each partner brings to the table, and the risks each assumes by being part of the enterprise (see Resources section for citation).

Some information and technical resources about partnerships are now on-line. As already mentioned, the Peter Drucker Foundation's website "Meeting the Collaboration Challenge" provides followup information and other resources based on a well-known book by James Austin, *The Collaboration Challenge*, published in 2000. This website concentrates on business-nonprofit collaborations (www.drucker.org/collaboration).

Independent Sector also has a website, called "Mission & Market - The Resource Center for Effective Corporate-Nonprofit Partnerships," which features background information on everything from types of partnerships to tax implications; and a set of case studies - e.g., Mattel and Girls, Inc. (www.independentsector.org/mission_market).

The Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health of the New York Academy of Medicine helps partnerships, funders and policy makers realize the full potential of collaboration in the health areas. The Center conducts research, provides learning activities, and produces knowledge products (www.cacsh.org).

Two other recent publications specific to the arts are described later, as part of the discussion of "what we know from science" about partnerships.

Partnerships also are achieving more public visibility. Co-productions have become all the rage in opera and musical theatre, and are promoted as a positive because quality is assured thanks to the heavyweight partners involved. The Guggenheim Museum has perhaps led the way in the cultural world in its partnerships - with the city of Bilbao, Spain for possibly the most visible new museum in the world (except for the Getty in Los Angeles), and another partnership with the Hermitage in Russia and also with one of the major hotels in Las Vegas.

What Science Says about Partnerships Partnerships have always existed informally in communities, directed at a wide variety of purposes in arenas ranging from the arts to health to education. As already mentioned, while some partnerships are quite successful, many others are not, or at least are not sustained over time despite continuing need for the assistance in creating systems change they provide.

The reasons for this are numerous, according to research on this topic (summarized by Thomas Backer and Alex Norman in a 2000 article - see Resources section for citation). For instance, research shows that turf and competition issues often arise, and there is often "bad history" in the community from past partnerships that have failed. Sometimes the collaboration becomes more

interested in sustaining itself than in doing the work it was originally created to do. And many such groups have endless planning meetings that don't lead to action.

The total amount of resources, including dollars and time, invested in these collaborative efforts is extensive. Yet, the scientific evaluation of these entities remains sporadic at best, and the results unclear. A current comprehensive literature review of evaluation of partnerships, *Evaluating community collaborations for serving youth at risk: A handbook for mental health, school and youth violence prevention organizations* (edited by Thomas Backer - see Resources section for more information) reveals the following:

* One study of 40 coalitions showed that while almost 90% of them did some type of evaluation, they described this evaluation as “irregular, partial and nonsystematic.” Very few of these coalitions took part in regular, formal planned evaluation over an extended period of time.

* An analysis of 34 studies of 252 partnerships concluded that the combined findings were insufficient to make strong conclusions about the effects of partnerships on communities.

* In another review of 68 studies, only six examples were identified that clearly documented some sort of significant change.

All of these reviews must be seen as a warning to those engaged in partnerships. The warning is not only about being cautious about partnerships (as already outlined above), but also that until partnerships begin more rigorously evaluating the outcomes of their work, they will face ever more serious questions from funders and critics.

There is, as a result of mixed evidence such as stated above, some skepticism about the current fervor for partnership, both in the literature and among people involved in such activities in communities. Former Surgeon General Jocelyn Elders put it humorously, but pointedly, in an address to the Rosalynn Carter Mental Health Symposium several years ago: "Collaboration has been defined as an unnatural act between non-consenting adults. We all say we want to collaborate, but what we really mean is that we want to continue doing things as we have always done them while others change to fit what we are doing."

There is both organized practice and some science on this subject, though it is often not used to guide the creation and sustaining of partnerships. Strategies for creating and sustaining community partnerships have been studied in education, mental health, health communication and other fields. The management science literatures of interorganizational networking and strategic alliances, for instance, offer research-based principles for beginning and sustaining partnership-like arrangements. In the business world, major conferences and management magazine articles on strategic alliances are commonplace. This business literature has seldom been used in the creation of nonprofit partnerships, however, even though the two types of activity appear to have much in common.

Mattessich & Monsey (see Resources section for citation) reviewed the research literature on collaboration and partnership in health, social science, education and public affairs. They identified a total of 19 factors from 133 studies examined. These 19 factors provide a good synthesis of critical factors in successful partnerships, and they can be meaningfully compared with the lessons learned presented in Chapter III of this publication.

Environmental Characteristics

- there is a history of collaboration or cooperation in the community
- the partnership is seen as a leader in the community
- the political/social climate is favorable

Membership Characteristics

- there is mutual respect, understanding and trust among the members
- the partnership has an appropriate cross-section of members
- the members see collaboration as in their self-interest
- the members have ability to compromise in the partnership's activities

Process/Structure Characteristics

- the members share a stake in both the process and outcomes of the partnership
- there are multiple layers of decision-making to keep the partnership moving
- there is reasonable flexibility in the partnership's operation
- there are clear roles for the partners, and policy guidelines are developed
- the partnership is reasonably adaptable in its operation

Communication Characteristics

- there is open and frequent communication among the partners
- the partnership establishes both informal and formal communication links

Purpose Characteristics

- the partnership sets concrete, attainable goals and objectives
- there is a widely-shared vision
- the partnership has a unique purpose

Resource Characteristics

- the partnership has sufficient funds to do what it needs to do
- there is a skilled convener to bring the partnership together

The above principles, along with others provided by the work of such writers as Kaye & Wolff, Kochar & Erickson, Minkler, Ray, Tushnet and Winer & Ray (see Resources section for citations) provide an "interpretive screen" by which the roster of arts partnerships following in Chapter II can be appraised. We will come back to these principles again in the "lessons learned" chapter of this paper as well.

Finally, funders also are beginning to explore both the strengths and limits of partnerships, with several recent essays appearing in the philanthropic literature (see Resources section for citations). For example, E.M. Kauffman Foundation executive Jerry Kitzi, in a *Foundation News and Commentary* article on partnerships, reflects that most foundations find it easier to require partnerships among their grantees than to create them within philanthropy! In a self-published report, the McKnight Foundation offers the following well-balanced commentary on partnerships for an initiative to help families in poverty: "Collaboration results in easier, faster and more coherent access to services and benefits and in greater effects on systems. Working together is not a substitute for adequate funding, although the synergistic effects of the collaborating partners often result in creative ways to overcome obstacles."

Literature Specific to Arts Partnerships Both the research and wisdom practice literature on partnerships in the arts is limited. Most of the partnerships described in the roster that follows were first identified through arts leader interviews conducted as part of this environmental scan. Typically, the information available about the partnership in either print or on-line form was from an internal report and not available in the open literature. Thus reference citations are not available for most of the partnerships listed below, although further information can be obtained by contacting the operating or funding organization behind them (website addresses are provided where available).

However, there are several key publications that have emerged on arts partnerships. For example, in their book and a recent *Harvard Business Review* article, arts marketing experts Joanne Scheff and Philip Kotler draw on an analysis of a number of partnerships among nonprofit arts organizations for audience building, reaching minority audiences in a community, collaborating with local businesses, and so forth, leading to six basic principles for effective arts partnerships (see Resources section for citations):

- 1 - The organization initiating the collaboration should decide on its primary long-term objectives and then identify partners that can contribute to these objectives - but also look objectively at how joining the partnership will benefit all participants.
- 2 - Consensus must be built for each major decision the partnership makes (which may mean either a majority or a unanimous vote, and it is important that all understand what consensus means in that sense).
- 3 - Trust must be built among the collaborators - it is the key to consensus building and to effective communications, and requires the partners to understand each others' cultures and ways of doing business.
- 4 - Frequent communications among the partners through meetings and other pathways is essential.
- 5 - Leadership roles must be carefully defined, with limits of responsibility set firmly.
- 6 - Adequate personnel and financial resources must be committed to the partnership.

In a pioneering study of 21 long-standing arts education partnerships (a collaborative educational effort between a school or school district and professional artists or arts organizations to provide in-depth arts experiences for children), reported in the 2001 publication *Arts Survive* (see Resources section for citation), Steve Seidel and his colleagues at Harvard's Project Zero came to the following conclusions about what promotes survival of these partnerships over time:

- 1 - Surviving partnerships place the needs of students and schools at the center of their mission
- 2 - Deep personal commitments to the educational power of arts experiences fuel surviving partnerships.
- 3 - In surviving partnerships, multiple dimensions of the work receive regular attention, such as:
 - * building and maintaining strong relationships between people and organizations

- * clarifying values and negotiating goals among partners
- * developing strong leadership and a clear local of decision making
- * securing adequate funding and resources
- * educating and advocating for the partnership broadly and constantly
- * maintaining and improving the quality and design of the educational program
- * making the work of the partnership visible through documentation, evaluation and assessment.

4 - Surviving partnerships embrace the need to listen, to learn and to change.

5 - Surviving partnerships require a broad base of ownership and investment.

Similar principles for effective arts education partnerships are reported in two recent publications of Arts Education Partners, *Learning Partnerships* (for local community-based programs), and *Strengthening State-Level Arts Education Partnerships*. Arts education partnership models also are presented in the recent Arts, Inc. publication, *Profiling National Models of Arts and School Connections*. The latter also includes brief descriptions of a number of partnership programs, including several of the programs also presented in the Roster below (see Resources section for citations of these publications).

II. Roster of Arts Partnerships

The literature review and interviews conducted for this study identified more than 60 arts partnerships, each of which is described below in a brief summary. There are, of course, many thousands of arts partnerships in the U.S., and this roster in no way attempts to present a representative sample. These were identified primarily through the study's interviews. The partnerships listed range from relatively small enterprises with two or three local partners, to large national efforts funded by foundations or the federal government at the multi-million dollar level per year.

The partnerships are organized under the 11 major purposes or content themes for arts partnerships identified in the previous chapter:

- 1 - artistic collaboration/joint programming*
- 2 - arts education, outreach and audience development*
- 3 - facility development*
- 4 - creation of cultural district*
- 5 - consolidated fund drive*
- 6 - advocacy*
- 7 - arts marketing*
- 8 - training and professional development*
- 9 - shared services and joint business operations*
- 10 - third party support and services*
- 11 - business/nonprofit relationship*

1 - ARTISTIC COLLABORATION/JOINT PROGRAMMING

► American Composers Forum Continental Harmony

In 1998 the American Composers Forum, a national membership organization of composers with 1,400 members, undertook Continental Harmony, a major three-year initiative conducted in partnership with the National Endowment for the Arts and a group of private funders. The initiative linked composers with 58 communities in all 50 states for community-designed and managed commissions, resulting in a nationwide "musical quilt." Some 14,000 community groups were invited to participate, and both local and national organizations (such as the Library of Congress) got involved. Plans are underway for a Continental Harmony II project.

► American Composers Forum Faith Partners

The American Composers Forum operates this program as a partnership with local religious organizations in various parts of the country. Formerly entitled the Church/Synagogue Residency Program, it has so far reached 43 congregations in six states. Composers receive an 18-month residency to collaborate with a consortium of diverse faith communities in the creation of new sacred music. Public performances including orchestral concerts are held as a result.

► **American Symphony Orchestra/Concordia Collaborative**

The American Symphony Orchestra in New York City developed an innovative managerial partnership with the Concordia Orchestra. ASO presents six theme-based concerts a year, linking performances to current New York art exhibitions and cultural events in a way that revitalizes the concert-going experience for regular attendees and also attracts a new public. Concordia presents four concerts a year, each focused largely on jazz influences in concert music. Because their artistic purposes and audiences are so different, the two orchestras are not competitors.

The partnership involves Concordia contracting with ASO to perform its administrative functions. The two orchestras share the same executive director, the same marketing director, the same address and most of the same staff. Each has its own stationery, mailings and logo. Concordia retains its own board of trustees and financial books, and pursues its own artistic vision.

This partnership has allowed Concordia to reduce its administrative costs by 40% and the ASO to earn additional income by providing management services. ASO uses some of those earnings to strengthen its administrative infrastructure, which benefits both organizations. For instance, there are more resources devoted to marketing, and also the combined infrastructure makes a positive impression on potential funders.

► **Arizona Theatre Company/Childsplay Collaboration**

For the last several years, the Arizona Theatre Company (the State Theatre of Arizona with productions in Phoenix and Tucson) and Childsplay (A Tempe-based children's theatre which tours its productions for young audiences and families all over the state) have been developing their ongoing partnership through a series of collaborations as well as an ongoing dialogue about the possibilities of merging, or of sharing services in more significant ways. The two companies have collaborated on presenting simultaneously an adult's and a children's play both written by well-known playwright Steven Dietz - an enterprise which for the most part has been successful. They also have looked at ways to share staff and facilities, taking a long view about the process of partnering, since there are many cultural, logistical and financial challenges to doing so.

For ATC, reaching young people is a critical part of their audience development, while for Childsplay, cash flow and other organizational problems could be relieved by joining forces with the larger, more administratively well-structured ATC. But even with these strong motivations the two companies already have learned that this type of artistic and administrative partnership must be explored very carefully, to avoid major pitfalls and blend together two very different cultures in a healthy way.

This partnership is reported in more depth in the National Endowment for the Arts Lessons Learned case studies, available on the Internet at www.arts.endow.gov.

► **Cornerstone Theater Company**

Founded in 1986, Cornerstone Theater Company develops and performs plays using a unique recipe for community collaboration - with individual community members, local artists, and community

organizations across the gamut (arts, government, commercial, etc.). A permanent, consensus-run ensemble of actors, playwrights and technical personnel works alongside community members (including many with no professional theatre experience), and organizational partnerships are developed for each project. Cornerstone at first worked primarily in rural communities, creating 12 musical productions in ten states. These productions were offered touring-company style, beginning with the 11 founding members piling into a big blue van to move around every two to four months.

In 1992, the company settled in Los Angeles to focus on urban collaborations. Los Angeles was chosen because of its enormous cultural diversity - "to live in Los Angeles is to live within driving distance of the whole world" - and it is a city facing joys and challenges that will soon be faced by many other cities throughout the U.S. and the rest of the world. For instance, from 1994 to 1996 a series of community collaborations were sited in Watts, at such venues as the Watts Towers. Currently community collaborations include one focused on Muslims and another on Catholic immigrants.

Cornerstone projects typically involve the following components:

* *community collaborations* - During a several month residency, professional artists work alongside scores of community artists of all ages on a new play or adapted classic which celebrates the community, performed in a community venue (these have ranged from shopping malls to a closed-down steel foundry) on a pay-what-you-can admission basis.

* *bridge shows* - After a series of residency projects, community participants from each show come together across community lines to create a culminating production in venues accessible to all participating communities. All artists on bridge shows are compensated on a professional basis, and admission is pay-what-you-can.

* *ensemble productions* - Ensemble and freelance artists create productions which strengthen ties between ensemble members, reflect concerns and sensibilities specific to them, and can become part of the company's permanent repertory. These productions run four to six weeks, are sometimes site-specific, often created to tour, and always include one pay-what-you-can performance per week.

* *partnership programs* - Cornerstone helps to found community-based theatres by donating a portion of box office proceeds after a residency, and then offers ongoing support to these groups by loaning equipment, expertise and time.

Also, Cornerstone collaborates with local partners in each of its place-based community collaborations. Partners have included service agencies, local school boards, foundations, government agencies, and local arts groups. For instance, in 1993, the Arena Stage in Washington, DC invited a partnership with Arena and with residents of Anacostia, a predominantly African-American section of Washington, to produce what became "A Community Carol," an adaptation of the Charles Dickens classic that ran for 40 performances to almost 30,000 people on the Arena mainstage.

* *educational programs* - Cornerstone shares its mission and methodology with students of all ages in continuing programs offered in partnership with schools and universities (such as an ongoing

program on community arts at the University of Southern California), and also through independent workshops offered throughout LA communities.

* *institutional collaborations* - Cornerstone shares its mission and community-based methods with other arts organizations, whether in full co-productions with larger institutions or lending production support to smaller theatres with similar missions.

In some cases, Cornerstone even creates its partners - the Norcatour Arts and Humanities Commission began after the 1997 residency in this small Kansas town, and now produces plays and sponsors other arts programs. Commission Director Ron Temple also has served on Cornerstone's Board of Directors.

Cornerstone has its own headquarters building, with rehearsal space, in an artists' district of downtown Los Angeles. The Company now is looking at expanded options for sharing its unique approach to community collaboration with other theatre companies and communities across the country.

► **Creative Work Fund**

Four foundations - Columbia Foundation, Evelyn & Walter Haas, Jr. Fund, Miriam & Peter Haas Fund and the Walter & Elise Haas Fund - partner on the Creative Work Fund, which is now about seven years old. In 2001, the Fund awarded about \$375,000 in grants to San Francisco arts groups. An additional \$175,000 was awarded through a nomination process to organizations collaborating with traditional and folk artists.

The Fund also brings together arts groups for partnerships. For instance, a recent successful collaboration involved Chanticleer (a men's singing group), the Women's Philharmonic, and Chen Yi (a woman composer). Vocal and instrumental music was performed as part of this collaboration along with dance, at the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts.

► **In Unison**

African-American churches in the Saint Louis, Missouri area developed a partnership with the Saint Louis Symphony Orchestra called "In Unison," with outreach efforts focused on African-American churches because they are a central component in family and community life and have played a significant role in nurturing musical talent. The orchestra's performance center, Powell Hall, is located in an African-American neighborhood, but area residents had previously criticized the orchestra for being aloof from its community. Orchestra representatives talk to church members to encourage them to attend concerts, and In Unison membership is free to the churches so long as participating congregations agree to purchase 20 or more tickets at a special discount price.

Concerts in the series are specially selected to appeal to In Unison members, including artists like pianist Andre Watts and the Boys Choir of Harlem. Orchestra members give one free ensemble performance in each participating church, which the church can use as a fundraiser or as free entertainment for the congregation.

The orchestra also provides access to educational materials, including information on African-American composers and artists. Backstage tours can be arranged, along with post-concert reception

invitations and free tickets for congregation youth, and a number of other partnership programs are included.

By In Unison's second season, the orchestra had built relationships with nearly 13,000 members of 23 churches, and it was recouping expenses for the program through ticket sales, even at the discounted rates.

► **Junebug Productions, Inc.**

The mission of Junebug Productions is to produce, present and support high quality performing arts that represents and encourages African Americans in the South of ordinary means who are working to improve their quality of life and reduce oppression. Much of the group's work is supported by partnerships. One is with the New Orleans Community Arts Program, the base for all of Junebug's home-based programming; the group also tours nationally and internationally with its original plays.

In another partnership, "Promise of a Love Song" is a play that has been presented collaboratively on tour for three years by Junebug, Appalachian Theatre Company (Kentucky), and Pregones Theatre (South Bronx, New York). Junebug also is involved with the Environmental Justice Project, which has 20 other partners and uses the arts as a form of both advocacy and public communication regarding a badly-polluted stretch of the Mississippi River called "Cancer Alley."

► **Magic of Music**

The John S. & James L. Knight Foundation launched the Magic of Music program in 1995 to strengthen symphony orchestras by encouraging a greater sense of excitement in the concert-going experience and a more vital relationship between musicians and audiences. In the first phase of the program, about \$5.5 million was distributed through planning and implementation grants to 12 orchestras. Generally the projects were successful in attracting new audiences with combined education and entertainment programs that created new gateways to the orchestra experience. Some of the projects also involved collaborative management strategies for the orchestras funded.

In the second phase, launched in 2000, some of the orchestras funded in Phase I were refunded in partnerships with one or more orchestras in Knight communities across the country, so that collaboration could take place. Planned annual retreats with all of the grantees will offer chances to share lessons learned, establish further collaborations beyond the ones with which the grant application initially dealt, and promote inter-organizational communication (some of which was originated among the Phase I projects). Supplementary support through technical assistance and audience segmentation research also will be provided to the collaborative programs.

For example, the Saint Louis and New World (Miami) orchestras will serve as host sites, sharing the models they developed in Phase I with orchestras in Charlotte, NC and Fort Wayne, IN. Specifically, Saint Louis' program design, collaborative experiences, musician involvement in program oversight and contract specifics will serve as a starting point for discussion. New World's training of musicians for a broader job description that includes interaction with the public in nontraditional community settings outside the full ensemble orchestra will serve as another starting point. The collaboration will be reciprocal, as the Charlotte and Fort Wayne orchestras can share their community engagement programs with the other orchestras - and ultimately the experiences of all four can be shared with the symphony orchestra community nationally.

► **Partnerships Affirming Community Transformation**

Partnerships Affirming Community Transformation (PACT) supports community cultural development projects undertaken by artists and other cultural professionals and organizations. The aim of these projects is to promote community development in geographic areas (e.g., a particular neighborhood in a city), a community of interest (e.g., shipyard workers), or any affinity (e.g., Latino teenagers). A program of the Rockefeller Foundation, PACT specifically encourages partnerships among individuals and organizations. For instance, a project that uses dance might involve a partnership between a community-based dance company and local social clubs.

The first awards in this program were made in 2000. For instance, the Village of Arts and Humanities in Philadelphia was given a grant to work with three neighborhood groups in park-building, intended to address urban blight and vacant properties in North Philadelphia.

► **Renaissance & Baroque Society**

Based in Pittsburgh, the Renaissance & Baroque (R&B) Society for years has been primarily a presenting society, hiring performers from out of town. In 2001, R&B began three collaborations, setting the stage for ongoing partnerships with other community organizations to enhance its audience and programs. For instance, it partnered with Pittsburgh Camerata and Chatham Baroque to perform a concert version of Handel's oratorio "Acis and Galatea."

R&B received an \$8,000 grant from the Heinz Endowment to support three collaborations, and in turn gave fees to the partnering organizations. Audience building, as well as practical economic and administrative aspects of a collaboration are all part of the positive motivation - along with the opportunity to enhance and expand the creative product.

► **Rural Drama Consortium**

The Roadside Theatre, a professional, nonprofit theatre based in Whitesburg, Kentucky, the Artist and Community Connection, a professional, nonprofit producing organization in Austin, Texas, and a third volunteer nonprofit performing arts presenting organization located in a rural western town, developed a consortium to develop and test a model for the creation of rural drama that is original, of high artistic quality, honors and perpetuates local traditions, and engages community concerns. Roadside and the third volunteer organization each wrote and produced an original play. Roadside wrote and produced its play in collaboration with the Mullins Family Singers from Dickenson County, Virginia, which has promoted family harmony gospel singing for over 100 years. ACC served as coordinator and producer of these two projects.

The Consortium offered an opportunity to look critically at how to deal with tensions created by a partnership in which one arts organization is professional and one is volunteer, and how a third-party producer can help both types of organizations achieve desired goals. The exchange elements of a collaboration between groups in different communities can help mitigate the feelings of isolation

and marginalization that are often present in contemporary rural life, another benefit of this partnership beyond the specific economic and artistic partnership goals.

This partnership is reported in more depth in the National Endowment for the Arts Lessons Learned case studies, available on the Internet at www.arts.endow.gov.

► **San Francisco Camerawork**

Camerawork is a nonprofit artists organization which promotes communication about contemporary photography through a variety of educational programs and exhibits. They sponsor lectures together with the Museum of Modern Art, the Art Institute, and the public schools. And Camerawork has an ongoing partnership with nine photography organizations and museums nationwide. Camerawork also has a partnership with New Langton Arts in the form of sharing space (since January 2001).

► **San Francisco Museum Partnership**

In 1999, the de Young Museum and the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts in San Francisco exchanged exhibition spaces in their respective buildings, in a unique partnership. The de Young was severely damaged in the 1989 San Francisco earthquake, and needed an alternate space for two traveling exhibitions to meet insurance requirements. So de Young management approached Yerba Buena about using their exhibition space, which was originally thought infeasible until Yerba Buena executive director John Killacky suggested actually exchanging spaces, which might have benefits for Yerba Buena in increasing their visibility in the community.

A number of other joint activities, such as a combined fundraising event held at Yerba Buena to underwrite some of the exchange activity costs, were also conducted, along with a series of joint educational programs about museum exhibition practices as well as about the specific art being shown at the two museums. The exchange partnership was considered a success by both parties, and has opened the door to ongoing dialogue about other collaborative ventures.

► **Stravinsky Festival**

The Los Angeles Philharmonic, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, the Los Angeles Library and a number of other cultural organizations in L.A. came together for a year-long project exploring the life of the great composer Igor Stravinsky in Los Angeles, where he spent his last years. The Philharmonic initiated the project by contacting arts leaders individually about the potential partnership. The intellectual and historical thread of the project was very strong, which helped to convince people right away that they should participate.

It also was a partnership amongst very busy institutions and people, which never had a single convening of all the partners in one place. The executive director of the Philharmonic coordinated the overall project, and structured the working relationships with both larger and smaller partners. For the smaller partners, the organizers pretty much structured how they would need to participate in the partnership, whose activities included concerts, symposia and informational exhibits.

► **Universe Project**

Undertaken by a group of visual and performing arts organizations in partnership with local scientific institutions in Pasadena, California, the Universe Project was born from a previous, and highly successful, partnership in which many of its players also had participated. In 1999, a multi-site exhibit with chamber music performances added in was initiated, called “Radical Past: Contemporary Art and Music in Pasadena 1960-1974.” The Armory Center for the Arts, Art Center College of Design, the One Colorado shopping center, the Norton Simon Museum of Art and Southwest Chamber Music were among its partners. At a celebratory breakfast for this partnership, the group assembled asked: “What’s next?”

People got excited about a collaboration that would use the universe as the central theme, and Jeff von der Schmidt of Southwest Chamber Music and Jay Belloli of the Armory Center for the Arts took leadership roles in launching the partnership. The idea sprang from conversations von der Schmidt had previously had with Ed Nygren of the Huntington Library Art Gallery, in which they looked at how numbers tie science and art together. Ultimately the partners just listed joined with the California Institute of Technology, Pacific Asia Museum and the Huntington Library, Art Collections and Botanical Gardens to create this year-long project, launched in September 2000.

Each institution had to raise its own money, and there was a joint curatorial committee that made decisions about what would be included. A local foundation and the City of Pasadena arts commission together contributed \$175,000 to the project. In some cases, several partners collaborated at the same site - for instance, Southwest Chamber Music had a concert of universe-themed music at the Norton Simon Museum, where a universe-themed exhibit of paintings from the Museum’s collection was in one of the galleries adjacent to its auditorium.

► **Urban Libraries Council**

This multi-site partnership involves museums, library and public broadcasting stations working together in a city to promote use of public libraries. An evaluation of the partnership by Urban Institute is being done, with eight communities as targets of case studies.

► **WAAA Equity Program Collaboration**

The Western Alliance of Arts Administrators (WAAA), a service organization for arts presenters and touring groups in the Western US, received support from the James Irvine Foundation to promote collaborations between mainstream presenting organizations and much smaller community-based arts organizations. These partnerships were specifically created with the goal of promoting an equitable relationship between the two unequal sized organizations. Enhancing outreach and service to culturally diverse audiences was often a goal of the projects, since most of the community-based organizations are culturally-specific.

There were two phases of grant making. Eight Phase I grants helped explore the requirements for collaboration and to increase community-based organizations’ access to resources available at the WAAA annual conference. Three of the phase I partners were provided Phase II grants to support their collaboration project.

An evaluative analysis of the three Phase II collaborations was conducted by Richard Linzer and Associates, with a number of resulting lessons learned. For instance, the evaluation found that effective collaborations require each partner to have sufficient time resources so that time

commitments to the partnerships are not made at the expense of other institutional priorities; that long-term collaboration needs a startup period for people to get to know and trust each other; and that clear limits on the goals and expected outcomes of the partnership need to be set at the beginning so that all involved have realistic expectations.

2 - ARTS EDUCATION, OUTREACH AND AUDIENCE DEVELOPMENT

► Arts Education Funders Collaborative

Chaired by the Walter & Elise Haas Fund, the Arts Education Funders Collaborative is a partnership between 13 foundations and the San Francisco Unified School District. The Collaborative helps to fund and manage projects in the school district for arts education.

► Arts Education Partnership

A division of the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Arts Education Partnership is aimed at strengthening state and community-level arts education partnerships across the country. These bring together the state education agency, the state arts agency and a state arts alliance, along with philanthropic, business and arts organizations.

At a 2000 conference reported in *Strengthening State-Level Arts Education Partnerships*, a number of factors accounting for the success or failure of these partnerships were discussed, along with steps partners can take to increase the odds of a partnership's success. *Learning Partnerships* is a guide for local community leaders in thinking about the same issues - the factors that make partnerships successful over time, the key questions partners should ask themselves at crucial stages in the life of the partnership, and the impact arts education partnerships have on students and communities.

Two of the community partnerships created using these approaches are described below - the Chicago Arts Partnership in Education (CAPE) program, and the Empire State Partnership program.

► Arts Partners Program

Begun in 1989, the Association of Performing Arts Presenters Arts Partners Program helps create and fund partnerships for audience development that involve presenting organizations, artists, and other community organizations (such as educational institutions) or individuals. The Program has been funded by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds and the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and has given out more than \$11 million in grants so far to more than 150 organizations. Grants are given both for planning (to help presenters develop partnerships) and for implementing audience development projects. Project grants are designed to provide substantial funding (\$50,000 - \$100,000) for the implementation of a well-planned adult audience development project involving an extended residency by a performing artist, company or group.

For instance, in 1994, the Anchorage Concert Association in Alaska collaborated with the UMOJA Community Association, Alaska Federation of Natives and other community organizations to host a four-week residency with Dance Brazil, to develop dance audiences in their 20's and 30's. Both teachers and community members were offered classes, and jam sessions were held at a local coffee

house with Dance Brazil percussionists and two local bands. ACA had previously received a planning grant to develop this project.

Currently Arts Presenters is developing an endowment for this program to continue its support of audience development projects in the future.

► **Arts Partnerships for Education**

The California Arts Council has distributed \$1.1 million in 2000 and 2001 to 17 arts organizations across the state, each of which has developed partnerships among schools and school districts, arts organizations, community and parent groups, businesses, foundations, and colleges and universities. All of the partnerships are directed at arts education for children in schools.

Networking and technical assistance for the grantees was provided by Arts, Inc., a Los Angeles-based arts service organization, and an independent evaluation conducted by Polaris, Inc. Early results showed that forming these cross-sector partnerships requires overcoming a number of challenges, such as foundations disinclined to support efforts that involve public agencies, unless they clearly see the leverage value of their funding; achieving buy-in from public schools at a time when attention is focused on “drilling for testing”; and promoting sustainability of partnerships after the initial period of funding has been completed.

► **Challenge America**

The National Endowment for the Arts in June 2001 awarded 196 grants totaling \$1.7 million to fund partnerships with schools, civic and community organizations that feature artist residencies in settings that offer young people safe environments in which to explore their expressive capacities. The projects serve primarily grades 6-12, and the partner organizations also include healthcare, youth service and social service providers as well as arts organizations.

For example, a grant was awarded to Free Arts for Abused Children of Arizona to supply a partnership with Youth Etc., the Salvation Army's Family Shelter, Brownstone Care, Family Support Resources and the Sunshine Group for the Multicultural Arts Camp. The summer camp provides training in art, music, drama and dance of cultures around the world to children 12-17 who have been abused and neglected, are homeless, or live in public facilities such as homeless shelters.

► **Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education**

The Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE) was started in 1993 by a group of corporations and foundations. Each CAPE partnership involves two or three Chicago public schools, four to five arts organizations, and one or two community organizations. Partnerships plan and deliver integrated arts education curricula that weave learning in the visual, performing, literary and media arts throughout academic subject areas. They recognize in-school arts specialists as central to the arts education process, and integrate in-school curricula with after-school and community based programming.

The CAPE central office provides oversight, professional development, funding, public relations, advocacy, and networking opportunities. The CAPE program has been evaluated by the North

Central Regional Educational Laboratory, with favorable results including evidence that CAPE participating students are more motivated to learn and that they participate more than typical students.

► **Community/Schools Partnerships for the Arts**

Community/Schools Partnerships for the Arts (C/SPA) brings together schools and community arts organizations to strengthen arts education in Sarasota County, Florida. C/SPA was organized following a crisis in which the public school arts education program was substantially cut. C/SPA then was formed by the County's Arts Council, and developed a multi-media presentation to persuade school principals of the value of arts education, as well as a long-range plan resulting from a brainstorming process with local stakeholders. As a result, art and music teachers returned to the schools, and actually increase in numbers, while some schools added dance and theatre curricula as well.

C/SPA used the National Standards to affirm the importance of the arts as part of public school education, and to offer suggestions for broad goals of arts education programs in Sarasota County which could both guide program development and serve as benchmarks. The program's efforts were reinforced both by a bottom-up stakeholder involvement policy that got individuals from many levels in the community involved, and also by the commitment of arts organizations in the community to support in-school programming, rather than to offer their own educational activities as a replacement in hard times.

This program is described more fully in an on-line journal about community arts, at www.aad.oregon.edu/culturework.

► **Creative Arts in the Public/Private Schools**

Creative Arts in the Public/Private Schools (CAPS) was started 30 years ago, and is primarily a partnership between the Durham Arts Council in North Carolina and Durham Public Schools. The partnership activity places artists in public schools to lead interactive and creative residencies that teach basic subjects and skills through the arts. During the 1999-2000 school year, for example, CAPS residencies were active in 397 classrooms and in 39 different schools in Durham.

► **Empire State Partnership Project**

Established in 1996, the Empire State Partnership (ESP) Project offers grants to support local school/cultural organization partnerships, a communications network including a website for these partnerships, and a year-round professional development program for the current grant recipient teams. Its aim is to identify, develop and support best practices in cultural/education partnerships focused on achievement of state learning standards, and grants are made to arts and culture organizations that apply with their educational partners. ESP has been evaluated by the Education Development Center. It is an interagency initiative that unites the State Education Department's strategic plan for raising standards for all students with the New York State Council on the Arts' goal of integrating the arts into all classrooms.

For instance, the Hangar Theatre and the Ithaca City School District receive an ESP grant to operate a district-wide arts education program with elementary, middle and high schools participating along with 20 artists and five cultural organizations.

► **Kennedy Center Partners in Education: Performing Arts in Schools**

The Partners in Education: Performing Arts in School program was established in 1991 by the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC. Currently, 76 communities in 40 states and the District of Columbia participate in this program. Partnership teams in each community consist of a representative of a performing arts center/presenting organization and a representative of a neighboring school system, who work together in developing educational partnerships within the local school system, aimed at professional development programs in the arts for teachers. The Kennedy Center provides annual training and development, and other information and networking opportunities for the local partner teams.

► **Wallace Funds Community Partnerships for Cultural Participation Program**

Beginning in 1999, the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds awarded \$9 million in grants to 10 community foundations, each of which have since built a community partnership designed increase participation in arts and culture activities in their communities. The funds underwrite new grants to local arts organizations, building partnerships among them, and to better engage both local artists and community members. A portion of each grant also goes to a permanent endowment at the community foundations, as part of sustaining these efforts beyond the period of the Wallace Funds' support. An external evaluation of this initiative is being conducted by the Urban Institute.

Community activities include development through research and collaborative ventures with other communities across the country of new approaches to building arts participation. The project grants issued by the ten community foundations primarily support collaborations among community groups, cultural organizations and artists. For example, one city developed a partnership between a major museum and community-based arts centers to broaden community access to the arts and build crossover audiences.

► **Wallace Funds Leadership and Excellence in Arts Participation Initiative (LEAP)**

Supported by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds, the Leadership and Excellence in Arts Participation Initiative has provided \$25 million in funding to arts organizations across the country, each of which has developed partnerships with other community institutions to promote "service to people" as a conjoint goal with artistic excellence. Many museums, performing arts organizations, and community cultural centers that put people at the center of their work find that they have higher ticket sales, attract new and more diverse audiences, and encourage more repeat audiences. Service to people and high-quality artistic product are aligned in each of the grant projects.

For instance, the Arena Stage in Washington, DC is partnering with local universities, museums and other arts organizations to conduct audience research, create new plays, boost marketing efforts, and expand programs that directly involve community members in order to attract a more diverse audience. The Center for Cultural Change in Portland, Maine is expanding its partnerships with

social service organizations, community groups and churches to deepen its connections with local populations, especially new immigrants.

► **Wallace Funds State Arts Partnership**

In 2001, 13 state arts agencies received multi-year grants totaling \$9.6 million to create partnerships for increasing cultural participation in their states through the State Arts Partnership (START) program - including leadership training, pilot projects, and improved technical assistance. The partnership activities also extend to work with each other and with the funder, the Wallace - Reader's Digest Funds; and the projects also are intended to lead to better coordination among public and private funders, and arts practitioners to create and disseminate knowledge and support the adoption of practices that build arts participation.

Wallace also is commissioning research on cultural participation, to enable both state arts agencies and local arts organizations to become more innovative and to avoid re-inventing basic approaches to building participation. The strategies developed will also be disseminated to all other state arts agencies across the country. The 13 participating state arts agencies are Arizona, California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina and Washington.

3 - FACILITY DEVELOPMENT

► **Art Partners Program**

The Art Partners Program was created by the City of Los Angeles' Cultural Affairs Department in 1993, when city budget problems threatened the closure of five city-owned community arts centers. Five partnerships were created to transform each of these centers. The partners in each collaborative project are: (a) the city, offering the facility, technical assistance and some program dollars; (b) a nonprofit arts agency, coordinating the project and offering community-oriented art programs; and (c) a corporate partner, offering funding or in-kind services of \$50,000 per year.

For example, the Lankershim Arts Center, located in a predominantly-Latino neighborhood in the San Fernando Valley, now houses The Other Side of the Hill Productions (a theatre company), Shirley Martin Dancers, Los Angeles Printmaking Society and Synthaxis Theatre Company. Target/Mervyn's, the department store chain, is the corporate partner.

The City has subsequently explored bringing other local arts centers in this partnership program, and establishing an endowment to help support it on an ongoing basis. These centers also partner with many other local arts organizations in their programming, and several of them also now house an Electronic Arts Academy, a training facility to help Los Angeles youth prepare for jobs in the multi-media publishing and entertainment industries (funded partly by SONY Pictures Entertainment).

► **500 South First Art Center**

The 500 South First Art Center partnership was formed to convert a 37,000 square foot former auto showroom into a shared space for the San Jose Museum of Quilts & Textiles, the San Jose Institute of Contemporary Art, the Tapestry and Talent program, and the Movimiento de Arte y Cultura Latino Americano. The conversion is in the planning stages, and more than \$200,000 has been raised for planning purposes. They hope to move into the new facility in less than three years. The four partner organizations also will have joint marketing and audience development goals, but have agreed that they will retain their individual identities and will not merge any programs. However, there will be coordination of educational activities as well as the obvious advantages of sharing the newly-remodeled, \$17 million venue. 500 South First Art Center may thus become a model for shared space amongst mid-sized arts organizations.

4 - CREATION OF CULTURAL DISTRICT

► DC Heritage Tourism Coalition

The DC Heritage Tourism Coalition is a five-year old membership organization whose partner organizations include museums, hotels, retailers, houses, cultural centers, churches and a variety of other entities in the District of Columbia with a common interest in promoting heritage-based tourism. They also partner specifically with arts groups as well. They host DC Heritage Neighborhood Day, which showcases the history of Washington neighborhoods, and a Duke Ellington neighborhood tour in the summer.

► Heart of Brooklyn Cultural Consortium

The Heart of Brooklyn Cultural Consortium is a partnership among the Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Brooklyn Children's Museum, Brooklyn Museum of Art, Brooklyn Public Library, Prospect Park Alliance and Prospect Park Zoo. The Consortium's goal is to heighten cultural awareness and substantially increase educational programming opportunities as well as to establish central Brooklyn as a must-see destination for all Brooklynites as well as New York City residents and tourists.

The Consortium was established informally in 1998 through joint programming among the members and was made official with the incorporation of the Consortium as an independent not for profit organization in early 2001. During an extensive planning process, BCC studied similar partnerships in other parts of the country and realized that theirs was unique. Further, the Consortium recently learned from one of its funders that it appears to have served as a model for proposed partnerships in Queens, Staten Island, Newark and Buffalo.

The Consortium completed its business plan this past year, which built upon a foundation of programmatic collaboration. Positive models have been created for how institutions with different missions and areas of expertise can work together to serve common goals. At present, the Consortium jointly participates in:

Brooklyn Cultural Adventures Program (BCAP) is a content-rich recreational camp for children ages 10 to 12. It was created in 1998 to engage children in fun, educational activities that introduce them to each institution's collections. As a collaborative project, its primary goal is to offer high-quality, low-cost camp programs for children aged 10-12 that use the strengths of each of the partner

organizations. BCAP campers represent a broad cross-section of Brooklyn's population, including African-American, Caribbean, Hispanic, and Caucasian families.

The Consortium has participated in several events that have proven to be effective ways to reach out to the diverse communities of Brooklyn and introduce more families to the member institutions. An example of this programming is The West Indian Day Parade, perhaps the largest Carnival celebration for the West Indian community anywhere in the world. In its 34th year, the parade draws millions of revelers and Consortium members regularly participate in the parade and festival to ensure awareness of these resources and reach out to a community that includes many recent immigrant families.

The Brooklyn Expedition is an educational technology collaboration between the Brooklyn Children's Museum, the Brooklyn Museum of Art and the Brooklyn Public Library. This joint website brings together the resources of these three major Brooklyn institutions to increase educational services to the community by offering teachers, children and families a new way to access three worlds of information in one place. The website encourages virtual as well as actual visits to the area's cultural institutions. The Brooklyn Expedition is funded through an Institute of Museum and Library Services National Leadership Grant.

Green Branches, a program of the Horticultural Society of New York has the participation of the Brooklyn Public Library and the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens and is a joint effort to create gardens at branch libraries. Once the gardens are installed BBG staff work with the library staff and volunteers in the neighborhood to build their capacity to take care of the garden. Young people from the community assist in the maintenance of the gardens.

The Prospect Park Alliance's Ezra Jack Keats Storytelling Program is presented in collaboration with the Brooklyn Public Library. This innovative program places librarians from BPL in the Prospect Park's Imagination Playground to read books to children of all ages. This free service provides an exceptional informal learning opportunity to residents of the adjacent neighborhoods - Prospect Leffert's Gardens and Crown Heights.

Additionally, five of the consortium members collaborate to run the Heart of Brooklyn Trolley, with hourly stops throughout Prospect Park and its neighboring cultural institutions. The trolley is free, and connects with the Brooklyn Children's Museum Trolley.

► **Milpitas Alliance for the Arts**

The Milpitas Alliance for the Arts in Milpitas, California, was formed in 1997 and is intended to support, promote and enhance the cultural arts in the city of Milpitas. It is a membership organization, and concentrates on local partnership activities in which a local arts event is targeted for the group's activity, e.g., a Filipino Festival.

The Alliance also coordinates the Art Leaders Summit Group, which includes 14 arts agencies which meets three times a year and also is exploring partnership activities. The "Art in Your Park" partnership is between the city's Parks Recreation and Cultural Resources Commission and MAFTA, with the goal of having art installations in every one of the city's 25 parks. A planning grant was awarded, and one installation has been made with others in the planning stages.

► **Museums of the Arroyo**

For the last 13 years, five Los Angeles cultural institutions have partnered on an annual event that both promotes the individual venues and the environment in which they are all sited - the Arroyo area between downtown Los Angeles and Pasadena. The Gamble House, Heritage Square Museum, Lummis Home and Garden, the brand-new Pasadena Museum of History and the Southwest Museum are the five partners. On the third Sunday of May each year, Museums of the Arroyo offers a daylong event which includes free transportation between the five facilities, and special events which provide “images of early Los Angeles.”

► **Tucson Arts District Partnership**

The Tucson Arts District Partnership (TADP) serves Tucson’s metropolitan population of 800,000 plus 2.7 million tourists annually. The Arts District has more than 200 organizations and encompasses all of downtown. TADCP’s mission is to revitalize downtown and provide a focused arena for Tucson’s rich artistic and cultural heritage, so as to re-establish the area as the heart of the community. It provides technical assistance, capital fund raising, marketing and audience development services, planning and development services, and small business loans.

TADP is funded through the City’s hotel bed tax, plus revenues from the state, local foundations and private donors. It offers print materials, a website, a banner program, and information center, and a variety of special events all requiring partnerships with both public and private organizations of many types in the city.

5 - CONSOLIDATED FUND DRIVE

► **Silicon Valley Arts Fund**

Now ten years old, the Silicon Valley Arts Fund was established to provide stabilization support for arts organization in the Silicon Valley region of California. It is a partnership of funders, initiated by such major local funders as the Packard and Knight Foundations, and Community Foundation Silicon Valley. In addition to raising a considerable amount of money for arts organizations in the region, the Fund also had the advantage of getting leadership in the nonprofit arts community to establish communication for the first time, so that they could establish other partnerships as time goes on.

6 - ADVOCACY

► **Enrich Your Life**

This advocacy campaign was produced through a partnership led by the Detroit Zoo and other major cultural organizations in Detroit, along with the Detroit Metro Convention and Visitors Bureau. Creative services were donated by W.B. Donor, a major advertising agency in the Detroit area. The campaign was an effort to bolster voter support for Proposition A, a tax-based arts funding initiative.

A website as well as other media services were created to support the advocacy campaign, which operated successfully though unfortunately the legislative initiative it promoted did not pass.

7 - ARTS MARKETING

► Arts for LA “Big List” Project

Arts for LA is the informal, unincorporated leadership council of the 15 largest arts organizations in Los Angeles. One of the group’s first projects was developing the “Big List,” which now has 40 members and more than 450,000 households representing every zip code in Southern California. This list is now available to all the members, with its diverse range of households (one of the inspirations for this project was the discovery in the initial submission of lists by arts organizations was that there was not a lot of overlap in the lists!), and a much higher quality body of data thanks to the conjointly-funded effort. Enhancements of the list with additional biographical data are also being developed.

► Arts Marketing Center of Chicago

A collaborative project of the Arts & Business Council of Chicago, Northwestern University and MacArthur and Sara Lee Foundations, the Arts Marketing Center (AMC) offers technical assistance, workshops, research and data services for nonprofit arts organizations in the Chicago area. They also operate an on-line resource center (www.artsmarketing.org) which is available to users across the country free of charge. Finally, AMC coordinates the National Arts Marketing Project in eight other communities, with funding from American Express. A comprehensive collaboration on marketing capacity building and skills development, AMC helps nonprofit arts organizations understand the marketplace in which they operate and develop innovative and effective marketing plans.

► Calgary Regional Arts Foundation Initiatives

Everyone associated with the Calgary, Canada Regional Arts Foundation initiatives is a volunteer, and funding for these programs comes from the Canadian government as well as from some corporations. Calgary Arts Partners is a partnership of 11 groups - five theatre companies, one opera company, Alberta Ballet, Calgary Philharmonic, Organ Festival, Epcor Centre for Performing Arts, and Alberta Performing Arts Stabilization Fund. A marketing study was done for this group by a Canadian research company, examining local arts attendance habits, audience attitudes and perceived barriers to more frequent attendance, etc. Now the next step is to determine what marketing activities might emerge as a result of this input. A website, Reallivearts.com, is being launched, which will promote the arts in Calgary; it is government-funded.

► Charlotte Marketing Services Organization * see note at end

The Charlotte Marketing Services Organization (MSO) was launched in 1994 with a planning project. It has since been through several transformations, and now is called the Blume Agency, with a considerably different focus and operation than the original project. Two of the collaborative's original four clients have departed, and the 10-person Blume Agency now focuses on (1) advertising services for its clients (organized more like a traditional advertising agency), (2) public relations services, and (3) a division that develops websites for smaller local nonprofit organizations (including but not limited to arts organizations). Mike Sowyak, a former ad agency owner, now is director of the MSO.

Work now is organized more on a project basis, says Judith Allen, Executive Director of the Blumenthal Performing Arts Center where the Blume Agency is housed, replacing the original model built around a core of retainer clients. For-profit clients (e.g., a small real estate developer) as well as nonprofit arts clients are being sought. The PAC also offers a centralized ticketing service and a shared database which groups performing there use, as well as an online calendar and a collaborative playbill publication which has been quite successful both from a revenue and publicity standpoint. A new service will help local arts and other nonprofits develop sponsorship programs.

► **Long Beach Max Marketing** * *see note at end*

Initiated in 1998 with a planning project, the Long Beach collaborative also has been through several major transformations as well as a number of staff changes. Called MaxMarketing and currently headed by Phil Powers under the umbrella of Public Corporation for the Arts, the project's attempt to replicate a significant part of the retainer client/shared services model of the Charlotte MSO was not successful, largely because of the difficulty in recruiting retainer clients.

Over time, MaxMarketing has evolved to a different approach which now seems to be more successful. Their two major current activities are (1) a "Marquee project," a shared poster-advertising activity which now is in 75 high-density locations throughout the city and involves 12 clients, including most of the largest arts organizations in the community; and (2) a database sharing project, which will include 8-10 Long Beach arts organizations (and all of the five largest) when it is launched. For the latter, a proposal has been submitted from Target Solutions, a vendor that will handle the merging of mailing lists, and then will develop programming for prospecting of the resulting database.

MaxMarketing also has a committed steering committee of local arts and marketing professionals, and has been successful in getting the marketing directors of the larger local arts organizations to meet on a monthly basis - which also provides input to the project. And it has been approached by the City of Long Beach to create "Long Beach Performs," a quarterly performing arts publication which may be both a marketing tool and a revenue generator (as the Charlotte playbill has been).

► **Metro Detroit Cultural Marketing Network** * *see note at end*

Building on a 2000 planning study by AMS, the Metro Detroit Cultural Marketing Network was initiated in 2002 by ArtServe Michigan, a local service organization for nonprofit arts. Funding from the Community Foundation of Southeast Michigan supplements the Knight grant. The project is linked to the Southeastern Michigan Community Partnership for Cultural Participation, coordinated

by the Community Foundation's senior consultant Larry Coppard, and funded by the Wallace Funds and 14 other funders.

The Network is planning two major initial activities: (1) a database cooperative, for which the Los Angeles "Big List" mailing list exchange was the central model, and (2) a media partnership with WWJ Radio/Infinity Broadcasting with support from the Detroit Free Press (the Knight paper in this community). A planned e-mail newsletter is at the core of the media partnership's current plans, modeled after the Great Lakes IT Report and AutoBeat Daily, both of which have been successful e-newsletters with revenues generated from advertising and subscriptions. The e-newsletter will be promoted through the media partners, and the current plan is that by the end of its second year this activity will be self-supporting, or perhaps even throw off some revenue that can be used to support other efforts.

► **SCFD Tier II Community Awareness Project**

For the last 13 years, the Scientific & Cultural Facilities District has funded more than 300 science and culture organizations in a seven-county area centered on Denver, Colorado. It is supported by a voter-approved sales tax (a penny on every \$10). Recipient organizations are organized into three "tiers" - Tier I are the four large regional institutions in Denver (Zoo, Museum of Nature and Science, Art Museum and Botanic Gardens); Tier II are mid-size performing arts, cultural and scientific institutions (those with annual operating incomes of about \$850,000 or more); and Tier III are about 300 smaller community groups that apply to county cultural councils through a grant process.

To support a wider vision, the 20 Tier II organizations formed the Community Awareness Project (CAP), which is funded by a 5% set-aside from each organization's individual award of SCFD funds. CAP activities include:

* a combined database of about 400,000 names submitted by participating Tier II organizations, resulting in a mailing list that is professionally updated and maintained by a company called MKTG Services, Inc., and which is available to Tier II organizations exclusively.

* new attendee outreach activities, which sends out through MSGi a prospect postcard to about 40,000 people each year, selected from specially-purchased magazine mailing lists. Cards returned indicate interest in specific Tier II organizations, and information about these interested respondents is then provided to the organization in question.

* market research, including focus groups and demographic data analysis from the combined database, which are used by Tier II marketing departments to make advertising decisions and target marketing efforts.

* membership in the Denver Metro Convention and Visitors Bureau, with all the benefits of membership that provides.

* a special advertising section promoting cultural events and organizations, "From Arts to Zoo," which is published three times a year in the *Denver Post* and *Rocky Mountain News*. The Denver Newspaper Agency underwrites this publication.

* Arts to Zoo website, which provides event calendars and other information to the Denver Metro area on-line.

* Educational events in public schools, support for transportation of students to Tier II organization events, a director of outreach programs from SCFD member organizations available to local schools, and the Alliance Project, which provides a higher-intensity program from Tier II organizations for one public middle school per county for two years each.

► **Silicon Valley Cultural Marketing Partnership** * *see note at end*

The Silicon Valley Cultural Marketing Partnership in San Jose, which began with a planning project in 2000, is now operated by Assistant Director Jeff Trabucco (a permanent Director is being recruited for the implementation project, which began in 2002). So far the SVCMP has been involved in setting up office facilities adjacent to those of its host agency, Arts Council Silicon Valley, and has provided partial funding support for a cultural tourism manager who is now working at the area's Convention and Visitors Bureau. The CVB may be the host of the project's community cultural calendar, which is modeled in part after San Diego's "Art and Sol" website. The first major activity is a shared database project, which will have event, customer and public relations components (electronic distribution of press releases); it is currently in the research stage, looking at similar models around the country.

The SVCMP is being evaluated by an outside consultant, Thomas E. Backer, PhD. The San Jose project also is undertaking a joint marketing research study. Alan Brown of Audience Insight was engaged to coordinate this project, and has already conducted interviews with funders and with large and mid-sized arts organizations. Activities on the planning horizon include an information and ticket center and an e-marketing information and services effort. Funding from other local foundations and from the National Endowment for the Arts has been received for this project.

► **Texas Arts Marketing Network**

The Texas Arts Marketing Network (TAMN) is a 25-year old database co-op with 47 organizational members, representing over 400,000 unique customer households in the Dallas/Fort Worth area. The pooled lists are centrally maintained by an outside company, and updated twice annually with National Change of Address, and appended with third party data to allow for further targeting of households by age, income, presence of children, etc. This is the oldest and best-established of the database cooperative projects, on which the Los Angeles "Big List" and many others are modeled.

8 - TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

► **Chorus America Choral Conducting Program**

Chorus America is a 1200-member national service organization for the choral field, supporting the work of choruses (professional, volunteer, children/youth and symphony/opera) across the country

through publications, conferences, training programs and other strategies. In 2002, Chorus America is partnering with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and Chorus on a joint program for training and developing choral conductors. Orchestra Music Director Daniel Barenboim will be the master conducting teacher. Participants in the four-day event will be selected by audition. Chorus America seeks other partnerships like this because its general experience with them has been positive.

► **Community Arts Partnership**

The Community Arts Partnership (CAP) project began in 1990 as a partnership between the California Institute of the Arts in Southern California, and several community arts centers. The partners collaboratively design imaginative, in-depth arts training programs in the areas of theatre, jazz, video, instrumental training and public art aimed at junior high and high school students. Each after school and weekend program was designed to provide college-level arts training to young people in their own neighborhoods, while furthering each organization's long-term institutional goals, as well as providing training for CalArts students to teach art in a variety of community settings.

CAP oversees 26 programs with 11 partner organizations at 36 sites throughout Los Angeles County, and is setting up a Digital Arts Network (DAN) to link ten of the partner organizations with digital arts labs, complete with video teleconferencing facilities. CAP has provided arts education for more than 85,000 students, and operates on a mentorship model in which the high school students are mentored by CalArts college students - with resulting benefits for both. The program is supported by a number of foundations, corporations and public agencies.

Recently a large grant was awarded from the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds to promote wider dissemination and replication of the CAP model to other communities.

► **Z Space Studio**

The Z Space Studio is dedicated to developing San Francisco Bay Area theatre. It provides a full suite of programs and services designed to develop the vision and craft of the individual artist, new works of highest caliber, and area audiences. For instance, Z Space operates the Development Lab, which provides studio space for up to 40 individual artists and offers training for them.

Another program, the Incubator, serves emerging companies by providing them with rehearsal space, office space and marketing support, as well as fiscal agency services. There are six groups that currently use the Mission Street space. Z Space also is partnering with the Hastings College of Law in San Francisco to renovate a 17,000 square foot theatre that will then become its home. And it partners currently with the Shakespeare Festival, to which it leases space.

9 - SHARED SERVICES AND JOINT BUSINESS OPERATIONS

► **Austin Circle of Theatres**

For more than 27 years, the Austin Circle of Theatres (ACOT) has worked to strengthen the performing arts community in Austin, Texas, and bring new audiences to the arts. ACOT has individual members, and also partners with schools, government agencies, business, media and other

organizations in the community to carry out its programs and promote the theatre experience in Austin. ACOT has helped launch five new theatres in the Austin area, has an annual theatre awards program, runs a half-price ticket agency, publishes a monthly newspaper (which is free to members), and puts on "Playfest," an annual celebration of local children's theatre.

► **Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington, DC**

The Cultural Alliance of Washington, DC has since 1978 been providing services on behalf of the 300 arts organizations which are its partner-members. Alliance activities include a ½ price ticket service available for use by all member organizations, training events and a monthly newspaper for members, a job bank, health insurance for artists, and a number of other programs. There are also 700 individual artist members. Some of the larger institutional members include the Kennedy Center and the Smithsonian.

The Alliance is a regional arts service organization, which seeks to increase appreciation, support and resources for the arts. They also facilitate a number of other partnerships between the cultural community and the business, government and media organizations in the Washington, DC area.

► **Delaware Center for the Performing Arts**

The Delaware Center for the Performing Arts emerged through a partnership between the Grand Opera House, OperaDelaware and the Delaware Symphony Association. The three organizations came together to share costs for communications, marketing, and computer networking; and also to provide one central location for patrons to access information about their performances. The partnership culminated in the construction of the Delaware Center for the Performing Arts, spearheaded by Grand Opera House, which opened in September 2000. The facility includes a 300-seat theatre, rehearsal halls, classroom space for the Grand Music and Ballet Schools, and administrative offices for the three groups.

The three arts organizations also have implemented cross-promotions through direct mail campaigns, offering discounts to each others' patrons as incentives to purchase subscriptions. All three have experienced increased subscription sales.

► **Pittsburgh Cultural Trust Shared Services Division**

The Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, founded in 1984, has led the cultural revitalization of downtown Pittsburgh and the creation of a cultural district which now has 14 venues. The Shared Services Division manages some of these venues, providing joint purchasing, joint market research, and a consolidated ticketing service which is available online, on the phone and at a box office. The Heinz Endowments has been a leading funder of all these activities, and serves as the principal funder driving arts marketing and related cultural activities in Pittsburgh.

The co-op ticketing service was developed from a research study conducted in 1999-2000 by AMS Planning & Research. The joint market research was conducted as part of the Heinz-funded "The Arts Bring Life to Life" cultural awareness campaign. Eight organizations in all are involved now in this partnership, and it is modeled in part on the Knight Foundation-sponsored Marketing Services Organization in Charlotte, NC (see description later in this report).

► **Three by Three Consortium**

INTAR Hispanic American Arts Center, New Federal Theatre (an African-American theatre) and the Pan Asian Repertory Theatre (all based in New York City) joined together in a partnership designed to meet the challenges of a shrinking funding base and the need to develop increased earned income. Sharing resources, they developed a joint marketing plan which encouraged audience crossover, attracted new traditional theatre audiences, and increased visibility. Though the successful step-by-step process of collaborating, the larger need for building a multicultural constituency and foster mutual understanding between communities also emerged.

The three long-time founder/artistic directors of these theatres have known each other for more than 20 years, and their friendly relationship was the foundation of this partnership activity. They came together to discuss how to develop new audiences, in spite of limited resources, to insure the future stability and self-sufficiency of their organizations.

The partnership received an NEA Theatre Discipline grant, and created a cross-over subscription program called the “Three by Three Series,” with three plays, three theatres and three cultures represented. There were some specific financial successes - increased box office revenue of 20%, reduced marketing costs by 50%. The Consortium also was able to attract new resources through grants from foundations as well as the NEA. They also recognized that there were needs for better support systems and technology links for the three entities to manage their partnership. And they found there were needs to use different marketing strategies to tap into non-traditional audiences.

This led to a second project in which women’s theatre works will be read in one weekend, to enhance audience cross-over and introduce new audiences to the three theatres. A third project brings the theatres together with community organizations for educational presentations.

This partnership is reported in more depth in the National Endowment for the Arts Lessons Learned case studies, available on the Internet at www.arts.endow.gov.

10 - THIRD PARTY SUPPORT AND SERVICES

► **Fund for US Artists at International Festivals and Competitions**

Supported by Rockefeller Foundation, the US Department of State and other foundations, the Fund for US Artists at International Festival and Competitions has since 1989 made funding available for US artists to participate in international events. This is the only source of such funding, which has motivated the partners to keep the program intact. Arts International monitors the program, and the Duke Foundation has expressed interest in coming on board as a funder.

► **National Arts Stabilization**

Since 1983, National Arts Stabilization has been supporting community-wide partnerships among foundations and other donors to help stabilize the financial, organizational and management aspects of arts organizations in a community. Participating arts organizations are able to increase their working capital and earner income, build endowments, and invest in infrastructure. This in turn makes them more attractive to potential donors, creating a positive cycle of capacity building.

NAS first works with community leaders to determine whether a community is ready for a stabilization project, then assembles a team of professionals to collaborate with a local committee in carrying it out. Assessment, planning, and technical assistance are all part of the “package” of capacity building interventions provided to participating organizations. The partnership of local funders and community leaders support the NAS intervention, and continues to have a leadership role throughout the lifetime of the project - guiding and providing context for the interventions that NAS as a national nonprofit capacity building provider offers. Boston, Kansas City, New York, Arizona, Baltimore, Seattle and Columbus NAS stabilization projects have served 86 arts organizations with a total investment of \$46 million in stabilization and capacity building.

NAS also provides executive education programs on strategy and managing change for arts leaders, conducts a special capacity building program in Cleveland, and offers as a consulting service a financial analysis of an entire community's arts organizations.

► **New Century Community Program**

In 1998, the Maine Cultural Affairs Council, with seven member agencies representing arts and culture organizations statewide, developed the New Century Community Program, which is now state-funded. In 2000, its first year of operation, New Century distributed \$2.3 million in state funds through more than 420 grants to communities in all areas of Maine, and also provided direct service and outreach programs to community institutions.

The purpose of this partnership grant making and capacity building activity for arts and culture institutions in Maine is to advance the well-being of the state of Maine, ensure a richer quality of life for Maine residents, protect Maine's unique cultural resources, and to enhance educational opportunities for people of all generations. The partnership also includes the Maine Community Cultural Alliance, a private nonprofit organization.

► **New York Arts Recovery Fund**

The New York Foundation for the Arts brought together a number of other arts organizations in New York City, such as the Alliance of Resident Theatres/New York, the Arts and Business Council, the Asian American Arts Alliance, the Association of Hispanic Arts, the Harlem Arts Alliance, the New York City Arts Coalition, and the Nonprofit Finance Fund, to serve as collaborative partners in creating the New York Arts Recover Fund. These partners will work with the City's Department of Cultural Affairs and the State's Council on the Arts on four activities to help City arts nonprofits recover from the devastating effects of September 11:

- * providing information resources concerning financial and other support available to affected arts organizations
- * advocating for a “fair share” of relief and recovery funding support to arts organizations and artists
- * developing a rapid emergency grants program, in collaboration with the Nonprofit Finance Fund and the Arts Community Federal Credit Union
- * developing marketing and public promotion campaigns about the arts.

The primary focus of the program will be on those living and working below Canal Street, though all arts organizations in the City are affected by the ripple effect of September 11 - as indeed are arts organizations across the country.

► **Performing Arts Research Coalition**

The Performing Arts Research Coalition brings together five major national service organizations in the arts - the American Symphony Orchestra League, the Association of Performing Arts Presenters, Dance/USA, OPERA America, and the Theatre Communications Group in a partnership to help performing arts organizations across the country improve their management capacity, increase their responsiveness to their communities, and strengthen local and national advocacy efforts.

Coordinated by OPERA America and funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the project seeks to improve and coordinate the way performing arts organizations gather information on their sector so they can offer a more unified and factually based voice on issues of common concern. In addition to providing more uniform structure for gathering local information, the project aims to increase awareness of opinion leaders and the general public about the role and significance of nonprofit arts and culture to American economy and society.

There also will be a pilot effort in ten American cities, with up to five performing arts organizations partnering in each one, for collecting audience data using a single protocol for audience, subscriber and community household (attitudinal) data gathering.

11 - BUSINESS/NONPROFIT RELATIONSHIP

► **Detroit Symphony/EDS Corporation Collaboration**

In the early 1990s, EDS Corporation, a major business in Detroit, was seeking to develop its community involvement as a strategic marketing tool. The Detroit Symphony was struggling to upgrade its information systems without much success. The strategic collaboration involved EDS agreeing to serve as the orchestra's information technology department. EDS provides the orchestra with computer technology, training for Symphony employees in how to use it, and project management for developing and implementing a marketing and fund-raising database system. There is also system integration occurring, as the Symphony's financial, marketing and development directors now share the same database and thus better coordinate their work.

In return, EDS receives market exposure for its products and services in all orchestra mailings, at the concert hall, and whenever the orchestra tours. And it can be seen as a good corporate citizen because of its work with the Symphony.

► **Oakland A's/Oakland Ballet Partnership**

The Oakland Ballet Company and the Oakland A's baseball team collaborated to establish A's Night in 1986. The team wanted to increase its community service and visibility in off-season, and the ballet company hoped to expand its audience and contribution levels. Several members of the team began to appear in a performance of *The Nutcracker* alongside regular company dancers, and the

team flew its players back to Oakland during this off-season event and supplied public relations staff to manage media coverage of the event.

The result: greatly increased ticket sales and visibility. The A's also helped leverage new corporate donors for the ballet, and the partnership enhanced the ballet's image with other local corporations, and had similar benefits for the team. In 1995, A's Night became All-Star Night, as a variety of professional athletes from the Bay area participated in the event.

** Note*

The Charlotte, Detroit, Long Beach and San Jose arts marketing projects described in this section all are "arts marketing collaboratives" funded principally by the John S. & James L. Knight Foundation as part of a national cluster of projects designed to help Knight communities wrestle with the challenges of marketing nonprofit arts. Launched in 1994, the Arts Marketing Collaborative work of the John S. & James L. Knight Foundation is helping ten communities build their capacity to do cooperative marketing among nonprofit arts organizations. The purpose is to strengthen community infrastructure for marketing the arts. This in turn helps build audience, increase revenues, stabilize partnering organizations so they can focus more on artistic development - and ultimately increase cultural participation.

In addition to the four currently operating projects, four others are in the planning stages of creating an arts marketing collaborative. In Fort Lauderdale, a planning grant also was awarded in late 2000, to the Broward County Cultural Affairs Department. A proposal for implementation funding has been submitted which focuses on the emerging "cultural district" in downtown, with tie-ins to collaborative marketing efforts that have already been underway in the area for some years.

A planning grant application also has been submitted in Philadelphia, without the first step of a planning project. Part of the reason for this sequence of events is that the city has been the focus of a great deal of infrastructure-building and cultural planning activity in the last several years, supported by major local funders such as the Pew Charitable Trusts (these activities are discussed further in Chapter IV).

A planning grant also was completed recently in Grand Forks, North Dakota and an implementation application has been submitted, to address the many needs of this community with respect to marketing of the arts.

Columbus received a grant from Knight Foundation for a cooperative audience development initiative among nine local arts and culture organizations that had previously partnered on a capital campaign, which resulted in a number of concrete suggestions for how marketing success of the community might be improved. This project may also flower into a more formal marketing collaborative.

Knight Foundation's commitment goes beyond its encouragement of planning and implementation of the arts marketing collaborative approach in its 26 partner communities across the country. In

1999, the Foundation published *Marketing the Arts*, a report on these collaboratives and lessons learned from them (a second edition will be published in 2003 or 2004).

In 2000, a “learning community” was formed which brings together those working on this effort for an annual meeting, coordinated by the Human Interaction Research Institute. The first learning community meeting was held in Los Angeles, in conjunction with the Americans for the Arts conference. The second gathering was held during the July 2001 AFTA conference in New York City. Outside experts on cultural participation were invited to speak at this meeting, and findings from a Knight-sponsored research study on arts partnerships were presented. A 2002 learning community meeting was held in Detroit in October, focused on nonprofit arts marketing/media relationships and the “nuts and bolts” of implementing an arts marketing collaborative.

In the future, Knight Foundation plans to explore how this cluster of grants can best fit with its new strategic direction, which places a much stronger emphasis on partnering with its 26 communities, and on grant making and capacity building activities that are initiated through a community planning process. For instance, among the first five communities to set their locally-generated priorities, Fort Wayne (IN) has prioritized “increasing availability and access to cultural programming,” and Grand Forks has set “building the capacity of arts and culture organizations.” Macon (GA) also is contemplating what might be done to initiate an arts marketing collaborative in their community. Both of these communities are engaged in initial exploration of whether an arts marketing collaborative might be right for them, and if so, how it should be shaped.

III. Lessons Learned About Arts Partnerships

In this section are presented two sets of “lessons learned” about arts marketing partnerships, both of which are derived primarily from the 89 interviews conducted for this study, as well as from the literature review and analysis of the more than 60 partnerships described here. These lessons in turn can form checklists that nonprofit arts leaders and funders can use to think about how to develop, implement and sustain partnerships.

A number of specific lessons about how to plan, implement and sustain an arts partnership emerged from the study - used as an informal checklist to guide thinking about the partnership process, they can suggest what to do, and in some cases what not to do. They're presented here under the following ten categories - the life cycle stages of partnership presented in Chapter I:

- 1 - *Deciding to Partner*
- 2 - *Planning*
- 3 - *Setting Objectives*
- 4 - *Defining Leadership*
- 5 - *Defining Membership*
- 6 - *Mobilizing Resources*
- 7 - *Integrating with the Community Environment*
- 8 - *Implementing the Partnership*
- 9 - *Evaluating the Partnership*
- 10 - *Promoting Sustainability*

Deciding to Partner

- ▶ Often the first step in developing a partnership is for a *community leader* to get people together to talk about common interests and needs - without any initial commitment to creating a partnership.
- ▶ *Consultants to individual organizations* can help to bring potential partners together, because they often have a more objective view of the partner's needs and potential for collaboration.
- ▶ In many cases an *outsider* (often a consultant, sometimes a peer from another community) can help to crystallize the vision of what a partnership is trying to achieve, by weaving together the diverse and sometimes contradictory viewpoints of the community partners.
- ▶ *Due diligence* need to be exercised up front, asking tough questions about whether the goal of the partnership is really important and feasible to achieve, whether there's true mutuality of interests among the partners, and whether there are resources (including the will of key players) to do it.
- ▶ When there are significant *startup costs* for a partnership, it is more important to have CEO-level representatives attend initial partnership meetings, since they can more easily make resource commitments.

Planning

- ▶ Most partnerships need to begin with some sort of *strategic planning* process that brings together the partners to look at the results of the initial “deciding to partner” stage.
- ▶ A partnership needs to be expressed in a *written document* - outlining the partnership’s objectives, process, timeline, budget, membership and task assignments for the partners.

Setting Objectives

- ▶ A powerful *intellectual focus* to the work being done by a partnership helps it to be successful.
- ▶ A sharp *mission focus* also contributes to success - a fairly narrow, clearly-defined mission that partners can understand and that draws mostly “like partners” to the table.

Defining Leadership

- ▶ Partnership representatives who have great *passion* for the art itself are more likely to contribute to the success of a collaboration, all other things equal. A key indicator of successful partnerships is if the artmaking is being taken seriously, rather than just the process or the community goals.
- ▶ *Personnel changes* in the partnership representatives, and especially in the leadership of the group, do not bode well, because partnerships tend in most cases to be quite fragile, especially when new.
- ▶ Successful partnerships require buy-in to the partnership process from the *leadership of partner organizations* at both the board and staff levels.
- ▶ It takes a special kind of *collaborative manager* to run a partnership well. These skills are not common in either for-profit or nonprofit management, where there aren’t many people who truly work by the principle, “you can get anything done if you don’t care who gets the credit.”

Defining Membership

- ▶ Partners with common values but *different kinds of artistic products* are often the best candidates for successful partnership.
- ▶ The best partners are those who are *clear about what they can do and what they can’t do* - both in terms of values and resources they bring to the table.
- ▶ Large organizations typically assign lower or mid-level staff to represent them on partnerships, so they are often slower to respond than small groups who have no one to assign but the CEO - these *differences in representation* must be addressed in setting up the partnership’s members.

- ▶ In some respects, partnerships with *non-arts organizations* (e.g., public schools) are easier because there is less competition for funding sources and over cultural agendas.
- ▶ Partnerships must determine early on if there will be *limits on membership*, by numbers, geography or “admission standards.” Some partnerships have caused bitter rifts in their communities because there were (or appeared to be!) unwritten standards for who was admitted and who was excluded.

Mobilizing Resources

- ▶ *Adequate resources* are fundamental to partnerships, especially in the arts where so many organizations are resource-poor and just on the edge of survival. Because partnerships often are promoted as “ways to solve problems without additional resources,” it is tempting to take that pronouncement literally, ignoring needed commitments of both money and staff resources from some or (usually) all of the partners.
- ▶ *Technology* is playing a greater role in effective partnerships, e.g., through use of e-newsletters, websites and e-mail listservs to keep the partners in touch, disseminate information and exchange resources or problem-solving input.

Integrating with the Community Environment

- ▶ In general, partnerships that pay attention to the *larger community context* in which they operate are more likely to be successful.
- ▶ There are *regional* differences in the way communities and arts organizations think about partnerships. For instance, there is a west coast nature of being “independent and free-thinking,” perhaps more so than in some other parts of the country. In whatever communities where this thinking predominates, partnership can easily come to mean “we’ve failed to do it on our own,” a point of view which can be injurious to a partnership’s success.
- ▶ In some communities there is a collegial relationship among arts organizations that comes from the *larger culture of the community* - if present, this makes it easier for partnerships to be born.

Implementing the Partnership

- ▶ Partnerships mean *change*, which can be especially threatening to some in an arts community because dealing with change in the partnership takes energy from dealing with the demands of the artwork itself.
- ▶ *Fears and resistances about change* need to be taken into account in designing and carrying out any kind of organizational change program, yet these principles often are not well-followed or understood by arts organizations.

- ▶ If the *psychological dynamics* of a partnership don't work, the organizational dynamics don't work either. Trust and reciprocity are the keys among the individuals who make up the organizational representatives of the partnership - but these are hard to establish, especially between unequal organizations
- ▶ Effective partnerships require all partners to *put something at risk*. Potential partners each need to look at the risks they will be taking, and make an according commitment to the success of the partnership by agreeing to accept this risk.
- ▶ Conversations among partners then need to address *how these risks are apportioned* - if they are unequally distributed this does not bode well for the partnership.
- ▶ Partnerships often fail because people look to each other to shore themselves up, to remediate *weaknesses* they perceive internally, when instead collaboration should be based on matching each other's strengths.
- ▶ A key to successful partnerships is to arrange for *positive outcomes* for all the partners - like all relationships in life, they are most likely to succeed in situations where "everyone wins."
- ▶ The partnerships that work the best are those with real *self interest that is easy to identify* - joint purchasing, joint facilities usage and rental, buying energy jointly, etc.
- ▶ Arts partnerships frequently don't take advantage of the best opportunities for *revenue generation* because they are hesitant to bring in partners from the business sector.
- ▶ There is no such thing as totally *equal collaboration* - there are always lead partners and some who put in more than others, and it is important to look at this inequality honestly.
- ▶ *Communication, communication, communication* - just like in marriage this is a key to successful partnering.
- ▶ Sometimes in partnerships there are so many problems that an *outside facilitator* is needed to set things straight - this can involve bringing in a mediator
- ▶ *Power differentials* are a critical issue and have to be dealt with if a partnership is to be successful, particularly if it includes a wide range of large/small or powerful/not so powerful organizations.
- ▶ Many partnerships make the partners *feel good* but they don't really obtain their stated goals, particularly if the goals are financial in nature.

Evaluating the Partnership

▶ Any partnership and its outcomes are likely to be seen in quite different ways by different partners. This “*Rashomon*” effect makes it more challenging to assess partnership success, and makes it imperative to obtain a range of viewpoints when doing the evaluation.

Promoting Sustainability

▶ Partnerships are more likely to be successful over time if they pay attention to *funding stability*, particularly in the face of external events, such as reductions of public dollars when there is a budget crunch. This means having a “plan B” for approaching other funders or streamlining operations if there are sudden and severe cuts.

▶ *Continuity* of communication and activity of partnerships is important, largely through regularly scheduled meetings of the partner organizations, with a strong press to send the same representative to the meetings each time, so that there is also a chance for interpersonal relationships to grow.

▶ Partnerships that begin as a *response to a crisis* are likely to function effectively at first, but then need to move to a different level of commitment and organization once the crisis has subsided. Partnerships created in the wake of September 11 are an example of this.

▶ Partnerships, like marriages, tend to *change over time*, and there must be recognition of that fact, including structures built in to deal with the shifting energies and commitments.

▶ It takes time to make partnerships successful - *patience* is one of the main virtues organizers of partnerships can have.

▶ The more *partnerships interact with other partnerships* the better - the networking among like units is very important for creating long-term success.

▶ Long-term effective partnerships create *lasting connections* deep within the participating organizations, which can outlast the partnership and even the individuals who have participated in it, or outlast the service of board members on a given institution.

▶ It's not in the vision or shared values, but in the *small details* of partnerships, that most of them founder - particularly in a lack of responsiveness to small changes along the way from what may have initially worked well.

IV. What Does This All Mean - for Arts Organizations, Communities, Funders, Evaluators and Researchers?

Implications for Arts Organizations and Communities For nonprofit arts and community leaders thinking about starting up an arts partnership, perhaps the three most important initial questions are: (1) how can the potential partners come together to decide if partnership is the right step to take (rather than automatically assuming that all partnerships are needed and good!)?, (2) toward what objectives will the partnership be dedicated?, and (3) what are the most important considerations in moving forward with a partnership, if that's the direction decided?

The steps suggested by the "Deciding to Partner" lessons learned in Chapter III can be a useful frame for answering the first question:

- * find a particular community leader and/or consultant to get people together for an initial discussion,
- * in that initial discussion, obtain *both* insider and outsider input to define the potential partnership's vision,
- * then exercise "due diligence" about such critical issues as whether there is a true mutuality of interests among the potential partners, and
- * identify "startup costs" that will have to be covered if the partnership is created.

The initial discussion also needs to include answering question (2) about the partnership's vision. The roster of partnership purposes presented in Chapter I can help with that, both in terms of zeroing in on what the main objectives are and what they aren't, and also connecting the potential partners with examples from other communities, such as the ones presented in Chapter II.

If this initial set of activities leads to the decision to move ahead with developing a partnership, those at the table can then consider how they'll address the eight key considerations for successful partnering that were presented at the beginning of this paper - along with other considerations that may be unique to their community and their partnership:

- * Systematic planning is critical to the ultimate success of partnerships, leading to a set of objectives and activities that the partnership's members can support.
- * Psychological challenges, such as power differences among the partners or resistances based upon previous bad experiences with other partnerships, can seriously jeopardize the chances for success; the partnership must focus both on identifying potential challenges such as these, and then taking active steps to resolve them.
- * A strong core idea or intervention strategy lies at the heart of most successful partnerships - they're "about something" that is concrete and relatively easy for the partners to identify.
- * Partnerships are not cost-free; they require financial and human resources to be successful.

- * Strategies learned from other successful partnerships can be incorporated usefully into a new partnering activity, especially if these are available at the critical early planning stages.
- * Partnerships that succeed over time also evolve over time, as they learn from their successes and failures, and maintain responsiveness to their community environments.
- * Good partnerships begin with a due diligence process to look at the pros and cons of partnering, including an estimate of needed start-up costs, done before the initial decision to partner is made.
- * If a partnership is intended to survive over a longer period of time, planning ahead for sustainability is needed at the outset, including creation of a revenue model that will provide financial support beyond initial funding (e.g., a time-limited foundation or government grant).

The lessons learned in Chapter III provide more detail on how to respond to each of these, and the 60-plus partnerships presented in Chapter II may also provide valuable resources for moving forward with specific partnership plans. As has been emphasized throughout this publication, the right frame of mind - based on all that was learned in the environmental scan - is to proceed with enthusiasm but also with caution.

Implications for Funders Partnerships funded by a foundation or government agency, or partnership activities that funders encourage in the community (through convenings, grant requirements, etc.), both can be enhanced through funders paying attention to the definitions and case examples given in this paper. The synopsis above also could be used to create a set of “funder guidelines” for appraising the potential of a partnership for which outside funding support is sought. It also may help funders new to the “business of partnerships” to keep in mind that the combination of strong funder directives and tolerance for variation in implementation may help to lead to more effective partnerships - just as in the case of artwork itself.

The case examples presented in Chapter II include partnership activities that were both created and supported by foundations. Learning more about the funder’s experiences with these initiatives may help shape future grantmaking initiatives, proposal guidelines, technical assistance or other capacity building support for partnerships, and so forth. Also, funders sometimes take an active role as actual participants in an arts partnership, in which case the same learnings presented here for nonprofit arts organizations also apply to them!

Implications for Evaluators and Researchers And what about the role of researchers and evaluators in this process? As has been said, relatively little research exists on the subject of partnership in the arts, so researchers working in this area have a lot of new territory to explore. The several sets of definitional elements, the case examples and the lessons learned presented in this paper can provide a framework within which researchers can work - and further research certainly will help to refine and shape what’s been presented here in this very preliminary, relatively unsystematic “first cut.”

For evaluators of partnerships, there also is a great deal of new territory to explore. As was said, most arts partnerships have not been evaluated, as is true of these collaborative relationships in other areas. The forthcoming book *Evaluating community collaborations for serving youth at risk: A*

handbook for mental health, school and youth violence prevention organizations (edited by Thomas Backer and cited in Resources) is the first review publication of its sort, and while it is directed to a particular type of partnership, the issues it covers are also the issues of evaluating arts partnerships.

Special Considerations for Arts Marketing Partnerships As is clear both from the scientific work reviewed earlier, and the experiences of the 60-plus partnerships just described, creating partnerships and helping them succeed over time is difficult work. There are some additional challenges nonprofits, funders and communities confront when the focus of the partnership is on improving the marketing capacities of nonprofit arts organizations. As Larry Coppard of the Southeast Michigan Community Foundation puts it: “marketing is more sensitive than almost any other kind of collaborative work.”

This is true for both for current and long-standing reasons. Among the latter: many artists and arts administrators have deeply-held apprehensions about marketing, and especially about applications of for-profit sector marketing approaches to the arts. They fear that art will be commercialized and trivialized, and that they’ll lose control - that artistic imperatives may be interfered with.

Moreover, there are some deeply-held values about the nature of art and its role in society. In high art organizations such as art museums, there are those who believe that their mission is to preserve and present art by their quality standards as professionals, and “if people don’t come, that’s OK,” as one interviewee put it about some of his colleagues! This is less likely to be the case in community-based arts organizations, but there too the fears of commercialization and loss of control may influence decisions to become involved in partnerships organized around marketing.

“Marketing has been a bad word in culture for the last 30 years” is how one interviewee summed up the problem; “it is the hardest thing in the world to blend commercial marketing with cultural organizations.” Many artists and arts administrators simply believe it is unseemly to “hawk their wares.” For instance, as one interviewee in this study reported, a luxury hotel forged a partnership with a major art museum with regard to a world-class exhibit coming to the museum. Both organizations made money from this venture, but the museum’s marketing people were never comfortable with it and resisted it.

As another example, cross-advertising and promotion - organizations involved in strategic alliances putting each other’s brands on things - is common in the business world, but not so much with nonprofit arts organizations. Larger nonprofit arts organizations are starting to understand the value of such approaches, but many smaller ones don’t, and there is much hand-wringing about commercialization of art museum shops and the like. And of course there also are protests from the commercial sector about the advantage nonprofit arts groups have when they do compete using businesslike strategies.

Naturally, these values and fears affect the decisions arts organizations make about individual marketing programs - often to the consternation of marketing personnel on larger arts organizations! - but they take on a special urgency when partnerships are proposed. The loss of individual choice-making that is inherent in the idea of a partnership makes partnering in the realm of marketing appear more threatening, and all the more so because these partnerships are relatively recent and don’t have the longer history behind them of certain types of artistic collaborations, where the “rules” for working together are better understood by all participants going in.

Beyond these challenges, there also are constant resource shortages in the world of nonprofit arts, especially among smaller organizations (where the “marketing budget” may be a few thousand or even a few hundred dollars a year, and the work is done by already overburdened volunteers or one-person staffs!). Partly because of the above-stated apprehensions and values issues, marketing functions are often among the first to go in a budget crunch. This may make it difficult to participate in a partnership on an ongoing basis, because the financial support for the internal marketing function is not there.

Larger societal changes also provide interesting challenges to the effectiveness of arts marketings. Tastes in cultural programming are changing, and the competition from other forms of live or recorded entertainment is increasing. Americans have less leisure time (though more are working at home and have more control over their use of time). Editorial coverage of arts in many newspapers has decreased, while advertising costs have increased. Information and ticket acquisition is moving increasingly to the Internet, especially for younger audiences. The emergence of “blockbuster” entertainment events has changed the landscape for all the arts. And a national trend away from subscriptions continues, as younger adults with shorter planning horizons replace older audiences.

And there is a problem with arts marketing personnel - good marketing people typically have to move to another arts organization to advance at all, because even larger nonprofit arts organizations have small marketing staffs; and they have to leave the nonprofit world altogether if they want to maximize their income. There are relatively few resources for effective training and development of the people doing arts marketing work, or for education of boards and organizational leaders.

Correspondingly, there is little use of what commercial marketers would call state-of-the-art approaches to marketing, such as “benefit marketing” and customer satisfaction research, in nonprofit arts. The resulting problem is that many arts experiences bear little resemblance to what “customers” most want (and many arts groups resent even being asked to call their patrons “customers”!).

At present, it is necessary to add to these challenges the uncertain times post-9/11, and the downturn in the economy. Earned revenues from ticket sales and other sources are down, and both individual and foundation philanthropy in the arts the same. Thus, it is more important than ever to have earned income that results from good audience development, arts education, and marketing of the arts in the larger context of enhancing cultural participation for an entire community.

A few resources are emerging to respond to these many challenges. Under funding from American Express, the Arts & Business Council offers ArtsMarketing Online, which provides a range of information products and interactive services for professionals developing marketing activities for arts organizations (described above under Arts Marketing Center of Chicago). *ArtsReach*, a journal devoted to arts marketing, collaborated with the Arts & Business Council and American Express on a 2001 national conference for arts marketing, and plans another event in April 2003. And both university and field-based arts marketing training programs and other interventions also are increasingly available.

Arts services organizations such as Arts Presenters and Americans for the Arts are paying attention to these issues. As outlined below, major foundations (particularly those in key communities such

as Philadelphia and Pittsburgh) are leading investment efforts in improving cultural communities that includes support for more creative marketing efforts.

The arts marketing partnerships presented in Chapter II are all concerned with building capacity (both among individual arts organizations and in the arts community at large) to undertake basic marketing activity. For example, the “Big List” project and the Texas Arts Marketing Network both offer a basic mailing list service that can be used for any number of marketing activities, and that’s all they do.

Some of these partnerships also are geared to coordinating programs and services that already have existed in a community, so that there can be more leverage and synergy - the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust Shared Services Division and the Knight Foundation Arts Marketing Collaboratives are two examples of this. And these pioneering arts marketing partnership efforts all have paid some attention to the need to deal with the complexities of change in their work, and to putting what they do into the larger context of the community’s cultural life.

Knight Foundation’s Arts Marketing Collaboratives have a particular point of view - starting from philanthropy, from a theory based and model approach, with systematic development in a number of communities. Now there is a change in structure for the Foundation itself, and a move more to locally-determined grassroots development of philanthropic priorities.

The Collaboratives have already been described, and their initial successes charted. Some of the current trends in this program with implications for the future include:

- * Problems have surfaced with the original collaborative in Charlotte, including concerns about the amount of institutional financial support provided to the project by its parent organization, the Blumenthal Performing Arts Center; and two of the original partners have elected not to continue their relationship with the collaborative.
- * Delays in implementation support for two of the other collaboratives have occurred, because of recent changes in Knight Foundation’s grantmaking policies.
- * There have been further developments for the Collaboratives learning community - the participating projects have supported the learning group’s continuation, but wanted a practical focus and a peer-to-peer technical assistance format for the October 2002 annual meeting.
- * Knight has committed to development and broad dissemination of a second edition of the “Marketing the Arts” publication, incorporating in a thoughtful way the learnings from the collaboratives so far (this is now scheduled for development and publication in 2003 or 2004).
- * There has been a need to deal with problems of leadership turnover in several of the arts marketing collaboratives - both the Charlotte and Long Beach projects have had several executive directors in recent months, with resulting difficulties in continuity of the project.

To fully understand both the developed and unfolding arts marketing collaboratives in Knight communities, the larger context of other major initiatives in the cultural side of each community must be examined. For instance, in Philadelphia, a major grant (\$1.8 million) was just awarded by

the Pew Charitable Trusts for arts marketing activities that will both supplement and expand the pending support from Knight Foundation.

Largely through the Pew Trusts, there have been major infusions of resources over the last two years for cultural planning and capacity building activities in the arts for Philadelphia. Key players include the Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance, with its Campaign for Culture (currently in the planning stages) and database co-op (also in the planning stages); and the Greater Philadelphia Tourism Marketing Corporation's emerging cooperative marketing programs (such as a cooperative advertising program for out-of-region publications, and \$550,000 a year in grants for collaborative projects).

The Pew Trusts also has funded the Cultural Management Initiative, a major new capacity building program for arts managers that uses a regranting approach. This Initiative is managed by Drexel University's Arts Administration Program (and is part of Pew's Philadelphia Cultural Leadership Program). And Pew also funds the Philadelphia History Exhibitions Initiative, a \$5.2 million investment in the region's history museums. This lively environment for culture in the city also includes the new Independence Visitor Center (IVC), WHYY, the local public TV station, and the Avenue of the Arts - promoting Philadelphia's Broad Street as a cultural destination.

The marketing aspects of all these activities now is being coordinated by the Leadership Council on Cultural Marketing, a recently-created body. Funding support for these efforts is provided not only by Pew but also by other major foundations such as the William Penn and Knight Foundations. There are many resources available, including financial ones, and a substantial infrastructure already exists, but the need for caution, and follow-through on the first steps that have been proposed is necessary before moving ahead with the larger vision that some in the arts nonprofit and funder communities have.

There also is a larger context in Detroit, where the Community Foundation of Southeast Michigan has played a major role in bringing together the Knight arts marketing collaborative, as well as conducting an allied project on cultural participation supported by the Wallace Reader's Digest Funds. And in San Jose, the major players include the Cultural Initiative, a private nonprofit organization begun several years ago to fulfill parts of the vision of a cultural plan which had been the topic of much community-building, the San Jose Convention and Visitors Bureau, the City of San Jose's Office of Cultural Affairs, and Arts Council Silicon Valley, which is the fiscal agent for the new Silicon Valley Cultural Marketing Partnership.

Other communities where Knight Foundation is not a player also have emerging larger contexts in which arts marketing partnerships can be supported. For instance, in Pittsburgh, the leading funder is the Heinz Endowments. The Shared Services Division of the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, beginning with a ticketing research study, is the base for their marketing collaborative, but there have been a number of other developmental activities of note.

For instance, Heinz funded the recent "The Arts Bring Life to Life" campaign, which included a major public outreach campaign based on the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique (ZMET), as well as quantitative research about arts participation by Princeton Survey Research Associates. The purpose of this campaign was to develop and deepen citizens' relationships with the arts, and raise awareness of the transformative role arts play in life, particularly among "infrequent" arts

participants. The ZMET approach was used to identify a psychologically-powerful theme for the campaign, which then used paid advertising and a number of other activities to advance its goals.

Now national cultural participation expert Jerry Yoshitomi is developing a Cultural Participation Initiative for Pittsburgh under Heinz support which will put these efforts into a larger context. His work will help create a learning community for Pittsburgh arts leaders, helping them put arts marketing and other activities into the larger context of cultural participation. Also, a phase II of the Arts Bring Life to Life campaign is being planned by Heinz and other supporters, in a larger context of capacity building and community-wide coordination.

In thinking about how to use these early experiences from communities like Charlotte, Long Beach, San Jose, Detroit, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, some more general guidelines for community and funder investments in arts marketing are needed. For instance, Alan Brown of Audience Insight made a presentation to "Cultural Marketing: A Leadership Dialogue in Philadelphia" in April 2001, identifying eight investment areas for arts marketing (see Resources section for citation):

- * People - professional development
- * Technologies - internet marketing
- * Knowledge - market research
- * Information and distribution channels - joint calendar projects
- * Collaborative programs
- * Constituency development - not just audiences
- * Customer service - residents and visitors such as for parking
- * Product development - programming including collaborations

These are all tied to organizational and community capacity building - a larger theme in the nonprofit environment and specifically in the arts today, as already discussed. Each of these investment areas in turn provides ways of moving on what Audience Insight (in its written presentation by Alan Brown) calls the Ten Building Blocks of Collaborative Marketing:

- * pooling database resources
- * sharing design and production
- * amortizing costs of marketing infrastructure
- * leveraging media buying power
- * sharing best practices
- * cooperating on skills development, planning, research and evaluation
- * cross-institutional product packaging and cultural tourism initiatives
- * consolidating sales operations (box office, telemarketing, group sales)
- * cooperating on advocacy and public information programs, and printed programs
- * creating joint outreach and audience development efforts

These provide a context for efforts to promote arts marketing partnerships. All must address the fundamental issue of quality - all the marketing in the world won't help if you don't deliver the arts experience you promised!.

The Bigger Picture Many arts partnerships go beyond the objectives of self-interest each of the partners bring to the table - economic efficiency, information-sharing, and so forth. They are aimed

at a larger mission of community change, such as increasing cultural participation. And even those that are not responding to a broader, community-wide mission must do their work and meet their objectives in the larger context of the arts community they live in, the wider diversity of nonprofits and funders, and the world at large.

The most important step any partnership can take in responding to this larger context for their work is to include in its early planning stages an “environmental analysis.” Questions need to be asked like: “What elements of the larger environment are relevant to the partnership’s objectives and activities, and how can these elements best be responded to?”

If the partnership is one aimed at combining back office operations, the attention to the outside world may be limited, though probably not zero (for instance, such efforts are likely to benefit from drawing on resources from the larger community on organizational capacity building). But if larger community change is the partnership’s basic aim, then understanding and responding to the context alluded to here is likely to take a considerable amount of effort.

It is beyond the scope of this publication to identify or analyze the detailed components of that larger context. But a few of its elements that bear most directly on the work done here are worth mentioning:

- * there have been many recent developments in the science and practice (and policy) of cultural participation (e.g., as discussed in recent articles by Jerry Yoshitomi, Thomas Backer and others in the *Grantmaker in the Arts Reader*) - these advances in programming and understanding can be used by many partnerships as a way of building or interpreting the partnership’s work on many subjects;

- * there also is an increasing research literature and more intervention resources than ever before on the creation and sustaining of partnerships, as an aspect of the growing American movement in nonprofit capacity building; and

- * there is a growing “wisdom literature,” some of it specific to arts organizations (such as Knight Foundation’s *Marketing the Arts* publication) that puts forth strategies for partnering.

As a next step in helping arts organizations (and their funders) to deal with the complexities of building and sustaining partnerships, the information from the present study could readily be combined with these national resources into both an accessible package of information materials, for wide dissemination in both print and online formats to the arts community. And training and technical assistance interventions could be more widely provided, building on the methods deployed for the Knight Foundation Arts Marketing Collaboratives learning community, and on other recent capacity building training programs in the arts, such as that of National Arts Stabilization.

The Human Interaction Research Institute developed such a program specifically for training arts managers in the skills of partnership building, offered in Southern California through support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the Los Angeles County Arts Commission. Peer networking and technical assistance also needs to be part of the “training mix” for such a program.

More integrated partnership-building assistance might be framed in the creation of projects specifically directed to studying a set of challenges, and making available TA and training through such an entity. For instance, Alan Brown of Audience Insight has proposed creating a special

institute which he calls an “arts marketing collective” to synthesize and make more systemic the work in this area, including the care and feeding of partnerships.

The need for both information packages and training/technical assistance activities on partnerships is all the more important given both the current environmental challenges alluded to at the beginning of this report - the downturn in the economy, the aftereffects of September 11, etc. This is a time of great change for the nonprofit world in general, and for the nonprofit arts community in particular.

There are also coming changes in leadership, particularly in culturally-specific arts organization, as pointed out by Cora Mirikitani of the Japanese-American Community Cultural Center. Many of the founders (now CEOs) of these culturally-specific organizations, started in the 1960's and 1970's are now near retirement, and when they move on the new leadership needs orientation to the skills of partnership, perhaps more vital now than when their predecessors took office.

There will be resistance to these interventions, of course. Janet Sarbaugh of the Heinz Endowments describes several studies by major management consulting firms about “how arts organizations can work smarter,” saying that in each case there was great resistance to the use of strategies the firms recommended among nonprofit arts leadership, because of fear of loss of control. These and other resistances will help to shape the future for arts partnership strategies, and the future will not be easy.

Finally, informal, naturally evolving partnerships also happen with increasing frequency in the world of the arts, and may need a separate study. For instance, the Pulitzer Prize-winning play *Angels in America* and many other theatre productions have never involved a formal partnership, but the play was work-shopped in one place, then presented in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and finally on Broadway. This partnership wasn't developed in advance, but rather was driven from one stage to the next by Tony Kushner, the playwright. What can be learned from this kind of spontaneous, evolving partnership?

Four overarching considerations emerge from this environmental scan of arts partnerships:

* **Capacity building** - arts partnerships may have artistic or programmatic goals, but most of them are also fundamentally concerned with building the capacity of arts organizations to accomplish their mission, and thus fit with the growing movement for strengthening nonprofits through capacity building that has so influenced both nonprofit management and philanthropic thinking in the last ten years.

* **Community-wide coordination** - arts partnerships almost all work to synthesize and make more accessible resources that already exist in the community, or bring new resources into being that are then integrated with those already available in a straightforward way. Thus coordination of what's there in the community is a key function of the typical partnership.

* **Change** - many of the practice principles and cautionary examples revealed in this study about “what doesn't work” are about how to handle the complex financial, administrative and especially human dimensions of the plain reality that arts partnerships exist because something needs to be changed in a community, and change is hard.

* **Context** - arts partnerships have a greater chance for success if they are seen in the larger context of the local, state or national community in which they exist - including other changes that are underway in a community, such as changes in cultural participation strategy or arts policy.

In developing and implementing a partnership, these four overarching issues might also be brought to the table in the process that was suggested at the beginning of this chapter. What are the potentials for a partnership to promote organizational capacity building for the nonprofit arts organizations participating in it, or for other arts groups in the community? How can its potential be maximized for taking account of the things that are already going on in the community in its selected areas of concentration? And how can the partners bring together their collective wisdom - and creativity! - in addressing the larger themes of change and community context as a successful partnership will require? The last question returns the discussion to where it began - partnership *is* an art, which should give nonprofit arts organizations addressing the challenges of partnership a step up in doing so effectively.

Resources

- Arts Education Partnership. (2000). *Strengthening state-level arts education partnerships*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arts Education Partnership. (1999). *Learning partnerships: Improving learning in schools with arts partners in the community*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arts, Inc. (2000). *Profiling national models of arts and school connections*. Los Angeles: Author.
- Austin, J. (2000). *The collaboration challenge*. New York: Drucker Foundation.
- Backer, T.E. (Ed.) (2002). *Evaluating community collaborations for serving youth at risk: A handbook for mental health, school and youth violence prevention organizations*. (In press - for further information see www.humaninteract.org)
- Backer, T.E. & Norman, A.J. (2000). Partnerships and community change. *California Politics and Policy*, 39-44. (Copies available through www.humaninteract.org)
- Brown, A.S. (2001). *Cultural marketing: A leadership dialogue*. Philadelphia: Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance.
- Kaye, G. & Wolff, T. (1997). *From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development*. Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.
- Kitzi, J. (1997). Easier said than done. *Foundation News and Commentary*, March/April, 39-41.
- Kochar, C. & Erickson, M.R. (1993). *Business-education partnerships for the 21st century: A practical guide for school improvement*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.
- Kotler, P. & Scheff, J. (1997). *Standing room only: Strategies for marketing the performing arts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LaPiana, D. (2001). *Real collaboration: A guide for grantmakers*. Published online by Strategic Solutions, www.lapiana.org.
- Mattessich, P.W. & Monsey, B.R. (1992). *Collaboration: What makes it work*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- McKnight Foundation. (1991). *The aid to families in poverty program*. Minneapolis: Author.
- Minkler, M. (Ed.) (1997). *Community organizing and community building for health*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Ray, K. (2002). *The nimble collaboration: Fine-tuning your collaboration for lasting success*. Minneapolis: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

- Scheff, J. & Kotler, P. (1996). How the arts can prosper through strategic collaborations. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 4-11.
- Seidel, S., Eppel, M. & Martiniello, M. (2001). *Arts survive: A study of sustainability in arts education partnerships*. Cambridge, MA: Project Zero, Harvard University Graduate School of Education.
- Tushnet, N. (1993). *A guide to developing educational partnerships*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Walker, C. (1999). *Partnerships for parks: Lessons from the Lila Wallace-Readers Digest Fund Urban Parks Program*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Western Alliance of Arts Administrators Foundation. (1995). *A study of the WAAA Equity Program Collaborations*. San Francisco: Author.
- Winer, M. & Ray, K. (1994). *Collaboration handbook: Creating, sustaining and enjoying the journey*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

Appendix A - Roster of Interviewees

Michael Alexander - Arts for LA and Grand Performances
Anne Allen - Morris & Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation
Peggy Amsterdam - Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance
Mark Anderson - Cultural & Planning Group
Ann Meier Baker - Chorus America
Robert Barrett - Los Angeles Convention & Visitors Bureau
Melanie Beene - James Irvine Foundation
Jay Belloli - Armory Center for the Arts
Ryan Blum - Western States Arts Federation
Deborah Borda - Los Angeles Philharmonic
Alan Brown - Audience Insight
Gary Burger - Colonial Williamsburg
Elisa Callow - Ahmanson Foundation
Andrew Campbell - Los Angeles County Arts Commission
Kathleen Cerveney - Cleveland Foundation
Wallace Chappell - American Ballet Theatre
Martin Cohen - Philadelphia Cultural Management Initiative
Julie Cherry - Milpitas Alliance for the Arts
Barbara Harris Cury - Museums of the Arroyo
Bruce Davis - Arts Council Silicon Valley
Michael J. Deasy - National Arts Partnership
Margaret DeMott - Durham Arts Council, Inc.
David Dower - Z-Space Studio
Judy Drucker - Concert Association of South Florida
Lani Lattin Duke - Los Angeles Times
Christine Dwyer - RMC Research Corporation
Kym Eisner - Skirball and Emerging Arts Leaders
Anne Focke - Grantmakers in the Arts
Nick Francis - Gateways Community Development Corporation
Sandra Gibson - Association of Performing Arts Presenters
Marnie Gillett - San Francisco Camerawork
Nancy Glaze - David & Lucile Packard Foundation
Marian Godfrey - Pew Charitable Trusts
Jonathon Glus - Pasadena Cultural Affairs Division
E. Derek Gordon - John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
Shelley Hammill - Arts Consultant
Lars Hansen - University of Southern California
Barry Hessenius - California Arts Council
Linda Hoeschler - American Composers Forum
Maria Jackson - Urban Institute
Lendre Kearns - Arts Consultant
Victoria Kirsch - Artist
Amelia Kohm - Chapin Hall Center for Children, University of Chicago
Mark Kramer - Center for Strategic Philanthropy
John Kreidler - Cultural Initiative Silicon Valley

Jodi Pam Krizer - Alvin Ailey Dance Foundation
Alan Kumamoto - Kumamoto Associates
David LaPiana - La Piana Associates
Steven Lavine - California Institute of the Arts
Heidi Lesemann - American Composers Forum Los Angeles Chapter
Robert Lynch - Americans for the Arts
Arnie Malina - Flynn Center for the Performing Arts
Carolynn Mambu - Morris & Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation
Peter Mark - Virginia Opera
Melanie Mayner - Scientific & Cultural Facilities District
Carol May - Consultant
Libby Maynard - Ink People Center for the Arts
Rory MacPherson - Wallace Reader's Digest Funds
Dan Miller - James Irvine Foundation
Cora Mirikitani - Japan-America Community Cultural Center
Michael Moore - Wallace Readers Digest Funds
John O'Neal, Junebug Productions, Inc.
John Orders - Arts Consultant
David Pankratz - ARTS, Inc.
Jennifer Cover Payne - Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington
Julie Franz Peeler - American Express Arts Marketing Center
Frances Phillips - Haas Fund and Arts Education Funders Collaborative
Joy Picus - Friends of the Observatory
David Plettner - Cultural & Planning Group
Jerri Price - Pasadena Symphony
Jane Pryzbysz - San Jose Museum of Quilts and Textiles
Nancy Ragey - Community Foundation Silicon Valley
Raymond Reisler - S. Mark Taper Foundation
Ellen Salpeter - Heart of Brooklyn Cultural Consortium
Janet Sarbaugh - The Heinz Endowments
Hope Schneider - Cultural & Planning Group
Earl Sherburn - Glendale Cultural Affairs Commission
Joan Shigekawa - Rockefeller Foundation
Mark Slavkin - Performing Arts Center of Los Angeles County
Kathryn Smith - DC Heritage Tourism Coalition
Natasha Terk - David & Lucile Packard Foundation
Erin Trapp - Western States Arts Confederation
Mark Valdez - Cornerstone Theater
Jeff von der Schmidt - Southwest Chamber Music
Huong Vu - Association of Performing Arts Presenters
Chris Walker - Urban Institute
Patricia Washington - Greater Philadelphia Tourism Marketing Corp.
Steve Wolff - AMS Market Research
Jerry Yoshitomi - Cultural Participation Consultant
Kathleen Zeifang - Morris & Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation
Sally Zinno - National Arts Stabilization

Appendix B - Roster of Partnerships by Category

Note: A website address is provided for each partnership described in this report known to be in operation as of November 2002. Those no longer in operation are indicated by "Completed."

1 - Artistic Collaboration/Joint Programming

American Composers Forum Continental Harmony www.composersforum.org
American Composers Forum Faith Partners www.composersforum.org
American Symphony Orchestra/Concordia Collaborative www.symphony.org
Arizona Theatre Company/Childsplay Collaboration www.aztheatreco.org
Cornerstone Theater Company www.cornerstonetheater.org
Creative Work Fund www.creativeworkfund.org
In Unison www.slso.org
Junebug Productions, Inc. www.gnofn.org/~junebug/
Magic of Music www.knightfdn.org
Partnerships Affirming Community Transformations http://208.240.92.21/99prog/ah_grantees.html
Renaissance & Baroque Society www.rbsp.org
Rural Drama Consortium www.roadside.org
San Francisco Camerawork www.sfcamerawork.org
San Francisco Museum Partnership Completed
Stravinsky Festival Completed
Universe Project Completed
Urban Libraries Council www.urbanlibraries.org
WAAA Equity Program Collaboration www.westarts.org

2 - Arts Education, Outreach and Audience Development

Arts Education Funders Collaborative www.haassr.org
Arts Education Partnership www.ccsso.org
Arts Partners Program www.artspresenters.org
Arts Partnerships for Education www.cac.ca.gov
Challenge America www.nea.gov
Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education www.capeweb.org
Community/Schools Partnerships for the Arts www.aad.oregon.edu/culturework
Creative Arts in the Public/Private Schools www.durhamarts.org
Empire State Partnership Project www.espartsed.org
Kennedy Center Partners in Education: Performing Arts in Schools www.kennedy-center.org
Wallace Funds Community Partnerships for Cultural Participation Program www.wallacefunds.org
Wallace Funds Leadership and Excellence in Arts Participation Initiative Done (as above)
Wallace Funds State Arts Partnership (as above)

3 - Facility Development

Art Partners Program www.culturela.org
500 South First Center www.sjqquiltmuseum.org

4 - Creation of Cultural District

DC Heritage Tourism Coalition www.dcheritage.org
Heart of Brooklyn Cultural Consortium www.brooklynpubliclibrary.org/hob
Milpitas Alliance for the Arts www.milpitasarts.com
Museums of the Arroyo www.gamblehouse.org/special/museums.html
Tucson Arts District Partnership <http://tucsonartdistrict.org>

5 - Consolidated Fund Drive

Silicon Valley Arts Fund www.artscouncil.org

6 - Advocacy

Enrich Your Life Completed

7 - Arts Marketing

Arts for LA "Big List" Project (contact Mr. Jerry Yoshitomi at yshjy@aol.com)
Arts Marketing Center of Chicago www.artsmarketing.org
Calgary Regional Arts Foundation Initiatives www.craf.org
Charlotte Marketing Services Organization www.performingartsctr.org/mso
Long Beach MaxMarketing www.artspca.org
Metro Detroit Cultural Marketing Network www.cfsem.org
Pittsburgh Cultural Trust Shared Services Division www.pgharts.org
SCFD Tier II Community Awareness Project www.scfid.org
Silicon Valley Cultural Marketing Partnership www.artscouncil.org
Texas Arts Marketing Network (contact Mr. Bill Gowan at gowan@swbell.net)

8 - Training and Professional Development

Chorus American Choral Conducting Program www.chorusamerica.org
Community Arts Partnership (get California Institute of the Arts) www.calarts.edu
Z Space Studio www.zspace.org

9 - Shared Services and Joint Business Operations

Austin Circle of Theatres www.acotonline.org
Delaware Center for the Performing Arts www.pfdf.org/innovation/innov_of_week/index.asp
Pittsburgh Cultural Trust Shared Services Division www.pgharts.org
Three by Three Consortium www.nyc-arts.org

10 - Third Party Support and Services

Fund for US Artists at International Festivals and Competitions
www.artsinternationalorg/programs/the_fund
National Arts Stabilization www.artstabilization.org
New Century Community Program www.state.me.us/CACHome.html
New York Arts Recovery Fund www.nonprofitfinancefund.org
Performing Arts Research Coalition www.operaam.org

11 - Business/Nonprofit Relationship

Detroit Symphony/EDS Corporation www.detroitssymphony.com
Oakland A's/Oakland Ballet Partnership Completed

Acknowledgments

Thanks are offered to all of the interviewees for this project who gave so generously of their time and insights - their names are given in the appendix. Almost half of these interviews with arts leaders were conducted by Rebekah Gibson, Senior Arts Advisor, Human Interaction Research Institute. Her input to the development of this report also is much appreciated.

Editorial reviews by two of HIRI's other Senior Arts Advisors, Alan Brown of Audience Insight LLC, and Carol May, also were much appreciated. Cultural participation consultant Jerry Yoshitomi offered many useful insights along the way. And the guidance for this study provided by John Bare and Heidi Rettig of the John S. & James L. Knight Foundation (and by Gary Burger, formerly on the Foundation's staff and now at Colonial Williamsburg) is acknowledged with gratitude.

