A Working Guide to the Landscape of Arts for Change

A collection of writings depicting the wide range of ways the arts make community, civic, and social change.

In San Jose, CA, MACLA (Movimiento de Arte y Cultura Latino) engages local traditional artists to encourage grass roots participation in National Night Out.
Movimiento Cosmico Aztec dance group performing at National Night Out, 2009

Building Worlds Together: The Many Functions and Forms of Arts and Community Development

By Lyz Crane

In this paper, Lyz Crane draws on the work of practitioners and researchers to characterize the field of arts-based community development in which arts and culture can help achieve place-based change related to the physical, social, and economic dimensions of place. From the premise that the existence of arts is considered a powerful end in itself, she then outlines the variety of ways that the actors and activities involved in arts and community development work can relate to and interact with each other to create sustainable communities. Looking at the cultural ecology of place, creative economy development focuses on fostering local creative businesses and supporting creative workers both in the arts and in supporting industries while cultural development may focus on preserving cultural assets—traditions, language, stories—or on building on them to create stronger, more connected communities. There is also a complex community development ecosystem of organizations, interests, and tools. Stakeholders may involve arts in their agendas, create arts programming, provide or develop arts spaces, employ artists, and/or partner with arts organizations. Indeed, both the arts and community development are part of the same ecosystem and all of these interactions fall into the category of arts and community development.

Different types of intersections are placed on a passive-active continuum of presence, participation, and application. Prominent nodes of intersection between the arts and community development are identified: animating public spaces; activating public spaces; serving as an anchor or focal point; and serving as a planning engagement tool. In terms of outcomes, there may not be much difference between an arts organization with a community-based program and a community organization with an arts-based program. Oftentimes, the choice of language has to do with their founders or how they are being funded. The difference in effectiveness between these two methods and even a third that is an equal arts organization–community organization partnership is only recently beginning to be explored.

A Working Guide to the Landscape of Arts for Change is supported by the Surdna Foundation as part of the Arts & Social Change Mapping Initiative supported by the Nathan Cummings Foundation, Open Society Foundations, CrossCurrents Foundation, Lambent Foundation, and Surdna Foundation.

Animating Democracy
A Program of Americans for the Arts

While working at the intersection of arts and community development, I have heard just about every combination of the words *arts, culture, community,* and *development*, to the point where I wonder if there is a magnetic poetry set available. To list a few: culture-based development/revitalization, cultural community development, community cultural development, art-based community development, artist space development, creative community building/development, cultural economic development, and the list goes on and on. These terms exist in addition to the already confusing worlds of traditional arts, community arts, community-based arts, cultural democracy, creative economies, and more.

In parsing the subtle definitions of each term, the main distinguishing factor between phrases is whether arts and culture are means or ends—that is, are community developers using the arts or are they creating the arts? The truth is that both occur regularly and both are community development. The arts have come a long way from being regarded as mainly a public good, and community development has come a long way from focusing primarily on housing and jobs. Both can be seen as ecosystems in their own right, and at the same time, both are a part of the same larger ecosystem and interact, overlap, and ultimately strengthen each other's agendas and outcomes.

This fit is natural. The most common element I see in people working in community development and in the arts is that they are, to borrow a term from the literary world of fantasy fiction, "world-builders." However, unlike in a fantasy novel, these actors are engaged in a process of enhancing their real-life environments to create new and better places.

In 2002, the Center for the Study of Art and Community (CSAC) published a "map" of The Ecology of Arts-Based Community Development.[1] Since then, the field has continued to flourish with new nomenclature, analysis techniques, and tools. This paper draws on both the CSAC work and the work of countless other researchers and practitioners to help deconstruct this ecosystem as it stands now and to present its basic elements with examples of how arts, culture, and community development interests can build worlds together.

ELEMENT OF WORLD-BUILDING

Geography

Partners for Livable Communities has an important mantra that will always stick with me: Community = People + Place. Community development does not have a single definition, but it is usually primarily *place-based change*. The concept of *place* is what distinguishes

this niche from other social justice agendas, which sometimes are place based but tend to be more focused on *people*. In this model of community development, outcomes are often defined not by individuals, but by an aggregate of all of the different dimensions of place: the physical setting, social capital and cohesiveness, and the local commercial economy. Arts are a means to help achieve these goals.

Cultural vitality has been described as the "Fourth Pillar" to the physical, social, and economic arenas of effective public policy for sustainable communities.[2] For world-builders, culture is what makes a place come alive. The Urban Institute has quantified cultural vitality in terms of the presence of arts, participation in the arts, and support for the arts.[3] In serving as this critical element of livability, the existence of arts is a powerful end in itself even without having to relate to a specific community agenda.

Arts and Community Ecosystems

As a result of this dual function of means and ends, the actors and activities involved in arts and community development work can relate to each other in a variety of ways. Many researchers and practitioners have begun to use the term *arts (*or *cultural* or *creative) ecology* as a valuable, all-encompassing term for these relationships.[4] This newer term allows for greater flexibility in discussing the interactions among different kinds of actors, tools, and forces in a given sector.

For example, three terms that are occasionally used interchangeably in this work are *arts*, *culture*, and *creativity*. While not actually having the same meaning, creative strategies and cultural strategies may, and often do, include the other. The words *creativity* or *creative* most often refer to an economy comprised of workers, products, and processes. *Creative* or *creative economy development* focuses on fostering local businesses that are a part of this economy, encouraging a culture of innovation, supporting creative workers both in the arts and in supporting industries, and training new labor forces to participate in this economy.[5]

The word *culture* includes the world of arts, but also includes skills and values present in all communities, including traditions, storytelling, cooking, crafting, and language.[6] *Cultural development* may focus on preserving these cultural assets or on building on them to create stronger, more connected communities.

Creativity and culture are each part of community development agendas, with the arts ecosystem playing an important role in both. There are five primary elements of the arts ecosystem that each offer distinct, yet interrelated resources and opportunities for community agendas:

- **The arts**: The performing, visual, literary, or media arts applied in any setting. The arts can be—but don't have to be—employed by arts actors and civic actors alike

to improve, educate, engage, and nurture.[7] The arts are occasionally divided up into groups such as commercial, nonprofit, and community, but in this context the distinction is not as important.

- **Arts programs or arts-based programs:** Administered by either an arts organization or a civic or private organization and involving the participation of individuals either as audience or practitioner. Arts programs generally focus on benefits derived from engagement in the arts, while arts-based programs generally use the arts as a tool toward some sort of physical, social, or economic end.
- **Arts spaces and artist spaces:** The former is any place that the arts occur or that a concentration of arts activity exists; the latter includes spaces for artists to live and/or work.[8]

In terms of arts actors, they include:

- **Artists and arts workers:** Practitioners who are involved in the creation or presentation of the arts either directly or indirectly in a variety of settings, including for public or personal benefit; who are also living and working in communities and are thus community stakeholders.
- **Arts organizations:** Tend to operate out of specific physical spaces; have organizational resources including: leaders, a board, funding, internal financial management, partnerships, communication tools, etc. As organizations, they are also community stakeholders.

The field of community development also has a complex ecosystem of organizations, interests, and tools. Indeed, both the arts and community development are part of the same ecosystem. Stakeholders—those who have a stake in the future improvement of a given community—are the prime civic actors and may include residents, nonprofit entities, civic associations, private entities, philanthropic entities, and governmental entities. There are far too many specific entities to name here, but those that most often interact with the arts on the neighborhood level include residents, small businesses, and community development corporations. On a larger level these may include: private developers, economic development entities (nonprofit, private, and governmental; local and regional), human service organizations/departments, planners, elected officials, and both corporate and foundation funders.

These stakeholders may involve arts in their agendas, create arts programming, provide or develop arts spaces, employ artists, and/or partner with arts organizations. All of these interactions fall into the category of arts and community development.

Connecting Arts and Community Ecosystems

With so many elements involved, researchers have developed many ways to describe these intersections. I have placed different types of intersections into three categories on a passive-active continuum of *presence*, *participation*, and *application*.

Conceptual Landscapes, artist talk with public at MACLA exhibit, March 2010. Documentation: Robertino Ragazza

These categories intentionally do not fit common categories such as *intrinsic* and *instrumental* benefits as offered in the RAND report, "Gifts of the Muse"; nor do they neatly correlate to economic or social impact analyses such as those produced by Americans for the Arts and the Center for Creative Community Development. These studies and others have shown that arts activity contributes jobs and revenue, enhances skills development, and builds community. Some of these benefits are on the private end of the spectrum in that they primarily affect individuals, while other are on the public end of the spectrum in that they provide some larger public or communal outputs.[9]

These characterizations are all valid ways of assessing the benefits of the arts, but not all of them are concerned with how that effect can be reproduced or developed intentionally. Community development stakeholders by nature have an interest in understanding *how* to apply arts activity to achieve greater benefits or specific community-based outcomes, which builds on understanding the benefits of what already exists.

Categorizing the intersection of arts and community development around *presence*, *participation*, and *application* draws on these other studies while providing a clearer idea of the mechanism behind the benefits.

Presence: In the presence category, the benefits of the existence of arts activity in a place can be quantified and qualified as creating jobs, generating revenue, serving as a social hub, animating space, contributing to cultural vitality, etc.[10] This might include large-scale cultural projects (whose benefits may be intended for visitors and residents alike) or small-scale cultural projects (designed to contribute to quality of life in a single community).[11] Stakeholders may become involved in the creation of arts activity because it is economically or socially profitable in terms of raising quality of life. Furthermore, the presence of arts and culture activity has been shown to have a strong impact on location decisions of both individuals and businesses.[12]

Participation: In the participation category, the benefits of being a presenter or a consumer of arts provide instrumental (measurable, external) benefits including skills development, community building, or health and wellbeing, as well as intrinsic (capacity and meaning) benefits including cognitive and emotional growth, communal meaning, and pleasure. The involvement of people in producing or consuming the arts has both individual and public

benefits.[13] Stakeholders may encourage arts education programs and arts in public places, or they may provide support to arts actors to present and share their arts with the public.

Application: Finally, the application category is where most community development activity takes place, with the arts as an asset. Animating Democracy refers to this category as "arts/culture work that is intentional in terms of a civic or social purpose."[14] The application of the arts involves the identification of a desired outcome and then design of an arts strategy or other involvement of the arts to achieve that outcome. Those strategies may seek to capitalize on and develop new assets to achieve presence and participation benefits, but may also include the design of an arts program that educates the community about public health or the creation of an artistic presentation around a local social issue to promote dialogue. In the application category, rather than focusing on the production and consumption of art, the focus is on the ways in which arts and civic stakeholders design arts programs, partner across sectors, and engage with the community to promote action toward a common vision.

In short, the presence and participation categories suggest that developing arts and arts activities as ends are valuable because of their specific social and economic benefits. In the application model, arts activity is encouraged or developed as a means to achieve any outcome that the community deems valuable.

Building Worlds Together

One might ask the question: what is the difference between an arts organization with a community-based program and a community organization with an arts-based program? In truth, as far as outcomes are concerned, there may not be much difference, and there are plenty of organizations that self-identify primarily as community or arts organizations, but that use similar techniques toward similar ends as their primary function. Oftentimes, the choice of language has to do with their founders or how they are being funded. There are also plenty of examples of arts organizations that have expertise in a particular community issue, and community organizations that occasionally or even regularly employ artists or art strategies. The difference in effectiveness between these two methods and even a third that is an equal arts organization–community organization partnership is only recently beginning to be explored.

There are challenges for all three models. In the first, arts organizations must familiarize themselves with development concepts outside the normal purview of arts training. In the second, community organizations may find themselves unable to understand or integrate the creativity and lightning-in-a-bottle unpredictability of arts programming. In the third, common problems in any partnership (power, capacity, communication) may undo what could have been an effective program.[15] In all examples, the most successful programs involve consistent, thoughtful integration of the skills and capacities of the arts and arts actor—creative thinking, problem solving, and engagement—into community agendas, as opposed to token involvement through sporadic creative exercises.

Additionally, there is no one right way for stakeholders to engage with the arts. Occasionally conflict arises between arts and community interests, not because they both do not believe in building better worlds, but because they have different ideas of how to achieve that goal. Some arts interests may feel that they are being pressured toward being used by community stakeholders in a way that is not their mandate, while some community interests may not understand why the arts are not more interested in taking on an explicit role in solving community problems. In this context, asking an arts organization that is uninterested in social services to become a delivery partner may not be successful, while asking a community stakeholder focused on housing development and small business creation to set aside funds for incorporating the arts in their process or outputs may not be possible within the resources they have available.

These challenges mean that it is doubly important in forming partnerships for arts and community interests to recognize and value the resources that each bring to the table. In the most effective partnerships, the arts and community stakeholders come together with a premise that a partnership will enhance, not distract, from their missions and resources. [16]

In particular, community development corporations (CDCs) have been pioneers in recognizing and reaching out to their local arts ecosystem. Today, CDCs generally cover a lot of ground, including low- and mixed-income housing, job training or workforce development, commercial real estate development, small business start-up, youth development, health, recreation, human service, and many other community goals. They are at the forefront of neighborhood livability. As such, most have grown to recognize the importance of working in partnership, of engaging residents and businesses in their processes, and of developing culturally-relevant opportunities. With a strong focus on communication, creative thinking, and community building, the arts have become a valuable tool. Additionally, with so many proven economic and social benefits of the presence of the arts, many CDCs are beginning to become arts space developers themselves, as well.

Bloodlines (entire installation), a piece b y MACLA artist in residence, Jane Castillo, in which community members embroidered family names onto fabric, 2010. Photo: Robertino Ragazza

Bloodlines (detail showing embroidered family names) by Jane Castillo, 2010. Photo: Robertino Ragazza

WORLD-BUILDING IN ACTION

While in a perfect world we would always have clarity around the focus, actors, and intended outcomes of a particular strategy or program, in reality, lines are often blurred. And yet, throughout the country and world, arts and community practitioners are pairing up to produce notable results, both in concentrated arts districts and in targeted physical, social, and economic development agendas.

Concentrated Arts Activity

There are just as many names for areas of *concentrated arts activity* as there are types of arts and community development. Arts districts can arise naturally or can be cultivated through targeted development processes. While the verdict remains out on the effectiveness of creating a cultural district in a place not predisposed to a concentration of arts activities, these types of districts have played increasingly prominent roles in neighborhood, city, and regional development, primarily for their economic and revitalization benefits, but also to some degree for their social benefits.[17]

Natural cultural districts: There has been much recent discussion of the concept of natural cultural districts, pioneered by the Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP) at the University of Pennsylvania. In their models, they show that cultural assets in these naturally occurring districts, such as Philadelphia's Old City, Norris Square, and 40th St, are already strengthening communities and building bridges between populations. SIAP suggests that, rather than trying to plan cultural districts from the top down, building on the naturally occurring critical masses of cultural assets in many low-wealth communities will result in greater wealth-creation and net community benefit.[18] Given the lack of success that many groups have had in cultivating successful cultural districts by force, this type of philosophy may gain prominence quickly and may also solve the problem of stimulating economic vitality and promoting opportunity in culture-based revitalization without generating displacement or expanding inequality, common by-products of creative economy agendas.[19]

Artist spaces: Another new body of literature being produced revolves around artist spaces, which may or may not be located within a cultural district, and that can have important benefits to both artists and the community. In a recent study of 23 artist space (live/work/sell) developments, almost half were positioned as community economic development and social improvement strategies. The others were positioned as viable business strategies or services for artist needs. Because there is little capacity in the arts world to develop such spaces, in many cases they were created by community development corporations or coalitions of civic and arts partners. These types of projects increase career opportunities and infrastructure for artists while improving artist relationships with the broader community. Additionally, they decrease blight and animate

spaces, increase arts participation opportunities for residents and contribute to pride, and catalyze other economic gains in their communities.[20]

Neighborhood districts: The most common focus of concentrated arts activity today is on neighborhood cultural districts, which generally involve some combination of the development of artist space, space for arts/cultural organizations and businesses, other formal and informal arts/cultural spaces, and some sort of common branding and/or management. Some may revolve around a broad creative economy agenda, others around individual artisans, others around a small nonprofit arts scene, and still others around commercial/retail/gallery spaces. Some districts are formed with the goal of supporting artists and the arts community, while others are formed with a goal of attracting outside local or nonlocal tourists and, consequentially, revenue. Most have some combination of all of the above.

Downtown districts: At one point in time, cultural districts were primarily considered to be clusters of large-scale arts institutions in city centers.[21] Some of these districts, for example the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust or Philadelphia's Avenue of the Arts, had managers, but most were created through multiple public-private projects designed to build world-class or iconic institutions in proximity to each other in order to promote tourism. In these models, culture is generally something to be produced for and consumed by mass audiences. These projects generally require investment from the arts community as well as city funding and private developers. Most mid- to large-sized cities these days have well-established entertainment districts of some sort for residents and visitors, which was not always the case.

All sorts of arts and civic entities have been involved in the creation of arts districts. Some examples include:

- **State-level** tax incentive programs such as those in Maryland and New Mexico, which are often developed in partnership with both arts and civic entities;
- **Public-nonprofit coalitions** such as Indianapolis Cultural Development Commission, a partnership of the Arts Council of Indianapolis, the Indianapolis Convention and Visitors Association, and Indianapolis Downtown, Inc., which has facilitated the creation of six cultural districts around Indianapolis in partnership with local community development corporations;
- **Individual community development corporations such** as in the Gateway Community Development Corporation's Gateway Arts District in Hyattsville, Md.;
- **Public-private partnerships** such as the Downtown Business Association, the Downtown Development District, the City of Baton Rouge, the Convention & Visitors Bureau, and the Baton Rouge Community Foundation, which is in the process of creating a Downtown Baton Rouge Arts and Entertainment District; and
- **Private developers** such as those in Portland's Pearl District and other commercial arts districts that spring up as a result of many individual investments (which are

often possible due to zoning and other related policies a city may enact to become more friendly to arts development).

Physical Development

The development of space for arts activity is itself community development. For example, developing subsidized artist housing contributes to affordable housing goals, particularly if that artist housing is targeted to low-income artists. Additionally, when applied, there are four prominent nodes of intersection between the arts and community development. These include:

Building Connections: Walls of Identity, Walls of Pride paired muralists Ernel Martinez and Shira Walinsky with teens at the E3 Power Centers run by the City of Philadelphia Department of Human Services. Photo: Jack Ramsdale

Animating public spaces: The arts may be employed by any actor or stakeholder to animate public space. This might involve murals or other public art projects, or arts-based design. The Philadelphia Mural Arts Program, designed as both an arts and as a civic program, has had phenomenal success in revitalizing parts of the city through vibrant murals exploring community identity. The Vermont Arts Council, the Vermont Council on Rural Development, and the Vermont Agency of Transportation collaborated in Danville to work with artists to bring aesthetic strategies for making traffic safer. Other projects have focused on infrastructure, for example, the work of artist Lorna Jordan for the City of Seattle in combination with wastewater engineers and prisons to create works of art in, around, and out of sewage treatment plants, prisons, and other civic structures.[22] Indeed, there has been growing buzz by some leaders in the arts about the idea of creating a new Public Works Administration that would revive the strong partnership between infrastructure and arts from the New Deal Era.[23] Finally, artists and arts workers transform their community through the integration of work spaces with public and private uses such as Chashama's incorporation of art into empty storefronts in New York City or the partnership between the Tacoma-Pierce Chamber of Commerce and the City Arts Commission on their Spaceworks project that has placed public art in vacant lots.

Activating public spaces: Arts organizations and civic bodies can each play a large role in transforming an underutilized location into a space where people congregate and

interact in a communal setting.[24] The Queens Museum of Art became so involved in programming festivals, public art exhibitions, and community clean-ups in their local public plaza that the New York City Department of Transportation decided to redesign the park and asked QMA to be officially involved, particularly in involving community stakeholders. City planners around the country have engaged the talents of Project for Public Spaces to identify ways to program public spaces with arts and culture in order to attract more people. Festivals—from the large-scale South by Southwest in Austin or Memphis in May to the smaller-scale annual music festival in Sandpoint, Idaho, to First Fridays in neighborhoods throughout the country—all bring the public together, expose them to new ideas, and provide a platform for the development of new community infrastructure such as transportation options and well-managed public space to support such events.

Artist Shaun "El Conquistador" Leonardo at the ring in Corona Plaza for his finale lucha libre wrestling performance as part of Queen's Museum's public art project *Corona Plaza, Center of Everywhere.* Photo: Courtesy The Queens Museum of Art

Serving as an anchor or focal point: Arts spaces and arts organizations, whether public, quasi-public, or private are a key element to cultural vitality and quality of life.[25] The Funders Network for Smart Growth has declared that arts spaces can provide critical focal points as attractive amenities for developing denser, more environmentally friendly communities.[26] The Reinvestment Fund, a national expert in financing neighborhood revitalization, has continually espoused the value in art space development toward community revitalization and development.[27] Groups such as ArtSpace and the Cultural Development Corporation have dedicated themselves to developing artist live/work space and commercial and nonprofit arts activity space as a means of both supporting the arts community and contributing to the future prospects of surrounding communities. Private developers have also developed new art space as a part of providing community benefits to complement housing and real estate strategies, for example, McCormack Baron Salazar's Center of Contemporary Arts in St. Louis.

Serving as a planning engagement tool: As the civic sector's understanding of the power of arts in community engagement grows, so do its uses. For example, James Rojas has partnered with local planners around the country to provide opportunities for community members to use colored blocks to model their imagined ideal communities. The Arts at Marks Garage in Honolulu has held an arts festival in conjunction with local civic stakeholders where community members voted on desired

physical changes in their community using finger paint and other visual arts. As experimentation continues and planners seek new and innovative ways to ensure community engagement, this use of arts as an engagement tool will likely grow.

Social Development

As the Social Impact of the Arts Project suggests, "Cultural participation generates a unique set of social networks, building a sense of collective efficacy within neighborhoods and building diverse links across geography, ethnicity, and social class."[28] Place-based social development focuses more on community engagement, on building community, social, and civic capital, and on community-wide agendas such as affordable housing and public well-being rather than on other social development agendas such as education, health, or social justice. These agendas also often focus on the changing community by exploring the history of a place, mediating tensions around identity and population changes, and engaging as many diverse voices as possible in arriving at a common vision for the future of the community.

One civic sector pioneer of harnessing the community-building power of the arts is the Local Initiative Support Coalition (LISC) of Chicago, which, with a writ mandate of community development, has created the multiyear demonstration program Building Community through the Arts. These programs have encouraged dialogue on community history, diversity, and identity, in addition to incorporating arts processes and actors into neighborhood development initiatives.[29] For example, LISC of Chicago helped to seed the School Engagement Initiative in Humboldt Park, which paired artists and teachers around issues such as gentrification, identity, and violence. They developed murals, festivals, and other arts activity as strategies for youth development and the transformation of the community.

Another model for social development for the arts focuses on the power and resources of arts organizations as community hubs. In the Shifting Sands Initiative, managed by Partners for Livable Communities and arising out of the Ford Foundation's Asset Building and Community Development program, economist and program officer Miguel Garcia challenged neighborhood arts and cultural organizations to build common vision, create tolerance and respect, and boost economic prospects in rapidly changing neighborhoods. As a part of this program, laboratory arts organizations such as Movimiento de Arte y Cultura Latino Americana (MACLA) in San Jose and the Queens Museum of Art were asked to attend local neighborhood meetings, develop relationships with civic leaders, hire community organizers, and partner with other organizations in community development agendas.

As a result, the involvement of these organizations provided a platform for the voices of underrecognized populations in their neighborhoods to be heard. The organizations have become neutral spaces where new and old populations come together and

engage in active dialogue around pressing community issues. The organizations have been involved in beautifying public spaces and storefronts. One even helped a local nonprofit health insurance company sign up over 1,400 people for health insurance.[30] The Center for Creative Community Development (C3D) has tracked these impacts through its new social network analysis tool that maps linkages between staff members, volunteers, board members, patrons, and partnerships to determine the level of interconnection with its community.[31]

One final powerful model for social development through the arts is the Los Angeles Poverty Department (LAPD), a performance-based organization focused on the Skid Row neighborhood whose residents are principally homeless people. LAPD partners with groups including SRO Housing, Inc., Inner City Law Center, and the LA Community Action Network to "connect lived experience to the social forces that shape the lives and communities of people living in poverty."[32] These partnerships, which include installations and performance series, have promoted the development of a viable low-income neighborhood with basic services such as transportation, decent housing, sanitation, and safety. Additionally, they have sought to build bridges between newer, more affluent residents and the older homeless and poor populations.[33]

Economic Development

Most physical and social development agendas are also economic development agendas, and most economic development agendas involve physical and social elements. Researchers such as Charles Landry and Richard Florida have popularized the notion that the arts and creative economies are critical to competitiveness on local, regional, and global scales. Other groups such as the Urban Institute and the Social Impact on the Arts Project have examined the arts' contributions to upward economic mobility for residents and small businesses in communities. Both of these frameworks involve leveraging the arts in several major categories:

Revitalization/economic engine: Much of the discussion of arts in revitalization revolves around cultural districts and cultural clustering, described earlier. However, research has also shown that introducing one anchor cultural institution, for example MASS MoCA in Berkshire County, Mass., can stimulate both direct and indirect economic payoffs to the entire community.[34] Other revitalization programs may focus attention in one area only, for example, in Paducah, Ky., where the Paducah Planning Department developed an Artist Relocation Program for blighted homes that resulted in over $20 million of new investment in the city.[35]

Commercial development and microenterprise: The arts themselves can be commercial development and can also build entrepreneurial skills toward the creation of new commercial enterprises. The International Sonoran Desert Alliance in Ajo, Ariz., has capitalized on both capacities by using the arts to develop youth and labor force skills,

and by training artists and artisans to develop microenterprises that have since become the new economic future of the town. The POINT Community Development Corporation in the Bronx has provided incubation space for new arts-based enterprises in addition to classes in arts production and the business of the arts, which has significantly contributed to the revitalization of the Hunts Point Community. Other major community development interests such as Local Initiatives Support Coalitions (LISC) and the Commercial Revitalization and Main Street programs of the National Trust for Historic Preservation regularly incorporate arts assets into their agendas.

Cultural tourism and branding: Cultural tourism and branding may exist on a neighborhood, city, or regional scale and constitute another major area of economic development with the arts. Cultural heritage tourism in particular has had a role in exploring identity. On the neighborhood level, the City of Chicago's Department of Cultural Affairs is considered the gold standard in the development of neighborhood tours that provide not only image and pride for underrecognized neighborhoods, but also funds and training to build the capacity of small businesses, restaurants, and residents to take advantage of the influx of tourists. Entire cities have branded themselves around their own creative industries and cultural assets, for example, in Providence, R.I., where the branding (The Creative Capital) is being led by the mayor's Department of Arts, Culture, + Tourism. On a regional level, projects such as the Crooked Road bluegrass heritage trail in Virginia have brought together multiple municipalities, development groups, and arts organizations to capture tourists and revenue on a regional scale.

Attraction and Retention: Finally, with Florida's 2002 Rise of the Creative Class came a frenzy around attracting and retaining creative workers in neighborhoods and cities alike. National association CEOs for Cities has provided extensive market research documented by economist Joe Cortright on the economic value of quality of life, with a large focus on the arts, as a part of these initiatives. Local organizations such as Venture Richmond have sprung up as public-private partnerships that seek to develop quality of life and artistic amenities, while simultaneously serving as a hub to businesses and residents interested in relocating to their city.

FUTURE WORLD-BUILDING

With so many different intersections, the number of people and institutions with feet in both arts and community work will only grow over time. Some of the challenges and opportunities that these entities face and will continue to face include:

- **Overcoming the language barrier:** If this exploration has shown anything, it is that the language used to describe this work is varied, subjective, and in many cases unclear in terms of intention, target audiences, and outcomes. As the field becomes more institutionalized, leaders in the arts and community development will have to arrive at some official common definitions that can be understood clearly by those new to the field from both sectors.

- **Training:** Arts administration programs such as the Maryland Institute College of Art are beginning to incorporate more community training into their programs, while groups such as LISC and NeighborWorks are finally beginning to integrate the arts into their training for community developers. Over time the development of such curricula will help shape the future of the field. Furthermore, additional training should help alleviate some of the common problems in partnerships between groups that do not fully understand each other.

- **Funding:** Funders, including the Kresge Foundation and Surdna Foundation, have begun to realign their programs to allow more opportunities for cross-sector funding. Additionally, at the federal level, the National Endowment for the Arts has embarked on a campaign to ensure that more federal departments allow arts organizations to apply for funding provided they are able to meet the challenges of achieving critical community outcomes. As more cross-sector funding becomes available, it will be easier for both community and arts organizations to fully leverage the others' assets. One final frontier is for the arts to become recognized tools or assets for banks in fulfilling their Community Reinvestment Act requirements. When this happens it will be a good indication that headway has been made.

- **Policy Integration:** At the moment, cultural policy primarily addresses funding and facilities for the arts. However, a growing number of local and regional policymakers are incorporating arts assets into agendas involving housing, transportation, environment, and more, which will continue to help legitimize the arts as valuable in community quality of life and development.

Every day, arts actors and civic stakeholders independently and in collaboration are creating new environments, connecting people, and envisioning a better future. As the sectors continue to learn more about each other, they become increasingly adept at turning their fantasies into reality and creating places that go beyond merely satisfying needs by providing all the components for a rich and fulfilled life for all people.

Lyz Crane served until mid 2010 as Director of Program Development at Partners for Livable Communities and is currently pursuing an MPA at New York University's Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service. At Partners she focused on the development and implementation of programs, initiatives, and conferences under the themes of culture in community building and economic development, cultural heritage tourism, the creative economy, community engagement, and leadership development. As a part of her portfolio, Crane was the Program Manager of the Ford Foundation–funded Shifting Sands Initiative and Douglas Redd Fellowship. Crane has also delivered technical assistance in many U.S. cities, developed publications on many of the topics listed above, and spoken at events and conferences nationally and internationally. In 2009, Crane was named a Next American Vanguard by the urban affairs magazine *Next American City*. She remains a Senior Associate at Partners.

For more information, visit: www.artsusa.org/animatingdemocracy

Endnotes

[1] Cleveland, William. 2002. "Mapping the Field: Arts-Based Community Development." Community Arts Network Reading Room. http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2002/05/mapping_the_fie.php

[2] Hawkes, Jon. 2001. *The fourth pillar of sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning.* Melbourne: Cultural Development Network & Common Ground Press.

[3] Jackson, Maria-Rosario, Joaquin Herranz, Jr., and Florence Kabwasa-Green. 2006. "Cultural vitality in communities: Interpretation and indicators." Washington DC: Urban Institute.

[4] Stern, Mark & Susan Seifert. 2005. "Natural' Cultural Districts: Arts Agglomerations in Metropolitan Philadelphia and Implications for Cultural District Planning." Philadelphia, PA: Working Paper #2005-2, Social Impact of the Arts Project, University of Pennsylvania.

[5] Stern, Mark & Susan Seifert. 2008. "From Creative Economy to Creative Society." Philadelphia, PA: Social Impact of the Arts Project, University of Pennsylvania.

[6] Partners for Livable Communities. 2005. *Mobilizing Arts and Cultural Resources for Community Development.* Washington, DC.

[7] Cleveland, 2002.

[8] Leveraging Investments in Creativity. http://www.lincnet.net/artist-space/glossary-of-terms. Accessed 31 July 2010.

[9] See McCarthy et al, 2002; Americans for the Arts, 2007; Sheppard et al, 2006.

[10] Jackson et al, 2006.

[11] Stern & Seifert, 2005.

[12] Cortright, Joseph. 2005. "The Young and Restless in a Knowledge Economy." Chicago, IL: CEOs for Cities.

[13] McCarthy, Kevin F., Elizabeth H. Ondaatje, Laura Zakaras, and Arthur Brooks. 2004. *Gifts of the Muse: Reframing the Debate about the Benefits of the Arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

[14] Dwyer, M. Christine. 2008. "Arts and Civic Engagement: Briefing Paper for the Working Group of

the Arts & Civic Engagement Impact Initiative." Animating Democracy: a program of Americans for the Arts.

[15] Cleveland, 2002.

[16] -Partners for Livable Communities. 2008. Shifting Sands Initiative: Arts, Culture and Neighborhood Change. Washington, DC.

[17] Stern & Seifert, 2005.

[18] Stern & Seifert, 2008.

[19] Stern & Seifert, 2005.

[20] Jackson, Mario-Rosario and Kabwasa-Green, Florence. 2007. "Artist Space Development: Making the Case." Leveraging Investments in Creativity & the Urban Institute.

[21] Jackson et al, 2006.

[22] Enwar, Clair. 2009, January 28. "Design Perspectives: Art in infrastructure is not a pipe dream." Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce. http://www.djc.com/ae/dp.html?id=12002451.

[23] Goldbard, Arlene. 2009. "A New WPA: Why a Sustainable Future Demands Cultural Recovery." Chicago, IL: Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago.

[24] Partners for Livable Communities, 2008.

[25] Jackson et al, 2006.

[26] Funders Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities. 2003. "The Arts and Smart Growth: The Role of Arts in Placemaking." Translation Paper #12: April 2003.

[27] Nowak, Jeremy. 2007. *Creativity and Neighborhood Development: Strategies for Community Investment.* Philadelphia, PA: The Reinvestment Fund.

[28] Stern & Seifert, 2005. Page 11.

[29] Barry, Patrick. 2006, May 12. "Artists Recruited to 'Build Community.'" LISC Chicago's New Communities Program. http://www.newcommunities.org/news/articleDetail.asp?objectID=515.

[30] Partners for Livable Communities, 2008.

[31] Oehler, Kay, Stephen C. Sheppard, Blair Benjamin, and Laurence K. Dworkin. 2007. "Network Analysis and the Social Impact of Cultural Arts Organizations." C3D Report NA4.2007. Williamstown, MA: Center for Creative Community Development.

[32] Los Angeles Poverty Department. http://www.lapovertydept.org/about-lapd/index.php. Accessed 31 July 2010.

[33] Jackson, Mario-Rosario & John Malpede. 2009. "Making the Case for Skid Row Culture: Findings from a Collaborative Inquiry by the Los Angeles Poverty Department and the Urban Institute". Animating Democracy: a program of Americans for the Arts.

[34] Sheppard, Stephen C., Kay Oehler, Blair Benjamin & Ari Kessler. 2006. "Culture and Revitalization: The Economic Effects of MASS MoCA on its Community." C3D Report NA3.2006. Williamstown, MA: Center for Creative Community Development.

[35] Lowertown Artist Program. http://www.paducahky.gov/paducah/lowertown-artist-program. Accessed 31 July 2010.

Other References

National Governors Association. 2009. *Arts & Economy: Using Arts & Culture to Stimulate State Economic Development*. Washington, DC: NGA Center for Best Practices.

Borrup, Tom. 2006. *The Creative Community Builder's Handbook: How to Transform Communities Using Local Assets, Art, and Culture*. Saint Paul, MN: Fieldstone Alliance.

Coletta, Carol. 2008. *Fostering the Creative City*. Chicago, IL: CEOs for Cities.

Florida, Richard. 2002. *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Perseus Books.

Landry, Charles. 2000. *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*. London, England: Earthscan Publications, Ltd.

Markusen, Ann & Amanda Johnson. 2006. *Artists' Centers: Evolution and Impact on Careers, Neighborhoods, and Economies.* Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, University of Minnesota.

Rosenstein, Carole. 2009. *Cultural Development and City Neighborhoods*. No. 21, July 2009. Charting Civil Society: A Series by the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy.