

## **Humanities working paper (Pew project on feasibility of state cultural policies)**

[Prepared by John Hammer, National Humanities Alliance, 7/01]

**Caveat:** While I expect that the heterogeneity of institutions in arts, historic preservation, and heritage/folklife parallel the situation in the humanities, it is nonetheless useful to state here that the financial, programmatic, and collaborative profiles of humanities institutions are highly individual -- e.g., some state archives are well financed and have broad areas of responsibilities while some others may be narrowly focused and disinclined to seek collaborations. Likewise state humanities councils vary in many ways, including how well and in which ways the state government provides support, how entrepreneurial the leadership is, and so forth. All of this is to say that it is difficult to generalize about humanities groups and institutions, especially in terms of inclination to collaborate and willingness to provide financial support for new initiatives. One general characteristic of private humanities institutions is a reluctance to enter into collaborations that call for the institution to provide sustained financial support.

**Definitions :** The following formal and less formal definition of the humanities is provided to illustrate the range of ways of considering the domain:

o The act that established the National Endowment for the Humanities reads "The term 'humanities' includes, but is not limited to, the study of the following: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; those aspects of social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment with particular attention to reflecting our diverse heritage, traditions, and history and to the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life."

o In a 1987 report entitled "The Humanities and the American Promise," the result of a colloquium funded, in part, by NEH, Merrill Peterson, a University of Virginia historian provides a definition of the humanities in terms of its practical importance to democracy, as well as to the intellectual life of each citizen that is probably more illuminating than the statutory description:

...we think it is misleading to regard the humanities basically as a set of academic disciplines or, even more restricting, as a set of "great books". We identify them, rather, with certain ways of thinking--of inquiring, evaluating, judging, finding, and articulating meaning. They include the developed human talents from which texts and disciplines spring. They are, taken together, the necessary resources of a reflective approach to life. The value of a reflective approach can be best appreciated by considering the alternative: a life unilluminated by reasoning -- in short, the "unexamined life" that Socrates described as not worth living. Where the humanities are vigorous, action follows from and is guided by reflection. It is their capacity to change, elevate, and improve both the common civic life and individual lives that make the cultivation of the humanities important to the American people.

## **PART 1: PERSPECTIVE ON THE READINESS OF THE DOMAIN**

### **A. The Humanities Domain at Present:**

**Universities** - By far, the largest contingent of the humanities domain is located in universities and colleges. Disciplinary departments (e.g., Department of Philosophy, Department of History) are home base for most scholars. Departments are responsible for teaching. Probably a majority of scholars in university departments are involved in research – either individually or, less frequently, collaborative research projects. The latter often involves research assistants and almost always requires external support through either grants or contracts. While it is fair to say that most higher education institutions have become more engaged with the public in recent years, public institutions have more incentive to reach out, often with prodding of legislators. In terms of collaborations outside of the university, departments are generally not the catalyst for such undertakings.

**o University-based humanities centers and institutes** - These are usually multi-disciplinary and frequently cited as the locus of ferment and originality (in contrast with disciplinary departments). In general, the centers and institutes are the component of a university most likely to engage in public humanities. It can be argued that universities have tended to support establishment of centers and institutes in part because, in recent years, the humanities have not done particularly well in competition for resources on campus.

**o University libraries** - American research universities as well as select liberal arts colleges are holders of major humanities collections. These libraries tend to be on the cutting edge of efforts to conserve and preserve the cultural and historical record -- that is, the core of the humanities. As noted below, libraries of all sorts regularly mount exhibits, offer lectures, and seminars on literary and other humanities topics.

**o Other humanities-oriented university activities** - Universities often have museums, art galleries, and other publicly oriented facilities or activities with strong humanities content.

**Elementary and Secondary Schools** - Humanities are also an integral part of elementary and secondary education, particularly in terms of English language and literature, foreign languages, history (often forming the core of social studies), and, less commonly, philosophy, art history, social science, etc.

**Historical Societies** - Historical Societies often function as centers for historical and sometimes, genealogical study. In addition, most historical societies function as history museums and, sometimes, house museums. In addition, some historical societies have large holdings and function as specialized research libraries

**Libraries (public and private)** - Libraries are the repositories of the core of the humanities records. In addition to books, newspapers, photographs, maps, engravings, film and recorded sound, libraries offer space and material for scholarship. In addition, libraries frequently offer special exhibits and, in effect, function as museums.

**Museums** - Museums have increasingly played a role in the humanities, not only for historical, literary, and sociological exhibits, but also as sites for study and scholarship. The educational role of museums has been expanding. Museums often have collaborative arrangements with schools, offer after-school courses, and other collaborations to develop traveling exhibitions, and other educational activities.

**Archives** - All states have archives that hold many of the key resources for the study of history and culture. Many towns and cities maintain archives as well. Most archives have preservation and conservation laboratories.

**Public Television and radio** - A substantial portion of public programming in the humanities -- and perhaps reaching the broadest audience -- is created and/or broadcast by the broad range of public radio and TV stations. The public stations, many affiliated with universities, provide access to a range of programs from the history of conflicts around the world to the roles of the blues in American life.

**State Humanities Councils** - Relative newcomers on the scene, state humanities councils are the chief instrument the National Endowment for the Humanities employs to foster public understanding of the humanities throughout the nation through state humanities councils in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam. All are free-standing 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations which operate with grants from NEH, state governments, private foundations, and numerous other sources. State councils have learned to be increasingly entrepreneurial in light of the weakened situation with NEH appropriations. Even before NEH's problems began, some state councils were so effective in finding support that NEH support represented less than 20% of their annual budgets. In part because they are public humanities-centered, state humanities councils are probably the most inclined of all humanities entities to seek partnerships and collaborations with other kinds of public and private organizations.

**Structures and operations** - Public universities operate with support from the state, tuition, earned income, income from endowments, federal grants and contracts, and increasingly, privately raised funding as the proportion of operational funding by the state decreases. Private universities usually do not have regular state subsidies but otherwise derive support from similar sources as the public institutions. Other humanities institutions other than state agencies are generally financed through dues, investments (endowments), earned income, and public and private sources.

**State agencies** - State governments provide support for a variety of cultural activities in a number of ways, often idiosyncratic to the state. Support may be provided through departments of state, education, tourism, state libraries, archives, and probably many other entities in at least one state.

**Extend or build upon** - For purposes of considering possible state cultural policies and related collaborations, the finances and structures of humanities institutions is mostly neutral or slightly negative. The state humanities councils are structured for collaboration with other institutions and, as noted above, problems at the NEH have focused attention on the entrepreneurial. Probably among private organizations, the state councils are already engaged in individual projects and collaborations that lend themselves to expansion on collaboration.

According to the Institutional Telecommunications Council, 35 states have a virtual university or the statewide organization to deliver distance education -- This would seem to offer fruitful possibilities for collaboration.

**Operations/Interactions - Federal programs that encourage collaboration among humanities organizations at the state or local level**

The state humanities councils, in general, are the most likely to interact with other centers within the domain and probably the most likely to initiate contacts and/or propose projects with other organizations. Recently, two NEH initiatives have served as catalysts for more collaborations between state councils and other humanities institutions:

o **The Regional Humanities Centers Initiative** is the signature activity introduced by NEH chair Bill Ferris as virtually the opening gambit of his chairmanship. While still in the planning stages, the RHC initiative is aimed at securing funding for and opening broad-gauged centers at a university-led consortium in 10 regions of the country. Each center will be based at a single university but include dozens of other universities and colleges, museums, libraries, historical societies, and the state humanities councils from the five states composing each region.

Although no RHC is operational -- and there are questions about the future of the initiative since Ferris is being replaced by Bruce Cole, an art historian from Indiana University who is an active proponent of traditional scholarship -- there are reports that the coalition forming and proposal development process has forged a number of state council-university bonds that may well outlast the RHC initiative. Apparently, university participants were particularly pleased at the practicality and well developed entrepreneurial skills of the state council leaders. And the state council people were pleased to find stronger interest in public humanities and in engaging the public on the part of the university participants.

o **The Encyclopaedia Initiative** is another Ferris initiative at NEH in which the state humanities councils are asked to take the lead in establishing a coalition of humanities organizations to develop a history/culture-centered encyclopaedia for every state. In addition, encyclopaedias may be developed for certain cities such as Chicago. Although this initiative is quite recent, it has engendered enthusiasm from state tourism authorities and local libraries.

And the US Department of Education is managing a new program to improve teaching history that promotes collaboration at the local level:

o **Teaching of traditional American history initiative** - This special \$50 million initiative administered by the US Department of Education was pushed through Congress last year by Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV). Grants are restricted to local education agencies (LEAs) but collaborations are permitted. Under the \$100 million earmarked for the second year (not yet enacted), LEAs are specifically required to form partnerships with one or more institutions of higher education, nonprofit history of humanities organizations, libraries or museums.

## **B. Current Evidence of need for, interest in, and readiness to learn from other states and other sectors about policy innovations -**

Pressure for devolution of federal government functions has been with us since the earliest days of the republic but its present manifestation probably can be dated to the presidency of Richard Nixon and the major expansion of grants in aid to the states. The trend was accelerated significantly under President Ronald Reagan as significant programs from the Kennedy/Johnson Great Society were block granted to the states.

Most states have developed or borrowed from other states cultural policies aimed at using historic tourism as an economic tool. Likewise, many states or localities have sought to use arts and to a lesser extent humanities to enhance quality of life in communities -- an important component in attracting and/or retaining private enterprise. Educational improvement is another area with significant cultural input for which policy innovation from across the states is a likely component.

Of course demand and need vary by states and regions. While there must be instances in which economic adversity produces positive cultural policies, in general, the reverse is true. There is much documentation to support reports that arts education -- particularly music education -- suffers when education cuts must be made. While history and English are rarely cut back, the parallel in the humanities has been foreign language education. There are certainly instances in which humanities activities have been seen as "frills" by policy makers and others in the process.

I speculate that virtually every state has good potential for policies that encourage collaboration among cultural organizations. A state that has a strong state humanities council, at least one university with outward looking cultural programs and at least one library, museum, and other cultural organization makes a good candidate for innovation in cultural policies.

### **C. Major barriers to state -level sharing and adaptation of effective policies -**

o **The economy** - To the extent that the collaborations envisioned are to be supported by state governments, the specter of economic downturn must be kept in mind. Mostly, state governments do not save for days ahead and, as a consequence, engage in sharp cutbacks when the cycle is down. Cultural activities are usually among the first cut back in recessions.

o **Ideas** - The domain of the humanities, as with arts, historic preservation, and folklife/heritage has some baggage that could serve as a barrier to adaptation into new cultural policies. The humanities are concerned with questions and ideas -- often unpleasant ideas. Many of the censorship issues of the day have to do with activities of arts or humanities individuals or organizations. The scholarly end of the humanities gets in trouble with scholarship that brings into question iconic figures (e.g., Jefferson and slavery). In public humanities programming, which is aimed at broadening knowledge, unpleasant questions can arise. Actually, given the possibilities for unpopular programming, the public humanities programs of state councils and others have encountered remarkably little public criticism. (For example, the California Council for the Humanities sponsored an exhibition and discussion of the art works at the center of the National Endowment for the Arts controversy in the early 90s -- included in the show was "Piss Christ" and, apparently, all the other art that offended Senator Helms *et al.* Interestingly, the show was well received and attended with no hot breath of censorship from Washington or within state.)

o **Professoriate** - The culture wars of the late 1980s and early 1990s left many legislators, some members of the media, and probably a rather small number of the general public skeptical about academics. Although battles between the academy and political world have existed at least since the early 20th Century, a significant part may be linked to the hawk and dove battles of the Vietnam War era. Without rehashing here, many of the critics of the academy are in positions of power in public life and in many cases they view humanities scholarship as centered in leftist politics. (Ironically, the assumption of academe as left may be more a perception than a reality. The academy, like other sectors in American life, is not monolithic and its members harbor a wide range of view -- Probably, in terms of political beliefs, the majority

fall into a moderate category.) This particular "barrier" is relative dormant but could return if the culture wars heat up again.

o **Structural problems** - Within complex structures such as universities and state governments, there are turf battles, empires, and what have you. A new collaborative project may be seen as undermining (or outshining) current programs. Often barriers such as these can be avoided or at least ameliorated through careful homework.

o **Humanities institution finances** - While certainly not unique to the humanities, many of the institutions in which the humanities dwell have relatively fragile finances. By this, I mean that, in general, new funding is a key ingredient for collaboration.

**Comment** - This review and the attached state case studies suggest that there are numerous possibilities for collaboration at the state level among humanities organizations and between state government and humanities organizations. At the same time, humanities collaborations with the domains of arts, historic preservation, and folk life/heritage exist and could expand.

The case studies underscore the importance of including state government in a meaningful (and early) way when exploring possibilities for state-wide projects.

A second concern that may be drawn from the case studies is that on-going collaborations based on operating support from humanities organizations are difficult to start but even more difficult to support over the long run.

**GEORGIA - *A policy initiative targeted on a single project that stimulates cooperation among private institutions and state agencies***

- 1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - The *New Georgia Encyclopedia*, the first state-based on-line single state enterprise, is being developed by the Georgia Humanities Council in collaboration with a number of key Georgia institutions. The focus of the e-encyclopedia is not only the history and culture of Georgia but also a wide range of topics from agriculture to environment to sports. Extensive links to other resources in Georgia as well as other locations will make the e-encyclopedia a portal to Georgia.
- 2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - A need to build upon a highly successful print guide to Georgia that was developed collaboratively by the Georgia Humanities Council, University of Georgia System and University of Georgia Press in the early 1990s. The organizers believed that a successful on-going encyclopedia project would raise the visibility of humanities in Georgia while at the same time strengthening collaborations among humanities institutions within the state. The e-encyclopedia will provide students with a useful tool that will prepare them for working in other digital environments.
- 3. Key actors in policy formation** - The Georgia Humanities Council first developed partnerships with the University of Georgia and the University of Georgia Press. Importantly, the Office of the Governor began participating in planning project development in 1998. In addition, there has been extensive consultation with numerous state agencies including the state archives, Department of Education, Historic Preservation Office, State History Program. Numerous Georgia higher education institutions have been involved.
- 4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - As noted above, the initial planning for the project began in 1998 as a review of possible next steps for a highly successful, collaboratively produced Georgia Guide which the Georgia Humanities Council, University of Georgia, and University of Georgia Press had first produced in the early 1990s. The review rapidly turned to the idea of a state encyclopedia that would range far beyond history and culture. Early planning called for simultaneous production of print and electronic versions modified later to electronic-only based upon consultation with other state and local encyclopedias. The very active involvement of the Office of the Governor raised the project's visibility as well as fund-raising prospects. (At present, Governor Barnes serves as chair of the project.
- 5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - The extensive consultation and visits with other state and local encyclopedia projects (e.g., Chicago, Kentucky, Louisville, West Virginia) provided the Georgians with practical information on relevant policies as well as the challenges of production. It was through these interactions that the decision was arrived at to limit production to the electronic versions.
- 6. Implementation experience and how barriers that were overcome** - Although the first edition of the e-encyclopedia is not scheduled for release until 2003, work is well underway at the project office which is located in Athens. The Athens location is especially appropriate because so much of the specialized expertise is concentrated there (e.g., the Executive Director of Virtual Library, Customer, and Information Services at the U/GA system office, GALILEO = GA Library Learning On-line), the University of Georgia Press, and the U/GA faculty from which editors of more than half the e-encyclopedia entries have been retained.

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - Although the e-encyclopedia is not scheduled to be introduced to the public until 2003, almost \$1.5 million has been raised for the undertaking. A grant request for \$200,000 is pending at the NEH. Important support came first from Governor Zell Miller who committed \$100,000 from his discretionary fund in 1998 and more recently, Miller's successor, Ray Barnes committed another \$400,000 in state funds in 2000.

**8. Potential for sustainability** - As noted above, two governors have committed substantial funds to the project. Because the project stands on the twin assumptions of free access and continuous updates, there will be an on-going fundraising challenge. Although there are no plans to issue a print version of the encyclopedia, video, CD-ROM, etc may become a source of income.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - Last year, the National Endowment for the Humanities launched a special initiative for development of state (and in some instances local) encyclopedias -- NEH specifies that the encyclopedias may be print and electronic or electronic alone. The Georgia experience to date suggests that the active involvement of the state government (preferably the governor) may be the key ingredient to success.



## **OKLAHOMA - *An initiative to coordinate private cultural activities statewide***

**1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - The *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* is a broad collaboration of arts and humanities organizations and institutions to institute a state-wide cultural policy.

**2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - The *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* was developed out of a perceived need for increased support for and access to the arts and humanities in Oklahoma.

**3. Key actors in policy formation** - The key actor in this initiative was the Oklahoma Cultural Coalition (OCC), a membership, dues-funded organization limited to non-profit or for-profit organizations which promote or provide arts, humanities or cultural services. The Coalition held its first annual membership meeting in 1992. In 1995, the governing members of the Coalition included: six arts groups (e.g., State Arts Council of Oklahoma, Arts Council of Oklahoma City, etc.); one arts and humanities advocacy group; the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities; one museum and the Oklahoma Museums association; the Oklahoma Department of Libraries; two tourism/commerce associations; the State Department of Education, the State Regents for Higher Education, the Oklahoma Arts Institute, the Oklahoma State Education Television Authority, the Oklahoma Historical Society, and two private companies.

The general membership in 1994-1995 included more than 50 additional organizations -- these included local arts and humanities councils, local theaters and theater companies, local library systems, local philharmonic, opera and visual art societies, a local museum, two halls of fame (jazz and cowboys), and several higher education institutions.

Development of the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* was funded by the following organizations: the State Arts Council of Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities, the Kirkpatrick Foundation, the Phillips Foundation, and the dues of the members of the OCC.

**4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - The impetus for the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* originated in 1991 with the biennial "Congress on the Arts and Humanities" sponsored by the OCC. Participants in the 1991 Congress -- including cultural advocates from diverse disciplines and geographic regions within Oklahoma -- passed a resolution charging the OCC, the Oklahoma State Chamber and the Oklahoma Legislative Arts Caucus with developing a statewide action plan.

Proud of the grassroots nature of the planning process, the authors of the *Oklahoma Plan* describe it as the "first bottom up, statewide cultural plan in the nation." In the initial planning state, the state was divided into 11 'Cultural Districts' to ensure geographic representation. Some Districts utilized town meetings, and others divided into task forces addressing the following areas: awareness, education, facilities, funding and programming. According to the 1995 overview, hundreds of volunteers participated at this stage, which produced more than 200 separate recommendations.

Following the planning process, the OCC met with cultural organizations, state agencies, legislative leaders and others to engender support for the plan.

**5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - The *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* was a direct outgrowth of the newly-formed Oklahoma Cultural Coalition.

**6. Implementation experience and how barriers were overcome** - The 1995 *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* describes itself as more of an outline than an action plan for culture policy. "The Oklahoma State Cultural Plan is a beginning... This plan will serve as both a map and as a compass. As a map, it outlines the paths that must be followed to reach specific goals. As a compass, it indicates direction, rather than route, and as such, allows for the modification of initiatives to better meet changing opportunities and challenges. If this plan maps a journey, then it is a journey of many destinations. Some will be reached rather quickly, while others will require greater effort. The effects of all are anticipated to be long-term and ongoing."

The 23 initiatives identified in the plan were to be carried out by the organizations and institutions involved in the plan's development -- not by the OCC or other central agency. The OCC role was to "facilitate and coordinate the undertaking of the plan" and "serve as a clearinghouse for information relating to the plan and implementation activities."

How have the proposed initiatives fared? After initial enthusiasm for the planning process, participation in meetings called by the OCC dropped dramatically. Planners involved at the time believe that this was due primarily to the fact that the novelty of the project had worn off. When planning full schedules, busy cultural advocates would choose to go to meetings regarding their specific area of interest and involvement (e.g., meetings regarding the local symphony, arts councils, etc.) rather than the *Cultural Plan* meetings, which related to broad formulations of cultural policy.

The 23 initiatives recommended by the *Cultural Plan* span a broad range of programmatic ideas. They were in hindsight probably overly ambitious, and too general.

Another significant barrier was lack of funding. Funding for the sustained coordination of the project never really materialized. Immediately, this meant that there was not enough money to support a full-time coordinator for the project; part-time coordinators were hired, but were difficult to retain. The 1995 *Plan* stated that "resources to implement and sustain activities will come from a variety of sources. In some cases, increased coordination and cooperation will achieve sought-for goals, while in others, organizations or agencies have agreed to undertake or absorb project costs. The OCC will also seek grant funding and state support for selected initiatives."

The absence of a full-time coordinator had to hurt fund-raising efforts. It may also have been the case that the state humanities and arts councils, and other likely sources of grant money, had exhausted their already limited discretionary resources when they contributed to the initial planning phase. An interesting question arises that if the energy invested in the initial planning phase had utilized public -- not exclusively private -- resources, would funding and enthusiasm for the plan have been more readily available?

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - Some documented outcomes of the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* include:

- Written plan to strengthen the arts and humanities in Oklahoma, and to improve access to cultural resources, resulting in 23 articulated goals informed by an intense planning process with broad, statewide participation.
- Strengthened or new relationships between cultural organizations in Oklahoma, especially between the arts and humanities sectors.

Implementation of specific proposals furthered in the Plan is not documented at this time.

**8. Potential for sustainability** - Lack of funding was a major issue for the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan*. While money was available for the initial, specific planning stages of the *Cultural Plan*, it never materialized to sustain the *Plan* as an ongoing project. The state humanities council and arts councils, already strained by tight budgets, were probably not able to contribute on a beyond the one-time contribution, or grant, made in the initial stages.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - The grassroots, "bottom-up" planning process used to develop the *Oklahoma Plan* has interesting potential for replicability:

- Geographic distribution into "cultural districts" allowed mass participation in the project, and allowed assessment of needs, interests, and perceptions directly from local communities.
- Individual communities could feel ownership of a plan resulting from this kind of participation; with such results as increased awareness of any resulting projects, and willingness to participate in their implementation. (However, in the short run, this has not yet been shown to be the case.)
- The "town meeting" nature of the process may have helped to activate local communities, and stir renewed interest in the arts and humanities.
- Shared planning and implementation responsibilities may have created or strengthened or new networks between arts and humanities organizations, as well as foster relationships between these organization and museums, libraries, state educational and commerce commissions.

Difficulties in replicating this process in other states could include:

- Larger population and/or geographical size.
- Definition of "cultural districts" in states where ethnicity or other factors may be more significant than geography, or may not coincide with geographical boundaries.

## **OREGON - A comprehensive policy for providing state funding for cultural activities**

**1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - In 1998, an ambitious Cultural Development Plan for the State of Oregon was developed by a Joint Interim Task Force on Cultural Development composed of cultural leaders including two members of the Oregon Legislature. The task force has proposed an Oregon Cultural Trust (OCT) as a mechanism for providing new resources and increased coordination for culture activities in the state. Supporters of the plan hope that it will be enacted by the legislature during the present session.

There would be three funding mechanisms under the OCT:

1. Community Cultural Participation Funds will provide, by formula, a minimum allocation to each Oregon county and to the nine federally recognized tribes to support local and regional cultural projects and collaborations that respond to the vision and goals of the OCT. The funding mechanism is intended to stimulate and support local cultural planning and projects. The funding formula would take into account both population and geography. The task force also has proposed development of cultural coalitions as options for local fund distribution and for the creation and monitoring of local benchmarks that relate to the overall OCT benchmarks for culture.

2. Cultural Development Funds would provide competitive grants funds to address both operating and capital needs for the stabilization and preservation of cultural resources, including physical structures, financial capitalization and organizational capacity.

3. Supplemental funding to the Cultural Partner Agencies (arts commission, heritage, historical society, humanities council, and state historic preservation) to support partnerships and collaborations as well as underfunded existing programs. The OCT funding will not supplant existing funding to these agencies. A portion of these funds will require collaboration between two or more partner agencies.

Finally, the plan calls for the collection of baseline data in the first year to assess cultural participation and access.

**2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - Oregon policy makers were seeking to:

- Protect and stabilize Oregon's cultural resources, creating a solid foundation for the future;
- Expand public access to and use of Oregon's cultural resources and enhance the quality of those resources;
- Ensure that Oregon's cultural resources are strong and dynamic contributors to Oregon's communities and quality of life

**3. Key actors in policy formation** - In developing the plan, the task force worked closely with the "cultural partners agencies" (Oregon Arts Commission, State Historic Preservation Office, Oregon Heritage Commission, Oregon Historical Society, and the Oregon Council for the Humanities.) The Oregon Tourism Commission also work closely with the task force but will continue to receive all of its support directly from the state legislature whereas the five agencies will be eligible for support from the Oregon Cultural Trust once it is established by the state legislature.

**4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - The state government of Oregon has been a long-time supporter of a variety of cultural organizations and activities in the state. Perhaps a legacy of New England settlers in the 19th Century was heightened interest history and other cultural matters.

As in many other states, Oregon leaders saw the economic boom of the 1990s as an opportune time to strengthen funding mechanisms for cultural activities. Task force members believed that the OCT will increase cultural agencies' capacity to leverage public and private funds for cross-cutting programs and initiatives advancing culture in Oregon.

**5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - The already fruitful working relationships among the "cultural partner agencies" including the state humanities and arts agencies suggested that a structure like the OCT could work to the advantage of all

**6. Implementation experience and how barriers that were overcome** - Legislation to implement the far-reaching plan is pending in the Oregon legislature. A recent conversation with the CEO of a cultural partner agency indicates that the OCT plan has been reviewed by legislative committees on its three-part funding plan (e.g., cultural license plate) and reported out positively. The outlook for enactment in the present legislative session is seen as very good.

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - n/a

**8. Potential for sustainability** - The OCT plan has excellent prospects for sustainability -- The plan calls for new revenue sources, including:

- o A new Cultural Trust Fund with a 10-year goal of \$218 million to be developed as a "fundamentally public initiative." The two primary revenue sources are the establishment of tax credits for corporations and individuals and the conversion of existing state assets to the trust fund. A special "culture" license plate will be designed and offered -- the value being both a revenue source and a "flag" for culture.

The existing public funding sources for the cultural partner agencies (Oregon General Funds and Lottery Funds) will remain in place. In addition, the Trust Fund will seek grants funding from outside Oregon, particularly from major philanthropic sources to address far-reaching cultural development initiatives.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - The Oregon plan has broad applicability for other states -- A central feature, the funding streams would probably impede close use of the model in many states.

**Comment** - While the Oregon Cultural Trust proves a model that seems to address many of the problems encountered in funding cultural activities, it may also narrow the options for funding offbeat but potentially valuable projects.

**PENNSYLVANIA** - Bipartisan support for policies promoting culture has existed in Pennsylvania for many years. There is no comprehensive cultural policy but rather a number of policies within the state government and among private cultural institutions. ***The collaboration between the Pennsylvania Humanities Council, a private 501(c)(3) organization and the Pennsylvania Arts Council, a state agency is a case in point -***

**1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - After more than half a decade of planning, the Pennsylvania Humanities Council (PHC) formed a partnership with the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts (PCA) significantly expands cultural programming while achieving important goals for both councils. Since a PCA planning grant was awarded to PHC in 1999, more than \$550,000 of state funds have been awarded to PHC. The infusion of funds permits PHC to significantly expand its *Commonwealth Speakers* bureau, where requests for presentations expanded from 355 in 1994-1995 to 805 in 2000-01. Funds also permit a doubling of PHC grants with an additional six grants set aside for arts criticism.

**2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - State leaders and citizens wanted to increase arts education, encourage groups involved in arts programming, build education into the program core rather than as an add-on, diversify arts education programs to include art history and criticism, promote public access to scholars and their work, and foster collaborations between community groups and colleges and universities.

For the humanities council, the partnership significantly expands the audience base by reaching new organizations and audience, younger audiences, and broadens service to minorities and immigrants. For PHC, the partnership assists with many strategic goals including: increasing the range of disciplines covered, promotes relationships with arts scholars and arts organizations, increases public service to libraries, historic organizations and others interested illuminating art in history, and, of course, securing a source of on-going state funding. Finally, the partnership helps to expand the PHC role in advocating for culture in the state.

The partnership allows the arts council to serve new audiences and organizations (e.g., senior centers and public libraries), enhances and extends PCA support for arts education, increases PCA's ability to reach under-served areas such as rural counties and inner-city neighborhoods, assists PCA in identifying talented individuals in the arts, and finally, strengthens advocacy for arts and culture.

**3. Key actors in policy formation** - The Pennsylvania Council for the Arts and the Pennsylvania Humanities Council were the key actors. Federal policies of the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities passively pressed both PCA and PHC toward the collaboration: The arts council was operating under a steady stream of Congressional directive to reach the under-served populations of the state, specifically rural and inner-city, both of which were being reached by PHC programs. For both councils, 1995 was a critical year in which Congress played out a chapter of the Culture Wars by drastically reducing the budgets of the NEA and NEH. For state humanities councils, as 501(c)(3)s rather than state agencies, the need to develop new sources of support came into sharp focus.

**4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - As noted above, 1995 was definitely a year that many cultural organizations began to reassess funding sources and program with a vengeance. That was the year the PCA began to see PHC as an ally in advocacy for government support of arts and against censorship; PHC identified PCA as a potential partner for developing new programs with state funds

From 1996 to 1998, both councils made significant changes in grant-making policies and procedures and began discussions with each other on collaborative possibilities. By 1999, program staff of PHC and PCA were meeting regularly and PCA made a \$10,000 planning grant for public meetings around the state, 1999 was also the year that PCA achieved a \$2 million increase in state funding. In 2000 and 2001, PCA grants of over \$500,000 have been awarded to PHC.

**5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - For the PHC, the partnership expands and broadens existing programs. The PHC has numerous other partnerships such as its *Technology and Community* program, initially funded with NEH funds, now supported by a \$400,000 in grants from the Howard Heinz Endowment. Another is the *Raising Our Sites: Community Histories of Pennsylvania* which is designed to help 12 history museums and historic sites reinterpret programs and attract new audiences. Regionally, PHC partnered with the other 4 state humanities councils in the Mid Atlantic Region to collaborate with whichever university-led consortium is awarded the NEH Regional Humanities Center for the Mid-Atlantic (which avoids having the state humanities councils left behind due to backing the wrong RHC applicant).

**6. Implementation experience and how barriers that were overcome** - Clearly, one of the advantages of the long gestation period for the PCA/PHC partnership is that barriers were identified and addressed before the partnership was implemented. New barriers are more likely to be encountered as the two councils move to change programs and/or address other audiences.

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - As noted above, the *Commonwealth Speakers* program has jumped from 355 requests for presentations in 1994-95 to 805 in 2000-01. Evaluations of related programs have been favorable. For example, Dale Jones of the Institute for Learning Innovation wrote in his evaluation of the *Raising Our Sites* program: "In my twenty years of working in history museums I have never seen such an impressive interpretive change in so many sites." (The program focuses on telling the stories of individuals and groups -- such as women, laborers, servants, and ethnic groups not usually included in Pennsylvania histories. Jon Darling, of the University of Pittsburgh, led discussion in a working class audience (more than half had not received college degrees) of the impact of new technology in Johnstown. Darling commented "It was the best sustained community education program that I have been associated with in my 30 years of teaching in and around institutions of higher education. I will treasure it for years to come."

**8. Potential for sustainability, and** - The potential for sustainability is excellent. The PHC is a well managed organization accustomed to conducting projects, evaluating applications and awarding grants, carrying out initiatives that are well received and well evaluated. Likewise, as the PCA pushes out the boundaries of its cultural turf -- and receives growing appropriations, the partnership with the PHC is likely to grow in importance.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - The potential for replicability is very good depending on the strengths and affinities of the major actors in the key institutions, barriers and other issues in other states. The major lesson to be learned is to more deliberately but to take the time to work out problems in advance.

**Humanities working paper (Pew project on feasibility of state cultural policies)**

[Prepared by John Hammer, National Humanities Alliance, 7/01]

**Caveat:** While I expect that the heterogeneity of institutions in arts, historic preservation, and heritage/folk life parallel the situation in the humanities, it is nonetheless useful to state here that the financial, programmatic, and collaborative profiles of humanities institutions are highly individual -- e.g., some state archives are well financed and have broad areas of responsibilities while some others may be narrowly focused and disinclined to seek collaborations. Likewise state humanities councils vary in many ways, including how well and in which ways the state government provides support, how entrepreneurial the leadership is, and so forth. All of this is to say that it is difficult to generalize about humanities groups and institutions, especially in terms of inclination to collaborate and willingness to provide financial support for new initiatives. One general characteristic of private humanities institutions is a reluctance to enter into collaborations that call for the institution to provide sustained financial support.

**Definitions :** The following formal and less formal definition of the humanities is provided to illustrate the range of ways of considering the domain:

o The act that established the National Endowment for the Humanities reads "The term 'humanities' includes, but is not limited to, the study of the following: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; those aspects of social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment with particular attention to reflecting our diverse heritage, traditions, and history and to the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life."

o In a 1987 report entitled "The Humanities and the American Promise," the result of a colloquium funded, in part, by NEH, Merrill Peterson, a University of Virginia historian provides a definition of the humanities in terms of its practical importance to democracy, as well as to the intellectual life of each citizen that is probably more illuminating than the statutory description:

...we think it is misleading to regard the humanities basically as a set of academic disciplines or, even more restricting, as a set of "great books". We identify them, rather, with certain ways of thinking--of inquiring, evaluating, judging, finding, and articulating meaning. They include the developed human talents from which texts and disciplines spring. They are, taken together, the necessary resources of a reflective approach to life. The value of a reflective approach can be best appreciated by considering the alternative: a life unilluminated by reasoning -- in short, the "unexamined life" that Socrates described as not worth living. Where the humanities are vigorous, action follows from and is guided by reflection. It is their capacity to change, elevate, and improve both the common civic life and individual lives that make the cultivation of the humanities important to the American people.

## **PART 1: PERSPECTIVE ON THE READINESS OF THE DOMAIN**

### **A. The Humanities Domain at Present:**

**Universities** - By far, the largest contingent of the humanities domain is located in universities and colleges. Disciplinary departments (e.g., Department of Philosophy, Department of History) are home base for most scholars. Departments are responsible for teaching. Probably a majority of scholars in university departments are involved in research -- either individually or, less



frequently, collaborative research projects. The latter often involves research assistants and almost always requires external support through either grants or contracts. While it is fair to say that most higher education institutions have become more engaged with the public in recent years, public institutions have more incentive to reach out, often with prodding of legislators. In terms of collaborations outside of the university, departments are generally not the catalyst for such undertakings.

**o University-based humanities centers and institutes** - These are usually multi-disciplinary and frequently cited as the locus of ferment and originality (in contrast with disciplinary departments). In general, the centers and institutes are the component of a university most likely to engage in public humanities. It can be argued that universities have tended to support establishment of centers and institutes in part because, in recent years, the humanities have not done particularly well in competition for resources on campus.

**o University libraries** - American research universities as well as select liberal arts colleges are holders of major humanities collections. These libraries tend to be on the cutting edge of efforts to conserve and preserve the cultural and historical record -- that is, the core of the humanities. As noted below, libraries of all sorts regularly mount exhibits, offer lectures, and seminars on literary and other humanities topics.

**o Other humanities-oriented university activities** - Universities often have museums, art galleries, and other publicly oriented facilities or activities with strong humanities content.

**Elementary and Secondary Schools** - Humanities are also an integral part of elementary and secondary education, particularly in terms of English language and literature, foreign languages, history (often forming the core of social studies), and, less commonly, philosophy, art history, social science, etc.

**Historical Societies** - Historical Societies often function as centers for historical and sometimes, genealogical study. In addition, most historical societies function as history museums and, sometimes, house museums. In addition, some historical societies have large holdings and function as specialized research libraries

**Libraries (public and private)** - Libraries are the repositories of the core of the humanities records. In addition to books, newspapers, photographs, maps, engravings, film and recorded sound, libraries offer space and material for scholarship. In addition, libraries frequently offer special exhibits and, in effect, function as museums.

**Museums** - Museums have increasingly played a role in the humanities, not only for historical, literary, and sociological exhibits, but also as sites for study and scholarship. The educational role of museums has been expanding. Museums often have collaborative arrangements with schools, offer after-school courses, and other collaborations to develop traveling exhibitions, and other educational activities.

**Archives** - All states have archives that hold many of the key resources for the study of history and culture. Many towns and cities maintain archives as well. Most archives have preservation and conservation laboratories.

**Public Television and radio** - A substantial portion of public programming in the humanities -- and perhaps reaching the broadest audience -- is created and/or broadcast by the broad range of public radio and TV stations. The public stations, many affiliated with universities, provide

access to a range of programs from the history of conflicts around the world to the roles of the blues in American life.

**State Humanities Councils** - Relative newcomers on the scene, state humanities councils are the chief instrument the National Endowment for the Humanities employs to foster public understanding of the humanities throughout the nation through state humanities councils in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam. All are free-standing 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations which operate with grants from NEH, state governments, private foundations, and numerous other sources. State councils have learned to be increasingly entrepreneurial in light of the weakened situation with NEH appropriations. Even before NEH's problems began, some state councils were so effective in finding support that NEH support represented less than 20% of their annual budgets. In part because they are public humanities-centered, state humanities councils are probably the most inclined of all humanities entities to seek partnerships and collaborations with other kinds of public and private organizations.

**Structures and operations** - Public universities operate with support from the state, tuition, earned income, income from endowments, federal grants and contracts, and increasingly, privately raised funding as the proportion of operational funding by the state decreases. Private universities usually do not have regular state subsidies but otherwise derive support from similar sources as the public institutions. Other humanities institutions other than state agencies are generally financed through dues, investments (endowments), earned income, and public and private sources. s

**State agencies** - State governments provide support for a variety of cultural activities in a number of ways, often idiosyncratic to the state. Support may be provided through departments of state, education, tourism, state libraries, archives, and probably many other entities in at least one state.

**Extend or build upon** - For purposes of considering possible state cultural policies and related collaborations, the finances and structures of humanities institutions is mostly neutral or slightly negative. The state humanities councils are structured for collaboration with other institutions and, as noted above, problems at the NEH have focused attention on the entrepreneurial. Probably among private organizations, the state councils are already engaged in individual projects and collaborations that lend themselves to expansion on collaboration.

According to the Institutional Telecommunications Council, 35 states have a virtual university or the statewide organization to deliver distance education -- This would seem to offer fruitful possibilities for collaboration.

### **Operations/Interactions - Federal programs that encourage collaboration among humanities organizations at the state or local level**

The state humanities councils, in general, are the most likely to interact with other centers within the domain and probably the most likely to initiate contacts and/or propose projects with other organizations. Recently, two NEH initiatives have served as catalysts for more collaborations between state councils and other humanities institutions:

o **The Regional Humanities Centers Initiative** is the signature activity introduced by NEH chair Bill Ferris as virtually the opening gambit of his chairmanship. While still in the planning stages, the RHC initiative is aimed at securing funding for and opening broad-gauged centers at a university-led consortium in 10 regions of the country. Each center will be based at a

single university but include dozens of other universities and colleges, museums, libraries, historical societies, and the state humanities councils from the five states composing each region.

Although no RHC is operational -- and there are questions about the future of the initiative since Ferris is being replaced by Bruce Cole, an art historian from Indiana University who is an active proponent of traditional scholarship -- there are reports that the coalition forming and proposal development process has forged a number of state council-university bonds that may well outlast the RHC initiative. Apparently, university participants were particularly pleased at the practicality and well developed entrepreneurial skills of the state council leaders. And the state council people were pleased to find stronger interest in public humanities and in engaging the public on the part of the university participants.

o **The Encyclopaedia Initiative** is another Ferris initiative at NEH in which the state humanities councils are asked to take the lead in establishing a coalition of humanities organizations to develop a history/culture-centered encyclopaedia for every state. In addition, encyclopaedias may be developed for certain cities such as Chicago. Although this initiative is quite recent, it has engendered enthusiasm from state tourism authorities and local libraries.

And the US Department of Education is managing a new program to improve teaching history that promotes collaboration at the local level:

o **Teaching of traditional American history initiative** - This special \$50 million initiative administered by the US Department of Education was pushed through Congress last year by Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV). Grants are restricted to local education agencies (LEAs) but collaborations are permitted. Under the \$100 million earmarked for the second year (not yet enacted), LEAs are specifically required to form partnerships with one or more institutions of higher education, nonprofit history of humanities organizations, libraries or museums.

## **B. Current Evidence of need for, interest in, and readiness to learn from other states and other sectors about policy innovations -**

Pressure for devolution of federal government functions has been with us since the earliest days of the republic but its present manifestation probably can be dated to the presidency of Richard Nixon and the major expansion of grants in aid to the states. The trend was accelerated significantly under President Ronald Reagan as significant programs from the Kennedy/Johnson Great Society were block granted to the states.

Most states have developed or borrowed from other states cultural policies aimed at using historic tourism as an economic tool. Likewise, many states or localities have sought to use arts and to a lesser extent humanities to enhance quality of life in communities -- an important component in attracting and/or retaining private enterprise. Educational improvement is another area with significant cultural input for which policy innovation from across the states is a likely component.

Of course demand and need vary by states and regions. While there must be instances in which economic adversity produces positive cultural policies, in general, the reverse is true. There is much documentation to support reports that arts education -- particularly music education -- suffers when education cuts must be made. While history and English are rarely cut back, the

parallel in the humanities has been foreign language education. There are certainly instances in which humanities activities have been seen as "frills" by policy makers and others in the process.

I speculate that virtually every state has good potential for policies that encourage collaboration among cultural organizations. A state that has a strong state humanities council, at least one university with outward looking cultural programs and at least one library, museum, and other cultural organization makes a good candidate for innovation in cultural policies.

### **C. Major barriers to state -level sharing and adaptation of effective policies -**

o **The economy** - To the extent that the collaborations envisioned are to be supported by state governments, the specter of economic downturn must be kept in mind. Mostly, state governments do not save for days ahead and, as a consequence, engage in sharp cutbacks when the cycle is down. Cultural activities are usually among the first cut back in recessions.

o **Ideas** - The domain of the humanities, as with arts, historic preservation, and folklife/heritage has some baggage that could serve as a barrier to adaptation into new cultural policies. The humanities are concerned with questions and ideas -- often unpleasant ideas. Many of the censorship issues of the day have to do with activities of arts or humanities individuals or organizations. The scholarly end of the humanities gets in trouble with scholarship that brings into question iconic figures (e.g., Jefferson and slavery). In public humanities programming, which is aimed at broadening knowledge, unpleasant questions can arise. Actually, given the possibilities for unpopular programming, the public humanities programs of state councils and others have encountered remarkably little public criticism. (For example, the California Council for the Humanities sponsored an exhibition and discussion of the art works at the center of the National Endowment for the Arts controversy in the early 90s -- included in the show was "Piss Christ" and, apparently, all the other art that offended Senator Helms *et al.* Interestingly, the show was well received and attended with no hot breath of censorship from Washington or within state.)

o **Professoriate** - The culture wars of the late 1980s and early 1990s left many legislators, some members of the media, and probably a rather small number of the general public skeptical about academics. Although battles between the academy and political world have existed at least since the early 20th Century, a significant part may be linked to the hawk and dove battles of the Vietnam War era. Without rehashing here, many of the critics of the academy are in positions of power in public life and in many cases they view humanities scholarship as centered in leftist politics. (Ironically, the assumption of academe as left may be more a perception than a reality. The academy, like other sectors in American life, is not monolithic and its members harbor a wide range of view -- Probably, in terms of political beliefs, the majority fall into a moderate category.) This particular "barrier" is relative dormant but could return if the culture wars heat up again.

o **Structural problems** - Within complex structures such as universities and state governments, there are turf battles, empires, and what have you. A new collaborative project may be seen as undermining (or outshining) current programs. Often barriers such as these can be avoided or at least ameliorated through careful homework.

o **Humanities institution finances** - While certainly not unique to the humanities, many of the institutions in which the humanities dwell have relatively fragile finances. By this, I mean that, in general, new funding is a key ingredient for collaboration.

**Comment** - This review and the attached state case studies suggest that there are numerous possibilities for collaboration at the state level among humanities organizations and between state government and humanities organizations. At the same time, humanities collaborations with the domains of arts, historic preservation, and folk life/heritage exist and could expand.

The case studies underscore the importance of including state government in a meaningful (and early) way when exploring possibilities for state-wide projects.

A second concern that may be drawn from the case studies is that on-going collaborations based on operating support from humanities organizations are difficult to start but even more difficult to support over the long run.

**GEORGIA - *A policy initiative targeted on a single project that stimulates cooperation among private institutions and state agencies***

- 1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - The *New Georgia Encyclopedia*, the first state-based on-line single state enterprise, is being developed by the Georgia Humanities Council in collaboration with a number of key Georgia institutions. The focus of the e-encyclopedia is not only the history and culture of Georgia but also a wide range of topics from agriculture to environment to sports. Extensive links to other resources in Georgia as well as other locations will make the e-encyclopedia a portal to Georgia.
- 2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - A need to build upon a highly successful print guide to Georgia that was developed collaboratively by the Georgia Humanities Council, University of Georgia System and University of Georgia Press in the early 1990s. The organizers believed that a successful on-going encyclopedia project would raise the visibility of humanities in Georgia while at the same time strengthening collaborations among humanities institutions within the state. The e-encyclopedia will provide students with a useful tool that will prepare them for working in other digital environments.
- 3. Key actors in policy formation** - The Georgia Humanities Council first developed partnerships with the University of Georgia and the University of Georgia Press. Importantly, the Office of the Governor began participating in planning project development in 1998. In addition, there has been extensive consultation with numerous state agencies including the state archives, Department of Education, Historic Preservation Office, State History Program. Numerous Georgia higher education institutions have been involved.
- 4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - As noted above, the initial planning for the project began in 1998 as a review of possible next steps for a highly successful, collaboratively produced Georgia Guide which the Georgia Humanities Council, University of Georgia, and University of Georgia Press had first produced in the early 1990s. The review rapidly turned to the idea of a state encyclopedia that would range far beyond history and culture. Early planning called for simultaneous production of print and electronic versions modified later to electronic-only based upon consultation with other state and local encyclopedias. The very active involvement of the Office of the Governor raised the project's visibility as well as fund-raising prospects. (At present, Governor Barnes serves as chair of the project.
- 5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - The extensive consultation and visits with other state and local encyclopedia projects (e.g., Chicago, Kentucky, Louisville, West Virginia) provided the Georgians with practical information on relevant policies as well as the challenges of production. It was through these interactions that the decision was arrived at to limit production to the electronic versions.
- 6. Implementation experience and how barriers that were overcome** - Although the first edition of the e-encyclopedia is not scheduled for release until 2003, work is well underway at the project office which is located in Athens. The Athens location is especially appropriate because so much of the specialized expertise is concentrated there (e.g., the Executive Director of Virtual Library, Customer, and Information Services at the U/GA system office, GALILEO = GA Library Learning On-line), the University of Georgia Press, and the U/GA faculty from which editors of more than half the e-encyclopedia entries have been retained.

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - Although the e-encyclopedia is not scheduled to be introduced to the public until 2003, almost \$1.5 million has been raised for the undertaking. A grant request for \$200,000 is pending at the NEH. Important support came first from Governor Zell Miller who committed \$100,000 from his discretionary fund in 1998 and more recently, Miller's successor, Ray Barnes committed another \$400,000 in state funds in 2000.

**8. Potential for sustainability** - As noted above, two governors have committed substantial funds to the project. Because the project stands on the twin assumptions of free access and continuous updates, there will be an on-going fundraising challenge. Although there are no plans to issue a print version of the encyclopedia, video, CD-ROM, etc may become a source of income.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - Last year, the National Endowment for the Humanities launched a special initiative for development of state (and in some instances local) encyclopedias -- NEH specifies that the encyclopedias may be print and electronic or electronic alone. The Georgia experience to date suggests that the active involvement of the state government (preferably the governor) may be the key ingredient to success.

## **OKLAHOMA - *An initiative to coordinate private cultural activities statewide***

**1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - The *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* is a broad collaboration of arts and humanities organizations and institutions to institute a state-wide cultural policy.

**2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - The *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* was developed out of a perceived need for increased support for and access to the arts and humanities in Oklahoma.

**3. Key actors in policy formation** - The key actor in this initiative was the Oklahoma Cultural Coalition (OCC), a membership, dues-funded organization limited to non-profit or for-profit organizations which promote or provide arts, humanities or cultural services. The Coalition held its first annual membership meeting in 1992. In 1995, the governing members of the Coalition included: six arts groups (e.g., State Arts Council of Oklahoma, Arts Council of Oklahoma City, etc.); one arts and humanities advocacy group; the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities; one museum and the Oklahoma Museums association; the Oklahoma Department of Libraries; two tourism/commerce associations; the State Department of Education, the State Regents for Higher Education, the Oklahoma Arts Institute, the Oklahoma State Education Television Authority, the Oklahoma Historical Society, and two private companies.

The general membership in 1994-1995 included more than 50 additional organizations -- these included local arts and humanities councils, local theaters and theater companies, local library systems, local philharmonic, opera and visual art societies, a local museum, two halls of fame (jazz and cowboys), and several higher education institutions.

Development of the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* was funded by the following organizations: the State Arts Council of Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities, the Kirkpatrick Foundation, the Phillips Foundation, and the dues of the members of the OCC.

**4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - The impetus for the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* originated in 1991 with the biennial "Congress on the Arts and Humanities" sponsored by the OCC. Participants in the 1991 Congress -- including cultural advocates from diverse disciplines and geographic regions within Oklahoma -- passed a resolution charging the OCC, the Oklahoma State Chamber and the Oklahoma Legislative Arts Caucus with developing a statewide action plan.

Proud of the grassroots nature of the planning process, the authors of the *Oklahoma Plan* describe it as the "first bottom up, statewide cultural plan in the nation." In the initial planning state, the state was divided into 11 'Cultural Districts' to ensure geographic representation. Some Districts utilized town meetings, and others divided into task forces addressing the following areas: awareness, education, facilities, funding and programming. According to the 1995 overview, hundreds of volunteers participated at this stage, which produced more than 200 separate recommendations.

Following the planning process, the OCC met with cultural organizations, state agencies, legislative leaders and others to engender support for the plan.

**5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - The *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* was a direct outgrowth of the newly-formed Oklahoma Cultural Coalition.



**6. Implementation experience and how barriers were overcome** - The 1995 *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* describes itself as more of an outline than an action plan for culture policy. "The Oklahoma State Cultural Plan is a beginning... This plan will serve as both a map and as a compass. As a map, it outlines the paths that must be followed to reach specific goals. As a compass, it indicates direction, rather than route, and as such, allows for the modification of initiatives to better meet changing opportunities and challenges. If this plan maps a journey, then it is a journey of many destinations. Some will be reached rather quickly, while others will require greater effort. The effects of all are anticipated to be long-term and ongoing."

The 23 initiatives identified in the plan were to be carried out by the organizations and institutions involved in the plan's development -- not by the OCC or other central agency. The OCC role was to "facilitate and coordinate the undertaking of the plan" and "serve as a clearinghouse for information relating to the plan and implementation activities."

How have the proposed initiatives fared? After initial enthusiasm for the planning process, participation in meetings called by the OCC dropped dramatically. Planners involved at the time believe that this was due primarily to the fact that the novelty of the project had worn off. When planning full schedules, busy cultural advocates would choose to go to meetings regarding their specific area of interest and involvement (e.g., meetings regarding the local symphony, arts councils, etc.) rather than the *Cultural Plan* meetings, which related to broad formulations of cultural policy.

The 23 initiatives recommended by the *Cultural Plan* span a broad range of programmatic ideas. They were in hindsight probably overly ambitious, and too general.

Another significant barrier was lack of funding. Funding for the sustained coordination of the project never really materialized. Immediately, this meant that there was not enough money to support a full-time coordinator for the project; part-time coordinators were hired, but were difficult to retain. The 1995 *Plan* stated that "resources to implement and sustain activities will come from a variety of sources. In some cases, increased coordination and cooperation will achieve sought-for goals, while in others, organizations or agencies have agreed to undertake or absorb project costs. The OCC will also seek grant funding and state support for selected initiatives."

The absence of a full-time coordinator had to hurt fund-raising efforts. It may also have been the case that the state humanities and arts councils, and other likely sources of grant money, had exhausted their already limited discretionary resources when they contributed to the initial planning phase. An interesting question arises that if the energy invested in the initial planning phase had utilized public -- not exclusively private -- resources, would funding and enthusiasm for the plan have been more readily available?

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - Some documented outcomes of the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan* include:

- Written plan to strengthen the arts and humanities in Oklahoma, and to improve access to cultural resources, resulting in 23 articulated goals informed by an intense planning process with broad, statewide participation.
- Strengthened or new relationships between cultural organizations in Oklahoma, especially between the arts and humanities sectors.

Implementation of specific proposals furthered in the Plan is not documented at this time.

**8. Potential for sustainability** - Lack of funding was a major issue for the *Oklahoma State Cultural Plan*. While money was available for the initial, specific planning stages of the *Cultural Plan*, it never materialized to sustain the *Plan* as an ongoing project. The state humanities council and arts councils, already strained by tight budgets, were probably not able to contribute on a beyond the one-time contribution, or grant, made in the initial stages.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - The grassroots, "bottom-up" planning process used to develop the *Oklahoma Plan* has interesting potential for replicability:

- Geographic distribution into "cultural districts" allowed mass participation in the project, and allowed assessment of needs, interests, and perceptions directly from local communities.
- Individual communities could feel ownership of a plan resulting from this kind of participation; with such results as increased awareness of any resulting projects, and willingness to participate in their implementation. (However, in the short run, this has not yet been shown to be the case.)
- The "town meeting" nature of the process may have helped to activate local communities, and stir renewed interest in the arts and humanities.
- Shared planning and implementation responsibilities may have created or strengthened or new networks between arts and humanities organizations, as well as foster relationships between these organization and museums, libraries, state educational and commerce commissions.

Difficulties in replicating this process in other states could include:

- Larger population and/or geographical size.
- Definition of "cultural districts" in states where ethnicity or other factors may be more significant than geography, or may not coincide with geographical boundaries.

## **OREGON - A comprehensive policy for providing state funding for cultural activities**

**1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - In 1998, an ambitious Cultural Development Plan for the State of Oregon was developed by a Joint Interim Task Force on Cultural Development composed of cultural leaders including two members of the Oregon Legislature. The task force has proposed an Oregon Cultural Trust (OCT) as a mechanism for providing new resources and increased coordination for culture activities in the state. Supporters of the plan hope that it will be enacted by the legislature during the present session.

There would be three funding mechanisms under the OCT:

1. Community Cultural Participation Funds will provide, by formula, a minimum allocation to each Oregon county and to the nine federally recognized tribes to support local and regional cultural projects and collaborations that respond to the vision and goals of the OCT. The funding mechanism is intended to stimulate and support local cultural planning and projects. The funding formula would take into account both population and geography. The task force also has proposed development of cultural coalitions as options for local fund distribution and for the creation and monitoring of local benchmarks that relate to the overall OCT benchmarks for culture.

2. Cultural Development Funds would provide competitive grants funds to address both operating and capital needs for the stabilization and preservation of cultural resources, including physical structures, financial capitalization and organizational capacity.

3. Supplemental funding to the Cultural Partner Agencies (arts commission, heritage, historical society, humanities council, and state historic preservation) to support partnerships and collaborations as well as underfunded existing programs. The OCT funding will not supplant existing funding to these agencies. A portion of these funds will require collaboration between two or more partner agencies.

Finally, the plan calls for the collection of baseline data in the first year to assess cultural participation and access.

**2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - Oregon policy makers were seeking to:

- Protect and stabilize Oregon's cultural resources, creating a solid foundation for the future;
- Expand public access to and use of Oregon's cultural resources and enhance the quality of those resources;
- Ensure that Oregon's cultural resources are strong and dynamic contributors to Oregon's communities and quality of life

**3. Key actors in policy formation** - In developing the plan, the task force worked closely with the "cultural partners agencies" (Oregon Arts Commission, State Historic Preservation Office, Oregon Heritage Commission, Oregon Historical Society, and the Oregon Council for the Humanities.) The Oregon Tourism Commission also work closely with the task force but will continue to receive all of its support directly from the state legislature whereas the five agencies will be eligible for support from the Oregon Cultural Trust once it is established by the state legislature.

**4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - The state government of Oregon has been a long-time supporter of a variety of cultural organizations and activities in the state. Perhaps a legacy of New England settlers in the 19th Century was heightened interest history and other cultural matters.

As in many other states, Oregon leaders saw the economic boom of the 1990s as an opportune time to strengthen funding mechanisms for cultural activities. Task force members believed that the OCT will increase cultural agencies' capacity to leverage public and private funds for cross-cutting programs and initiatives advancing culture in Oregon.

**5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - The already fruitful working relationships among the "cultural partner agencies" including the state humanities and arts agencies suggested that a structure like the OCT could work to the advantage of all

**6. Implementation experience and how barriers that were overcome** - Legislation to implement the far-reaching plan is pending in the Oregon legislature. A recent conversation with the CEO of a cultural partner agency indicates that the OCT plan has been reviewed by legislative committees on its three-part funding plan (e.g., cultural license plate) and reported out positively. The outlook for enactment in the present legislative session is seen as very good.

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - n/a

**8. Potential for sustainability** - The OCT plan has excellent prospects for sustainability -- The plan calls for new revenue sources, including:

- o A new Cultural Trust Fund with a 10-year goal of \$218 million to be developed as a "fundamentally public initiative." The two primary revenue sources are the establishment of tax credits for corporations and individuals and the conversion of existing state assets to the trust fund. A special "culture" license plate will be designed and offered -- the value being both a revenue source and a "flag" for culture.

The existing public funding sources for the cultural partner agencies (Oregon General Funds and Lottery Funds) will remain in place. In addition, the Trust Fund will seek grants funding from outside Oregon, particularly from major philanthropic sources to address far-reaching cultural development initiatives.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - The Oregon plan has broad applicability for other states -- A central feature, the funding streams would probably impede close use of the model in many states.

**Comment** - While the Oregon Cultural Trust proves a model that seems to address many of the problems encountered in funding cultural activities, it may also narrow the options for funding offbeat but potentially valuable projects.

**PENNSYLVANIA** - Bipartisan support for policies promoting culture has existed in Pennsylvania for many years. There is no comprehensive cultural policy but rather a number of policies within the state government and among private cultural institutions. ***The collaboration between the Pennsylvania Humanities Council, a private 501(c)(3) organization and the Pennsylvania Arts Council, a state agency is a case in point -***

**1. Brief summary of policy and its significance** - After more than half a decade of planning, the Pennsylvania Humanities Council (PHC) formed a partnership with the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts (PCA) significantly expands cultural programming while achieving important goals for both councils. Since a PCA planning grant was awarded to PHC in 1999, more than \$550,000 of state funds have been awarded to PHC. The infusion of funds permits PHC to significantly expand its *Commonwealth Speakers* bureau, where requests for presentations expanded from 355 in 1994-1995 to 805 in 2000-01. Funds also permit a doubling of PHC grants with an additional six grants set aside for arts criticism.

**2. Stimulus, need, catalyst for the policy** - State leaders and citizens wanted to increase arts education, encourage groups involved in arts programming, build education into the program core rather than as an add-on, diversify arts education programs to include art history and criticism, promote public access to scholars and their work, and foster collaborations between community groups and colleges and universities.

For the humanities council, the partnership significantly expands the audience base by reaching new organizations and audience, younger audiences, and broadens service to minorities and immigrants. For PHC, the partnership assists with many strategic goals including: increasing the range of disciplines covered, promotes relationships with arts scholars and arts organizations, increases public service to libraries, historic organizations and others interested illuminating art in history, and, of course, securing a source of on-going state funding. Finally, the partnership helps to expand the PHC role in advocating for culture in the state.

The partnership allows the arts council to serve new audiences and organizations (e.g., senior centers and public libraries), enhances and extends PCA support for arts education, increases PCA's ability to reach under-served areas such as rural counties and inner-city neighborhoods, assists PCA in identifying talented individuals in the arts, and finally, strengthens advocacy for arts and culture.

**3. Key actors in policy formation** - The Pennsylvania Council for the Arts and the Pennsylvania Humanities Council were the key actors. Federal policies of the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities passively pressed both PCA and PHC toward the collaboration: The arts council was operating under a steady stream of Congressional directive to reach the under-served populations of the state, specifically rural and inner-city, both of which were being reached by PHC programs. For both councils, 1995 was a critical year in which Congress played out a chapter of the Culture Wars by drastically reducing the budgets of the NEA and NEH. For state humanities councils, as 501(c)(3)s rather than state agencies, the need to develop new sources of support came into sharp focus.

**4. Supporting factors and climate, including history** - As noted above, 1995 was definitely a year that many cultural organizations began to reassess funding sources and program with a vengeance. That was the year the PCA began to see PHC as an ally in advocacy for government support of arts and against censorship; PHC identified PCA as a potential partner for developing new programs with state funds

From 1996 to 1998, both councils made significant changes in grant-making policies and procedures and began discussions with each other on collaborative possibilities. By 1999, program staff of PHC and PCA were meeting regularly and PCA made a \$10,000 planning grant for public meetings around the state, 1999 was also the year that PCA achieved a \$2 million increase in state funding. In 2000 and 2001, PCA grants of over \$500,000 have been awarded to PHC.

**5. Related and complementary policies and efforts** - For the PHC, the partnership expands and broadens existing programs. The PHC has numerous other partnerships such as its *Technology and Community* program, initially funded with NEH funds, now supported by a \$400,000 in grants from the Howard Heinz Endowment. Another is the *Raising Our Sites: Community Histories of Pennsylvania* which is designed to help 12 history museums and historic sites reinterpret programs and attract new audiences. Regionally, PHC partnered with the other 4 state humanities councils in the Mid Atlantic Region to collaborate with whichever university-led consortium is awarded the NEH Regional Humanities Center for the Mid-Atlantic (which avoids having the state humanities councils left behind due to backing the wrong RHC applicant).

**6. Implementation experience and how barriers that were overcome** - Clearly, one of the advantages of the long gestation period for the PCA/PHC partnership is that barriers were identified and addressed before the partnership was implemented. New barriers are more likely to be encountered as the two councils move to change programs and/or address other audiences.

**7. Documented effects and outcomes** - As noted above, the *Commonwealth Speakers* program has jumped from 355 requests for presentations in 1994-95 to 805 in 2000-01. Evaluations of related programs have been favorable. For example, Dale Jones of the Institute for Learning Innovation wrote in his evaluation of the *Raising Our Sites* program: "In my twenty years of working in history museums I have never seen such an impressive interpretive change in so many sites." (The program focuses on telling the stories of individuals and groups -- such as women, laborers, servants, and ethnic groups not usually included in Pennsylvania histories. Jon Darling, of the University of Pittsburgh, led discussion in a working class audience (more than half had not received college degrees) of the impact of new technology in Johnstown. Darling commented "It was the best sustained community education program that I have been associated with in my 30 years of teaching in and around institutions of higher education. I will treasure it for years to come."

**8. Potential for sustainability, and** - The potential for sustainability is excellent. The PHC is a well managed organization accustomed to conducting projects, evaluating applications and awarding grants, carrying out initiatives that are well received and well evaluated. Likewise, as the PCA pushes out the boundaries of its cultural turf -- and receives growing appropriations, the partnership with the PHC is likely to grow in importance.

**9. Potential for replicability and what can be learned from the example** - The potential for replicability is very good depending on the strengths and affinities of the major actors in the key institutions, barriers and other issues in other states. The major lesson to be learned is to more deliberately but to take the time to work out problems in advance.