

Programming for Someone— Professional Outreach

Arts councils, in looking at community needs, are filling council-initiated programming roles as well as service and advocacy roles. In doing so, the considerations about the arts and the life of the community beg all of the questions concerning accessibility — and quality. Can there be both?

In no conversation I have had with an arts council leader has there been a mention of a role model or sense of history in this outreach work. It has always seemed that the community schools of the arts, most of which have evolved from a commitment to music, were a natural link. Perhaps it is taken for granted, but there appear to be only tangential relationships. Today, the membership of their service organization — the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts — includes more than 60 non-degree-granting schools teaching music, dance, drama, and the visual arts. Most developed originally as neighborhood settlements with a priority in music.

While their role today has changed, many of these institutions still exist to ameliorate the conditions of the urban slums. The Third Street Music School Settlement in New York City, founded in 1898, is a good example, as is Washington, D.C.'s Community School of Music. In offering alternative arts programs that are especially tailored to their clientele, the community schools of the arts . . . are attempting to respond to the real needs of the people they serve. In most cases their faculty are professionals in their field, and scholarship programs ensure that no student is denied instruction due to financial need.

The well-known story of Benny Goodman's fifty-cent lessons at Chicago's Hull House, an institution that helped children from poor families, is being replicated today by young, talented students all across the United States.¹

A look at the general directions of these institutions would answer the question of why they have not related to the arts council movement. The expansion of their programs to include more than music (i.e., visual arts or links with some other kinds of institutions, such as museums), is a more recent development.

There are all sorts of issues in outreach work: what kinds of artists, training, and goals? Some of these answers have been deliberated best by other organizations, such as Affiliate Artists, Inc. or Hospital Audiences, Inc. (HAI), where there are specific community residencies, training programs, and arts services for communities. The emphasis is different in the two organizations. HAI has been an arts service for

people in a variety of human settings, including hospitals, prisons, substance abuse treatment programs, nursing homes, psychiatric facilities, developmental centers and other rehabilitative agencies. . . . HAI responds to the arts as a basic human need. Although the arts are not presented as a therapy, involvement in the arts can be a highly therapeutic process. HAI's services are guided by aesthetic judgments as to what will best engage the minds and spirits of its clients.²

In some cities, as in Durham, North Carolina, the arts council has been the local coordinator. There ACCESS (formerly HAI-Durham) has been a project of the Durham Arts Council and has provided information tools—an artist registry enabling the institutions to program arts directly.

Affiliate Artists, Inc. is the national nonprofit organization that promotes the career development of performing artists and fosters new audiences and sources of support for the arts in communities across the country. Of the major programs of Affiliate Artists, some might include the assistance of a local group such as an arts council. One has been the residency program, where a young performing artist, such as a dancer, singer, instrumentalist, or mime, would reside in a community for six weeks during a year.

While in residence an Affiliate Artist makes 80–100 appearances in a variety of informal settings—schools, churches, factories—wherever people naturally gather—giving “informances,” an informal way of performing that allows the artist and his audience to know each other.³

Other types of residencies have included a one-week residency, which comprises a concentrated week of community appearances and a formal con-

cert or recital, and the CART program — reaching the smaller communities, initially in the Southeastern United States, where community leaders have been trained in the skills of artist residency management. Arts council professionals made up 42 percent of the CART trainees in one year.

Since 1966, Affiliate Artists has placed over 225 artists in well over 500 residencies in almost all states, and has also raised over \$9 million in corporate, private, and government funds for the arts to reach over 8 million people.

Arts councils then have interacted with programs such as these in many communities and have sponsored many of their own programs, usually using local artists (the Affiliate Artists' artists are not local) to support the idea of the professional artist in new challenges and in every nook and cranny of the community.

Many arts councils themselves are programming for neighborhood arts, senior arts, arts for the handicapped, and public arts, with artists-in-residence in special programs full-time; but few are giving first and full priority to these efforts. In Cortland County, New York, the Arts Council's outreach efforts are diversified among other sponsoring and programming services, although outreach is a major emphasis.

The Walnut Creek (California) Civic Arts Department sponsors more than 80 classes each week in a system of six attractive prefabricated portable modules (approximately 10,000 square feet), and at one moment enrollment averaged 1,200 students a week.⁴ Another arts council's outreach work has been described in a magazine article by Alice Fuld:

The Grand Monadnock (New Hampshire) Arts Council's *Arts for Special Audiences* provides workshops and performances for handicapped, disadvantaged, and institutionalized people in Cheshire County. Usually, the artists go to the people they are serving. . . . [A] magician has performed in a nursing home, [a] sculptor . . . conducted a clay workshop in the county jail, clowns from the Phoenix Nest Company entertained at an institution for retarded children, and the Lincoln Elementary School recorder ensemble gave a luncheon concert at the Keene Senior Citizens Center.

Begun in January 1979, with a special program grant from the United Way, *Arts for Special Audiences* has presented more than 100 events in its first ten months. Twenty-two area human service programs and more than 30 artists are now involved in the flourishing program.

The project grew naturally out of the work of the Grand Monadnock Arts Council. Its [former] Executive Director, Sara Germain, described the regional organization as a "social service agency for the arts. We exist to bring the enjoyment and education of arts experiences to all the people who live here."⁵

For most programming councils, there are the issues over how to include the leisure-time artist, the "Sunday painter," and the "nonprofession-

als." Most include opportunities for those who enjoy participating in an art form to do so. Questions come about as to what happens to the art that is produced. If it is clearly a self-development program, the product is most important in relationship to the development of the person's individual skills. Exhibiting such work and casting judgments upon it may be problematic. If there is a community-wide exhibition, it is difficult for most councils to try to exhibit professional and nonprofessional work at the same show. There are a few exceptions, but in many such situations, the professional artists will not participate. Many of the smallest communities have few professional artists. Most councils settle this kind of dilemma by clarifying exhibit rules, criteria, and regulations, and by alternating exhibition spaces or having two spaces. As one of many council directors explained, "Mixing the two categories is not possible; while the first responsibility would be to the professional artists, the avocational artists want some exhibition opportunities." It is through bringing in professionals and working for continuing quality that the point is self-explanatory. Not enough, perhaps, to satisfy some.

In St. Paul, COMPAS was formed by the St. Paul-Ramsey Arts and Science Council to meet community demand for arts opportunities for all citizens. The funds for COMPAS come from a variety of public and private sources.⁶ As the community arts programming agency, it conducts a wide variety of arts programs. The activities all have several hallmarks: They are participatory in all arts disciplines, decentralized to reach people where they are, responsive to community interests and issues, flexible in adjusting to changing needs of artists and neighborhoods, and creative in program design. Typical cosponsors and programs sites include neighborhood district councils; businesses; ethnic and folk culture centers; churches; historical societies; unions; housing agencies; economic development councils; institutional homes and day centers; and the St. Paul parks, libraries, and schools, as well as the Police, Fire, Probation, Port Authority, and Community Education Departments. In a given week, one could find professional artists performing at a day care center for gifted children one day and for disabled children the next; a dancer teaching at a community center in the morning and a playground in the afternoon; a weaver teaching in a high-rise apartment complex for the elderly; a poet tutoring gifted children in her home; and a muralist painting a retail shop wall.

COMPAS concentrates on providing opportunities for first-hand daily experiences in the arts. COMPAS works with every kind of agency and person and has developed some creative and innovative programming, not the least of which is a program called Intersection, involving four of the 17 neighborhoods in an attempt to look at the neighborhoods and see how the arts can be a part of them. The people within determine

the style and direction. The Neighborhood Arts program, involving workshops, performance, and murals, is the only one that receives city funds and is run in cooperation with the Parks and Recreation Department year round.

The COMPAS model may be something that other councils should look at, since it is the *business* of COMPAS to do outreach programming. Getting across the idea that there are training, methodology, and philosophy behind real outreach programming is an idea that still badly needs to be developed. COMPAS starts with the needs of the people (or the community involved decides those needs), finds the professional artist or group that can help, and trains the professional to work in that particular situation on a full-time, ongoing basis (budget about \$650,000). Time is needed for training and for the creation of real trust and continuity. This is a very important concept.

The Cambridge (Massachusetts) Arts Council moved into programming in a community where the cultural riches (as they relate to the great universities) are often retained in highly pocketed settings, so that those resources might be more broadly distributed. Encouraging the loan of art exhibits and student performances to public locales such as housing projects and community centers, the Council has caused them to be shared in this "dense, ethnic, and predominantly blue-collar city." A second priority was a concern for the "city as a broad canvas for arts intervention"; other programs have included a law mandating 1 percent for public art in public construction and the utilization of CETA funds to commission unemployed musicians, painters, dancers—artists of all types—to implement their work in neighborhood settings in collaboration with community groups. The leadership has said, "We have used the arts to address major urban problems of neighborhood identity, visual blight, institutional indifference, ethnic separatism."⁷ Perhaps best known for innovative competitions juried by professional artists (used to raise the quality of the environment in spaces such as city parks and unkempt open spaces, and to elevate the level of graphic design on such things as municipal vans and rubbish trucks), the Council has tried to develop programs that capitalize on the wealth of talent that the resident artists represent.

To direct all resources toward a goal of combining the elements thus described, as well as the ethnic traditions represented by the Portuguese, Italian, French-Canadian, Spanish, West Indian, Caribbean, and Afro-American inhabitants, the Council designed a festival of one week's duration.

Never before had fifteen neighborhoods worked towards a common goal—celebrating their shared environment and enhancing it. After a week of arts events, which included the drum combo on the roof of a subway station while Cambridge poets flashed their work on the electric sign band below,

and the dedication of a piece of kinetic sculpture by an internationally known sculptor and Cambridge resident in the heart of the city's most garish commercial district, Central Square, the festival culminated in a day of neighborhood festivals followed by processions to the river bank. Here Cambridge residents viewed a river filled with floats built by the city's many architectural firms and enjoyed an afternoon of parades and entertainment donated by area artists.⁸

According to the former Director of the Cambridge Council,

We have used the arts to address the overriding issue of how it feels to live in a city and how it can feel better, by involving the community at large in the process of addressing these issues.

During the festival week, every conceivable art form is showcased, and no pocket of the city is left untouched. Leaving behind the traditional boundaries of theater, concert hall, and gallery, artists perform on street corners, on rooftops, in hotel lobbies, and in storefront windows. Every hospital, housing project, elderly and community center is involved. Artists have worked with residents for months planning and creating each neighborhood's festival participation. . . . Neighborhood groups collaborate with artists in the creation of permanent works of art, and celebrations are scheduled to dedicate them.⁹

The description of the Cambridge River Festival and the work of the Council of that city leaves one a sense of their purpose: "to broaden the relationship between the arts and the city's neighborhood by encouraging individual participation in the creative process itself and thereby increase awareness of the arts from the inside out."¹⁰

Yet another program of the Cambridge Arts Council called Arts on the Line—a program to incorporate the decorative and fine arts into the Metropolitan Boston Transit Authority's Red Line Northwest Extension—has involved the imagination and energies of designers and representatives of the Cambridge and Somerville communities, art consultants, architects, artists, and transportation planners, who have tackled the many issues to be faced in creating functional and exhilarating public places.¹¹ Funded with .5 percent of the construction budgets of the four stations committed by the Transit Authority, the process involved four selection panels and advisory committees of professional artists and museum personnel, as well as persons from Community Development, historical commissions, business, and the arts. Gyorgy Kepes, one of the 20 artists commissioned for work at the Harvard Square Station, has created "color-light space," produced by transparent colored glass, in which the waiting passenger becomes "actively engaged in the visual dynamics of motion and passage which underlie a transit situation." He has said, "Art in the subway will give you a quality of promise."

In the Cambridge story, such innovation ultimately revolves around

the commitment and quality of personal involvement by the participants, plus the history of a sympathetic transit system, which was incorporating art into facilities even before the appearance of the 1977 Department of Transportation report encouraging exactly that.¹²

In creating for the subway system, the artist must have a large scope in mind, not discrete precious objects. He must consider spaces, traffic patterns, durability, and the differences in the opportunities presented by the quiet spaces and noisy places. And the audience spans all age levels: "Perhaps the only common denominator is that everyone is there because they want to be somewhere else and no one is there to see art."¹³

In Seattle in 1977, as Peter Larsen has written,

I knew the moment I heard the phrase that it surely described our organization's work: Neighborhood Arts! The National Endowment for the Arts, through its Expansion Arts program, was looking for cities to participate in a new pilot project, CityArts. Grand! Just step in there, show these folks what fine work we've been doing and make our bid for the pie. . . .

But listen a moment . . . here is a dancer saying she gives solo performances in neighborhoods, an actor speaking of the need for rehearsal space, others talking and nodding. In fact, nearly everyone in this meeting room seems to think they're doing neighborhood arts too. . . .

Motivated first by self-interest and later seduced by the logic and evolving rationale of our work, the Neighborhood Arts Task Force, an ad hoc citizens' advisory committee, began holding regular, open meetings in the autumn of 1977 to design a new arts program around the hoped-for National Endowment for the Arts grant. Three months of effort generated a document outlining a philosophy and an accompanying program we felt to be equitable and responsive.

We wrote not of new arts forms, but of reaching new audiences. We wrote not of making every citizen an artist, but of fostering a larger awareness of the arts. We wrote of outreach and participation as vehicles to understanding. We wrote of gleaning private contributions to favor the health of the arts. We wrote of "process" and "involvement" as measures to be weighed as we weigh "taste" and "quality."

We wrote of a format for this program which would be democratic, flexible, and evolving. We asked that an advisory panel of artists and citizens be appointed to guide the program and that regular open meetings be initiated to review progress and share ideas.

Some of our ideas seemed radical to the arts establishment of 1977. Our intention was not to subvert, but rather to provide new opportunities for cultural activity.

Looking now from the perspective of three years of participation in the program, I am at once satisfied and hopeful. Satisfied that the Endowment's purpose has been matched with local integrity to produce a meaningful program. Hopeful too, that as the most responsive program of the Seattle Arts Commis-

sion, Neighborhood Arts will not calcify into any static form but will continue to evolve to serve changing cultural needs.¹⁴

It is in the outreach areas of activity, however, that both Expansion Arts (CityArts) monies and CETA monies have served to extend arts council activities. Because the Expansion Arts monies were intended to stimulate local support of these types of programs, the arts agencies or councils in cities such as Knoxville; Boston; Baltimore; Chicago; Charlotte/Mecklenberg County, North Carolina; Los Angeles; Detroit; Minneapolis; Atlanta; Buffalo; Dallas; Miami; San Antonio; Seattle; and Madison, Wisconsin, agreed to a three-year effort to that end, to be evaluated at that time for its potential to continue — up to \$50,000 per city per year from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Frank Hodson, Chairman of the Endowment, has reported:

In reviewing the history of the CityArts program, it seems to me it provides a particularly effective way to respond to three, basically local, issues: (1) Effective federal assistance of emerging community arts organizations; (2) Leveraging of additional public and private money for such organizations; and (3) Provision of technical assistance to help such organizations develop managerially as well as artistically. The evaluation of the CityArts program concludes that the program has helped achieve new levels of professionalism in emerging community groups; assisted with planning, training, and management; improved the climate for the arts by strengthening the funding and access role of local arts agencies with municipal governments; offered new arts opportunities to vast audiences usually denied such access; stimulated new levels of private support and volunteerism in the arts through service on advisory panels and boards of directors of community arts organizations; served as a model for new methods of distributing arts funds within a city; and provided a new cadre of professionals — neighborhood arts managers.

The results in some cities have been impressive. Taking three of the CityArts cities (Dallas, Atlanta, San Antonio), the city agencies (two public, one private) had a collective budget of \$2.6 million. The [Endowment's] CityArt[s] grant to the three agencies totaled \$167,500. In 1982, those same budgets aggregated nearly \$3.4 million, a 31 percent increase.

In 1978, the number of emerging arts groups supported by these agencies totalled about 60. Today, that number is closer to 100.¹⁵

In Chicago's CityArts program's first year, 65 organizations received grants ranging from \$500 to \$3,500 to conduct workshops, exhibits, performances, and publications. The more than 600 events directly served over 80,000 Chicagoans in 1979 alone. In 1980, 58 groups received funding for projects. These agencies supervise a process here; they do not do the programming. The primary purpose of these support programs has been to

help the smaller neighborhood groups—the centers and the performing and exhibiting groups that are professionally managed (generally with budgets under \$100,000). It has not been to start new groups, although over the years, many new ones have emerged. The criteria for support usually specify a length of time for which the groups have had to exist to establish a track record of reliability, good management, and artistic quality that can be evaluated.

Since the whole idea evolved to help start a local process, it will be important to evaluate for the future how well the concept of local support for these smaller groups really takes hold. How many of the cities in the pilot program have absorbed and will absorb the programs into their own budgets after the three-year period? Are the reasons for doing so compatible with the intent? What are the expectations of the arts groups? How well are they able to articulate their concerns in a focused way? Buffalo and San Antonio are among cities that have committed themselves to continuing their CityArts programs in 1982, after the Endowment grants have expired.

The use of CETA funding for artists and organizations has been among the most active debates of the 1970s. Arts organizations as old and traditional as the Wadsworth Athenaeum and as new as the arts councils all over the United States hired CETA-paid workers to work in the community. The programming arm of arts councils was boosted many times over in some cases. Some innovative and level-headed programs were initiated; some situations generated administrative disaster as private agencies could not deal with new public administrative requirements and details, and arts organizations came “out of a hat” only to find later that ongoing operational support required planning of a different sort.

In New Orleans, in cooperation with the Area Agency on Aging, the Arts Council placed several poets in senior citizens centers and homes for the elderly, developing what became the base for a subsequent, larger-scale CETA-funded artists' program. . . .

The major problem with the CETA program was its overwhelming administrative detail. The Arts Council was able to employ an administrator and secretary to handle it, but the Board was frustrated because it ended up costing the Arts Council additional funds beyond those reimbursed by the CETA program. The Arts Council staff was still struggling through some of the paperwork six months after the program ended. Problems or not, it did permit the Arts Council to extend the life of its highly successful senior citizens program.¹⁶

Other problems surfaced much earlier, because CETA funds were earmarked for salaries and employee benefits and could not be used for ma-

terials and supplies. The monies for production had to be sought elsewhere. Many directors of theater arts projects have mentioned the fact that they have had to "beg, borrow, or steal costumes, sets, and props."

It was only when the arts councils that did develop CETA programming understood their role and limitations that they could stay on top of it. In Buffalo, for instance, the Arts Development Services introduced a program of Arts Resources in the Community. Instructional kits in many art forms, developed by CETA artists, were disseminated with accompanying workshops.

It has been felt by some that those using CETA funds were not in a sense opportunists; "we used dollars to get personnel instead of getting leadership, and the good people will be found anyway." Too often, artists were used who should not have been put into 40-hour weeks and under authoritarian situations, and who were indignant about this. Some agencies found that it wasn't so difficult finding artists for the earlier project-oriented CETA programs, but that the later regulations made it difficult to find qualified people, and the training requirements were difficult.

In 1978, when the 95th Congress approved legislation to extend CETA for four years (through fiscal year 1982), it drew in the focus and limited program participants to those who are unemployed, underemployed or in school, *and* economically disadvantaged. Under the earlier provisions of the act, most participants could be either unemployed or disadvantaged. The 1978 amendments also emphasized jobs and training for welfare recipients.¹⁷

For many city arts commissions, large CETA programs became the rule of the day in the years between 1974 and 1979. In Chicago, by 1980, over \$1.5 million of a \$2.5 million-plus budget was CETA-funded. An artist-in-residence public service program employed 108 artists for 1,137 performances and special events, 1,531 workshops and residencies, and 260 projects that reached people in child care centers, schools, senior citizen centers, handicapped centers, and the neighborhoods.

Between 1975 and 1980 in Seattle, artists were asked to propose projects that could be funded under CETA. From several hundred applicants, the Seattle Arts Commission chose about 50 to work on short-term five-month projects. They were paid \$476 a month for a 26-hour work week. Seattle also used CETA monies to subsidize dancers working for the city Parks and Recreation Department and to support the Seattle Symphony Orchestra.¹⁸

Speaking from first-hand knowledge about the Artist-in-the-City program, a photographer who documented as part of his project every art-

ist in the CETA program for more than a year wrote at the end of his tenure:

Take fifty federally funded CETA positions. Fill them each year with artists who have designed projects to be carried out for the benefit of the city and its citizens. Administer the program with a maximum of flexibility, allowing the artists the independence they need to achieve their ends. That's the Artist-in-the-City program, and it seems almost too good to be true. But it is true, and it's been working since 1975.¹⁹

The program has been phased out.²⁰

The Department of Cultural Affairs in Atlanta was organized in 1975 with funding provided through the Atlanta CETA. As with other programs, individual artists were given employment with the city's arts organizations. In 1978 alone, the Department administered 150 CETA arts positions. The placement record of Atlanta's CETA arts participants in permanent employment (the whole point of the training role) has been over 80 percent — above the national CETA averages.

The Council for the Arts in Westchester County, New York, came up with a creative way to recoup some of the personnel losses from CETA in a way new to the arts. By working through the On-the-Job Training Program, sponsored by the local chambers of commerce, and the Private Industry Councils, which deal with permanent jobs only, half the salary costs for the training period were picked up; after this period, the new employer had to absorb the full costs.

In general, though, if the agency is a city agency, there is no problem with the philosophies of the CETA program, which fits right in with other unemployment programs. If the council is a private council, there are some basic dilemmas. Too many artists did not become placed in jobs related to their arts careers after the CETA programs. Too many programs left organizations dependent on the positions filled by CETA workers, struggling to adjust budgets to support these positions once CETA monies were withdrawn. There has been too much uncertainty. And, if everyone is totally honest, too many artists, whose main qualification was unemployment and who did not have professional experience before, still find themselves unemployed after.

Arts councils took on these programs because they filled two needs: (1) they created employment for artists, and (2) they made the arts accessible to everyone — those constituents who had been no one else's priority. But they were high-risk programs and did not solve the long-range problems.

The San Francisco Art Commission has had, over the years, exciting neighborhood arts programming concepts. The Neighborhood Arts program came into existence in 1967, in the period of "a spectacular revival

that thrived outside the mainstream of the established institutions.”²¹ It has been recognized for forging new innovative methods. Over the years it has moved from functioning as a festival coordinator, to providing technical support service, and finally into offering greater assistance for individual artists and emergent groups, through program development for each of the neighborhoods and citywide community arts planning.

If ever there was programming that, at its height, pervaded every nook and cranny of a city, this was it. Operating funds for this program, the largest of the commission’s programs, came from the commission, the Hotel Tax Publicity and Advertising Fund, the Zellerbach Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr., Fund, and the National Endowment for the Arts. The program’s four main categories of activities have been these: cultural centers; public service arts (workshops, performances, and other services by professional artists); arts support services (use of studio, workshop, rehearsal, and performance space – stage, sound and light equipment with accompanying operating staff, publicity, and the Scrounger’s Center for Reusable Arts Parts Recycling Center used by artists and arts groups); and special programs (music and dance concerts, plays, play and poetry readings, lectures, seminars, and demonstrations, and participatory events for children, seniors, and the disabled, regularly scheduled in each of the cultural centers and other community facilities). Arts exhibits, thematic festivals, and ethnic celebrations on a neighborhood and citywide basis have been held throughout the year.

Also in San Francisco, there is a unique support system developing for neighborhood arts. The need for it came about when, in the mid-1970s, revenue-sharing monies (\$5 million) went into the construction of the new symphony hall, and half that amount again was given to purchase neighborhood cultural facilities. As too often happens, no monies were set aside for ongoing administration or maintenance; the support for the neighborhood programs was to come from “neighborhood leadership.” Thus, at each of the four centers purchased and renovated by the city, there is now a “Friends of” group that has committed itself to supporting the programming at these facilities. A consortium of the Friends groups is developing to solidify their common efforts and goals further. There is hope that these groups can seek private monies that would not be given to a city commission. The “Friends” are people related to the individual communities.

The leveling problems a Proposition 13 can have on a small agency in city government, the elimination of CETA, and the fact that San Francisco public monies are only a portion of the operating and administrative costs have all had their impact.

In San Francisco, municipal support of the arts is a long-standing tradition. . . . A rather broad, inclusive definition [is] given to the arts. Due to the

structure of San Francisco city government, no one authority has administrative control over all arts institutions or arts-related activities. Many noncity agencies receiving municipal dollars operate on varying fiscal years.²²

The funding for the arts in San Francisco is very complex, and sources of funds for arts are diversified. Thus, long-range planning, given all of these complications, is very difficult to focus on.

In December 1970, the scope of projects was somewhat limited. Programming expanded with the tremendous CETA influx (San Francisco was one of the very first cities to adapt CETA for artists) and the taking on of the commission-built centers. In 1980, the core office staff was almost entirely made up of CETA employees. The total group of CETA workers was once 140. Today the program is tighter and the budget and staff are smaller.

The concept of outreach, then, has become extended to neighborhoods, to passers-by, and to every part of the community — anyone who might conceivably come into contact with the arts. The value of these outreach programs has been debated ad nauseum. Too often they have come and gone with government monies because they have represented opportunities. Only when the motivations and goals are clear, and an advocacy is developed based on understanding the artistic values, will there be support of an ongoing nature, putting these programs in more than the category of “democratic thought and social action.” There has been too little leadership really able to do more than articulate in uneasy tones the questions of the injustices and inequalities.

NOTES

1. Charles B. Fowler, “On Education,” *High Fidelity/Musical America*, July 1977.
2. Hospital Audiences, Inc., *HAI News*, Fall 1979, p. 4.
3. Affiliate Artists, Inc., (brochure, 1981).
4. City of Walnut Creek (California) Civic Arts Department, “Civic Arts, 1979” (a background fact sheet, 1979).
5. Alice Fuld, “Arts for Special Audiences,” *Community Focus*, February 1980, pp. 14–15.
6. Community Programs in the Arts and Sciences, “Arts in the Community” (brochure, 1980).
7. Pamela Worden and Ronald Lee Fleming, “Neighborhood Value: Reinvestment by Design,” *Public Management*, August 1977, pp. 14–17.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.
9. Pamela Worden, “The Arts: A New Urban Experience,” *Challenge*, February 1980, pp. 17–21.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Cambridge Art Council, “Arts on the Line/Art for Public Transit Spaces” (brochure, 1980).
12. “Design, Art and Architecture in Transportation,” (Report to the Secretary of

Transportation (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, September 1977).

13. Cambridge Arts Council, "Arts on the Line/Art for Public Transit Spaces," introduction by Hugh Davies.

14. Peter Larsen, "Neighborhood Arts" (Seattle Arts Commission material, 1977).

15. Frank Hodsoll (address given at CityArts Conference, Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 9, 1982).

16. Robert Mayer, "The Local Arts Council Movement" (background paper for the National Endowment for the Arts National Partnership Meeting, June 23–25, 1980), p. 35.

17. National Urban Coalition, *Understanding CETA* (Washington, D.C.: Author, p. 4).

18. Stephen Brown, "The Public Artist Returns," reprinted in U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *The Partnership of CETA and the Arts* (Washington, D.C.: National Policy Institute, 1978), p. 7.

19. Charles Adler, "F-Stops with Artists," *Seattle Arts*, September 1980, p. 1.

20. Karen Gates, *Seattle Arts*, May 1980, p. 1.

21. San Francisco Arts Council (brochure), p. 26.

22. Luisa Kreisberg, *Local Government and the Arts* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1979), p. 143.