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ABSTRACT

During the 1960’s state arts agencies sprung up at a rapid pace in many states due to the available funds appropriated to state governments through the national agency, The National Endowment for the Arts. The growth of these state agencies continued over the years and many state governments began appropriating funds for the arts in the state budgets. Most states, however, had little to no policy on the arts, which caused public officials and the agency itself to re-examine its presence with state legislatures.

From the 1970’s on some state arts agencies established or assisted in developing a state arts advocacy group to help serve the constituents interests at the state level. Although there are several state arts agencies that have no consistent relationship with the state arts advocacy group, this case study investigates the state arts agencies that have a constant relationship with the state arts advocacy group and how that relationship has benefited overall state policy on the arts as carried out by the state arts agency. A review of literature that pertains to the history of state arts agencies, arts advocacy, and the use of lobbying for interest groups is provided as well as interviews with key staff, lobbyists and stakeholders from the states Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio. Fiscal policy for the arts in each state as well as the programmatic policy of the state arts agency is examined in conjunction with the characteristics of each state agency's relationship with the state advocacy group. Priority indicators of both the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy groups as determined by interview findings, mission statements, key stakeholder groups, and policy initiatives will determine the strength and consistency of the relationship between each group in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States history of public funding for the arts remains a contentious issue. Some policymakers and taxpayers are opposed to arts funding based on ideological views and fiscal conservative values. Nonetheless, the United States has created a national agency to provide block grants to states, among other national arts grants, which led to the rapid formation of many state arts agencies (SAAs). The history of the formation of state arts agencies demonstrates the need for a state arts advocacy group as a partner in the policy process. At the time states were forming SAA’s, no formation constituency for the arts existed. Grassroots arts advocates are organized and mobilized by state arts advocacy groups (SAAGs) to express the value of the arts to policymakers and stakeholders. The multiple constituencies, when organized and mobilized by the SAAG to lobby policymakers, convey the value that the state arts agency brings to communities in the state. Arts advocates, researchers, educators, and arts participants when pleading their case, hope for continued support by the federal and state governments public funding. Shifts in the political, social and fiscal atmospheres that take place over time change advocacy strategies of the arts constituents.

During the mid 20th century, Americans saw a new centralization of public funding with the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and its components, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). This centralization of public funding for the arts was followed by rapid budget growth for the NEA as well as state government appropriations for the arts. It can be said that the
manner in which public funding for the arts came about was in a top down fashion. The arts
constituency was unorganized when state arts agencies were created, thus some SAA’s worked
with state arts advocacy groups to unite a coalition of grassroots supporters to engage in the
political process. John Urice (1992) provides a succinct description of the abrupt shift to state
level funding and the impact this has had on the stability of many state arts agencies:

State Arts Agencies (SAAs) were not, in most cases, organic creations of their
governments or their voters. Because state agencies did not evolve from a defined
power base or constituency in most states, the agencies by and large have failed to
define, serve and mobilize a politically effective constituency. Finally, SAAs have
failed to fulfill an implied mandate and mission to prepare their grant recipients
for survival in times of declining fortunes and in a society with shifting values (p.
1).

Many state arts agencies and independent stakeholders in the arts community formed arts
advocacy groups to strengthen visibility in their state legislatures by organizing arts supporters to
become politically active. Many state arts agencies do not consistently experience a strong,
successful working relationship with their state arts advocacy group. Thus tension can cause a
weakening of the advocacy process and strategies of the SAAs and SAAGs.

This thesis studies three state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in Illinois,
Minnesota, and Ohio to explore how they manage their relationships with one another. My
research will determine whether this relationship leads to greater visibility of the state arts
agency as a key state agency valued by the public. My research will also measure the success in
state level politics as the advocacy group works to mobilize grassroots constituents and provide
qualitative and quantitative data to legislatures that communicates the added value the state arts
agency brings to the state’s communities utilizing public funds. Although generalizations for all
SAAs and SAAGs is not possible due to the limitations of the case study and diversity of many
SAA and SAAG structures, I anticipate that this research will allow other researchers and arts practitioners to examine this relationship in their own state. They can decide whether or not their state arts agency and state arts advocacy group are working most efficiently for the benefit of their states’ arts policy.

As research in the field of arts policy continues to expand and progress, many researchers recount and explore the unique rise of public funding for the arts in the United States, but little has been written about the impact that arts advocacy groups have had on state level arts policy. By reviewing the state arts agency history and the literature that exists on arts advocacy groups, the need for advocacy groups as a partner in the policy process becomes clear. In order to mobilize support for the SAA, constituents need to be united and bring one message to the state legislature that expresses the value and public need for the state arts agency. The public funding atmosphere has been volatile overtime, with citizens and policymakers expressing ideological oppositions to the use of taxpayer money to fund the arts. In the future it may become more volatile in light of the current economic downturn and the funding of multiple wars internationally. It is now a more pertinent time than ever to examine if and how state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups are working together to justify their portion of the ever-slimming pie of state government budgets. Dennis Dworkin (1991) stated that ‘in most cases, the emergence of state advocacy groups has been crucial to successful drives for increased arts funding’ and in fact several advocacy groups evolved out of the direct concern of tight budgets and subsequent action of staff and stakeholders of state arts councils (p. 199). Dworkin examines these close relationships and cites positive examples of successful advocacy groups that retain a close and strong alliance with the state arts agency. This research seeks to delve deeper into those
relationships to determine the context in which a relationship is cultivated and how the combined efforts impact state arts policy.

**Research Questions and Objectives**

This research seeks to explore the alliance between state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio and what changes policy at the state level occur, answering the question:

How do state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups collaborate to increase or sustain arts funding at the state level, promote state arts agency programs to multiple constituencies and collaborate on advocacy efforts given the nature in which the arts constituency has been organized and mobilized over time in a given state?

In order to better understand such an alliance, I will frame my analyses based on the review of literature, and evidence gathered from narrative interviews as well as documentation and research produced by all participating organizations. The alliance between SAA's and SAAG's must be evaluated in light of the historical arts policy context, including the NEA. This historical overview can be found in the Review of Literature chapter. Socioeconomic conditions and the policy environment of each state will be evaluated because as Richard Hofferbert and John Urice assert, “...it is nonetheless safe to assert that the accumulation of comparative policy output research argues convincingly for taking reasonable account of variance in both the socioeconomic context and some facets of the political conditions...” (p. 312). While state budget allocations are a direct measurement of arts policy success, it is undoubtedly influenced by other conditions. Therefore in order to evaluate the success of the SAA, SAAG alliance I will also analyze program policy of the state arts agency (i.e. granting categories, additional resources for grantees), staff size and roles for both the SAA and SAAG in the advocacy process. The overall
arts policy environment of the state as determined by historical fiscal data and narrative interview findings from both past and current employees, changes to the state arts agency, and other internal documentation produced by the state arts agency or state arts advocacy groups in their respective states will be evaluated.

Since beginning my research, significant shifts have occurred in both state level and federal governments. State budgets are continually being cut to deal with revenue shortfalls, there is a housing crisis, which is affecting credit and loans markets, and our nation is at war. The national government is investing in banks that are in need of financial rescue, continues to fund a war on multiple fronts, and unemployment is nearing 10 percent. Meanwhile, arts councils throughout the country are asking their state legislators to sustain and increase their budgets. Douglas S. Noonan (2007), a cultural economist, notes that “agency budgets are particularly sensitive to past appropriations, past state revenues and NEA grants, some demographic variables, party control of state government, and state budgeting rules” (p. 293). This literature places state budget allocations for the arts in the context of the overall state budget and evaluates the potentially complex policy process that determines appropriations given political, social, and economic conditions and is done so using an empirical model based on panel data (Ibid, p. 294). It seems more pertinent than ever, in light of today's economic crisis, to see how state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups deal with such issues as loss of funding. In light of such issues I seek to understand how state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups continue to demonstrate to their state legislature the need for sustained funding when other essential social welfare programs face budget cuts in times of declining state revenue.

Much of the analyses of the Illinois Arts Council and Illinois Arts Alliance, the Ohio Arts
Council and Ohio Citizens for the Arts and the Minnesota State Arts Board and Minnesota Citizens for the Arts require evaluation not only of existing scholarly research, but also literature produced by SAA's and SAAG's, and national arts policy groups. The review of literature provides a historical context for state arts agencies and the citizen participation movement.

Literature produced by state arts agencies and other national organizations such as Americans for the Arts (AFTA), the national arts advocacy group, and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA), a national organization that represents and serves state and jurisdictional arts agencies. This literature is evaluated to understand current trends in advocacy and the suggestions professional organizations provide in light of current fiscal, social, and cultural policy both nationally and at the state level. Documents produced by state agencies and state advocacy groups will also provide insight to state opinions of arts policy, and messages each organization sends to their state legislature and constituency.

Significance to the Researcher

Prior to beginning my graduate studies at The Ohio State University, I worked closely with many arts organizations in Columbus, Ohio as an intern, volunteer and everything in between. I spent much of my time on the 2nd floor of the Verne Riffe Center for Government and the Arts where I met Donna Collins, Executive Director of Ohio Citizens for the Arts. Prior to meeting Donna, I had little knowledge of arts policy or arts advocacy. I was introduced to a whole new world of research and practice that has shaped my future career path and course of study. Shortly before beginning my graduate program in Arts Policy and Administration at OSU, I was offered an opportunity by Donna to join her in the work she carries out for Ohio Citizens for the Arts. I accepted the position of Member Services Coordinator for OCA, and it has shaped
my research interests today.

I came to work for OCA in the summer of June 2006, a budget year, where I jumped right in to several tasks and learned something new on a daily basis. Many arts advocacy groups experience the frustration of limited resources, and it is no different for OCA. This provided me the opportunity to delve into multiple tasks to assist Donna in carrying out OCA’s mission and share the responsibility of OCA’s work. My day-to-day experiences at OCA provided a context for my graduate coursework. In each course I completed, from learning about the history of the NEA from Dr. Margaret J. Wyszomirski to learning the importance of public value from Dr. Wayne P. Lawson, I was able to relate much of it to the work I did at OCA. My position provided a context for my coursework, and increasingly I became interested in the application of political theory to practice.

Becoming involved with the student advocacy organization, Central Ohio Student Advocates for the Arts (COSAA), I experienced my own leadership roles in advocacy and was able to facilitate a strong relationship with COSAA and OCA. I had the opportunity for two consecutive years to travel to Washington DC and advocate on Capitol Hill for the NEA. In my second year I was leading new advocates in the process. Both of my experiences in The Governor’s Awards for the Arts and Arts Day Luncheon in Ohio, and visits with federal legislators on Capitol Hill solidified for me the importance of arts advocacy, and my responsibility to stay informed and act on issues that support the arts and arts education. From Americans for the Arts, the national arts advocacy group advocating on behalf of the National Endowment for the Arts, to Ohio Citizens for the Arts advocating for the Ohio Arts Council’s budget, I realized that each of these organizations needed to work in tandem to portray a strong
constituency and unified message on behalf of the arts community. I began to ponder the value
the Ohio Arts Council found in OCA. What value did the membership of OCA place in our
organization? Did the arts council truly benefit from the work Donna and I so diligently carried
out? From my perspective of member services coordinator at OCA, it had always been the
sentiment of the OAC that the advocacy group was essential and needed at the state level. I
began my position at a time when another person was coming into a new position as well. Julie
Henahan had accepted the position of executive director of the Ohio Arts Council about the same
time I accepted my position. Over the past two years I have watched how OCA's relationship
with the OAC has grown on a professional and even personal level, leading me to believe that it
is not all business.

The strong partnerships so evident in the arts lead to me wonder what it is that leads to a
successful partnership. I harnessed this curiosity, with the help and direction from Dr. Margaret
Wyszomirski and began to decipher what aspects of a partnership between a state arts agency
and state arts advocacy group produced a desirable outcome. She provided me with literature
published by Americans for the Arts titled *The State of the Field: A Look at Statewide Arts
Advocacy and Service Organizations* by Julia Fabris McBride. It is here that it became evident to
me that not all state arts agencies had close ties with the state arts advocacy group. In some cases
there were severe rifts in that relationship, so much so that each group was advocating different
messages to their state legislature. This literature further allowed me to see how other state arts
advocacy groups characterized their relationship with the state arts agency. How diverse they
were!

In conducting this research, I have learned a great deal about the history of the state arts
agency movement, and the direct link between the manner in which state arts agencies were established, and the rise of advocacy groups. The creation of the state arts agency was not organic. No constituency was organized to advocate on behalf of this new state agency, rather state legislatures took advantage of NEA funds to form a state arts agency. As state arts advocacy groups came into existence, state arts agencies were still defining their position in state government while continuing to grow in size, experience and managerial capacity (DiMaggio, 1991). State arts agencies continued to grow, and began to take on more responsibilities for the field, proving that fiscal policy on the arts was not the only notable important unit of analysis. Mark Schuster (2002), in his research *Policy Planning with a Purpose or the Art of Making Choices in Arts Funding*, reflects on his experiences:

> Nearly everywhere I went I was told that the arts council no longer thought of itself as merely a grant making agency; rather, it was taking concrete steps to become more strategic, stressing development of the field, and, as a result, to inform its activities it was relying more on information and on research that ever before (p. 16).

With increasingly elaborated roles to fill as a state arts policy leader, the state arts agency must utilize its partners to the fullest. The state arts advocacy group acts as the voice of their memberships, sharing information with the arts council for the benefit of the grantees and supporters of the arts in a given state. I feel that my work at OCA is a necessary piece of the state arts policy movement, and I seek to find out whether this sentiment is shared with academics and practitioners alike.

**Significance to the Field**

This thesis aims to expand on the theories that state arts advocacy groups working with the state arts agency and utilizing the maximum resources available improve state arts policy and
increase budget appropriations. Due to the variation of many SAAs and SAAGs, generalizability is not attainable. However lessons can be learned and advice shared among other state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in the nation given the findings of this study. I hope that more state arts agencies will begin to evaluate their relationship with the state arts advocacy group and vice versa and share information and resources that will strengthen the arts in their state. History shows that there is no model for state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups to work in tandem. This thesis aims to identify the successes and pitfalls that these organizations encounter in working together for the greater good of the arts policy and arts constituency of the state as well as the means in which both organizations facilitate such a relationship over time. The aim of these case studies is to better understand the roles that each organization defines for each other and themselves in the state context of arts policy and the history of the state arts agency and state arts advocacy group relationship.

My first hand experience in assisting to facilitate such a relationship, helped focus my curiosity on the overall internal processes of organizational partnerships working toward a common goal. The literature encompassing the history of state arts agencies and the NEA provides a context in which the need for an organized coalition of advocates is needed. Little has been written about the means in which this coalition is cultivated to benefit the state arts agency.

An important study conducted by The Ohio Arts Council and funded by the Wallace Foundation, on the public opinion of the arts in Ohio titled The State of the Arts Report, surveyed Ohio citizens to ‘ascertain the public perception of the arts’ (2001). It is in this study that the state agency utilized its findings to shape future policy of Ohio and also initiated a shift in the way advocates and arts policymakers presented the value of the arts to their stakeholders. This
study incorporated seminal literature to change and evolve the manner in which advocacy efforts are perceived. Mark Moore’s (1995) *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government* presented the concept of public value, and describes how government managers can help to ‘create and show that the results obtained are worth the cost of private consumption and unrestrained liberty forgone in producing the desirable results; Only then can we be sure that some public value has been created’ (p.29). Furthermore, this literature discusses the concept of public value, and how it can be facilitated between authorizing environments, operating environments, and the public value created. This concept, discussed in more detail in Chapter Two: Review of Literature, has significant implications for the ways in which SAAs and SAAGs make their case for support of the arts, and how these organizations are able to convey the value that constituents find in the arts beyond operational data and into the effects of arts participation that cannot be quantitatively collected.

**Chapter Overview**

Chapter Two, Review of Literature, provides a historical context for the history of state arts agencies, and the national granting agency, The National Endowment for the Arts. The importance of this literature review demonstrates the top down manner in which state arts agencies were created based on the availability of national funds to all fifty states. Two facets of this historical overview demonstrate the need for a strong arts constituency. The first facet recognizes the fact that more general American federalist trends expanded the role of states and allowed for more delegation in many policy areas (DiMaggio, 1991). The second facet emphasizes the fact that state agencies did not evolve from a defined power base or constituency (Urice, 1992). Finally, the influence of the concept of public value is discussed in shaping the
arts advocacy environment, and how SAAs and SAAGs are using this to convey more than quantitative data to their stakeholders. Mark Moore’s discussion of public value provides an important context for arts advocacy because SAAs are operating in the public sector, in which success cannot be determined simply by profit. The importance of advocacy and constituent support are clearly identified in this discussion.

Chapter Three, Methodology, outlines the research methods used for this multiple case study. Narrative interviews were used to collect data otherwise unattainable through literature. A discussion of my unique participant observer role identifies strengths and weaknesses of my chosen methodology. Tom Wengraf’s (2001) ‘Model of Interviewing’ demonstrates the emphasis of moving from subjectivities already held about my research to objectivity in the interview process. The process of data collection and my compliance with the Office of Responsible Research Practice’s Institutional Review Board is discussed in detail to describe the processes required of research at The Ohio State University. This chapter also outlines my central research question and the success measurements used to evaluate the relationship between SAAs and SAAGs.

Chapters Four – Illinois, Five – Minnesota, and Six – Ohio, discuss the findings of my case studies in each of the three states. Each chapter is organized in sections based on my evaluations of budget allocations and program policy. State budget allocations for state arts agencies from 1969 to the present are measured to determine how the state arts agency’s budget allocations have increased or decreased over time. This measurement is evaluated in light of the history of the SAA and the formation of the advocacy group in a given state. The arts policy environment of the state is evaluated because of its significance in determining state budgets, and
the vulnerability of the state arts agency to budget cuts. Program policies of the state arts agencies are evaluated to determine how the state arts advocacy groups and arts constituency respond to such programs. Staff resources, agency documents such as strategic plans and position documents are evaluated based on their explicit language that supports a relationship with the state arts advocacy group. Arts impact research by the state arts agencies and the state arts advocacy groups is evaluated to determine what aspect of the arts each SAA and SAAG focuses research and data for each state. SAA and SAAG involvement in national advocacy, as well as freedom of expression issues is evaluated to determine advocacy priorities of each SAA and SAAG. Data from narrative interviews will be evaluated in each of these sections where appropriate.

Each state is designated its own chapter because each state is treated as an individual case study. Chapter Seven, Researcher Analysis, summarizes the data collection and analysis for each of the cases. Each case is analyzed based on what information may be generalized to other states, and what information is unique to each case. I will outline qualities that I have found to be evident of a successful state arts agency and state arts advocacy group relationship based on my findings in Chapter Four through Six. The larger implications for the field are discussed as well.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to achieve a sustainable budget, provide programs that benefit constituent groups in the state and maintain strong and lasting relationships with state policy makers, state arts agencies need to connect and maintain a consistent voice among all stakeholder levels. Shortly after the creation of many SAA's, state arts advocacy groups were formed to assist in the process of maintaining a consistent voice and advocating a unified message to state level politicians. As John Urice (1992) points out in his article *The Future of the State Arts Agency Movement in the 1990's: Decline and Effect*, “there is little evidence of grassroots support for the establishment of the state arts agencies, rather the emergence of a constituency followed the creation of the agency” (p. 2). He continues to note that the state arts groups did not demand the formation of a state arts agency but it was the availability of funds from the NEA that lead to the creation of the SAA. Coalitions of advocates, or patrons of political action, were cultivated to rally support and engage the arts constituency in the policy process. As states continued to increase budget appropriations for SAAs, state level advocacy became increasingly important.

As Mark Schuster (2002) points out in his article *Sub-National Cultural Policy-Where the Action Is: Mapping State Cultural Policy in the United States*, “direct support for the arts and humanities at the state level is now (and has been for some time) a more important source of direct government aid to the arts, culture, and the humanities in the US than is direct support at the federal level” (p. 5). The typical sub government triad works together to bring about successful arts policy at the state level, this triad consists of: policy makers, the state arts agency, and those working as conduits between these two groups: arts advocates. Policy makers include
anyone who has the ability to change state, or local policy on the arts. Arts advocates include anyone who benefits, utilizes, or has a stake in the services funded by the state and carried out by the state arts agency. This group is often called upon to contact their elected officials to speak to them regarding important legislation that has an impact on the state arts agency and is organized by the state arts advocacy group. Arts advocates, include both those working within state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups as well as outside advocates. Those working within state arts agencies include lobbyists, board members of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy group members. The people in this group have the capacity to be in either two of the preceding categories and many in the last category play dual roles. For example, being a board member of the state arts advocacy group as well as a director or employee of an arts organization receiving state arts agency funding. For the purposes of the concentration of my research and case studies, I will be paying special attention to state arts agency employees, state arts advocacy group employees, board members and lobbyists, both past and present, via narrative interviews and evaluations of their organization's literature that speaks to both policymakers and constituents. Each group must work together in an efficient and transparent manner to ensure the greatest success for the arts in their particular state. For the purposes of this research I am solely concerned with state level policy. Although local and federal level policy do impact state level policy and do enter the discussion, the agencies operations that I am concerned with occur at the state level and therefore all research and case study efforts will be concentrated here.

Mark Schuster (2001), in his article, *Policy Planning with a Purpose or The Art of Making Choices in Arts Funding* provides a succinct definition of policy while describing it in relation to an agency that carries out programs using government funds:
If policy is 'a definite course or method of action selected...from among alternatives and in the light of given conditions to guide...present and future decisions', the tools of government action are the generic mechanisms or methods that are available for implementing these policies, and a government program is a particular, identifiable combination of these tools designed to implement a particular policy (p. 9).

The tools Schuster speaks of are grants resources to state arts agencies. When a state agency allocates its grant monies to organizations, schools, and individuals around the state, the programs in which the recipients are participating is the implementation of arts policy at the state level.

The term 'arts policy' largely devolved from the federal level down to the state level, and in most modern literature is more commonly referred to as cultural policy. For the purposes of my research I will use the term 'arts policy' to refer to both federal and state level actions taken by both legislators and arts agencies. Margaret Wyszomirski (2004), in her article From Public Support for the Arts to Cultural Policy, explains the difference between the two terms and how cultural policy began to be used with more prominence after the 1990's. She explains that the term 'cultural policy' is a more encompassing term and that:

Indeed, strands of United States cultural policy proceeded under many names, programs, and agencies, such as support for the humanities and the National Endowment for the Humanities; public broadcasting and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; cultural diplomacy and exchange and the United States Information Agency, or public art commissioning and the Art in Architecture Program of the General Services Administration (p. 469).

For the purposes of this research I will use the term 'arts policy' for clarity, since the focus of this thesis is solely on a state arts agency. Wyszomirski notes that consistent with such presumptions, public discussion about federal support for the arts would, during the next three decades, focus primarily on issues of agency structure, on administrative procedures, or on agency
appropriations (Wyszomirski, 2004). Because the primary focus of my examination of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups is at the administrative level, I feel the term 'arts policy' is most appropriate in my research since no discussion of other cultural funding or activities will take place.

The literature review for this research includes empirical and theoretical essays from the public policy and arts policy fields as well as resources made available by organizations in federal and state level organizations working to advance arts policy in the United States. Existing literature examines state arts agency history, evolution, and context in overall state government policy as well as predictions and recommendations for the future of the field. Furthermore literature exists that discusses the role of the state arts advocacy groups, their importance to the state arts agencies, and how both the grassroots advocates and lobbyists work to benefit state arts policy. This review of literature chapter looks at the history of the state arts agency and the devolution of certain arts policies to the state level coinciding with events such as the rise of citizen participation in government. Subsequently the movement that brought citizens to participate in government positioned the advocacy group to become an important partner in state level politics. Dennis Dworkin (1991), in State Arts Advocacy Groups: A Historical Overview states that “in most cases the emergence of state arts advocacy groups had been crucial to successful drives for increased funding” (p. 199).

An overview of the practitioner documents assists in understanding current trends revealing how the partnership between the state arts advocacy group and state arts agency is sustained and the goals in which each group intends to meet, stated in documents such as research efforts, advocacy plans, and agency strategic plans. This will provide a context for
examining the partnerships between the Ohio Citizens for the Arts and the Ohio Arts Council, the Illinois Arts Alliance and the Illinois Arts Council, and the Minnesota Citizens for the Arts and the Minnesota State Arts Board. In combination with fiscal data and interview findings, a framework for a strong partnership will emerge to identify what characteristics and priorities create an alliance that results in stronger arts policy at the state level.

The State Arts Agency

The NEA and the Rise of State Level Policy in the Arts

To understand the history of the state arts agency, it is imperative to briefly examine the founding of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Before the NEA was established, several states had founded a state arts council, with other funding for arts activities coming largely from private donations and government projects involving public art projects. By 1965 a federal granting agency was created with hope, but also with the ambiguity and uncertainties that are natural products of political compromise so that funding efforts could be expanded both nationally and at the state level (Urice, 2003). Although the concept of federally supporting the arts had long been challenged, three commissioned reports that ‘were used in the political process of agency creation to influence mission, goals and purposes’, as well as examples of public art support abroad led to the founding legislation, public law public Law 89-209 The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, which included the creation of a grant making federal agency The National Endowment for the Arts. (Ibid, p. 5-6).

Much literature has been written about the history of the NEA, most often reviewing the events leading up to its creation and the changes in the agency that have taken place over time. One mainstay within the agency and an important factor in my research is the availability of
block grants allocated by the NEA to each state as an incentive to create a state arts agency. Kevin Mulcahy's (2002) literature, *The State Arts Agency: An Overview of Cultural Federalism in the United States*, describes how the availability of such grants lead to a rapid boom of state arts agency creation across the country.

By 1965 seven states had established state arts agencies but... despite such innovation and growth, however, the catalyst responsible for the emergence of the arts agencies in other states was to come from the NEA with its federal-state partnership program. The program, which began in 1967, made block grants of up to $50,000 available to each state to a.) establish a state arts agency and b.) guarantee a continuing financial commitment to 'furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all people and communities in each of the several states' (p. 74).

Because of the availability of funding from the federal agency, all 50 states invested rapidly to take advantage of the extra revenue available. At this time most states had no established policy on the arts, thus directives came from either the federal level or state arts agency heads were left to create much of the internal policy of the agency as well as grant making policy on their own. Mulcahy asserts that in articulating the goals for state arts agencies, state legislators listed broad based goals and stressed the cultivation of arts appreciation and the nourishment of artistic quality and creativity, but provided little guidance in terms of specific policies and programs (Ibid, p. 69). Looking back at the short 43 year period since the creation of the NEA, one might get a better understanding of the haphazard nature under which most state arts agencies came into being.

SAA directors came from significantly different backgrounds and SAAs were set up differently from state to state. Some agencies were part of larger agencies, some were created as independent agencies and others are 501(c)3 not for profit organizations. Because of the diverging structure of state arts agencies, there are significant differences in the ways in which
each agency distributes grant funds, communicates with constituents and handles arts policy issues at the state level. For example, in 1977 the Minnesota State Arts Board developed a regional arts council system 'to provide an effective means to distribute arts funding throughout the state. Eleven councils facilitate local decision-making and foster involvement in the arts in every community of the state' (www.arts.state.mn.us). This example demonstrates the diverging focuses many state arts agencies exhibited as most important. John Urice describes the history of state arts agencies in politics as a 'time specific activity, and not an ongoing process' (Urice, 1992). Because of the relatively autonomous nature of many SAAs during the 1960's, the role of political involvement seemed to be an afterthought, or only a budget cycle activity.

During the first decade of this new arts funding era, the state of the arts coincided with a public funding boom, with relatively little need to make hard, clear policy choices (Wyszomirski, 1980). All fifty states had SAAs and the availability of funding meant that the number of organizations benefiting from these funds continued to expand. By the late-1970's, as the public funds became more stagnant, state arts advocacy groups began to spring up as a reaction to lagging federal funds. As Margaret Wyszomirski wrote in 1980, 'the last few years have seen a rapid politicization of the arts and an intensification of public debate over arts policy' (Ibid, p. 30). SAAGs provided some of the answers to this debate as Jack Walker (1983) in his article Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America states; “Government agencies organize their constituents not only in order to improve coordination in the federal system, but also to lobby the Congress...on their behalf” (p. 401). The creation of many SAAGs assisted in the grassroots support of advocating for greater funding of the arts which had been the practice of many other citizens groups where they learned “a cardinal principal of interest group politics –
that there is strength in numbers, cohesion, and organization” (Wyszomirski, p. 31).

Each agency dealt differently with fostering relationships with their state legislature and the National Endowment for the Arts. As state arts agencies experienced budget increases at the state level, the NEA overtime experienced a decreasing budget, which began to blur the relationship between the SAAs and the federal agency. In *Public Money and the Muse* Paul DiMaggio (1991) recognizes how the rapid growth of state arts agencies began to devolve much arts policy power to the state level. He states that as the state arts agencies “grew in size, experience, and managerial capacity they challenged the endowment vigorously, demanding more flexible guidelines for the funds they regranted, more influence in developing guidelines, as well as a symbolic acceptance as partners, rather than subordinates, in the policy process” (p. 219). John Urice (1992) also notes that “just as the NEA was growing in the period between the 1960's and the 1980's so too were the state arts agencies multiplying programs, invariably resulting in confusion and the priorities of each agency” (p. 3). Directors of state arts agencies also recognized the significance of their more direct relationships with constituents and demanded a greater stake in arts policy at both the federal and state level.

In his evaluation of state agencies and the NEA in the Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, *Sorting Out Our Roles: The State Arts Agencies and the National Endowment for the Arts*, Jeffrey Love (1991) provides four factors that lead to the blurry roles for the respective agencies. First, he states that “by 1993 the congressional reauthorization of the NEA increased the amount of program funds available to SAAs to 27% combined, secondly, with an insufficient increase in NEA funds to offset these state allocations in other program areas” (p. 216). Third, and around the same time as the increases in SAA allocations were rising, “a new initiative to
target underserved communities combined with a provision that half of anything over 175 million dollar budget be spent on arts education, challenged the strength of the NEA in relation to the power of state arts agencies” (Ibid, p. 216). The growing significance of state level arts policy led both policymakers and constituents to take notice of the changing environment in this field. Funding was shifting and strengthening at the state level, and these sub national levels of government were experiencing a shift in influence as well. Kevin Mulcahy in his article The State Arts Agency: An Overview of Cultural Federalism in the United States notes that:

> Overall, it should be recognized that the states and localities are the major public funders of the arts and culture in the United States, not the federal government and especially not the NEA. As NEA funding has declined dramatically, state and local arts councils have increased their support and demonstrated their institutional resilience in sustaining the nation's cultural infrastructure (p. 77).

As more federal dollars went to the states, they were able to use this as leverage for the increased support at the state level. DiMaggio recognizes that one part of the context for considering decentralization of support for the arts includes more general trends within American federalism, which have expanded the role of the states (DiMaggio, 1991) and Kelly Barsdate (2001), from the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, also recognizes the trend of devolution which “transfers policy and spending authority from federal to state, and state to local – has affected most policy arenas” (p. 2). But DiMaggio also recognizes the single most important aspect of this devolution, he states that “all public arts agencies, the Arts Endowment as much as its state counterparts, depend on legislative appropriations and whatever else they do, they must keep legislators happy in order to survive” (p. 228). The shift to a focus on state arts policy, from a largely national focus, proved to be a challenge for SAAs. The agencies had not organized a strong coalition of supporters when the decentralization of arts funding began to
occur. As Jack Walker (1983) states in his article, “the formation of new (interest) groups was one of the consequences of major new legislation, not one of the causes of its passage” (p. 403). Constituencies had to be organized, and rallied to support the SAA in their state, which is why many SAAGs came into existence.

The decentralization of funding also challenged state arts agencies to demonstrate the value of their agency and the many reasons that state arts agencies should continue to be appropriated growing or adequate budgets in their respective states. Paul DiMaggio (1991) suggests that:

Without explicit change in the allocation of federally appropriated arts funds between federal and state agencies, steady real dollar decline in the NEA budget, along with sharp gains in state appropriations for the arts, led to what was, in effect, a wholesale de facto devolution of funds and authority from the federal level to the states (p. 221).

What John Urice (1992) also points out three reasons for the devolution to state control of the arts and subsequently led to complications among state level policy strengths. Urice suggests that “SAA's were not organic creations of their governments, and because they did not evolve from a defined constituency, state arts agencies struggled to define an effective constituency and finally SAA's failed to fulfill an implied mandate and mission to prepare their grant recipients for survival in times of declining budgets and shifting societal values” (p. 1). Although this outlook seems rather dim, these are issues SAA's contended with overtime, in the face of a changing political environment.

From Devolution to Citizen Participation

Two significant movements in state arts agency history led to the creation and importance of state arts advocacy groups. As state level budget allocations to state arts agencies increased,
arts policy began to garner clout with state level policymakers due to the increase in federal funding in combination with better-organized efforts at the grassroots levels. State arts agencies were beginning to feel the pressure of the scrutiny of their growing budgets and the need to justify the ways in which their agency chose to operate. Kevin Mulcahy notes that state arts agencies in the United States experienced an 'arms length' principle following the British Arts Council's model (Mulcahy, 2001). Although SAAs still enjoy some 'arms length' autonomy today, the sense of accountability for the use of public funds has increased over time. Advocates must be prepared with strong evidence that demonstrates the importance of the SAA in order to justify the need for increased state funding in a way that appeals to their legislator. If advocates and lobbyists are expected to lobby their legislators they must be equipped with valid and valuable information presented in a way that legislators see the importance not only to the state but to constituents in their districts at all local levels.

The significance of the devolution of power and funding responsibilities to the state level demonstrate a national political decentralization of grant making as well as the growing strength of state arts agencies in relation to the NEA. DiMaggio (1991) describes the devolution of funds during the Reagan Era as “a direct result of legislative action, with devolution occurring behind the back of explicit policy due to concurrent reductions in federal resources and increases in appropriations by the states” (DiMaggio, p. 222). Despite a sagging budget, the NEA was still fulfilling its mission of serving all parts of the nation, but this was now largely happening with state level control, informing most national policy issues through the concerns and efforts experienced at the state level (Love, 1991). Federal grants seem to have an impact on state level allocations, however upon further analysis it seemed that it was also the novelty of such grants
that had an impact on state level funding, not particularly the federal grant amount or the rate of increase (Urice, 1992). The devolution of power and the fragility of state funding put a strain on a still fairly new policy field and state government agency. This subsequently compelled some state arts agencies to establish a stronger coalition of advocates, while identifying their purpose at the state level in the context of the overall welfare of its citizens.

State arts agencies began to identify more clearly who their constituents were, as well as develop relationships with policymakers and more clearly articulate what they felt the state arts policy should be. In examining the state arts agency political environment, Kelly Barsdate (2001) from the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, a membership organization serving state and jurisdictional arts agencies, identifies the policy roles of state arts agencies is to be “making the case for more resources, allocating them strategically, shaping non arts policy affecting the arts, establishing networks to achieve goals and providing data and information services” (p. 4).

Although this list is not comprehensive, it does describe the wide array of activities that SAA's participate in. With the growth of funds coming largely from state legislatures, state level advocacy became increasingly important. John Urice (1992) identifies some faults with the tactics in which SAA's confronted their constituencies:

SAA's have multiple constituents: state legislature, the boards and staffs of the organizations applying for or receiving grants, educators, and parents, and artists are but some. Each of these groups—most of whom have primary loyalties elsewhere—might be unified to support state arts funding. But, except in rare cases, little was done to synthesize the diverse elements of the arts lobby in any meaningful way. Implicit trust was placed in grass roots groups, not in an elite cadre of power brokers who could influence legislation (p. 3-4).

In order to maintain strong relationships with those influential constituents, the SAA risked the chance of alienating smaller, less influential constituencies who relied on agency grants for the
survival of their own organizations. The state arts advocacy groups, with guidance from SAA's, were able to foster these relationships in a more meaningful and beneficial manner that better accommodated the arts community.

John Urice and Richard Hofferbert (1985) describe how state arts agencies operated fairly under the radar of public scrutiny because “many areas of public policy engage intense interest on the part of only a small clientele or administrative sector, without either consuming a large share of revenue or coming to the central attention of most taxpayers” (p. 2). Operating under the radar initially helped many SAAs experience steady budget growth. But during times of controversy or economic downturn, many policymakers and taxpayers begin to question the distribution of state funds. During the culture wars which came to a head in the 1990s, many SAAs and other cultural agencies experienced increased visibility and opposition to their allocation of public funds based on ideological differences among different constituencies and policymakers. State arts agencies, when faced with scrutiny and questioning, rely on both their internal documents that promote the strength and validity of their arts policy. They also rely on the stories of public value from constituents who have directly and indirectly been impacted by use of public funding in the arts, a task assisted by many state arts advocacy groups.

Citizen participation is a movement which can be traced back to the immediate post World War II period (Stenberg, 1972). Industrialization and the rise of urban communities lead to a rise in government participation. At this time the citizens participating in advocacy and representing their communities on committees and boards were business leaders, educational and civic leaders who associated with the political elite and had something to gain. As more social assistance programs and policies developed over time, coinciding with the rise of the civil rights
movement, many minorities and lower class citizens who felt distrust of local power holders became active participants given that policymakers were focusing attention at a more regional level than had previously been the case (Stenberg, 1972). Although the arts constituency was not largely a marginalized group, the trend in citizen participation in government helped push forth the advocacy movement in the arts. In 1979 Rosslyn Goldfarb, an employee of the Pratt's School of Continuing Education, shared her experience in arts advocacy training in the Journal of Art Education. She states that:

Thus it will be seen that the arts advocates role has many facets, the necessary components being a true understanding of the breadth of the arts and their position in our culture, the knowledge of established procedures of reaching the desired audience necessary to effect change, and understanding the political, economic, and social needs of the persons/institutions to whom the plea is presented (p. 22).

A brief look into the exchange theory of interest groups also provides evidence of the relationship between a strong coalition of advocates and the organization and leaders of such a coalition. Robert Salisbury (1969) in his literature, An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups, states that “in order for the group to survive a sufficient balance must be maintained in exchange; members must receive benefits and leaders enough return...to warrant continued participation” (p. 16). Although this literature is dated, it was written around the time that many arts advocacy groups were formulated, thus it is likely that arts advocacy groups largely followed the wave of many other advocacy groups in politics. Arts advocacy groups faced the challenge of understanding the benefits they could provide to their members at large with limited resources and few tangible goods based on the cause for participation. After all, most arts advocates were seeking money, and for a state arts advocacy group, the benefits were difficult to warrant membership fees and dedicated participation. In order for participation to occur, Salisbury
describes different types of benefits members might experience:

Solidary benefits...are intrinsic to the parties, they are experienced directly and within the self and derive in the main from the acts of associating and include such rewards as socializing, congeniality, the sense of group membership and identification, the status resulting from membership, fun and conviviality, and so on. Whereas purposive benefits or incentives consist of the realization of supra personal goals, goals of the organization or group (Ibid, p. 22).

Because there was little incentive other than more state dollars for the arts constituencies at large, advocates were enticed by a sense of belonging and the good they were creating when advocating for the arts, in short making their communities and state a more culturally rich place.

State Arts Advocacy Groups

State arts advocacy groups, though often faced with issues such as financing, a vacuum in leadership, or the inability of the executive to get the board motivated (Dworkin, 1991), have aided state arts agencies in working to establish budget increases as well as legitimize the SAAs position as a state agency. Kevin Mulcahy suggests that:

Another important factor contributing to the growth of state support for the arts has been the emergence of state advocacy groups. The growth of these organizations is a logical outcome of the public arts movement generally and is also a manifestation of the constituencies that have grown up around state arts agencies (Urice 1992). Virtually every state has an arts advocacy group. Unlike the national level advocacy groups...a state arts advocacy group seeks to speak for the general cultural constituency within its territory (p. 76).

Like state arts agencies, state arts advocacy groups were created in rather differing fashions as well. Shortly after the decade-long prosperity of public funding for the arts in America some state arts agencies created advocacy groups to help increase public support and create more visibility for the SAA within the state legislature. Some were created by constituents who felt that a stronger, more organized coalition was needed in the arts, and some were heavily run by volunteers thus waning and resurfacing over time due to an unstable organization. Despite the
manner in which most advocacy groups have formed, Dennis Dworkin (1991) demonstrates that the rise of advocacy groups only a decade after the formation of many SAAs, comes from a set of similar goals. Most states began to realize that there was an increased need for arts funding, and that “arts supporters became aware that state funding could be increased by lobbying efforts in the state legislature” (Ibid, p. 4). State arts advocacy groups were founded often by a dedicated group or individual who understood the role of interest groups, had influence or knew stakeholders that could begin to see results of lobbying the state legislature. As growth slowed for many SAAs and the NEA in the mid-1980s, it became imperative to SAAGs and constituents that their action was needed to sustain or increase funding for SAAs and organizations at the state level. Finally, once advocacy groups began to emerge, other states followed the trend, recognizing that advocacy worked, and there was a need for a unified voice to appeal to state officials.

Dennis Dworkin (1991) also provides the most comprehensive overview of state arts advocacy group history and describes their activities as “monitoring legislation, training members to advocate, providing public service announcements, publishing 'action alerts' and newsletters, and sponsoring annual advocacy days at the state capitol” (p. 2). State arts advocacy groups have succeeded over time in rallying both grassroots support for the arts as well as lobbying the state legislature with the help of volunteer or paid lobbyists. Some state arts advocacy groups and state arts agencies held annual advocacy days as early as the 1980s to honor legislators and the arts community. Perhaps the most difficult activity carried out by a state arts advocacy group is to maintain and inform the greater arts constituencies and foster participation from citizens of the state, in particular those influential citizens who have strong
connections with public officials.

Given the limited capacity of state arts advocacy groups, much of the informing on how to advocate, as well as understanding the process of arts funding amongst the general public must be combined with state arts agency efforts. Many state arts agencies, including the Ohio Arts Council and the Illinois Arts Council, include in their grant guidelines that organizations receiving public funding from the state arts agency demonstrate that they have communicated to their public officials the significance the state dollars made to their efforts in the community. This process brings about more accountability to the grantees and also engages citizens of the arts field to the practice of advocacy.

Public Value

An important connection exists between citizens demonstrating the direct benefits of public funds and the way in which legislators are able to understand the significance that more arts dollars has on their communities. This is demonstrated best through the concept of public value. Mark Moore's (1995) book, Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government, defines the concept of public value by using brief cases within public administration that demonstrate “that managers are able to show that the results obtained (through public service of a particular agency) are worth the cost of private consumption and unrestrained liberty forgone in producing the desirable results” (p. 29). Presented using a triangle schema, the idea of public value involves the three important groups in the relationship between state arts advocacy groups and state arts agencies. These groups consist of the authorizing environment, the operating environment, and the public value created by arts advocates. This concept is particularly important in the context of SAAs and SAAGs because the SAAs provide funds to organizations.
where stories of public value often develop. The SAAGs help constituents share their stories with the legislature in such a way that those stories:

...are legitimate and politically sustainable to attract both authority and money from the political authorizing environment; and are operationally and administratively feasible in that the authorized, valuable activities can actually be accomplished by the existing organization (Ibid, p. 71).

In the summer of 2008 the Ohio Arts Council brought in Jonathan Katz, CEO of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, and invited both the board of the state arts agency and state arts advocacy group. The Ohio Citizens for the Arts and Ohio Arts Council’s boards participated in a workshop that reviewed the state of the current political environment in Ohio as well as the successes and work needed to be done by each group. The 'public value triangle' was used heavily as a framework to discuss how each group operated within this triangle. Figure 2.1, the public value triangle, demonstrates the way in which this triangle involves policymakers, constituents and the conduits of these two groups. But this is not the first time that the SAA and SAAG in Ohio were introduced to such a concept. The Ohio Arts Council, with the help of a grant from the Wallace Foundation, conducted a study evaluating the state of the arts, in which Ohioans were surveyed to better understand how they viewed the arts and public funding for the arts. The *State of the Arts Report* (2001) is used by the OAC “as a baseline to shape future policy and programs, to develop the organization's long-range plan and to maximize the effectiveness of OAC’s existing programs” (p. 6).
It is imperative that this public value triangle be explained, and I will use the notes taken from attendance at the Jonathan Katz workshop at the Ohio Arts Council as well as notes from previous workshops with Jerry Yoshitomi, and of course Mark Moore's seminal literature. The circles of Figure 2.1 represent three groups of people that involved in the advocacy process and arrows represent the value expressed in any given advocacy opportunity. The decision makers, or authorizing environment, are those who influence funds or leveraging of funds in the community including legislators and businesses. This is the group to whom value must be communicated and “it is to politics and law that public managers are both theoretically and practically accountable” (Moore, p. 105). Capacity, or the operating environment, is “comprised not only of resources but also partners and capacities that produce arts events, present exhibitions, publish literature, etc.” (Yoshitomi, 2004). The bottom line of the triangle moves from value to capacity representing arts activities and events that are created with some portion of public funding. This is where value is generated. Value can created from the performance or exhibit and the experiences and lessons individuals gained while attending these events or classes. Moore states that “public managers can also create value by establishing and operating an institution that meets citizens desires for
properly ordered and productive public institutions” so that the stories shared by constituents with their legislatures can always be derived from the funding of the SAA (Moore, p. 52).

All remaining lines travel from the bottom toward the authorizing environments. This in some ways represents the practice of grassroots advocacy. The value that is created by the capacity of the arts agency must be communicated to decision makers, and “it is vital that artists and arts organizations gather evidence of their value” (Yoshitomi, 2004). Each small arrow labeled a, b, and c, are the means in which the message of public value can be communicated to the authorizing environment in ways that are meaningful to them as public officials or community leaders. Arrow a represents information generated largely within the state arts agency, to support the cause of increased state support. These documents can include evaluation of successful programs, statistics involving state dollars, and other support materials justifying the need for an increase in budget funds. The agency should also be able to explain the value lost in the arts community should they suffer a reduction in state legislative appropriations, “since one of the persistent values in our political environment is the desire to keep the public sector as small as possible” (Moore, p. 72). Arrow b represents the means in which arts organizations demonstrate value. Constituents can bring the decision makers to events such as dress rehearsals, art exhibits or other activities or performances in which the decision maker has a chance to develop his or her own personal value of the experience. Arrow c represents the support materials used by arts advocates and most often provided by the state arts advocacy group to assist in explaining your cause to a decision maker. This does not necessarily have to be a physical document, but as Jonathan Katz referred to them, the evidence can be proxy arguments to support the stories of public value. They can include arts education statistics such as SAT
scores for students with arts education and students without, as well as economic impact studies which demonstrate the benefits of the arts and culture sector on a given community or state.

Because this information is not often common knowledge or widely available to citizens, the state arts advocacy group has a responsibility to educate its members and the arts constituency on the many ways in which advocacy can take shape. If advocates are prepared with poor information and inadequate resources, public officials will see this effort as a disorganized coalition, which is not to be taken seriously. It is also important that “asking and listening are valuable capacities for ascertaining the aspirations of the authorizing environment” (Yoshitomi, 2004). This task can be daunting for a state arts agency operating with little staff and numerous other tasks the state agency must perform. If a state arts advocacy group and state arts agency are in constant communication, arts advocates, state arts agency employees and legislators will all be on the same page in terms of their recognition of the benefits of state funding for the arts.

There are hurdles to the flow of this process as represented in figure 2.1. Kelly Barsdate (2001) in her review of *The State Arts Agency Policy Environment* points out, term limits, the overall health of the state budget, and the perception of appropriateness of state government funding for the arts can all complicate and only increase the need for the grassroots advocates to be informed of state arts policy on a regular basis (p. 2). Moore also warns that “managers need external actors (i.e. taxpayers) for their permission to use public resources in pursuit of a given enterprise. They cannot command their compliance, they need to persuade them” (Moore, p. 113).

*The Role of the Lobbyist*

State arts advocacy groups sometimes suffer from a lack of funding or strong leadership,
their budgets are small and sometimes organizations suffer the loss of a founder and subsequently the loss of focus in the mission of the state arts advocacy group. There is however, another important role used by some state arts advocacy groups, which offsets the lack of time or resources available to either the state arts advocacy group or the state arts agency. The role of the lobbyist is to work to increase public support for the arts by assisting in maintaining relationships inside state government, and continually stay up to date with the most recent activity happening within the state legislature. For a director of a state arts advocacy group, it is difficult to spend much of his or her time in the state legislature and still have the ability to keep the grassroots advocates informed and educated on the role of advocacy. This often requires statewide travel. There are also limitations to what the state arts agency can do because of its position as a state agency.

Many times the words advocacy and lobbying are seen as interchangeable, however, there are some very distinct differences. Bob Smucker (1999) in his *Non Profit Lobbying Guide* describes the differences between 'direct lobbying' and 'grassroots lobbying' or advocacy. Smucker describes 'direct lobbying' as the communication that an organization has about legislation with legislators or government officials who participate in the formulation of legislation. In this capacity, a lobbyist is meeting with legislators to discuss specific details of legislation. This person attends legislative hearings, knows the records and histories of legislators and their support of the arts, and often has more personal relationships with certain public officials than an average citizen. Smucker provides some characteristics of a lobbyist and what he or she can do that the average advocate may not consider; he states “that for a nonprofit, a lobbyist knows how to make the right move at the right time” (Ibid, p. 4). For example, lobbyists
generally lobby for several causes at the same time. Sometimes, these causes may overlap and share common interests, and if legislation is being written that may benefit more than one state agency, the lobbyist can work with partnering agencies or advocacy groups to rally grassroots support behind specific legislation.

In *The Non Profit Lobbying Guide* Bob Smucker (1999) describes 'grassroots lobbying' as an attempt to influence legislation through an attempt to affect the opinion of the general public. When state arts advocacy groups publish action alerts or hold advocacy-training sessions, this information is aimed at the general public. The job of advocacy is something that would be too daunting and not valid enough if carried out by artists, arts administrators, and arts educators alone. Richard Hofferbert and John Urice (1985), when discussing explanations for state support, note that “most observers of the arts know that a relatively small percentage of the public provide most of the inspiration and management. However, we suspect that the transformation of that inspiration into governmental financial commitments requires a solid base of tacit support within a mass public” (p. 313). It is imperative that state legislatures know that there is enough value in the state arts agency that the public would be significantly effected should funding decrease or cease to exist. This 'grassroots advocacy' furthermore demonstrates the concept of public value and its impact on decision makers. Lobbyists are unable to bring all of these stories of public value to their job. Nor can they spend their limited time with legislators telling such stories. A lobbyist must discuss the arts in technical policy terms, and it is the role of the public to demonstrate the added value the arts bring to their communities through advocacy at the grassroots level. Trudy Brown (1979), a retired art educator in Sacramento, published her account in the *Journal of Art Education* of an advocacy experience and the feedback from one
state official. She wrote that:

Last week I received a letter from a state assemblyman, a member of the ways and means committee, and I quote the last sentence 'the tremendous unity and diligence of so many arts supporters has been an impressive and bold force for needed changes in State Arts Policy' (p. 27)

To me, this story exemplifies the greatest impact that citizens advocating for the arts has on legislators and their ability to recognize a well-organized coalition among the many groups that advocate for their cause on a daily basis. Stories of impact and value are something that a lobbyist simply cannot provide.

A lobbyist does provide validity to a constituency in the work, which he or she carries out at the state level. In the document published by Americans for the Arts titled *The State of the Field: A Look at Statewide Arts Advocacy and Service Organizations* the role of the lobbyist is discussed in relation to the ability of state arts advocacy groups to carry out other activities knowing that the lobbyist is able to navigate the political atmosphere given their knowledge of the political process. The literature states that a lobbyist is able to understand the political subtleties and negotiate invisible barriers that an executive director may not have the capacity to do (Americans for the Arts).

*Significance to the Study*

The history of the state arts agency movement clearly demonstrates why the need for advocacy groups arose. In light of the top down approach to initially fund the SAAs, a constituency had to be organized and taught to advocate for their cause at the state level. But this did not happen immediately, as the need for organized grassroots support was not imminent in the mid 1960's because of the ever-increasing funds that seemed to continually support SAAs for about a decade. The increasing appropriations from the NEA in combination with the increasing
state legislature appropriations created a honeymoon period for the arts and public funding. By the late 1970s when many advocacy groups were formed including Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio, managers and policymakers alike recognized the growing importance of an organized coalition of supporters. A variety of social, economic and political shifts over time led to a need for greater accountability on behalf of the state arts agencies, since by the mid-1980's large sums of their funding was coming from state budgets.

Public value research demonstrates ways in which SAAs and SAAGs can communicate to their authorizing environments exactly what it is that constituents find valuable and the benefits that the SAA brings to each community. This concept, while not explicitly stating the need for an advocacy group, outlines a very viable and beneficial role of such a group to assist the SAA in organizing and motivating grassroots advocates who communicate such stories of public value to the authorizing environment. Like other public policy areas, the arts too must solidify a conceptual framework for “shaping the ways in which we motivate, advocate, and operate” (Yoshitomi, 2004). Advocates as serving as conduits between the way in which the SAA is perceived by the state legislature, and the perceptions they create telling their stories and use the state funds for meaningful arts activities in their communities.

This chapter argues that although SAAs may be capable of organizing and motivating grassroots advocates and conducting research on the benefits of the arts in their state, a partnership with an SAAG can provide more resources to continually organize advocacy efforts. Many SAAGs were created over time with the purpose of rallying grassroots support and advocate in ways that by law SAAs cannot do in order to position the arts in a more stable place within state government. Although it is not the case that some SAAGs work solely to benefit the
budget of a SAA in their state, the history of the state arts agency movement and shifting
political trends demonstrate a need for such a partnership. Throughout the history of the state arts
agency movement, the SAA was and still remains to this day the sole agency to disburse state
appropriations in the arts. Funds are appropriated at the state level to benefit a state’s
communities, and if the SAA does not demonstrate their value to the state legislature, especially
in light of growing deficits and fiscal conservatism, the need for arts funding is not fully
comprehended. It is the duty of arts advocates to create and demonstrate the value of the arts, and
it is the shared duty of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups to organize such efforts.

My thesis research aims to explore the relationship between state arts agencies and state
arts advocacy groups, and the work they do together to organize constituents throughout their
state to advocate greater funding for the arts in their state. A resonating goal throughout history
and for many state agencies is the desire for greater allocation of public funds, and it is no
different in the arts. An in depth examination of three state arts agencies and the respective
advocacy groups in their state is intended to evaluate each groups efforts in the shared goal of
increased funding. By assessing the ways in which each organization works to create and
advocate the value of the arts, this research seeks to further define the role of both the state arts
agency and the state arts advocacy group in creating public value for the benefit of the arts
community in their state.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research is to begin to understand the relationship between the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy groups as they operate to increase public support for the arts in a given state. A history of the state arts agency movement and the citizen participation movement is given in a review of the literature, and narrative interviews will be conducted to explore how stakeholders of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups view their relationships with each other and for the greater good of arts policy at the state level. In order to evaluate the relationship of SAA's and SAAG's, several factors will be reviewed to answer my central question:

How do state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups collaborate to increase or sustain arts funding at the state level, promote state arts agency programs to multiple constituencies and collaborate on advocacy efforts given the nature in which the arts constituency has been organized and mobilized over time in a given state?

An overview and evaluation of the history of the state arts agency movement and the manner in which arts advocacy groups evolved is evaluated in the review of literature chapter. This chapter helps position the state arts agency today, and the historical relationship that state arts advocacy groups have developed with their state arts agency so that the contemporary context can be evaluated while taking into consideration important historical events. I have chosen three states to study in order to determine whether successful arts policy results from the collaborative policy efforts of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups. In order to determine that a state is achieving successes in their arts policy I have chosen specific measurements, including state budget allocations for SAAs and, program policies of the state arts
agency. Reviewing staff size and resources of both the SAA and SAAG, and a review of arts impact research of both the SAA and SAAG can determine evidence of success. The arts policy environment of a given state, and the political history, are considered to provide a context for the SAA and SAAG relationship. Some of this information will be gleaned from documents provided by state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups and some will be gathered from narrative interviews conducted with state arts agency staff, lobbyists, state arts advocacy group staff and board members. The narrative interviews will assist in understanding the perceptions both organizations and stakeholders have regarding the relationship between SAA's and SAAG's.

Design Overview

This research will employ a case study methodology to examine the organizational relationship as well as the interpersonal relationships of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio. I chose to use case study methodology because as Robert Yin (1989) asserts “the case study’s unique strength is it's ability to deal with a full variety of evidence” (p. 19). To evaluate such a relationship means to speak first hand with those people who foster this relationship and work cooperatively with an organization toward a shared goal. But not only is it important to know how the practitioners feel about the relationship, it is important to evaluate how those practitioners will carry out activities that demonstrate cooperation and partnership to achieve policy success at the state level such as in strategic plans and mission statements. It is also imperative to examine the history of the relationship to determine the stability and longevity of such a working relationship. Given the multiple layers of evaluation, a case study allows the researcher to “examine the contemporary
events when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (ibid, 23).

My employment as member services coordinator for Ohio Citizens for the Arts, the state arts advocacy group in Ohio, places me as the researcher in a unique position. Morris Schwartz and Charlotte Green Schwartz (1955) define participant observation as a situation in which “the observer is part of the context being observed” and recall and interpret events in which the observer was present (p. 344). Renee Fox (2004) describes the role of the participant observer as one that requires a considerable amount of self-examination and self-monitoring by the participant observer throughout the research process. As a researcher I must set aside any subjectivities I have in relation to the alliance of state arts agencies to their state arts advocacy groups, and rely on the data to support or refute my hypothesis.

Using my position as a participant observer in the Ohio case gives me the opportunity as a researcher to observe the interactions of SAA and SAAG staff which gives me greater insight than a narrative interview and overview of policy documents from the agencies. Although I cannot draw similar conclusions in the cases of Illinois and Minnesota, as I cannot observe first hand their day-to-day interactions, I can identify similar circumstances that support or refute a strong working relationship based on what I have observed in Ohio. Despite my lack of insider-ness in Illinois and Minnesota, I presented myself as both a researcher and a practitioner of the field in hopes of establishing a connection and trust with my interviewee. My request for participation in my research can be found in appendix B. As Schwartz and Schwartz (1955) recognize the observer and the observed become important to each other and although I am not observing the interactions first hand in Illinois and Minnesota, I sought to establish a trust and
connection with the people I choose to interview in hopes that they will be forthright and open about the situation in their respective states and know that I am working to open dialogue and encourage further investigation into the examination of such a unique alliance between two organizations.

Choosing case study methodology allows me to examine human relationships as they take place in the context of a political setting. But as Robert Stake (1978) notes case studies “are not suitable basis for generalization” (p. 5). Because SAA’s and SAAG’s are so varied from state to state in structure and capacity, I could not possibly generalize given my findings in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio. These three states share similar SAA and SAAG structures, similar demographics as well as a similar rural urban ratio. Generalization may occur among them given similarities found in the arts policy of the states, however because the structures of so many other states differ so vastly, generalization is not attainable in this study. My goal is not to generalize to all state arts agencies and their relationship with the state arts advocacy group but to open the conversation and provide a basis for other SAA’s and SAAG’s to examine their relationships and realize the maximum benefits that can be achieved through them.

The purpose of studying three individual states is to be able to compare findings from all three states in light of my central question, using selective success measurements. The overwhelming amount of data that can be undertaken is simply too large for the scope of this study so I have chosen to use a “structured, focused comparison” that Juliet Kaarbo and Ryan Beasley (1999) credit to Alexander George (1979) that is “focused because it deals selectively with only certain aspects of the case…and structured because it employs general questions to guide the data collection” (p. 377). I am researching the specific phenomenon of the rise of
citizens groups, and must limit all points of measurement to this specific aspect of SAA history and contemporary practices. The success measurements of each alliance are as follows in figure 3.1, Success Measurements and Evidence of a Successful Relationship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- State legislative budget allocations from 1969-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grant Program policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of a Successful Relationship**

- Existing arts impact research and advocacy documents available to constituents
- Staff size and resources
- Strategic planning documents, position and mission statements

figure 3.1: Measurements and Evidence of a Successful Relationship

**Narrative Interviews**

This thesis will use narrative interviews to develop a rich description of the SAA and SAAG relationships in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio from the perspective of stakeholders in each of the organization categories. James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium (1995) define active interviewing to emphasize that all interviews are reality constructing, meaning making occasions which will allow me to acquire a greater understanding of those positions in the SAA and SAAG relationship which I do not have experience and that is not covered in the review of literature. Tom Wengraf (2001) describes interviewing “for facts, analyzing the interview material for factual content, for information about certain referents” is a frequent and reliable way to use interview findings in qualitative research (p. 9).

In order to conduct narrative interviews, I must first be able to grapple my own bias and subjectivity on the research topic. As previously described my employment status creates a desire
for success in the overall evaluation of the relationship between state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups. My status as more than a 'passive observer' forces me to take the additional step of evaluating my subjectivity to the research at hand and move toward objectivity for the sake of valid data findings (Yin, 1989). A flow chart, Figure 3.2, developed by Wengraf demonstrates the movement one can take from recognizing his or her own subjectivities and understanding how objectivity must be injected into all interviews to glean unbiased and clear data.

Figure 3.2 Tom Wengraf’s Model of Interviewing
Tom Wengraf (2001) describes this flow chart as a set of inferences that must be 'coherent with each other in light of the mutual inspection of objectivity and subjectivity and of the diagram's bottom line, which is the resources and handicaps from which I start or, my existing prior knowledge and assumptions, prejudice and ignorance. The process is iterative (p. 12).

When developing my interview questions, I attempted to start with the assumption of complete objectivity for all organizations. I used a set of open-ended questions for each category of interviewee in each organization involved in the case study. Each interviewee in distinct categories was asked the same question in all three cases. Although some questions I felt qualified to answer on my own, I developed questions as if I had no inside information for the interview portion of this study.

Questions for the interviews were developed based on my central research question and subsequent questions that evolved in my review of literature. Yin (1989) asserts that for case studies “the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p. 86). Because much of the information on the relationship of state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups is not documented, my interviews aim to serve the purpose of corroborating theories proposed in research on state arts agencies, and citizen participation (see, Dworkin 1991). The interviews aim to decipher perceptions in the field as well as corroboration or refutation that arts policy literature espouses. Figure 3.3 Interview Questions, lists the questions asked to each individual group of stakeholders who were contacted at every organization involved in the case study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>List of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State Arts Advocacy Group      | - Please describe your working relationship with the state arts agency.  
- How do you measure successful policy as it relates to your work and the arts?  
- What was the impetus for the creation of the advocacy group? How has the mission or focus changed over the years?  
- What was the political climate like when the advocacy group was created?  
- When unexpected circumstances occur that require immediate action in the legislature how is this situation handled?  
- Do you believe that the advocacy group must at all times consult the state arts agency on policy activity carried out by the advocacy group or lobbyist? If so why, if not then why not?  
- What kind of programs do you offer to your members? Who is your membership comprised of?  
- Who's interest do you serve as the state arts advocacy group? |
| State Arts Agency Director     | - Please describe your working relationship with the state arts advocacy group.  
- How do you ensure that the policies of the state legislature are beneficial to the arts?  
- How do you measure successful policy for the arts at the state level?  
- When the state arts advocacy group was created how was the relationship established? How were roles defined?  
- What arts agency staff are the key communicators to the advocacy group?  
- What improvements did you notice after the establishment of the advocacy group?  
- How does the state arts agency ensure that the correct message is being brought to the legislature?  
- Who's interest do you serve as the state arts agency? |
| Lobbyist/Legislative Liaison   | - When you were brought in as a lobbyist for the arts advocacy group, how was your role defined?  
- How do term limits impact your relationships with legislators? (Question only for Ohio)  
- How do you communicate with both the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group to ensure that you are bringing the right message to the legislature?  
- What was the political climate like when the advocacy group was created?  
- As a lobbyist you spend your days within the legislature, how do you determine which policies will be beneficial and which will be detrimental to the state arts agency?  
- How do you distinguish between lobbying and advocacy? |
| Board/Council Members          | - What constituencies are represented on your board?  
- Whose interests are being served by the arts advocacy organization?  
- What type of advocacy activities do the board members participate in? Ex: fundraisers for political candidates, donations, legislative visits etc  
- What is your role in relation to the state arts agency?  
- What do you understand the relationship between the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group to be? |

Figure 3.3 Interview Questions
Due to travel limitations, the interviews conducted with participants in Illinois and Minnesota were conducted via telephone. This structure was not ideal as I felt much of the openness was hindered in silent pauses, and the lack of in person interactions. In *The Active Interview* James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium (1995) describe “creative interviewing as an occasion that displays the interviewer’s willingness to share his or her own feelings and deepest thoughts” (p. 12). The experience of interviewing by telephone lacked the richness of in person interaction in which I was able to see facial expressions, and evaluate body language of interviewee's.

**Data Collection**

Data for this research was collected using qualitative case study methodology while also examining fiscal data from state arts agencies. Fiscal data for the legislative appropriations of state arts agencies in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio were provided by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) and span from 1969-2008 (NASAA, 2008). The legislative appropriations include line item dollars and are used as a success measurement. NASAA also provided a 2008 survey of legislative appropriations as well as a funding and grant making report so as to have further insight to the way in which fiscal data is analyzed in the field. It is important to discuss fiscal policy because other policy such as programmatic policies, staff policies, and resources depend on the fiscal vitality of a state arts agency. Fiscal data is documented in spreadsheets and charts in the analysis chapter of each state.

It is difficult to collect the data from my experiences as a participant observer. Since I have been cultivating my research question I have been evaluating events that I take part in through Ohio Citizens for the Arts and how those events are shaped in light of the relationship
with the Ohio Arts Council. Much of this data comes from my recollection of those experiences. Morris Schwartz and Charlotte Green Schwartz's (1995) literature *Problems with Participant Observation* describes the gap of what occurs at the event and the recollection of this event. The recollection process is recounted according to the authors as follows:

- The split second subsequent to the event which it is registered
- an interpretation of its significance in the context within which it occurred, resulting in more awareness of the event
- the transcription of the event into data form of mental or written notes (this is where participant observation becomes a process of registering, interpreting, and recording)

Because this process is 'unavoidably retrospective' my data collection is susceptible to remembering those components I saw as important at the time (Ibid, 1955). Furthermore my role as a participant observer forces my interactions with staff and other constituencies to be shaped around our relationship history. This is not the case when I am evaluating Illinois and Minnesota, however, but this also reasons that I will not be able to experience the role of participant observer in these cases.

I have retained copies of all email correspondence with staff, lobbyists, and board members of all organizations who are participating in my study from Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio. Email topics included support requests for IRB purposes, introductions to my research and communications regarding interview schedules (personal communication, May 2008-December 2008). Research subjects were all contacted initially via email, which was followed by an introduction telephone call after they had received my research proposal and request for their participation. All participants were over the age of 18 and affiliated with either the state arts agency or the state arts advocacy group in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio and informed that their identities would be made known due to the nature of the case studies. Interviewee's signed a
consent form, which can be found in appendix B, agreeing to participate with the choice of withdrawing at any time.

I completed training requirements through the Collaborative IRB's Training Initiative's, passing its exam in November 2007. Each organization participating in my study wrote a support letter to the Institutional Review Board stating that their organization was willing to participate in my study and had been informed about the purposes of the study, their rights, and the fact that they would be identifiable in my data analysis. The Institutional Review Board required that I submit an application for exemption, stating that there is little, if any risk associated with my research. I was also required to submit my interview questions, consent for participation in research form, a research proposal, and recruitment script. I was determined to be exempt from review by the Office of Responsible Research Practices under category two on September 23, 2008 (Protocol Number 2008E0537).

Data Analysis

In order to support or refute my hypothesis, I used narrative interviews in combination with a historical overview in my review of literature and my experiences as a participant observer in the case of Ohio. I also used comparative case study (Karbo & Beasley, 1999) to analyze the collected data from my case studies in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio. These case studies are being used to test the relatively undocumented theory in an effort to develop 'testable hypotheses' (Ibid, p. 374). Karbo and Beasley (1999) describe three different uses for comparative case study in theory building: cases to develop theory, cases to explore and refine theory, and cases as tests of theory (Ibid, pp. 375-376). There are little known case studies that evaluate the relationship between state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups. Americans
for the Arts study *The State of the Field: A Look at Statewide Arts Advocacy and Service Organizations* (2005), provides an overview of the advocacy groups in each state, and discusses the importance of a strong relationship with the state arts agency. This literature offers little analysis on the importance of relationship building and what it means for each group. This comparative case study will begin to introduce three cases in which the perspective of both the SAA and SAAG have equal voices to express their opinions of the relationship. This process will assist in 'exploring and refining' a theory of benefits in arts policy. As the researcher, I will be “examining certain aspects of the theory at stake within the confines of an empirical instance” (Karbo & Beasley, 1999).

Karbo and Beasley (1999) offer six steps, which I have followed to conduct a comparative case study:

1. Identify specific research questions for focused comparison (p. 378)
2. Identify variables from existing theory (p. 379)
3. Case selection (p. 379)
4. Operationalize variables and construct a case codebook (p. 383)
5. Code-write cases (p. 385)
6. Comparison and Implications for theory (p. 386)

Following this process has allowed me to narrow the use of variables to avoid “losing the possibility of discovering controlled relationships” (Ibid, p. 378). I have organized data on all three cases and separated the data according to each state. The data is maintained in an easily comparable format for each state.

Robert Yin (1989) suggests using 'various analytic techniques' to better understand
evidence gathered from narrative interviews and participant observation such as creating flow charts and chronologically ordering information (p. 106). In order to make my evidence collection as coherent and clear as possible I have created documents for each state which contains first the fiscal information from 1969-present, followed by both the state arts agency and state arts advocacy group mission statement evaluations, program evaluations, staff and resource evaluations followed by all interview data. I am able to evaluate each state's set of data comparatively and infer 'causal links' to explain whether or not a strong relationship between SAA's and SAAG's lead to successful arts policy in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio (Ibid, p. 113). Irving Seidman (1998) in *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and Social Sciences* describes the analytic process of interview data as needing to “have attention to detail, a concern for security, and a system for keeping materials accessible” (p. 95). The suggestion Seidman makes, which I have followed is to “organize excerpts from the transcripts into categories and search for connecting threads and patterns and connections between various categories” (p. 107). By using this process I am able to weed out information that seems to have less of an impact on my hypothesis and reveal data that promotes or refutes my hypothesis. This also allows me to look at each interview and set of data in the same way for all three cases as to avoid misinterpretation of data.

Participant observation data was largely collected based on my reflections of previous events that took place before the initiation of this study. As stated previously, my experience as a participant observer is only valid in Ohio, and therefore this data is only available for the case of Ohio. As Schwartz and Schwartz (1955) point out “the role of affective participant will inevitably become involved in and with the observed's emotional life” (p. 350). I think it is safe
to say that all of the interviewee's have an emotional stake in their line of work, and I see this as part of myself as well. I have developed relationships both personally and professionally with some of my interviewee's in Ohio. When reflecting upon data previously collected I must remove my personal self from the situation and evaluate the data in light of my hypothesis and success measurements for the purposes of validity of my research to avoid data distortion. Schwartz and Schwartz suggest “reorienting attitudes toward involvement, to assist in developing some detachment from the situation and in reducing the distorting impact of the involvement as well as sensitizing him(her)self to new aspects of the phenomena under study” (p. 351). This process of reorienting myself as researcher allows me to interpret the data in such a way that is meaningful to my study.

In this thesis I seek to discover whether state arts agencies experience success in state level arts policy when the relationship with their state arts advocacy group is one that is cultivated on a personal level. I will also look for evidence to determine if such a relationship can be deteriorated on such a level. I will determine what outside factors at the state and federal level can affect the relationship between SAA's and SAAG's and subsequently arts policy at the state level. Mission statements, strategic plans, and position statements produced by SAAs and SAAGs is evaluated to determine whether explicit mention of a facilitation of this relationship exists. My role as a staff member of a state arts advocacy group will undoubtedly influence my perceptions and interactions with my interviewee's, however by working toward 'detachment' from this role while using additional knowledge to “sensitize myself to new aspects of the phenomena” will allow me to challenge my preconceived assumptions (Ibid, p. 351). The use of multiple sources of data including a review of literature will increase the validity of my research,
and while I am unable to generalize on this topic, I hope to be able to insight further research on this dynamic relationship to advance state level arts policy and unite all stakeholders to work toward a common goal of greater resources for each state in the arts.
CHAPTER 4

ILLINOIS

Illinois Arts Council

The Illinois Arts Council was created in 1965, the same year that the enabling legislation for the National Endowment for the Arts was passed. This agency is an independent state agency, created with the purpose of encouraging the development of the arts throughout Illinois assisting artists, arts organizations, and other community organizations (www.state.il.us/agency/iac). The state of Illinois and the National Endowment for the Arts allocate funds annually to the Illinois Arts Council. The mission of the Illinois Arts Council is 'building a strong, creative, and connected Illinois through the engagement of all Illinoisans in the pursuit of, participation in, and enjoyment of the arts' (www.state.il.us/agency/iac). Core values were also created by the agency emphasizing cultural diversity, long-term sustainability, and engagement in the arts.

A council of 21 citizens of Illinois, who are appointed by the governor, governs the agency. A professional staff of 21, including a legislative liaison, is employed by the state agency and oversees grants programs and grant applications for the state of Illinois. A panel process is employed to review grants, and the Council Chairman appoints panelists on an annual basis. Since 2000, the Illinois Arts Council has been experiencing budget cuts, after receiving a more than $5 million increase prior to 2000.

Illinois Arts Alliance

The Illinois Arts Alliance is a statewide arts advocacy organization promoting the values of the arts in the state of Illinois. The advocacy group was created in 1982 when a group of arts advocates banned together to fight the elimination of state funding for the arts in Illinois. The
mission of the Illinois Arts Alliance is:

The statewide arts advocacy and service organization promoting the value of the arts to all residents of Illinois. Through research, capacity building and communication, IAA advances widespread support of all the arts, enhances the health of the arts and cultural sector, and fosters a climate in which the broadest spectrum of artistic expression can flourish (www.artsalliance.org).

The organization has also created a set of values, which state that the arts play an essential role in economic, social and educational growth for the state of Illinois, and that the arts are for all. The advocacy group also makes a value statement:

The arts are established as central and indispensable to Illinois communities and residents. As one of the State's leading industries, the arts are acknowledged to enhance the quality of life, fuel creativity and innovation, sharpen the state's competitive edge, promote cross-cultural understanding, and connect Illinois to the international community (www.artsalliance.org).

Although the organization used to have both a 501c4 and 501c3 component in the form of a foundation, the Illinois Arts Alliance has decided to let their 501c4 status expire as they feel that their lobbying activities still do not exceed the spending limit allowed by law.

The Illinois Arts Alliance welcomed a new director Ra Joy in 2007 after his predecessor Alene Valkanas retired. Alene had been with the agency for more than twenty years. A new image and branding will be unveiled in February 2009, in order for the organization to escape the doldrums of recognizing the organization as synonymous with the previous director’s name. Alene began this work before her retirement, to assist Mr. Joy in this re-branding process. The Illinois Arts Alliance’s board is made up of 42 members, and holds chair positions for arts education, resource and development, and a legislative chair.

State Budget Allocations: 1969-Present

The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies holds data on all legislative appropriations for
Illinois' arts agency from 1969 to the most recent budget cycle. The following chart represents Illinois' legislative appropriations, including line items. The first time that the Illinois Arts Council was appropriated line item funding was in 1981, and then not again until 1990. Line item appropriations seem to be sporadic, but have increased the Illinois Arts Council's budget over the past ten years. The chart in figure 4.1, State Budget Allocations including line item funds for the Illinois Arts Council, demonstrates graphically the legislative appropriations including line items, showing the points at which funding was at its greatest.

Figure 4.1 State Budget Allocations Including Line Item Funds for the Illinois Arts Council

This chart demonstrates that the Illinois Arts Council experienced a continually growing budget until 1982, the same year that the Illinois Arts Alliance was formed. The IAA was formed
in response to a budget cut that would have virtually eliminated the arts agency. The advocacy group was able to lobby the legislature to avoid deep cuts to the state arts agency. Alene Valkanas, former director of the Illinois Arts Alliance, describes the situation of arts spending by the state of Illinois when she came to the organization in 1982:

> When I first joined with the arts alliance we were 32nd in per capita spending for the arts. We decided at that time, given the stature of Illinois, and the importance of Chicago that we should be in the top 10. So our placement increased, our number decreased, as we got closer to our goal. We were number 10 when I left (Valkanas, 2008).

From 1982 until 1991, the Illinois Arts Council experienced steady growth in the size of their budget. From 1992 until 1998 the Illinois Arts Council’s budget allocations slowly decreased. A strategic campaign employed by the Illinois Arts Alliance helped the IAC advocate for budget growth that ranged from $16 million to almost $22 million. Overtime, the state legislature became increasingly aware of the importance of the Illinois Arts Council, and Rhoda Pierce, former director of IAC describes how the state legislature handled budget cuts when revenues were low, stating that “it depended on state revenue if funds had to be cut, and we (IAC) were at the point where cuts were made across the board and the arts weren't singled out” (Pierce, 2008).

Both the Illinois Arts Council and the Illinois Arts Alliance describe the importance of maintaining legislative relationships in securing the IAC's budget allocations. Karla Kunzeman, legislative liaison for the Illinois Arts Council describes how her role at the IAC revolves around the legislative cycle stating “that the most important part legislatively is the funding; we want more money. When the legislature is in session I am at the capitol and when they are not in session I am in the arts field” (Kunzeman, 2008). Ra Joy, current Illinois Arts Alliance director, describes his advocacy work with IAC as “a close collaboration around efforts to strengthen the
arts infrastructure in Illinois” (Joy, 2008). Each organization emphasized the importance of maintaining a presence within the legislature as key to securing continued funding in the state of Illinois. Former director, Rhoda Pierce described her efforts with the governor's office and the legislature as “sending yearly reports, reporting after grants cycles are completed, and sending letters about what we are doing with the money” (Pierce, 2008). She further describes this process as “a steady and constant education and keeping in touch with the legislators and the governor” (Pierce, 2008).

Arts Policy Environment of the state of Illinois

Like Minnesota and Ohio, Illinois is a Midwestern state with large cities like Chicago and Peoria, while still maintaining very rural areas in the south and central part of the state. Illinois is the most populous and diverse state in the Midwest. Chicago is perhaps one of the largest cultural hubs in the Midwest, housing many universities and internationally renowned arts institutions. Illinois has also been a major battleground state for republicans and democrats. Since the Illinois Arts Council was founded, predominantly republican governors have led the state. Illinois, like Minnesota, does not have any term limit legislation, and both the Illinois Arts Alliance and the Illinois Arts Council have designated legislative positions within their organizations to strengthen political relationships. The Illinois Arts Council employs a legislative liaison, and the Illinois Arts Alliance employs a lobbyist, both of whom work together to increase IAC funding. Like Ohio, Illinois has experienced controversy regarding artwork displayed at a publicly funded organization. In Illinois the IAC did not fund the exhibition, rather a local university did and the Illinois Arts Alliance took a political position in this situation. Most recently, the Illinois Arts Council suffered almost $4 million dollars in cuts, and Ra Joy describes
it as having more to do with politics than state revenue shortfalls.

The Illinois Arts Council survived for many years, before the advocacy group was formed, on little arts funding and it was a direct response to budget cuts that the advocacy group was formed. Alene Valkanas, who was politically active in the cultural community of Chicago in the early 1980’s, reflects on the beginning of the Illinois Arts Alliance stating:

A group of concerned citizens got together and said you can’t eliminate this funding because of the consequences. You cannot eliminate these resources. Bands of people were effective in winning restoration and an increase (Valkanas, 2008).

From 1977 to 2003, republicans, who for the most part were favorable towards the arts, governed the state of Illinois. Karla Kunzeman describes the legislature in 1989, when she began working for IAC as “pretty divided by partisanship and it divided the agency” (Kunzeman, 2008). Partisan politics today still impact the agency, and because of the diverse demographics of the state, republicans and democrats are in strong competition for leadership and control.

As the advocacy group refined their mission, controversy over a student's artwork at the Chicago Art Institute motivated the IAA to take a stance, to the behest of the Illinois Arts Council. The Illinois Arts Alliance, after being confronted by the Art Institute, decided to take a stand for the freedom of speech rights of the art student, and the Illinois Arts Council had concern over the effect on their budget. Valkanas describes how the Illinois Arts Alliance handled the controversy:

After much consideration by board, staff and lobbyist, we spoke out on behalf of the school. We worked with a public relations political firm to draft a statement. As a consequence, we were to have a $21, 000 grant approved through the peer panel process, and our grant was reduced to $1 (Valkanas, 2008).
This decision by the Illinois Arts Alliance undoubtedly caused tension with the Illinois Arts Council and Valkanas states that “the arts council was concerned that this issue would effect their budget or lead to possible elimination, and they did their best to separate themselves” (Valkanas, 2008). The controversy did not have an impact on the IAC's budget and Alene Valkanas describes this experience as “a turning point that helped us reaffirm what we really worked for; not just money but integrity for freedom of speech” (Valkanas, 2008).

The following year the Illinois Arts Council received an almost $3 million increase, but this controversy changed the relationship with the advocacy group. The situation presented a unique challenge for IAA, in that the arts were threatened in Illinois based on an issue unrelated to the Illinois Arts Council funding. The IAA chose to act, based on the purpose of their mission and dedication to all of the arts in the state of Illinois. The Illinois Arts Alliance established that it would act on arts policy they saw as needing their attention, despite the disapproval of the Illinois Arts Council. For years following this event, the Illinois Arts Council suffered budget cuts, after the initial increase in 1990-1991, but during this time period many states felt the effects of a national recession. During this time period many states felt the effects of a national recession. Karla Kunzeman describes the detrimental effects a divisive arts community can have on the overall statewide efforts stating “when the arts groups come together as a united front we all benefit and when they are divided we suffer” (Kunzeman, 2008). It is not always the arts community however that when at odds can lead to budget reductions.

In the most recent budget cycle, the Illinois Arts Council experienced more than $4 million in cuts, and many credit the governor's intentions for this cut. Tensions between Governor Ron Blagojevich, and Speaker of the House of Representatives Michael Madigan were played out in
the most recent budget cycle in the state of Illinois. Ra Joy describes FY 2008 as “a tragedy for the arts and arts funding for Illinois” (Joy, 2008). Although the current financial crisis can be credited for many decreased legislative appropriations in the arts, Joy credits politics more so than decreasing state revenue. A political rivalry between Governor Blagojevich and Speaker Madigan now positions the IAA and IAC in working toward budget recovery, to increase funding once again. Karla Kunzeman remembers that “the legislature tried to restore funding most recently, but the governor vetoed the increase” (Kunzeman, 2008). Shirley Madigan, chairwoman of the Illinois Arts Council is wife of Speaker Michael Madigan, and many saw this cut in the Illinois Arts Council’s budget as a way for Governor Blagojevich to retaliate against his political opponent. This had not been the first act of retaliation between the two democrats, and the Illinois Arts Council may have been a pawn in a political game. Although the Illinois Arts Alliance may not be able to guard against such political tactics, Ra Joy describes this experience as “reinforcing the need for having a strong and effective advocacy effort” (Joy, 2008).

Illinois has suffered significant budget decreases for the arts, some of which is the result of a fiscal dual between politicians. Since the controversy of the student artwork at the Chicago Art Institute, the Illinois Arts Alliance and the Illinois Arts Council have new leadership, and a renewed sense of relationship. Terry Schrogum describes his relationship with IAA director Ra Joy as “an excellent working relationship” and insists the lines of communication are open (Schrogum, 2008). Similarly, Ra Joy describes his relationship with Terry as “a strong and growing working partnership” and reiterates Schrogum’s sentiments about constant communication (Joy, 2008).
Program Policy

The Illinois Arts Council has fifteen granting categories that range from program grants to grants for individual artists. These programs have specific requirements in their guidelines for honoring legislators through thank you letters. The Illinois Arts Council also holds special ceremonies so that legislators and arts organizations receiving grants can connect. The Illinois Arts Alliance provides extensive opportunities for advocacy, and presents programs to promote the process. Both the Illinois Arts Alliance and the Illinois Arts Council present several events in partnership that promotes advocacy and legislative involvement. Both organizations work together to hold events in legislative districts, targeting specific legislators to thank them for supporting the arts. These events stemmed out of what used to be a statewide arts day, and both organizations decided to change the approach for a broader reach and increase visibility at more local levels.

The grant programs of the Illinois Arts Council are diverse and range from arts in education, to artist residencies as well as literary awards, ethnic and folk arts apprenticeships and special assistance grants. Terry Schrogum describes how each grantee is required to honor their legislator stating “we require each grantee to send a letter to both their Senator and Representative, whenever they receive a grant” (Schrogum, 2008). The Illinois Arts Council also administers check-presenting ceremonies to organizations, where the legislator has a chance to present a large check to an organization or artist. This provides legislators with a sense of involvement and ownership in the granting process, and gives the organization or artist a chance to thank the legislator in person. Furthermore Terry Schrogum notes that the Illinois Arts Council “encourages organizations to make sure that legislators and their staff are invited to events so
they can become better acquainted with the arts organizations in Illinois” (Schrogum, 2008).

Like Minnesota and Ohio, the Illinois Arts Council and Illinois Arts Alliance used to hold a state-lobbying day in Springfield, Illinois to lobby legislators to support the arts. In recent years the organizations have decided to focus on the local level and create arts advocacy events to reach out more personally to specific legislators. Terry Schrogum describes the disadvantages of a state capitol lobbying day stating:

Springfield becomes a mob scene with every group there to advocate for every interest they have. Legislators are overwhelmed with these visits, and we feel it is much more affective to meet with them in their own districts in a more relaxed setting (Schrogum, 2008).

Rhoda Pierce, former IAC director, states that “we (IAC) partnered with the state arts advocacy group to jump start a local arts agency movement which is very important now” (Pierce, 2008). This local concentration, according to Ra Joy, “allows for targeted advocacy events in key legislative districts” and he mentions that the IAA partners with local arts organizations who hold the ability to vote for these legislators (Joy, 2008). This tactic of a deeper, rather than broader reach, allows the advocacy group to target specific legislative districts honoring influential politicians in their home districts. Legislators probably experience a sense of pride in their community, and it also gives them a chance to get better acquainted with the arts organizations in their community. By concentrating on the local level however, IAA runs the risk of alienating legislators by not focusing on a given district. It may be difficult to incorporate all legislators in a matter of years so the advocacy group must strategically choose local sites and legislators to honor in a given year.

The Illinois Arts Alliance and the Illinois Arts Council also work together to present a
conference every other year, *One State: Together in the Arts*. This conference began in 1999, every other year taking place in a different location. Statewide participation is encouraged, and this opportunity allows arts leaders to “re-ignite their passion for their work in the arts” ([www.artsalliance.org](http://www.artsalliance.org)). Alene Valkanas sought support from the Illinois Arts Council to present this conference, and at one point the IAC asked to co-convene this event. Terry Schrogum notes that “marketing staff from IAC work closely with the IAA to coordinate this event” where there are specific sessions for advocacy (Schrogum, 2008). In the past, this event has focused on arts participation, leadership, online marketing and presence, and arts advocacy. Presenters from the arts community held sessions at these events, and this also allows arts administrators a chance to network throughout the state.

TAP, The Advocacy Project, is a training program presented by the Illinois Arts Alliance to train leaders in the advocacy process. This project was created during Alene Valkanas's tenure and she describes is as “a project to engage the most influential people that we could” (Valkanas, 2008). The project serves as a fast paced training session to help arts leaders build relationships with lawmakers, help shape public policy, participate in the policy process and strengthen the arts through advocacy ([www.artsalliance.org](http://www.artsalliance.org)). Engaging advocates is important year round because as Valkanas describes:

> One of the hardest campaigns was not when there had been a significant cut, but rather when there has been small annual cuts. It is really hard to get anyone interested when it isn't as large; it is hard to engender the kind of activism when you go through 3-5 years of these kinds of slow reductions (Valkanas, 2008).

As has been the case in the past Illinois arts appropriations, the legislature has taken small cuts for several years and this is where the advocacy process becomes essential. Rhoda Pierce credits
the advocacy group with “working on position papers, economic impact studies, and data to back
up claims to support IAC funding” and provide materials to support advocacy efforts (Pierce,
2008).

The Illinois Arts Alliance offers extensive programming to its members, and the arts
community in Illinois and partners with the Illinois Arts Council on several of these events. The
partnership between these organizations to promote arts advocacy and involvement from the arts
community, demonstrates a willingness of both organizations to rally grassroots advocates in
support of the arts. This partnership is essential for continued support at the state level, and
allows advocates a chance to have access to information supporting IAC. The Illinois Arts
Alliance publishes extensive literature on the advocacy process and makes much of this material
available on their website for the general public.

Staff Resources of the Illinois Arts Alliance and Illinois Arts Council

Research and dissemination in the arts is a key priority of the Illinois Arts Alliance, and the
Illinois Arts Council assists the IAA in sharing grant data. Both organizations also employ staff
dedicated to maintaining relationships with legislators, and these staff members also work
cooperatively on events and legislation impacting the arts. During the tenure of Alene Valkanas
at IAA, she was able to strategically rally board members and engage them in advocating for an
increase to the Illinois Arts Council’s budget. Though Ra Joy admits it is not his favorite method
of engaging advocates, the IAA uses a program called capwiz to encourage online advocacy,
which can be tracked daily. Ra also expresses the desire to continually grow his advocacy
network through membership and engagement throughout the state of Illinois. The Illinois Arts
Alliance also publishes extensive literature on the advocacy process and provides toolkits and chances for mentorship’s through resources available on their website.

Both Ra Joy and Terry Schrogum emphasized the importance of sharing information and data to “ensure materials are consistent with where we are headed, and that is achieved through regular and in depth communication” (Schrogum, 2008). Terry describes how the Illinois Arts Alliance has the chance to talk about specific legislation, and advocate for increases, where the Illinois Arts Council cannot, and so the Illinois Arts Alliance verifies and validates information through the IAC. Ra echoes Terry’s sentiment in stating that “there are positive outcomes in leveraging resources and Terry has a willingness to increase engagement” (Joy, 2008). The Illinois Arts Alliance however is the primary source for disseminating research and information. Alene Valkanas, during her tenure, encouraged the production of advocacy resources and research, and current director Ra Joy has continued to produce resources that are easily accessible to the citizens of Illinois.

IAA provides an online resource center, which makes available leadership, mentor programs, and peer coaching toolkits. These materials were developed to involve arts organizations and leaders in the arts community to encourage and facilitate participation within their own organizations and their communities. Many of these resources are made for the organization’s own use, taking participants through design, implementation and evaluation. IAA uses peer evaluations, focus groups, and models from other states to design such programs, to respond to the needs of the arts community in Illinois. In order to produce these materials, the Illinois Arts Alliance partners with organizations both nationwide and within the community of Illinois. The Illinois Arts Alliance also provides resources for arts education advocacy, and has legislative
goals to increase appropriations to the Illinois State Board of Education’s Arts and Foreign Language Grants Programs. Arts related research published by the Illinois Arts Alliance focuses on the economic impact of the arts in Illinois, and how the arts bridges communities. The IAA published a research report titled *Funding the Arts*, to gain a better understanding of the impact of foundations, in relation to arts granting organizations. Foundations as well as partnerships with local and national institutions in fact fund much of this research.

Technology, and a growing network within the arts community has made it easier for the Illinois Arts Alliance to reach out to more people. Alene Valkanas credits the role of the Internet in the ability for “thousands of people to do the work, technology has connected people and energized the grassroots” (Valkanas, 2008). A program called capwiz, which is made available by Americans for the Arts, gives arts advocates a chance to use the Internet as a way to communicate and write to legislators via email. This program can track the number of letters sent to legislators on a given day or in response to an email action alert sent by the advocacy group. Indeed IAA makes great use of employing the Internet to disseminate information. The Illinois Arts Council’s website lacks sufficient research, grants descriptions, and advocacy tools for their constituents. The website does not include information databases or networking resources, like that of the Ohio Arts Council’s web page. The online presence of IAA also helps their network base grow, and Ra Joy describes this as a “top goal, not directly related to the budget line” and can be measured through membership to the organization (Joy, 2008).

During Alene Valkanas’s tenure, she used her network of advocates to venture into one of the IAA’s biggest successes in 1998. She describes the event as follows:

The governor who had served for a long period had included fiscal conservatism among
his hallmarks, and he was set to leave office so we mounted a campaign and sought out his principle donors who were also donors of major cultural institutions. We identified about forty and the directors of these institutions worked with board members to encourage these donors to write letters to the governor and encouraged him to give the IAC an increase. They gave the IAC a $3.4 million increase (Valkanas, 2008).

This strategy is representative of board member activism, and demonstrates how members can use their contacts and community leaders as a source of advocacy. Alene states that this is “another reason why you need a good legislative committee and a board that is representative of all the constituents that you serve” (Valkanas, 2008). The Illinois Arts Council strives for diverse board representation as well. Although the council board is appointed by the governor, Rhoda Pierce notes that “we have business leaders, arts educators, heads of arts organizations, patrons, members of the judiciary, members of local government, state government staff, but we don’t have legislators, they have never been on the council” (Pierce, 2008). This is why the legislative staff of both the Illinois Arts Council and Illinois Arts Alliance must work to maintain legislative relationships and constantly educate legislators about the IAC, and the activities that the organization funds.

Key staff resources of both the Illinois Arts Council and Illinois Arts Alliance are their legislative positions, maintaining a strong presence in the Illinois state legislature. A paid lobbyist is employed by the Illinois Arts Alliance, and he works closely with Karla Kunzeman. She describes her role as “a legislative liaison that works with the governor’s office to help with legislative issues and represents the agency (IAC)” (Kunzeman, 2008). Some of the activities that Ms. Kunzeman participates in are “getting out into the districts, legislators invite organizations that receive grants for check presenting ceremonies” which give legislators and the arts organizations a chance to get media coverage, and the organizations are recognized by
legislators as well (Kunzman, 2008). Aside from Mr. Schrogum, Karla is the key staff at the IAC who communicates with the advocacy group.

The IAA relies heavily on their research and networking to motivate the grassroots advocates of Illinois, and use the Internet to disseminate such information. Alene Valkanas, during her long tenure, emphasized the importance of both research and motivating advocates and the IAA provides them with the resources to do so. Working in collaboration with the Illinois Arts Council, the IAA is able to advocate for the IAC’s budget, but also fosters relationships with other statewide groups to promote arts education. Both organizations also work to present activities for their constituents in the advocacy process. Co-convening multiple events a year allows both organizations a chance to unify a single message that grassroots advocates can reiterate in their communities. Since both directors are fairly new in their positions, the relationship is strong and collaborative, but as the Illinois Arts Alliance embarks on their re-branding efforts in 2009 to establish the organization as a separate entity from the IAC their roles may shift from their current places.

Internal Documentation of The SAA and SAAG Relationship

In February 2009, the Illinois Arts Alliance will unveil its two year re-branding efforts, including a name change to the organization, but their mission will essentially remain the same. Although I did not have access to this information, both Ra Joy and Alene Valkanas participated in this process and emphasized that the mission of IAA will remain the same. The Illinois Arts Council’s 2007-2012 strategic plan emphasizes their new values, and objectives they hope to reach within the given time period. Five actions are listed in order to achieve those goals, and the IAC focuses on strengthening their organization and more efficiently utilizing their resources.
The Illinois Arts Council presented four questions to answer in order to help the agency with the foundation of its strategic directions:

1. What do the arts mean to the people of Illinois?
2. How and why do people participate in the arts?
3. How do the arts add value to their lives and their communities?
4. What role should the Illinois Arts Council play in making their vision a reality?

When asked how the IAC ensures a unified message in the advocacy process, Terry Schrogum noted that “this issue was handled in the strategic plan of the agency, it is about raising the visibility of the arts and ensuring the arts are supporting the community” (Schrogum, 2008). The overarching goal of this plan is to “build public will” and create “vital, prosperous and livable communities” (IAC, 2007). Advocacy and expressing the value of the arts is emphasized in the first objective of the IAC’s strategic plan stating “a growing number of Illinoisans will understand and affirm the role and value of the arts and creativity to themselves, their communities and their state” (IAC, 2007). Although the IAC mentions using public value data, encouraging grassroots advocacy statewide, and information gathering to increase the understanding of the importance of the arts, there is no mention of a partnership with the Illinois Arts Alliance. In fact, nowhere in the strategic plan does the IAC mention a partnership with the Illinois Arts Alliance in strengthening advocacy efforts. Each objective very clearly outlines the actions the IAC will take, and the IAA will probably be involved however no explicit statements exist. Terry Schrogum however emphasized that when he began as executive director, he was “familiar with the working relationship (with IAA) and wanted to ensure that it continue and grow as a productive relationship” (Schrogum, 2008).
The Illinois Arts Alliance is also working to establish itself as an independent organization by re-branding. Ra Joy provided two reasons for this re-branding process, the first being a way to clear up confusion that they are in fact the same organization as the Illinois Arts Council. He noted that the IAA often gets confused with the Illinois Arts Council and this can cause problems at times when people realize that Ra is in fact not the director of the granting agency. The second reason for the re-branding of IAA is to separate the organizations image with that of long tenured director Alene Valkanas. Joy noted that since Alene had been the face of IAA for so long, many people identified the agency with her work. Alene supported this re-branding, and the process helped the organization refine their goals while maintaining their mission.

The 2007 annual report for the Illinois Arts Alliance highlights that year’s activities and welcomes new director Ra Joy. Of interest to this thesis, the IAA in partnership with the Illinois Arts Council, and the State Board of Education presented an Education Leaders Institute. Although this event, which took place in March 2008, was not discussed in the interview process, Alene Valkanas discussed the importance of arts education advocacy to IAA:

> We took on arts education advocacy in partnership with the Chicago Community Trust, provided funding to create a staff position to advance arts education in the schools. We were lobbying for curriculum based arts education. We saw near $7 million going specifically to local school districts. Although we had always advocated for arts education we added on to our agenda (Valkanas, 2008).

Both the IAA and IAC express interest in strengthening arts education in Illinois, but this far no joint efforts have been expressed by either organization. One objective in the Illinois Arts Council’s strategic plan hopes to “achieve a continued partnership with the Illinois State Board of Education and maintain the Illinois Arts Councils role as a key player in statewide planning for arts education” (IAC, 2007).
Summary

The Illinois Arts Alliance and the Illinois Arts Council are entering a new period of relationship building between their organizations. For years a relationship had been established between IAC and IAA, however both Terry Schrogum and Ra Joy, new to their positions, have a chance to reorganize this relationship and set new priorities for each of the organizations in terms of advocacy efforts statewide. In the past, the relationship between IAC and IAA has been both positive and at times at odds with each other’s goals. Ra and Terry have a chance to build a relationship and establish roles different from those established in the past.

Ra Joy has certainly maintained former director Alene Valkanas’s sense that the Illinois Arts Alliance is an independent organization working on behalf of the citizens of Illinois. In the past, The IAA has chosen to take a stance on issues that the Illinois Arts Council would rather they did not. However since this issue revolved around freedom of speech, and artistic expression, Alene and the IAA felt they needed to act. Ra Joy has not been in a situation of this kind to date, and now that there is a new director, it is unclear whether activities like this past experience will be challenged or punished by the IAC. Director Terry Schrogum hopes in the future that his relationship with the IAA will continue to be productive, and seems willing to explore each other’s roles despite any formal acknowledgement in strategic planning documents. Both the IAC and the IAA have staff dedicated to maintaining legislative relationships, and work together within the Illinois legislature to nurture the IAC’s image.
CHAPTER 5

MINNESOTA

Minnesota State Arts Board

The state of Minnesota has had some sort of arts agency since 1903. In 1965, the same year the National Endowment for the Arts founding legislation was passed, Minnesota changed the name of the agency to the Minnesota State Arts Council. At this time the mission was altered to “advance the interests of the arts, develop the influence of arts in education, and fine arts in Minnesota” (www.arts.state.mn.us). Again, in 1975, the Minnesota state legislature changed the agency’s enabling legislation and subsequently changed the name of the agency to The Minnesota State Arts Board. A few years later, the agency created a regional arts council system, which facilitated local decision-making, and aimed to increase community involvement (www.arts.mn.state.us). At this time, the agency’s budget was $500,000 and had only been slowly increasing since 1969.

In 2003 the agency board approved a new mission and vision statement, and the agency also introduced a set of values. The current mission of the Minnesota State Arts Board is a four-point statement detailing how the agency will promote and cultivate the arts in Minnesota. The mission states that the Minnesota State Arts Board will:

- Serve as a leading catalyst for creating a healthy environment for the arts that fosters broad public participation in, and support for, the arts in Minnesota.
- Promote artistic excellence and preserve the diverse cultural heritage of the people of Minnesota through its support of artists and organizations.
- Act as a responsible steward of the public trust.
- Work with the statewide network of regional arts councils to ensure accessibility to arts activities for all Minnesotans (www.arts.state.mn.us).

The value statement of the agency states that “All Minnesotans have the opportunity to participate in the arts” (www.arts.state.mn.us). In Illinois, the IAC created a set of values, and the Ohio Arts Council has only a mission statement. A board of eleven citizens who are appointed by the governor oversees the Minnesota State Arts Board. One member represents each of the eight congressional districts in Minnesota, and three members represent the entire state.

**Minnesota Citizens for the Arts**

Minnesota Citizens for the Arts (MCA) was formed in 1975, by a group of concerned citizens hoping to increase legislative involvement in the arts. The organization was formed as a 501©4 non profit organization. At this time a bill involving funding for a sports stadium was introduced, and MCA wanted to ensure that the arts and culture were getting equal funding. At this time, The Minnesota State Arts Board was receiving only $300,000 in legislative appropriations, and the citizens group was able to secure funding that doubled the state arts agency budget due to their lobbying efforts. MCA employs Larry Redmond, the organizations lobbyist, who has been with the organization since 1977. The current executive director, Sheila Smith, has been with MCA for more than ten years.

The mission of Minnesota Citizens for the Arts is to “ensure opportunity for all people to have access to and involvement in the arts” (www.mncitizensforthearts.org). Like the Illinois Arts Alliance, MCA advocates the arts for all, including advocating for issues of freedom of
speech and expression. The organization employs a staff of three and also a paid lobbyist. The board of Minnesota Citizens for the Arts is made up of 36 voting members, and has several committees including a finance committee, membership committee, nominations committee and arts advocacy day committee as well as diversity and arts education ad hoc committees. Each year Minnesota Citizens for the Arts presents a state arts advocacy day at the state capitol where advocates visit state legislators to express and share the importance of the arts in their communities. Executive director, Sheila Smith is also very active at the national level, and served as past chair of the State Arts Action League, part of Americans for the Arts.

State Budget Allocations: 1969-Present

The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies holds data on all state legislative appropriations to the state arts agencies since 1969 to the most recent budget cycle. The following chart in figure 5.1 is representative of the appropriations to the Minnesota State Arts Board, including line items. It was not until 1981 that the Minnesota State Arts Board received line item appropriations, and in the past ten years the MSAB has not received any line item appropriations. At times however, the line item appropriations have accounted for more than $3 million of the Minnesota State Arts Board’s budget.
Figure 5.1 State Budget Allocations Including Line Item Funds for The Minnesota State Arts Board

This chart represents the small size of the Minnesota State Arts Board’s budget until almost the 1980’s. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts lobbied the state legislature and the MSAB received modest increases from the advocacy organizations first efforts. By 1977, however the Minnesota State Arts Board’s budget more than doubled, providing the MSAB with a budget of over $1 million. In the 1980’s funding bounced up and down in the range of $1.5 million to just over $3 million and by 1997 the MSAB had experienced their largest increase to date, more than doubling their budget due to the advocacy efforts of MCA. Sue Gens, interim director of the Minnesota State Arts Board, describes the common goal between the state agency and MCA as “having the largest amount of public investment possible. We work collaboratively in trying to generate state and federal funding” (Gens, 2008).

This past election cycle in Minnesota, a constitutional amendment was introduced that would
dedicate funding for the next 25 years to the arts and culture, as well as clean water, wildlife and
natural resources. The amendment increased the state sales tax by three eighths of one percent
and the additional funds generated from that increase are divided by allocating 19.75 percent of
this tax revenue for the arts, arts education, and arts access for 25 years
(www.mncitizensforthearts.org). According to Sheila Smith, “the arts and culture funding will be
appropriated by the legislature every two years, with the money going to the regional state arts
council’s as well as the historical society, at least tripling funding for the agency” (Smith, 2008).
In FY 2008 the state of Minnesota had a per capita spending of $1.97 for the arts ranking 8th in
the nation (NASAA, 2008).

It is unclear how this additional funding will affect legislative appropriations to the MSAB
since this additional funding from sales tax dollars will add to state arts funds. Smith was elated
about the amendment, and Minnesota Citizens for the Arts played a large role in advocating the
passing of this amendment. She also noted that it may change how MCA lobbies, stating that
“MCA will be lobbying to protect the budget of MSAB” since these funds bring a significant
increase to the Minnesota State Arts Board’s budget (Smith, 2008). In Minnesota there was no
direct funding for arts education aside from education system funding, and this amendment will
allocate some portion of its funds towards arts education activities, a great win for arts education
advocates. This was seen as a big win for the advocacy group as well, and the arts in Minnesota
overall. It is unclear whether legislators will look at these funds as a replacement for budget
appropriations, and shift MSAB legislative appropriations to another state agency, especially as
state budgets face slowing revenues and deficits.

Arts Policy Environment of the state of Minnesota
Minnesota shares many qualities of other midwestern states, with a population makeup of urban cities like Minneapolis and St. Paul, combined with areas of very rural populations especially in the northern part of the state. Minnesota's political parties are unique in that their democratic party merged with the farmer-labor party to form one major political party in the state now known as the Minnesota democratic-farmer-labor party. The party is affiliated with the national Democratic Party, and shares many similar policy ideologies but has roots in third party movements with a strong stance on farmers’ rights (www.dfl.org). Both republicans and democrats have governed the state and also a large number of third party leaders since the amending of the Minnesota State Arts Board's enabling legislation in 1965. Unlike Ohio, the state does not have term limits and Minnesota Citizens for the Arts has employed the same lobbyist since 1977, allowing a chance for relationship building over a significant period of time. Minnesota has been susceptible to the faltering economy, and while prices for corn and other crops have boosted farmers’ incomes, most other sectors in the state, especially small businesses, are feeling the pressure of an economic downturn.

The significance of third party or independent governors in Minnesota has had an impact on the Minnesota State Arts Board's budget. Under governor Al Quie, of the Republican/independence party, the MSAB received its largest increase in budget history in 1997. Conversely, with current governor Tim Pawlenty in office, the MSAB received its largest budget cuts to date. Gauging the current political environment and economic conditions allows the state arts advocacy group to strategically decide whether they will be asking for continued support or an increase in the MSAB's budget. Sheila Smith states that “when the state has a surplus the measurement is how much funding we can get for the arts, and when there is a deficit
it is how well do we limit cuts” (Smith, 2008). Although the agency received an increase in their 2008 budget, the economic crisis and the leadership of a governor who has cut arts funding in the past makes it seem less likely that the arts agency will experience another increase in the next budget cycle. Sheila Smith describes how the arts advocacy group can help the Minnesota State Arts Board in light of their relationship with the governor:

Our job is to do the lobbying. The state arts agency head needs to meet with the community, communicate what it is that the agency does, they need to do that groundwork. They are a state agency, they are an agency of the governor, and they have to do whatever the governor asks them to do. They cannot work around the governor, because that is whom they work for. What we can do as a political action organization is push for another direction because we represent the public, and we may call them (MSAB) and let them know what is going on but they would need to be careful going behind the governor's back (Smith, 2008).

Relationship building in the Minnesota legislature may prove to be easier than has been the case in Ohio, since the state does not have any term limit laws. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts also has the advantage of employing a long-term lobbyist, who has been with the advocacy group for over 30 years. Ohio too, has employed the same lobbyist, but Ohio now struggles with term limits in the state legislature, a regulation Minnesota does not employ. Sheila Smith, however describes politics as an ever changing, game in which “you cannot generalize, there is an interplay of many strong personalities, so you have to look at where the state budget is, and who is being played off against us. Our job is to do the lobbying” (Smith, 2008). Former director of the Minnesota State Arts Board, Bob Booker, reflects positively on his relationship with legislators stating that “I worked directly with legislators on bills to increase arts funding, public art programs, and educational projects” (Booker, 2008). The Minnesota State Arts Board has not had a tumultuous relationship with the Minnesota state legislature, only suffering from low
visibility in its early years.

The Minnesota state legislature did not always have the interests of the arts at the forefront, and it took a group of concerned citizens organization to help increase funding when the budget was well below $1 million. Sheila Smith describes the creation of the advocacy group, in response to a funding issue in Minnesota:

In 1973 there was almost no funding for the arts, and the state was discussing building a dome stadium for sports, and civic leaders on a statewide basis were angry that the arts and culture were not being discussed. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts was created around this time, and started agitating (Smith, 2008).

Although the legislation regarding the stadium arts bill did not pass, in the coming years MCA was successful in creating more visibility for the Minnesota State Arts Board, and their budget soon exceeded $1 million. The Minnesota State Arts Board also experienced a restructuring around the same time as their budget increases. In 1977, the regional arts council system of funding was created, to more equitably distribute grant funds to all areas of the state.

The current composition of the Minnesota State Arts Board allows the agency to justify their statewide reach, and also shifts some granting responsibilities to more local levels. The disbursement of funds in this manner may allow for greater stability in the Minnesota state budget, however it does not seem to have a significant impact on the agency's appropriations, given the volatile nature of the MSAB's budget over the years. Funds from the Minnesota state arts board are distributed to regional arts councils based on a base amount plus a calculated figure from each regions percentage of population and land area. The regional arts councils, consisting of multi-county regions, typically fund smaller, local organizations in their specific region.
Program Policy

The Minnesota State Arts Board is unique in its regional arts council system. In 1977, the state legislature amended the agency's legislation to create eleven regions, geographically divided based on population size that would distribute a percentage of grant funds based on geographical distribution. Sue Gens, interim director for the MSAB, describes the regional arts council system “as a historic geographic distribution. Once the money transfers to them, they have granting powers” (Gens, 2008). The granting process for the Minnesota State Arts Board is divided by categories for organizations, artists, and schools, while the regional arts councils differ in their granting structure. The structure of the regional arts councils makes it more difficult to evaluate programs. But, since the board of the MSAB is made up of the leaders of these eleven regional arts council areas, decision making is more centralized than it might first appear. The MSAB did not discuss any measures requiring grant recipients to thank legislators for their support. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts emphasizes the shared goals with the MSAB, however director Sheila Smith was clear to note that the advocacy group maintained their autonomy in lobbying congress on specific legislation. The advocacy group lobbies on behalf of the arts agency's budget as well as for the arts community in general, meaning it may take action on arts policy that does not directly impact the Minnesota State Arts Board, which is described in the advocacy group's five point policy plan.

The Minnesota State Arts Board grants programs are divided based on the type of institution or person applying. Grants programs are divided between artists, schools, and organizations. These programs range from institutional operating support to grants for series presenters. Artists’ grants range from community partnerships to arts in education opportunities. Grants for schools
are available to schools anywhere in the state of Minnesota, or to schools that employ artists in residence. Bob Booker, former director of MSAB, describes how during his tenure these programs were evaluated:

You must pay attention to the surveys of opinion among arts leaders and at the same time drill down what experience the end user, the resident of the state is receiving as a service or an opportunity to experience the arts wherever they live. We accomplished this by focus groups, round tables, listening sessions that included members of the arts community as well as citizens groups, community leaders and public officials (Booker, 2008).

This involvement of the arts community in combination with public officials lets each stakeholder group input their opinion on how the MSAB forms program policy. It is unclear whether or not the advocacy group attended these events as well. Sheila Smith hints that there may have been some involvement, but stresses Minnesota Citizens for the Arts independence as a separate organization:

MSAB is a government agency so we lobby them. But because our goals are similar, we very often work in partnership mode. Because our work results in resources they distribute, but we are a separate grassroots organization created by the citizens of Minnesota, to make sure the arts had a voice (Smith, 2008).

Former director Booker does not reflect positively on his relationship with MCA, describing his working relationship as “at times very rewarding and successful, and at other times combative and unfruitful” (Booker, 2008). Bob Booker did not elaborate on successes or unfruitful interactions, but did cite MCA’s role in selecting MSAB council members as one example of a counterproductive efforts to advance policies at the MSAB. Current interim director Sue Gens describes program evaluation based on participation stating:

For us it is about participation, our vision is that everyone has opportunities to participate, attend or has the opportunity available to their children. Grant applications are tracked but I wouldn't call that a measure of success, because
encouraging the amount of applications that you can't fund seems counterproductive. We offer and provide them assistance, but we are not striving to get the numbers higher (Gens, 2008).

The regional arts councils also provide grants to the arts community strictly in the regions designated to the local agency. There are 11 regions, each of which receives state legislature appropriations through the MSAB appropriations and a significant amount of the regional arts council's also receive funding from the McKnight Foundation. This foundation is a private, philanthropic organization seeking to improve the quality of life for present and future organizations. The foundations granting programs range from funding the arts to neuroscience research, and they have funded research my MCA as well (www.mcknight.org).

Each regional arts council has anywhere from five to ten grant programs. These programs include operating support grants, individual artist grants, arts education grants, and project-based grants. Some more specific programs include grants for workshop ideas, technical support and grants for organizations that work to make their programs more accessible to people with disabilities. There is a strong emphasis on small organization grants, and some regions have specific grants that support local art forms, including Native American artwork. The Minnesota State Arts Board holds a regional arts council forum, consisting of voting members who represent staff of the regional arts councils. This forum is presented in partnership with the MSAB, MCA, and others. The forum serves as a chance for the arts agencies in Minnesota to plan for budget requests to the Minnesota State Legislature, professional development for the regional arts council staff, and develop activities that will be carried out jointly with the Minnesota State Arts Board and Minnesota Citizens for the Arts. This process allows the regional arts councils and the MSAB a chance to discuss policy in one place, together, and also to plan
advocacy activities.

Minnesota Citizens for the Arts partners with the MSAB for the regional arts council forum, and engages these leaders in the process of advocacy. These regional arts councils also assist the advocacy group in coordinating advocacy activities, and rallying grassroots advocates meeting with legislators in their districts. Sheila Smith emphasizes that it is the responsibility of everyone in the arts to be an arts advocate and states that “we lead and organize them, educate them about why they should be lobbying their legislators” (Smith, 2008). Like Ohio, Minnesota Citizens for the Arts holds a state arts advocacy day annually at the state capitol.

MCA also creates a five point public policy agenda to set goals each year in their advocacy activities. For 2008, their first goal is listed as State Public Arts Funding, and their second action to achieve this goal is to restore the MSAB appropriations to its highest amount and work toward a budget increase. Under this section, MCA states that “if there are cuts in the appropriation, both the MSAB and the regional arts councils should share proportionally in these decreases” (MCA, 2008). Although this is the best way to deal with budget cuts, MCA is working to lobby for policy actions by the MSAB. Under the first priority, MCA states that they will “represent the interests of the Minnesota arts community...and strongly encourage the MSAB and regional arts councils to examine their programs to ensure that they are serving all Minnesotans in the most effective way possible” (MCA, 2008). MCA director Sheila Smith, like Valkanas in Illinois, stressed the importance of freedom of expression issues and opportunities for all Minnesotans. Aside from securing greater funding for the arts in Minnesota, MCA is working toward changing policy at the MSAB as well. When the advocacy group is lobbying the state arts agency, this may cause some contention in policy creation and adjustment between the
two groups. MCA however, does work to change multiple other Minnesota laws and regulations that affect the arts including arts education, cultural bonding requests, and taxes. Given limited resources of many advocacy groups, this organization takes on many agendas on behalf of the arts community, which is something, the state arts agency cannot do.

Staff Resources of the Minnesota Citizens for the Arts and the Minnesota State Arts Board

The Minnesota State Arts Board shares information with MCA so that the advocacy group can have the most accurate information to advocate for greater appropriations. The MCA board of directors is made up of representatives from the regional arts councils, arts organizations, educators, and arts advocates. MCA also uses their website to provide information and research to arts advocates regarding grants information and advocacy training. The Minnesota State Arts Board is represented with members from each of the eight congressional districts in Minnesota. Through their website, the Minnesota State Arts Board provides resources for grants applicants, and other opportunities for people to participate in the arts. Little arts impact research is made available on the MSAB website. MCA’s website houses a larger amount of arts impact research and advocacy materials.

Sue Gens describes how the MSAB shares information with MCA so that they can more accurately describe the activities of the Minnesota State Arts Board in the advocacy process. She states that “MCA uses our database and asks us to help them with information regarding grants to different legislative districts” and further states that “the regional arts directors on MCA's board are grantees of the MSAB, so there is a close relationship with the grassroots advocacy work they do” (Gens, 2008). This grants information is made available by request from Minnesota
Citizens for the Arts, along with original research produced by MCA. The advocacy group has conducted several research studies including *The Arts: A Driving Force In Minnesota's Economy*, which is a research study detailing the impact of Minnesota's arts and cultural industry on the state's economy. The report also includes regional data, and can serve as a great advocacy tool. This economic study was funded primarily by the McKnight Foundation and defines what an economic impact study is, and how MCA used economic data to come to their conclusions. The following year, in 2007, MCA conducted a study evaluating the economic impact of artists in Minnesota, titled *Artists Count: An Economic Impact Study of Artists in Minnesota*. This report details spending by individual artists to merchants and local businesses in Minnesota and the impact this has on businesses in Minnesota. These reports provide detailed statistics that legislators find value in, and serve as justification for continued funding by the Minnesota Legislature for the arts and culture in the state.

Bob Booker however reflects differently about the resources that the MCA board brings to the advocacy process. He describes the relationship that MCA has with major institutions in Minnesota stating:

MCA was created by a select group of major arts organizations to specifically grow their allocation from the state. The advocacy group continues to support these groups through direct advocacy at both the legislature and the MSAB. In addition, these organizations contribute a sizable donation annually to the citizens group and are classified as 'guarantors' (Booker, 2008).

Board members serve to bring resources to the citizens group, however many of the regional arts councils are represented on the MCA board, bringing geographic representation. Booker also emphasized the growing importance of the MSAB board of directors in relation to the advocacy group. When asked who the key communicating staff at the agency with the advocacy group
were, he described what he felt was problematic with the MSAB board of directors:

   Generally the executive director and the deputy director were key communicators with the advocacy group. More recently the board has taken an active role in working directly with the advocacy staff and lobbyist going around MSAB staff to do so (Booker, 2008).

In further describing the role of the board, Booker felt it was important to note that “over the past six or seven years the advocacy group has worked to place most of the members on the MSAB...and unfortunately the former and current governor was not engaged with the appointment process” (Booker, 2008). This created conflicts of interest between the MSAB and MCA. Sue Gens however did not resonate this sentiment, and it is evident that the directors during Bob Bookers tenure did not share the same idea as to how this relationship between the SAA and the SAAG was to be carried out.

   Sue Gens describes a collaborative relationship when working to craft a unified message to the legislature, and how the MSAB works with MCA to do so. She states that “we worked to make sure we had strong legislative information about how funding affects communities in our messages and materials” (Gens, 2008). Gens continues to describe that the message is crafted “depending on what is happening with the legislative cycle” a sentiment that Sheila Smith also resonated (Gens, 2008). Although Gens is the interim director, she noted that she has been working in the arts in Minnesota for over 25 years, and credits this experience for her ability to understand the policy process and craft a strong message to bring to legislators.

   Minnesota Citizens for the Arts strives to arm advocates with strong research and economic data. The research produced by MCA is heavily based on economic impact, but research available ranges from linking the arts to the quality of living in Minnesota, to how the arts help at
risk youth. This research is all available on MCA's website, and is easily accessible to all arts advocates. The MCA website allows advocates to locate legislators, write emails to them, and makes available state legislators positions on the arts through links to Americans for the Arts research. There are even short one-page handouts that can easily be used when providing data to legislators. The MSAB however makes available little research data, and instead relies on MCA to share this information with constituents. MCA has a stronger hand in the policy process, and lobbies to both the Minnesota Legislature as well as the MSAB regarding policy that is favorable to all arts constituents in Minnesota. The fact that MCA lobbies the arts agency may cause tension with the agency if they share different views regarding how they operate and run their programs.

Internal Documentation of the SAA and SAAG Relationship

The Minnesota State Arts Board has available its 2004-2007 strategic plan, while MCA creates an annual public policy agenda. Both of these documents provide detail as to how each organization will foster their relationship with one another. In the Minnesota State Arts Board's strategic plan, the agency documents their mission, and values and continues to frame goals in which the agency hopes to achieve between 2004-2007. The values of the MSAB reflect what is important to the agency in programs, research and advocacy. A ten-point list is compiled and provides brief definitions to each of their values, including public value.

Goals for the agency are outlined and specific actions are detailed as to how the agency will achieve that goal. Goal one of the strategic plan states that the MSAB will “increase the
level of support needed to sustain and grow a healthy arts community” (MSAB, 2004). Although details of achieving this goal make no mention of collaborating with MCA in securing greater funding, activities such as maximizing other state funding, and working toward establishing the budget back to its greatest appropriations are discussed (MSAB, 2004). These are clearly activities that MCA are working toward achieving and are even detailed in their public policy agenda for 2008 as well.

Goal three, 'serve as a leader, promoting the value of the arts to Minnesota's quality of life' details how the agency will promote the importance of the arts using public value stories as well as connecting with arts leaders to share these experiences. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts is listed as a partner in:

Communicating the importance of public and private investment in the arts by: acknowledging private and public sector leaders who support the arts in their communities in order to strengthen support for the arts; increasing public communication about the arts in Minnesota, emphasizing local leadership in the arts and arts in education (MSAB, 2004).

MCA, along with other statewide organizations will work with the MSAB to recognize leadership in the arts. This is the only mention of MCA in the MSAB strategic plan, while other goals detail evaluations of programs, and activities at the national level. Both MCA and the MSAB are active at the national level, and each organization details their national work with importance in their strategic planning documents.

The priorities of MCA are detailed in their public policy agenda, created annually by
MCA and their board. The priorities for 2008 are detailed as follows:

- State Public Arts Funding
- Taxes
- Cultural Bonding Requests
- Arts In Education
- National Arts Policy

This policy agenda, written much like a strategic plan, describes activities MCA participates in outside of advocating for the MSAB's budget. This document also presents information that reads like recommendations for the Minnesota State Arts Board's policies. For example, in the priority point cultural bonding request, the document states that MCA will “encourage the MSAB to take a proactive role in identifying other sources of public funds for capitol projects for the statewide arts community” (MCA, 2008). This goal again emphasizes MCA's role in working to affect the policies of the state arts agency, by lobbying the agency. MCA's emphasis on lobbying the agency to change policy demonstrates the advocacy group's desire to alter state arts agency policy should they see it as unfavorable. Sheila Smith is active in national arts advocacy, having served as the past chair of the State Arts Action Network, part of Americans for the Arts which serves as a meeting place for advocacy and service organizations throughout the nation.

Summary

There is no doubt that Minnesota Citizens for the Arts has a strong presence in representing the arts around the state. They have advocated for nonprofits rights, because this
greatly impacts many arts organizations, and they have also advocated for greater funding for the arts from a variety of sources. The arts advocacy group lobbies for greater funding for the MSAB because it is the greatest source of funding for the arts in Minnesota. They also lobby the arts agency, to change or alter policy that it is beneficial to the arts community as a whole. It was perhaps this desire to affect or change the policy of the Minnesota State Arts Board that Bob Booker, former director found “combative and unfruitful” in describing his relationship with the Minnesota Citizens for the Arts (Booker, 2008).

The work that MCA does on a daily basis, and the research that they create provides resources to arts advocates assisting in the advocacy process at the state level. Other legislation that Minnesota Citizens for the Arts has changed due to their grassroots efforts include legislation that would require no one working in a not for profit could have a greater salary than the governor. This would have influenced leaders of some of the major institutions, who have larger budgets that may allow directors salaries to be greater than that of the governor. MCA also advocated against legislation that would ban smoking, and in this legislation smoking in theatrical performances would have also been banned. Though some of this legislation does not affect the greater arts community, MCA saw it as important to their constituents, and partnered with other organizations to change such policy.

The regional arts council granting system of the Minnesota State Arts Board allows for greater geographic representation in disbursing grants, and these regional arts councils also provide grants to smaller organizations. The centralized policy center of the MSAB is weakened
due to this structure, and the MSAB creates little in the way of research to support claims for continued arts support at the state level, and it seems MCA has largely taken this role. Each group, MCA and MSAB, work largely independently from each other in the policy process and MCA has a significant role in creating arts policy in Minnesota. Because of the regional arts council directors positions on MCA’s board, the advocacy group works directly with them to change and create arts policy at the state level. In Minnesota, MCA is the leader in policy research, and policy change. MCA advocates for the MSAB, but also advocates to them regarding their granting policies.
Ohio Arts Council

The Ohio Arts Council was created in 1965, the same year that the founding legislation for the NEA was passed. This state agency is an independent Ohio agency overseen by a board of directors who are appointed by the Governor of Ohio. Four members of Ohio’s legislature, two each from the House of Representatives and Ohio Senate, are appointed as non-voting members to the Ohio Arts Council’s board. The mission of the Ohio Arts Council is to “fund and support quality arts experiences to strengthen Ohio’s communities culturally, educationally, and economically” (www.oac.state.oh.us). Grant funds are provided through allocations of the Ohio General Assembly biennially, and the National Endowment for the Arts annually. The Ohio Arts Council ranks 35th in per capita spending on the arts in the United States, which totals $.93 per person in the state of Ohio in 2008 (www.oac.state.oh.us).

In recent years the Ohio Arts Council has made significant changes in administration and policy within the agency. After a 28-year tenure as executive director, Wayne Lawson retired from his position and the agency welcomed Julie Henahan, former deputy director, as its new executive director in September 2006. The Ohio Arts Council was awarded an 11.1% increase in the FY08-09 biennium budget. This increase and additional appropriations have been lost due to state budget reductions, with the state of Ohio facing a budget deficit at the end of FY 2009. From 1998-2000, the Ohio Arts Council experienced its largest appropriations from the Ohio State Legislature, and has been slowly declining since this time. Programs within the agency have also been changed, from a discipline based grant process, to broader categories that
encompass a wider range of organizations applying for grant funds. Program restructuring is an ongoing process based on changes in the field. The agency is currently embarking on a new strategic plan, and is conducting listening tours throughout Ohio to help inform policy and the new strategic plan.

Ohio Citizens for the Arts

Ohio Citizens for the Arts is a statewide arts advocacy organization founded in 1976. The organization is supported by its membership of grassroots advocates as well as organizations throughout Ohio, who work together to increase public support for the arts. The mission of Ohio Citizens for the Arts “is a volunteer, nonprofit grass roots organization working to increase public support of the arts in Ohio. Through the efforts of hundreds of individuals and arts and education organizations, Ohio Citizens for the Arts advocates on behalf of the Ohio Arts Council and the arts throughout the state” (www.ohiocitizensforthearts.org). The organization is governed by a board of directors and employs two office staff members as well as paid legislative counsel.

Each year, Ohio Citizens for the Arts presents the Governor's Awards for the Arts and Arts Day Luncheon, in partnership with the Ohio Arts Council, to serve as a capitol-lobbying day as well as honor award winners and the entire House of Representatives and Ohio Senate. The board of directors is comprised of a 36-member board, as well as representation from five statewide arts service organizations, and four members of a president’s advisory council. The executive director of the Ohio Arts Council attends all board meetings, and provides updates as to the activities of the Ohio Arts Council. Donna Collins, executive director of Ohio Citizens for the Arts, served on the OCA board prior to serving as its executive director. She is also director of the Ohio Alliance for Arts Education and uses her position in each organization to provide the
citizens of Ohio with arts and arts education legislative updates. These positions compliment each other in their combined advocacy efforts for greater arts funding.

My position in the evaluation of Ohio Citizens for the Arts, and the Ohio Arts Council is a unique situation, which is not representative of the case in subsequent evaluations of Illinois and Minnesota. As a full time employee of Ohio Citizens for the Arts, I have the advantage of attending all board meetings, coordinating and participating in activities with the Ohio Arts Council, and dealing with the day to day administrative tasks of OCA. In order to be objective when analyzing data, I first have to recognize where my subjectivities occur. As stated in my methodology chapter, the process of remembering certain events is ‘unavoidably retrospective’ therefore certain events are remembered in light of what I recognized as important both during and after the event had occurred (Schwartz and Schwartz, 1955). To evaluate the case of Ohio in an objective manner, I will use my participant observer status to add extra insight upon evaluating the lines of communication between OCA and the Ohio Arts Council. I will avoid using information in which I am not entirely involved or informed about, and rely only on the collected data from narrative interviewing to evaluate such events.

State Budget Allocations: 1969-Present

The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies holds data on all state legislative appropriations for the state’s arts agency beginning in 1969 to the most recent budget cycle. The following chart is representative of Ohio’s legislative appropriations, including line items. However, fiscal data in Ohio shows that from 1969 to the present day there have never been line item appropriations by the state legislature. The chart in figure 6.1, State Budget Allocations Including Line Item Funds for the Ohio Arts Council, demonstrates graphically the state
legislative appropriations, and shows the years where funding for the arts agency was at its greatest.

Figure 6.1 State Budget Allocations Including Line Item Funds for the Ohio Arts Council

This chart demonstrates the low visibility, and subsequent slow growth of the Ohio Arts Council’s budget from 1969-the mid 1970's, prior to the formation of Ohio Citizens for the Arts. Former director of the Ohio Arts Council Wayne Lawson, who became director around the time that the advocacy group was formulated, recognized the low visibility of the arts agency stating that “more and more states gained increasing amounts of money...how do you protect yourself as a state agency; one of those ways is with a lobbyist and an advocacy group...and the objective of course was to go after the money” (Lawson, 2008). In Ohio Citizens for the Arts mission statement it is explicitly stated that the organization lobby's on behalf of the Ohio Arts Council's budget. This phrase in the mission statement avoids confusion in defining the purpose of the
advocacy group. In Ohio, unlike many other states, the advocacy group defines clearly its role in relation to the Ohio Arts Council. As a non-profit organization, Ohio Citizens for the Arts has the ability to lobby the Ohio legislature for more money as Donna Collins, executive director of Ohio Citizens for the Arts states “OCA has opportunities that the Ohio Arts Council cannot partake in...as a non profit, we can ask for more money for the Ohio Arts Council, and traditionally that is what we have done” (Collins, 2008).

The Ohio Arts Council experienced peek funding during the late 1990's followed by a slow decline from 2001 until the 2006 11.1% budget increase. The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, in their FY 2008 Legislative Appropriations Annual Survey, noted that overall more states experienced increases in FY 2008 than in the previous five years (NASAA, 2008). This survey also states that “aggregate state legislative appropriations have decreased by $10.7 million since 1999” a downward trend which the OAC's budget reflects (NASAA, 2008). Funding for the NEA has also decreased over time, leaving state arts agencies to rely more heavily on their state legislative appropriations. For this reason, state arts advocacy groups have grown in importance, organizing advocates to visit their legislators, and in Ohio specifically to ask for greater funding for the Ohio Arts Council. Ohio Citizens for the Arts, since its inception in 1976, has consistently been a voice for the arts, avoiding the effects of financial struggles, leadership struggles, and major disagreements with the Ohio Arts Council. There are, however, outside factors that influence the appropriation of funding for the arts and in Ohio. It is a state that tends to feel the effects of an economic recession longer and deeper, and the arts can be particularly vulnerable to these recessions.

Arts Policy Environment of the state of Ohio
Ohio has generally been a conservative state, one whose demographics range from very urban and multicultural in cities like Cincinnati, Columbus and Cleveland to very rural in areas such as the Appalachian regions in the southern part of the state. The Ohio Legislature implemented term limits in 1992, which has had a profound impact on relationship building with legislators and continues to be a challenge (www.ncsl.org). Republicans and democrats have both governed during this 43 year period since the creation of the Ohio Arts Council in 1965. The Ohio Arts Council remains a relatively small agency in relation to other state agencies making up only less than one twentieth of one percent of the state's budget, therefore building a case for increased support, especially in light of an economic downturn, can prove to be challenging.

During the culture wars that came to a head in the 1990's, the Ohio Arts Council was placed directly at the forefront of the controversy. An exhibition at the Contemporary Arts Center in Cincinnati, displayed works by artist Robert Mapplethorpe, and due to the nature of the photographs exhibited by an organization supported with Ohio Arts Council grants, questions were hurled at the agency regarding their involvement. These conditions have significant impacts on legislative appropriations for the arts, and navigating this difficult political environment has proved challenging for the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group.

The Ohio Arts Council and Ohio Citizens for the Arts recognize the difficulties that term limits present in Ohio. In the past, agency directors, lobbyists and constituents were able to build strong relationships with legislators who were continually re-elected into office and often held leadership positions. Of course, without term limits, the chance of encountering a long serving legislator who had unfavorable opinions towards the Ohio Arts Council could also prove to be challenging. It seems however, that since term limit legislation passed in 1992, it has caused
more difficulties than it does advantages. Bill Blair, legislative counsel for Ohio Citizens for the Arts, recognizes the impact of term limits on advocacy stating:

(Term limits) have a tremendous impact and makes advocacy very hard. Without term limits, people would create a natural progression and move up and learn about how state government works. Now they are in for a few terms and assume leadership roles while looking to see where they are going next (Blair, 2008).

Since legislators can only serve up to eight years in an office, many second term legislators often fulfill leadership roles early on, making it necessary for arts advocates to build relationship quickly. Donna Collins, described how she works around the difficulties of term limits to build stronger relationships with policymakers:

You must develop relationships with policymakers, not just at the Ohio House of Representatives and the Ohio Senate, but those in school board positions, on city councils and in local government. Those people usually end up climbing the policy ladder (Collins, 2008).

Another challenge confronted because of term limits is the familiarity and visibility of the Ohio Arts Council to legislators. Educating legislators as to the activities the Ohio Arts Council funds in the communities they represent, and the importance of those activities to their communities is imperative in order to sustain their budget and receive increased funding. But with legislators moving in and out of positions so quickly, it proves difficult to continually educate new legislators as to who the Ohio Arts Council is, the value Ohio's communities find in the agency and it is the job of Ohio Citizens for the Arts and arts advocates to educate their elected officials. When detailing the goals of Ohio Citizens for the Arts at the beginning of its inception, Wayne Lawson described the need for “higher visibility of the importance of the arts, more legislative involvement, and of course more money” (Lawson, 2008). Visibility became a
greater problem after term limit legislation, due to the high legislator turnover. The full effects of term limit legislations would not have been felt until 2000, and in 2001 the OAC began to experience budget decreases. This was also a period of recession for the nation.

Factors such as the economy and the health of the state budget have significant impact on the Ohio Arts Council's budget. Partisan politics however, have less of an impact than I had originally hypothesized. The Ohio Arts Council's budget has suffered its greatest losses under a republican governor, but also experienced some of its greatest increases under a republican governor as well. During the mid 1990's the Ohio Arts Council saw its budget go from $8,260,686 to $16,456,606 by 2000, during the terms of Republican Governor George Voinovich. During Voinovich's successor Governor Bob Taft's term, however the Ohio Arts Council saw its budget drop from its high of $16 million to $11,238,161. When Ohio Citizens for the Arts was formed, the state was under Republican leadership and had a budget of less than $1 million, however as Bill Blair recognized, the lack of funding was due to “a lack of any arts policy at the state level as well as low visibility” (Blair, 2008).

Visibility, however become a bigger threat during the culture wars of the 1990's. The controversy of the Ohio Arts Council's role in funding the exhibition at the Contemporary Arts Center placed both the state agency and the arts advocacy group in a media frenzy. The issue of responding to media questions, as well as questions asked by legislators, needed to be handled delicately and the OAC handled this issue. Wayne Lawson decided that handling the media and policy maker’s questions was a task only to be handled by the state arts agency. He describes the lines of communication regarding the event:

They (policymakers and media) wanted to know if we had any money in it, did
you have anything to do with it etc? So we had an emergency plan, which came out of our office and was used by the advocacy group to respond to questions. All questions from legislators and the media were to be referred to our agency. One person would handle those questions...the advocacy group did not speak to the press independently (Lawson, 2008).

This strategy brings to light the issue of role defining between the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group, which I believe to be one of the biggest issues of contention in most states. Because Ohio Citizens for the Arts does not speak for the Ohio Arts Council, but rather advocates on behalf of their budget allocations, it is the role of the state arts agency to defend their grant decisions, not the state arts advocacy group. Wayne Lawson defined the roles of each organization in terms of developing policy:

If you are going to look at the way policy is developed, funds are given to an agency legitimized by law, overseen by a board appointed by the governor to create and make policy. The advocacy group is formed to act as the voice in support of those policies (Lawson, 2008).

Both Donna Collins and Bill Blair supported Wayne Lawson's role definition in regards to Ohio Citizens for the Arts. OCA has not taken a position on freedom of speech and expression issues nor voiced their desire to defend such issues. Bill Blair describes how roles were defined when OCA was formed stating “we defined the role as an organization that was devoted solely to arts advocacy” (Blair, 2008). When asked about changes to Ohio Citizens for the Arts mission, Donna Collins stated that “the mission as really remained the same, it is truly to ensure the highest level of funding at the state and federal level for the arts council and the NEA, which ultimately is the arts in Ohio” (Collins, 2008). When roles are ill defined, it seems that controversy occurs when there is a struggle for control over how to handle certain situations. The Ohio Arts Council creates policy in the arts and Ohio Citizens for the Arts promotes those
policies to advocates and the Ohio Legislature. Both organizations rely on continued support from advocates and the Ohio Legislature.

During recent months, as has occurred in the past, Ohio has suffered significant economic downturns in 2008, leading to OAC budget cuts. In FY2008, per capita funding for the arts is Ohio is $1.09, ranking Ohio 32nd in arts funding in the nation. Julie Henahan, executive director of the Ohio Arts Council, recognizes the struggle of the times stating “the state legislature is going to be looking at everything that is expended and make sure it is valuable and needed investment” (Henahan, 2008). She continues on to note that “it would be very easy for a small agency, like the Ohio Arts Council to get lost in the flood of pleas for support” but that “it is not a time to be reticent” noting that “this isn't necessarily going to get us any more money, but it might save us from losing any more money” (Henahan, 2008). Sometimes a budget decrease is unavoidable, and all state agencies suffer the blow, as has been the case in Ohio in 2008. Both organizations respond differently to changes in the political environment of Ohio. Budget cuts to OAC mean less grants awarded, and the arts constituency needs to be prepared and educated on what they can to do work toward more funding in the future. The OAC strategically decides if they want to make cuts in staff, organization resources and grant funds, if they have the autonomy from the governor to do so. OCA works with constituents to help them articulate to their elected officials exactly what budget cuts mean for their organization and their communities. OCA does not strive to quell community frustration over budget cuts but assists constituents in becoming active in advocacy to avoid deeper cuts. OAC then legitimizes their budget cut decisions to constituents and listens to their feedback and cycles this information into future policy decisions.
Program Policy

In recent years, the Ohio Arts Council has changed their guidelines as well as rearranged their grant programs to better suit the needs of their constituency. There are several activities that the Ohio Arts Council has participated in over the years to better understand the needs of the arts constituency. When leaders at Ohio Citizens for the Arts and the Ohio Arts Council were asked who’s interests they serve, each person's answer was the same: the citizens of the state of Ohio. Without a satisfied constituency, the job of Ohio Citizens for the Arts becomes more difficult in motivating advocates, and the Ohio Arts Council runs the risk of losing the value that their constituents express to their legislators, thus legitimizing the agency to policymakers. Program policy is formulated by OAC, in light of constituent complaint or compliment and promoted by both OAC and OCA.

Wayne Lawson describes the bottom up manner in which policy changes are made at OAC. He cites a specific example of complaint from the Appalachian region of Ohio stating, “when we heard complaints from the Appalachian region of the state that they weren't being served, we created the Appalachian Arts Program” (Lawson, 2008). This is an example of the cyclical nature in which policy is informed by constituent feedback to the agency. Former Director Lawson goes on to describe how he dealt with describing policy changes to their constituency:

If you are going to add a program and your money is the same or less, somebody is not going to be in the same place they were the year before, so you have to justify it. That was my job, was to be in the field when people are raising their voices and making sure that they understood that the policy was for everybody and that was key (Lawson, 2008).

Changes in agency programs are made through the information the arts agency in partnership
with the state arts advocacy group gather while out in the field, traveling throughout Ohio. Donna Collins describes how she works closely with the OAC to gather information from the field, stating “we work closely with the OAC, and travel with them on their listening tours, grants workshops, and we have an opportunity to present to the general public and a breakout hour for advocacy training as well” (Collins, 2008).

The manner in which both the OAC and OCA gather information from the field is both different, as well as collaborative. For instance, some of Ohio Citizens for the Arts board members manage or direct arts institutions seeking grants from the Ohio Arts Council. The make-up of the board is important because this group has the greatest access to information, as well as influence. In recent years, Ohio Citizens for the Arts has made efforts to diversify their board, adding leaders of arts organizations in smaller communities, a more diverse geographical representation, and artists. The Ohio Arts Council uses final grant reports, regional meetings, and activities such as the listening tours and grants workshops to gather information from the field. Julie Henahan describes how OAC gathers feedback from the field currently:

Information provided through final reports after organizations have completed grants, another is when we get out in the field with regional meetings and have the opportunity to talk face to face with our grants constituents. The listening tours are designed specifically to find out what is important to our constituents and their communities, and how they define cultural vitality and what is vital to their communities (Henahan, 2008).

In Ohio, roles of both organizations are clearly defined, both agencies serving the same constituency but in distinct ways. Wayne Lawson describes the process in which program policy was changed or developed during his tenure:

You have to decide as an arts agency with board approval to create programs that
would best serve the constituency. You have to do that through statewide meetings, strategic planning, and it's ongoing. You have to feed that information back into the system. Some of it works, some of it doesn't but bottom line is always that the constituents are tax payers (Lawson, 2008).

It is the role of the OAC to create, change or alter policy, and Ohio Citizens for the Arts supports and promotes that policy statewide. Bill Blair recognizes the distinction in roles stating that “some SAAs think that the advocacy group wants to be the arts agency. We have always stayed away from that in Ohio, OAC and OCA understand their roles” (Blair, 2008).

Communication is key in maintaining a healthy working relationship between two organizations. Lines of communication are direct, from one executive director to another. However, since the Ohio Arts Council has a greater staff size than Ohio Citizens for the Arts, there are more people dealing with the information passed between organizations. Also, legislative counsel Bill Blair communicates directly with both Julie Henahan, and Donna Collins about information gathered through his lobbying efforts.

As has happened in the previous budget cycle and in the past, the Ohio Arts Council has suffered budget cuts and must determine where such cuts will take place. Previous director, Lawson describes how he handled the budget cuts stating that “our job was to make sure we maintained at all times an equality of distribution. That was very important” (Lawson, 2008). Legislative visits are key to working toward a budget increase or maintenance of the current appropriations. However Ohio Citizens for the Arts and the Ohio Arts Council must approach legislators very differently because of the OAC's position as a state agency. Julie Henahan describes her communication with legislators as “a chance to introduce myself and the agency in person, we publish a quarterly newsletter specifically for the Ohio Legislature, and invite all
legislators to Riffe Gallery openings, as well as other events, and always make sure to say thank you” (Henahan, 2008). But when it comes to asking for more money, there are a series of processes through the Office of Management and Budget that the Ohio Arts Council must go through to abide by state budgeting policies. At OCA however, it is in their mission to ensure greater funding for the OAC, and there are less restrictions for the advocacy group. Although OCA has to abide by the 1976 Lobbying Law, the 501©4 status of the organization puts less of a financial restriction on the organization and its lobbying activities. OCA still engages in activities such as thank you letters to legislators, invitations to events, letters of congratulations but they also are able to meet with and lobby specific legislators on finance committees who have greater control in overseeing budgeting legislation. Because Ohio Citizens for the Arts lobby's solely for the Ohio Arts Council's budget, little confusion exists on the goal of the lobbying efforts in congress.

Resources of the Ohio Arts Council and Ohio Citizens for the Arts

Resources of both the Ohio Arts Council and Ohio Citizens for the Arts exist as tangible research documents, economic and grant data as well as the grassroots advocates who lobby their elected officials and share the value of the Ohio Arts Council. OCA’s task is to educate advocates on their role in the advocacy process, and also provide quantitative and qualitative data to support the ask for increased funding. Resources such as the Dunn and Bradstreet creative industries reports, an annual economic impact study published by Americans for the Arts, as well as literature produced by the Ohio Arts Council are used to make the case for increased arts funding. Because staff and budget size restrict Ohio Citizens for the Arts from producing and conducting extensive research continually, the organization relies heavily on volunteers such as
graduate students or community members, board members, a professional lobbyist, and their alliance with the Ohio Arts Council to maximize the benefits of their resources.

The Ohio Arts Council has produced several research studies, some with funding from foundation grants. Two specific documents, The State of the Arts Report (SOAR) and Focusing The Light, provide insights to the advocacy work that Ohio Citizens for the Arts conducts. The State of the Arts Report, published in 2001, surveyed citizens of Ohio to better understand their perceptions of the arts in Ohio and the Ohio Arts Council specifically. This document not only helped the Ohio Arts Council tailor their programs, and strategic plans to the needs of Ohio's citizens, it provides OCA useful data to use in the advocacy process. Focusing The Light includes information to help arts organizations with strategic planning, evaluation and advocacy. Donna Collins collaborated with the Ohio Arts Council to write the advocacy chapter and stresses the importance of communicating with legislators. This demonstrates a priority in advocacy training on behalf of the Ohio Arts Council.

Both organizations also have governing boards, which serve as resources dispersed across the state and working at the grassroots level. Board members are appointed to work both in their communities and statewide to strengthen the arts and rally arts advocates in their communities. As president of the Ohio Citizens for the Arts Board, and a member of the Ohio Arts Council’s Board, Jeff Rich strives to “encourage everyone on each board to participate in local communities that acquaint public officials with needs for Ohio’s arts community” (Rich, 2008). Ohio Citizens for the Arts strives for geographic diversity on their board, to represent all areas of the state, and find strong advocates to reach the greatest number of legislative districts in Ohio. The Ohio Arts Council’s Board, which is appointed by the Governor, is usually composed of
influential arts and community leaders statewide. Julie Henahan describes the advantage of board appointments stating:

One assumes that part of the reason they have been put on the board is because of the relationship they have with the governor and some of the legislators. That is an asset that they bring to their position on the OAC board. I have been working on getting the board to feel comfortable in that role (Henahan, 2008).

Henahan admits that she would also like the Council members to feel more comfortable reaching out to Donna and Ohio Citizens for the Arts, and noted that only a few do so currently. She stressed a desire to improve relationships in this area, and increase communication with the advocacy group (Henahan, 2008).

Lobbyist Bill Blair, who communicates regularly with both Julie Henahan and Donna Collins, provides insight where both OAC, and OCA cannot maintain a regular presence with the Ohio Legislature. Blair describes his role as a lobbyist as “not only making sure they (arts advocates) know how to advocate, but also that they do that and use the tools we provide’ and further states that ‘the most effective kind of lobbying is done at the grassroots level” (Blair, 2008). As a lobbyist, Blair is able to meet with legislators throughout budget cycles, promote the Ohio Arts Council and rely on arts advocates to back up his requests for support by the Ohio Legislature. He can also gain a better idea of which legislators may become a champion for the arts when policy changes to the agency occur. Blair also lobbies for major Northeast Ohio arts institutions, universities in this region, and the Alliance for Public Telecommunications and the Great Lakes Historical Society. Although Bill Blair spends much of his time lobbying the Ohio Legislature, the importance of grassroots advocacy is not diminished. His work lends the familiarity of the policy process, and a sense of insider-ness during the process that most
advocates don't experience. But since arts advocates are constituents of their elected officials, they carry the power to keep legislators in office and this is important to all policymakers.

Grassroots advocates are the largest and most diverse resource of both the Ohio Arts Council and Ohio Citizens for the Arts. Both organizations work to maintain relationships with their constituents, and in return ask them to support the Ohio Arts Council by visiting and engaging their legislators. Donna Collins describes how she views relationship building as a measure of success for OCA:

I guess when I first started at OCA I thought about measuring success by dollars. If we increased the budget we are successful. But what I have learned over time is that while that is still our main goal, it’s also to develop meaningful relationships across the state at the grass roots (Collins, 2008).

When grassroots advocates are able to share stories of public value with legislators whom they can cast a vote for, their public officials are most willing to listen to them. Donna Collins works throughout Ohio with arts organizations and communities to develop advocacy strategies. Advocates are a very diverse group of people, and some have strong political ties. Some donate money to political campaigns and some share similar social circles with legislators. Because these advocates make investments in political candidates, they are able to leverage more support for the arts in return.

Both Ohio Citizens for the Arts and the Ohio Arts Council utilize their websites to provide constituents with access to information and advocacy materials. The Ohio Arts Council has multiple databases for artists, teaching artists, and organizations to network in Ohio. Their grants process is entirely online, and access is available for past grant awards. OCA, like the Illinois Arts Alliance utilizes the Americans for the Arts program, capwiz, so that constituents can look
for information on legislators, email or write letters to them, and locate media in Ohio. Action alerts are sent via capwiz, and advocates can use this desktop strategy to write legislators in response to legislative action regarding arts funding in the state.

Resources of both organizations are shared to maximize their benefit and impact. Both organizations foster relationships with board members, constituents and elected officials. Board members of OAC are not chosen, but the agency and constituents can make suggestions to the governor as to who they feel would best fill the open appointments. OCA however, has the option of nominating board members with relatively little restriction. In the past, the OCA board has been made up of leaders who primarily come from major institutions like museums, symphonies and operas. OCA must continue the current trend in diversifying its board to maximize representation among the arts constituency in Ohio. Relationship building and maintenance can greatly enhance each organizations network, and OAC and OCA work collaboratively with influential constituents and board members to promote the Ohio Arts Council throughout Ohio and to policymakers in the state legislature.

Internal Documentation of The SAA and SAAG Relationship

The Ohio Arts Council has published an extensive strategic plan for the period of 2006-2009. This report documents specific activities that the Ohio Arts Council will conduct or is in the process of conducting, to reach intended outcomes. Some goals have been cut short due to lack of funding, however many goals involve Ohio Citizens for the Arts and can provide insight to the relationship these organizations have and where their work overlaps. In goal one of the strategic plan, the Ohio Arts Council describes actions they will take to “invest in Ohio’s rich cultural resources” (OAC, 2006). One action is described as “promoting all new funding areas and
working with Ohio Citizens for the Arts and legislators on providing statistics, public value stories, economic and social rationales on why the arts are vital to all Ohioans” (OAC, 2006). I see this action as an ongoing process, and one that will assist in achieving the overall goal. This action succinctly describes the work of OCA, but also demonstrates that the OAC will have a role in gathering stories and working with OCA to provide data to legislators.

Goal three ‘helping citizens of all ages learn and thrive through the arts’ focuses on arts education in Ohio, and aims to take action working with Donna Collins, in her capacity as the Ohio Alliance for Arts Education (OAAE) director (OAC, 2006). By including Donna in the policy discussions of the OAC’s arts education work, she is able to better promote arts education through her advocacy work at OCA and OAAE. OCA is also mentioned in partnership with OAC to help with their third goal, suggesting Donna would be participating and representing both roles as director for OCA and OAAE.

The importance of developing and using advocacy tools is referenced in goal five: foster vibrant and healthy communities through the arts (OAC, 2006). OCA’s role is framed by collaborating to develop advocacy-training tools, and help organizations share their stories of public value. Ohio Citizens for the Arts has developed economic impact studies, continues to disseminate the creative industries reports and conduct advocacy-training workshops. Workshops are held at OAC events such as the 2008 grants workshops, but all other research materials were created largely independently of OAC. It may be useful for OCA to provide constituents with more in depth grants information from OAC, relating funding data directly to the work of OAC in the advocacy process. Partnership fostering is further discussed in goal six: sustain and cultivate strategic partnerships that broaden and support the arts. OCA is mentioned under the
action ‘revisit agreements with major partners to confirm priorities and responsibilities and 
identify new opportunities for 2007-2009 (OAC, 2006). The shift to a new OAC director gave 
both organizations a chance to reassess the way they work together and what areas can be 
strengthened or expanded in their work. It is important that each organization establish their 
shared goals, to avoid activities that may conflict with each other’s interests.

Both Julie and Donna describe their organizations relationship as collaborative, and discuss 
the need for open lines of communication. Julie Henahan states:

I think that it is the most important aspect of OCA and OAC is to have open lines 
of communication and the ability to say the truth to each other and nobody gets 
their feathers ruffled. We cannot move forward if people aren’t honest with each 
other and there is some kind of subterfuge on either side. That is not going to 
work and in other states that is what happens and it doesn’t serve the arts council 
or the citizens of that state (Henahan, 2008).

As Julie referred to, the clarity of motives is important, and as stated in the strategic plan, they 
must be reevaluated periodically. Donna Collins describes the openness of OCA’s intentions 
stating “we don’t seek permission from the OAC to do our work. It is more of a collaboration 
and trust issue, so that it is very clear that our motives are pure and we intend just to support the 
OAC’s work” (Collins, 2008). OAC and OCA also collaborate to sponsor the Governor’s Awards 
for the Arts and Arts Day Luncheon. This planning process is ongoing, and the event serves as a 
state advocacy day held annually. The governor gives selected arts constituents an award for their 
service in the arts community and the full state legislature is also invited. Legislators are sat with 
their constituents and honored for their continued support of the OAC. Although Wayne Lawson 
recognizes that “the advocacy group is formed to act as the voice in support of the (OAC’s) 
policies”, he also recognizes that there will always be contention in fostering such a relationship.
This contention is unavoidable, and is a natural side effect of close partnerships between organizations. By keeping the lines of communication open, OAC and OCA confront issues of contention immediately, avoiding frustration buildup and further tension. Contention however can build up among different groups, including board members and constituents so both organizations must be careful to deal with such issues.

The mission statement of Ohio Citizens for the Arts, includes a reference to the OAC, and notes that the organization advocates on behalf of the agency and the arts in Ohio. Including OAC in the mission statement demonstrates their commitment to advocating for the agency’s budget, however does not limit them to strictly advocating for the OAC. Donna Collins is active at the national level, and serves as vice-chair for the State Arts Action Network, with Sheila Smith of Minnesota and Ra Joy of Illinois. Ohio Citizens for the Arts however does not have a strategic plan, reiterating their advocacy goals.

Summary

Ohio Citizens for the Arts and the Ohio Arts Council have remained partner organizations since the formation of OCA in 1976. This perhaps is due to the fact that when OCA was formed, the OAC was involved, and Wayne Lawson worked with colleagues throughout the state to motivate grassroots advocates and maintain a stronger presence in the Ohio Legislature. The mission of OCA has remained unchanged, and the organization works to support the OAC’s budget in their advocacy efforts. Ohio Citizens for the Arts has not taken a stance on an issue that is in contrast to OAC policies, and this is often where tension occurs. Actions taken by the advocacy group have caused rifts in relationships in other states, but Ohio has managed to avoid any major disagreements.
The political climate in Ohio may prove to be one of the most challenging aspects of advocacy efforts on behalf of both organizations. When economic conditions deteriorate Ohio, as a large manufacturing midwestern state, it tends to feel the impacts deeper and longer. The OAC’s budget is not immune to such downturns, and this can be detrimental with such a small portion of Ohio’s overall budget. Especially in light of current economic conditions, OCA and OAC need to be sure to have valid, research and data that supports continued state support. Furthermore, OCA needs to continue to grow its membership and engage active advocates, which can prove to be a challenge. Asking members to continue to pay membership fees may be difficult as people’s budgets continue to tighten. OCA needs to engage those advocates who have strong political influence, as well as a well-rounded coalition of advocates who represent a large portion of Ohio’s communities. The Ohio Arts Council may also come under scrutiny from their constituents over diminished grant funds. The OAC, which could likely face additional budget cuts in the next biennium budget due to declining state revenue, may face frustration from constituents relying on grant funds for their organizations budgets.

Board members of OCA and Ohio Arts Council board members are increasingly important resources, having the ability to engage citizens in all areas of the state. Both OAC and OCA have limited travel and staff resources. With board members who represent diverse Ohio communities, it is important to engage strong community leaders to rally the grassroots in their hometowns. OCA must also rely on their board to recruit new members and continue to increase their membership to support their budget. Research is another important resource that both OAC and OCA must continue to produce. Collaborations with each other, with board members at state universities, and foundation grants can help produce meaningful studies that will assist in the
advocacy process. The Ohio Arts Council is embarking on their second iteration of the SOAR report, and this could prove advantageous for both organizations to understand changes that have taken place since the first study and determine how the OAC’s policies have changed initial perceptions defined in the first SOAR report.

In order to sustain a meaningful relationship between the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group there is one factor that cannot be minimized: communication! This has been a strong point for OAC and OCA, and both organizations have avoided major rifts in discrepancies regarding miscommunication. Furthermore, OCA has always had a clear mission to advocate on behalf of the Ohio Arts Council’s budget. Although this may limit the organization in its involvement to advocate for funding outside of the OAC’s budget, Donna Collins is able to advocate for Department of Education funding for arts education in her capacity as OAAE director. It is unclear whether advocating for funding outside of the OAC budget could benefit the arts, and in some states the advocacy group does just that. But this could also create competition for state funds with the OAC, and therefore it has been the stance of OCA to avoid such competition for state funds.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION: RESEARCHER ANALYSIS

This thesis investigated the relationship between state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in three states based on organizational structures, and responses from administrators facilitating these relationships in Illinois, Minnesota and Ohio. My personal interest in these cases has been discussed, including my participant observer status with the case of Ohio. Literature concerning the history of the state arts agency movement and the arts advocacy group's role in this movement has been reviewed. My methods for conducting this case study have been clearly explained based on narrative interview procedures and data collection processes from case study and participant observation literature. I have examined how each state's arts agency and advocacy group facilitate relationships with each other based on narrative interviews, reviews of strategic plans, and the resources each organization makes available to the state's arts constituency at large. Key staff interviewed were those I believe to be the leaders involved in advocacy efforts of the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group. In addition, when available board members and lobbyists were interviewed. In this chapter, I will discuss my findings of the three case studies: successful actions and activities by state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in facilitating their relationship, what other states can learn from these cases, and the implications for the arts policy field at large. I will also discuss the lessons learned while conducting this research and offer suggestions for future researchers pursuing a similar case study in the field.

Findings
Each state arts agency in these case studies was founded in these states at different times, but as largely evident in the review of literature, states took advantage of funds available from the NEA and created state arts agencies to administer available federal grant money at the state level. Most SAA's were not organic creations of an expressed need by a specific constituency at the state level. Although many organizations such as museums, operas, and symphonys had been established prior to available SAA funds, generally an arts constituency did not advocate for the establishment of a state level arts agency. State arts advocacy groups were created to assist in rallying grassroots support for the arts. After state arts agencies established a constituency which needed to be organized and mobilized. These SAAG's sometimes supported the SAA and lobby for increased arts funding. Some states created arts advocacy groups based on a specific incident threatening arts funding, and some in order to increase SAA visibility to avoid the threat of decreased funding. Ohio Citizens for the Arts was formed in 1976, being one of the earliest formed SAAGs, but this still occurred almost a decade after most SAAs were formed. The central question for this research is as follows:

How do state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups collaborate to increase or sustain arts funding at the state level, promote state arts agency programs to multiple constituencies and collaborate on advocacy efforts given the nature in which the arts constituency has been organized and mobilized over time in a given state?

Findings will be analyzed in three sections: budget allocations to state arts agencies, organizational priorities as seen in: mission statements, strategic plans and other related research, and interview data findings with agency and advocacy group facilitators of the relationship and their perceptions of each other. The first section summarizes state arts agency and state arts advocacy group efforts for increased or sustained funding for the SAA. A primary goal for all
state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups is increased or sustained arts funding, which is why budget allocation trends and state arts agency and state arts advocacy group advocacy efforts are important to analyze. Documents such as strategic plans and mission statements provide documented evidence of the SAA and SAAG activities to facilitate a partnership with one another. Interview data allows me to understand how each SAA and SAAG perceives their relationship with one another based on narrative evidence from staff. Most interviews were conducted via telephone, which put me at a disadvantage in analyzing body language in response to questions asked. Body language cues were not discussed in cases where interviews occurred in person for consistency in my analysis.

State Budget Allocations

The current economic situation effects all state arts agencies in this case study, although initially both Minnesota and Ohio received increases in budget appropriations for FY2008. Illinois received a budget cut, however this cut seemed to be the result of a political strategy of the governor retaliating against his political opponents. Nationally, the trend for increases in state arts agency appropriations has been its greatest in the past five years but the significant decreases in Illinois and Florida brought down aggregate appropriations totals (NASAA, 2008). Although most states experienced budget increases, overall growth has slowed over the past ten years due to economic downturn (NASAA, 2008). The three case studies in this research reflect national trends, which show the highest budget appropriations occurring between 2000-2001. Illinois, Minnesota and Ohio have all experienced their highest appropriations during this time period and have set target goals to reach these levels again.

Illinois's budget allocations for the arts as of late have been a victim of political strategy
games of the current governor. Typically the cultural hub of the Midwest, the state of Illinois has suffered its largest budget cuts in FY2008. Governor Ron Blagojevich, during the previous budget cycles, has minimally increased the Illinois Arts Council's budget. It is evident that the $4.6 million decrease in the past budget cycle was probably not a result of decreasing state revenues. The fiscal year 2008 Legislative Appropriations Survey by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies credits the decrease in Illinois (and Florida) for substantially bringing down national total aggregate data (NASAA, 2008). The case of Illinois provides an example of the effects the political environment can have on an SAA budget. This $4.6 million decrease is an historical decrease for the IAC. This decrease also emphasizes the importance of board appointments and their relationships with policy makers. Shirley Madigan’s husband, House Speaker Michael Madigan and the governor were political rivals. Many saw the cut to the IAC’s budget as a tactic to retaliate against a political rival by Governor Blagojevich.

The Illinois Arts Alliance was formed in response to the threat of budget cuts. In 1982 the organization has since had to guard against such threats. Because the Illinois legislature actually restored funding, which was subsequently cut by the governor, the efforts of the advocacy group were not entirely fruitless. In fact, the advocacy group’s strategies have guarded against budget cuts in the past, and this current situation demonstrates the overarching effects of political relationships.

The Ohio Arts Council has experienced budget increases and decreases during Governor Ted Strickland's first term. Unanimously the House of Representatives, the Ohio Senate, and Governor Strickland granted an 11.1% increase to the Ohio Arts Council during the Fy2008-2009 budget cycle. Unfortunately due to declining state revenues, and the risk of an unbalanced
budget, Governor Strickland has made two cuts to the agency since this time. The agency however was not singled out in either round of budget cuts, but treated like all other state agencies in the budget cutting process. In the past, the Ohio Arts Council has experienced a healthy budget with overall growth, but follows national trends of decreases in the past ten years due to the economic downturn. The arts advocacy group in Ohio was created with the distinct purpose of working toward greater state appropriations. This mission has not changed within the organization today. Ohio Citizens for the Arts has also been able to avoid any major struggles to control policy with the Ohio Arts Council, and each has benefited from clearly defined roles over time.

Unlike Illinois and Ohio, Minnesota has made large gains in their state's budget allocations. After suffering budget reductions since 2002, the Minnesota State Arts Board was able to gain an increase of almost $2 million in the most recent budget cycle. Until 1998, the Minnesota State Arts Board survived on a modest budget, making small gains over time. Shortly after the MSAB experienced their highest appropriations of $13.1 million, Governor Tim Pawlenty took office and the MSAB continually experienced a decreasing budget until the most recent budget cycle. Minnesota also succeeded in passing The Clean Water, Land, and Legacy Amendment to the state constitution, which allocates a portion of the increase in sales tax to the arts and arts education. This increase in funding through sales tax was seen as a large win for the arts in Minnesota, and secures funding for the next 25 years.

Minnesota Citizens for the Arts played a large role in the passing of the constitutional amendment allocating sales tax dollars for the arts and arts education. Sheila Smith, executive director of MCA, notes that she has been working on this campaign for over four years. As stated
in my analysis chapter, however, a chance exists that since this funding is going to the MSAB and regional arts councils legislative appropriations could decrease in light of decreasing state revenues. The governor, or the Minnesota state legislature may feel less compelled to increase funding for the MSAB in light of their newly appropriated sales tax funds. The Minnesota State Arts Board made little mention of this constitutional amendment in our narrative interviews, so it is unclear how the agency feels about this funding change, and it will undoubtedly change the way that MCA advocates for arts funding.

Our nation is facing the most severe economic crisis it has faced in decades and state arts agencies are subject to funding cuts in the face of state revenue shortfalls. Ohio has already experienced such cuts, and will likely not experience an increase in the next budget cycle as Ohio weathers the economic downturn with falling state revenues and a weakening economy. Minnesota has succeeded in increasing their state's appropriations to the arts and culture, and secured a second revenue source for the state agency. Although the effects on state appropriations are yet to be discovered, as state revenues fall in times of economic downturn, the MSAB has an alternative source of funds from this newly passed amendment. In the past, the Illinois Arts Alliance was able to strategically lobby the governor for an increase in funding, however the most recent budget cycle demonstrated the agency's vulnerability to political rivalries. As the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies has noted several states have already responded to revised economic revenue projections by decreasing original spending projections for FY 2008 (NASAA, 2008). State budget allocations are important to analyze because state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups need sufficient funding to continue their programs. By analyzing what advocacy efforts the SAA and SAAG utilize to secure funds and budget allocations history,
success strategies become more apparent. The political environment also demonstrates what issues are working against or for arts advocacy efforts.

*Organizational priorities as seen in mission statements, strategic plans and other related research and other documents*

All three states arts advocacy groups have differing priorities as seen through their arts impact research and internal planning and policy documents. State arts agency documents emphasize the importance of the SAA and SAAG relationship in documents such as agency strategic plans. All three state arts advocacy groups rely heavily on focusing their work toward the goals set forth in their mission and value statements. State arts agencies however have little room to shift priorities and all primarily serve as granting organizations that serve the arts and culture statewide. The agencies do differ however in their research production and policymaking.

The Illinois Arts Alliance is in a period of transition after former director, Alene Valkanas, who directed the agency for over twenty years, retired. The new director, Ra Joy, and former director Alene Valkanas worked together to re-brand the organization, to escape the image many citizens made in connecting the IAA with Alene Valkanas. Part of the organization's re-branding process also entails a new name for the organization, in order to clear up confusion among their constituents where people think of the Illinois Arts Alliance as the same organization as the Illinois Arts Council. The IAA insists that their mission and primary purpose will remain the same throughout the re-branding process. Arts education funding remains important to the IAA, and the organization advocates for the Illinois State Board of Education funding arts education
programs. IAA continues to support freedom of speech and freedom of expression issues so that 'a climate in which the broadest spectrum of artistic expression can flourish' (Illinois Arts Alliance).

The Illinois Arts Council also has recently welcomed a new executive director, Terry Schrogum who was previously a member of the council board. The relationship between the Illinois Arts Council and the Illinois Arts Alliance was and continues to be in transition during the early stages of both directors' tenure. Because the working relationship was already established, each director is working to maintain open lines of communication. Although the agency discusses the importance of raising visibility with the state legislature, the strategic directions document of the IAC makes no mention of partnering with the Illinois Arts Alliance to achieve this goal. Goals like increasing grassroots support and using public value data are stated explicitly, however no partnership with IAA is mentioned. The Illinois Arts Alliance publishes extensive research reports with the support of local and national foundations, but the IAC makes available little in the way of research benefiting the arts community of Illinois.

The mission of Ohio Citizens for the Arts explicitly states that the organization works to increase public support for the arts in Ohio; through the efforts of hundreds of individuals and arts and arts education organizations advocates on behalf of the Ohio Arts Council and the arts throughout the state (www.ohiocitizensforthearts.org). The mention of OAC in the mission statement strongly aligns the organization with the state arts agency. Unlike Illinois and Minnesota, Ohio Citizens for the arts does not take a position on freedom of speech and expression issues for the arts in Ohio. Ohio Citizens for the Arts does not publish a strategic plan, making available their goals during a specific time period. It may serve the organization well to
explicitly state goals that the board and organization intends to achieve in a specific period of time. OCA works with graduate students at the Ohio State University, to create research documents promoting the economic and social impact of the arts and arts education. OCA does not apply for funding from the OAC, unlike the advocacy groups in Illinois and Minnesota. Donna Collins describes the reasons as a conflict of interest between the advocacy group and those they serve that also apply for grants from the OAC.

The Ohio Arts Council focuses on facilitating their relationship with OCA in several goals published in the organizations strategic plan. OCA is mentioned in this document in the lists of actions the arts agency will take to achieve their stated goals. Actions to facilitate advocacy efforts with OCA include developing advocacy-training tools and working to promote new programs as well as public value stories, and economic and social data to legislators. The Ohio Arts Council has also published research promoting public value in the arts, examining the perceptions of the OAC among their constituents through the State of the Arts Report. They are embarking on its second iteration of this research report.

Minnesota Citizens for the Arts produces an annual policy agenda which outlines the organizations policy goals for the coming year. The SAAG includes their advocacy efforts for the Minnesota State Arts Board and also details their goals in changing other policy areas that affect the arts and arts organizations in Minnesota. This document represents MCA's strong leadership role in changing policy at the state level. The organization also publishes extensive studies on the economic and social impact of the arts in Minnesota as well as documents that assist constituents in the advocacy process. The website of Minnesota Citizens for the Arts is the epicenter of this information, and the organization uses it extensively to make such resources available to their
constituents. The mission of Minnesota Citizens for the Arts, ensuring opportunity for all people to have access to and involvement in the arts, gives the organization the freedom to act on a variety of policy issues.

The Minnesota State Arts Board provides an out of date strategic plan on their website. The document emphasizes the importance of arts advocacy activities and mentions the fostering of their partnership with MCA in the advocacy process. Both organizations also co-host a Forum of Regional Arts Councils of Minnesota to plan and prepare for future budget cycles, and provide professional development for the regional arts council leaders. The MSAB works in partnership with MCA to advocate for policy changes at the state level. MCA, however, is the primary organization promoting policy change both statewide and within the state arts agency. Sheila Smith, director of Minnesota Citizens for the Arts credits this to the limitations of the MSAB due to their status as a government agency. MSAB provides little research but instead focuses on program promotion to their constituents and MCA publishes much of the research on arts policy in the state of Minnesota.

All three state agencies promote their partnerships with the arts advocacy groups in different ways. The Ohio Arts Council explicitly mentions how they will facilitate such a relationship and OCA reciprocates such actions in carrying out their mission daily. The Minnesota State Arts Board works closely with MCA to promote advocacy activities, but leaves much of the leadership for policy change up to the advocacy group. MCA also advocates to the MSAB for changes in their policy to make sure that all citizens have access and opportunity in the arts. The Illinois Arts Council and the Illinois Arts Alliance share established relationship is transitioning into a new period with leadership of the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group.
Neither organization provides solid documentation of the means by which they will facilitate such a relationship. Verbally both directors seek to continue collaborating on such advocacy efforts and to increase funding for the Illinois Arts Council. Though all SAAGs in these case studies were created in response to budget concerns for the state arts agency, Minnesota Citizens for the Arts and the Illinois Arts Alliance have taken strong stances on arts policy outside of the state arts agency. At times this has adversely impacted their relationship with the SAA.

*Interview data findings with agency and advocacy group facilitators of the relationship*

Conducting narrative interviews allowed me a chance as a researcher to gather information that is otherwise not available in the field of arts policy. Specific stories recalling experiences of the SAAs and SAAG’s and history of the organizations cannot be gathered through documents and this information is largely not available to the public. As a participant observer in the case study of Ohio, I am more familiar with some of the history of the organizations and arts policy environment of the state than the organizations in Illinois and Minnesota. I had to rely on the narrative interviews with key staff to gain a deeper sense of the relationship that each organization has had with one another throughout time, and whether there were any major periods of controversy or fights for control over state arts policy.

I had the chance to speak with former director of the Illinois Arts Alliance, Alene Valkanas, who was able to recall specific instances in which the IAA’s relationship with the Illinois Arts Council was challenged based on choices the advocacy group was making. The former Illinois Arts Alliance director made it clear that the advocacy group supported the rights and freedoms of
the arts in Illinois despite objections from the IAC. Alene described the IAC’s displeasure with the IAA’s participation debates on freedom of expression issues. Former Director of the Illinois Arts Council, Rhoda Pierce, was vague when describing her relationship with the IAA during Alene’s tenure but described a generally positive relationship. Since both Terry Schrogum and Ra Joy are relatively new to their director positions, both treaded lightly and spoke positively about their open communication and willingness to work together. Ra acknowledged that there had been times of conflicts of interest, but never ones with lasting effects and resolutions were always reached.

Former director of the Minnesota State Arts Board, Bob Booker, did not speak positively about his relationship with Minnesota Citizens for the Arts. He found the advocacy group as attempting to control state policy and MSAB policy, and stated he has ‘little respect for the ethics of Minnesota Citizens for the Arts’ (Booker, 2008). It is evident in hearing Bob Booker’s testimony that his relationship with MCA and Sheila Smith was for the most part unproductive and tense. Sheila Smith did not reiterate former director Booker’s feelings, and did not discuss any past issues with MCA’s relationship with the MSAB. She was clear to note that the advocacy group did not need to seek any permission, but rather only keep the arts agency informed of the advocacy group’s activities. Because MCA lobbies the MSAB for policy changes, conflicts over control of such policy were likely between Smith and Booker. Current interim director of the Minnesota State Arts Board, Sue Gens, did not identify any policy struggles with MCA. Booker describes a tumultuous past relationship, and a fight for control over aspects of the state arts policy, including appointments to the Board of Director’s of the Minnesota State Arts Board. A conflict of interest arises when the advocacy group, who lobbies the SAA, actively works to
appoint SAA board members.

The Ohio Arts Council’s former director, Wayne Lawson, had been director of the agency since the inception of Ohio Citizens for the Arts until 2006 when Julie Henahan was appointed executive director. Wayne describes a sense of partnership between the two organizations, but insists that the advocacy group not attempt to change policy, a belief of the council. Roles seem to be clearly defined between each organization, and Donna Collins, executive director of Ohio Citizens for the Arts, expresses no desire in controlling or changing arts policy in Ohio. Both Donna Collins and current OAC director, Julie Henahan, were confident in the way that their organizations worked collaboratively to increase arts funding. Lobbyist Bill Blair, who has been with OCA since its inception, also expressed that roles were clearly defined at all levels. Unlike the Illinois Arts Alliance, Ohio Citizens for the Arts did not take a vocal stance when the controversies of the Robert Mapplethorpe exhibits were occurring. Wayne Lawson describes the control that OAC had over the situation and OCA did not struggle to be vocal or control media perceptions of the issue.

At the present time, all states seem to express a strong working relationship, but the advocacy groups in Illinois and Minnesota strongly asserted their independence from the state arts agency. Staff interviewed in Illinois are in their first few years of their positions and had little evidence of action that revealed a long successful relationship. Many facilitators of the SAA and SAAG relationship in Ohio have been with their respective organizations for more than ten years, and it seems in this case that roles are clearly defined and there is little struggle for control of policy as was the case in the past in Minnesota.

Qualities of a successful relationship
Both narrative interview data as well as review of pertinent literature uncovers three qualities of a successful relationship between state arts advocacy groups and state arts agencies: communication, control, and collaboration. These three factors are important to maintaining a working relationship between each organization. I do not believe that the state arts advocacy group should be an extension of the arts agency, however, it is important that each organization work together since their overarching missions of improving the arts in their states are similar. As always both state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups in Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio seek to increase funding by lobbying their state legislature.

Communication is important to always make sure that the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group have the same information regarding policy changes, budget changes, or overall opinions of their shared constituency base. Americans for the Arts survey of arts advocacy groups in *The State of the Field*, states that communication is key in maintaining a close relationship with the state arts agency. When either organization withholds information or attempts to work independently from each other, neither can work completely to improve the arts policy of their state. Bringing a unified message to policy makers regarding the essential component of the arts in a given state is imperative to successful advocacy efforts.

Control can be an ugly word when people are competing for it, and it can be detrimental to the success of arts policy at the state level if there is not clarity in which group, the SAA or the SAAG, changes arts policy within the agency. By law the state arts agency has the legislative power to change or adapt arts policy at the state level. The arts advocacy group can advocate for changes to that policy, but has no legal authority to make such changes. It is important for both the advocacy group and the arts agency to understand the changes that need to take place in
policy, and this is once again where communication becomes so important. Changes in granting procedures, program guidelines, or distribution of legislative appropriations are made by the state arts agency. Both the SAA and the SAAG should work together to gather information about constituents’ feelings toward these policies to achieve the deepest understanding of the needs of those they are serving. The governor and the legislature are the only other entities that can control arts policy at the state level through budget appropriations, and changes made to the arts agency’s enabling legislation, and council appointments. This is why it is important that the advocacy group focuses their advocacy efforts to this stakeholder group, and work with the arts agency to succeed in favorable appropriations decisions for the agency.

Collaboration between the state arts advocacy group and the state arts agency can happen on many different levels. The two organizations should collaborate on efforts to rally grassroots advocates in participating in the advocacy process and collaborate on efforts to increase financial support. By law the state arts agency cannot lobby the legislature for increased funding to their budget. This is the job of the arts advocacy group and grassroots advocates. The SAAG can work with the arts agency to ensure that they are advocating for favorable policy changes for the arts agency, and use valid evidence to support such changes. Both organizations can also collaborate on efforts to engage constituents in different ways. The state arts agency can change guidelines to ensure that constituents and grants recipients are doing their part to thank legislators for the appropriations of SAA funding. State arts advocacy groups can also work with the SAA to co-host events and advocacy training sessions for constituents.

The state arts agency and state arts advocacy group must maintain clarity on all three elements of success. It is no doubt that personal relationships and professional preferences can
interfere or interject in the flow of information and lines of communication. After all, personalities clash as we have seen throughout the history of politics, and state arts agencies and advocacy groups are not immune to this. The policy environment of the state also changes advocacy strategies, and the SAA and SAAG need to be able to collaboratively create action plans. Sometimes this environment brings unavoidable changes, like recent budget cuts in Ohio due to falling state revenues. It is during times like these when the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy groups is so valuable. No SAA or SAAG in this case study have any formal agreements on their roles in relation to each other. Much of the relationship nurturing happens on a voluntary basis with both organizations desiring to improve and progress the field of arts policy and the arts community for the constituents in their state.

Do the three case studies exhibit qualities of a successful relationship?

Since the relationships and facilitators of the relationships between SAAs and SAAGs are always changing it is difficult to judge the success of such relationship in a given period of time. The three case study states, Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio, were evaluated based on current trends as well as past perceptions of this relationship. In every state changes have taken place over time including agency structure and leadership. In subsequent paragraphs, I will evaluate each state based on the three qualities of a successful relationship listed above: communication, control and collaboration.

All three states appeared to have successful means of communicating between organizations. Both Illinois and Ohio’s interviewees noted that there was almost daily or weekly
communication between the state arts agency and the state arts advocacy group. Sheila Smith, in Minnesota noted that she makes the MSAB aware of all activities MCA carries out, but did not describe any close lines of communication. In Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio the arts advocacy groups have access to grant information which is public information, and all three state arts agencies described immediate access at any time for the advocacy group to this information. In Ohio, Julie Henahan expressed a desire to improve communications with her council board and Ohio Citizens for the Arts to further advocacy efforts. In Minnesota, former MSAB director Bob Booker expressed that there was too much communication and control taking place with the MSAB board and MCA.

Control over arts policy at the state level seemed to be the greatest point of contention between SAAs and SAAGs. In the past, Illinois took a stance on issues of freedom of expression, something that although the IAC did not have involvement in but disagreed with IAA’s position. Because this was not an IAC funding issue, but still involved public funding to a public arts institution the IAA took a position and defended a student’s right to freedom of artistic expression. This situation had little impact on the IAC and it is evident that the IAA today, under new direction, would still strive to protect such freedoms. The challenge will prove to be whether the IAC has a role in future cases like this. In Ohio, the OAC did have a role in funding a controversial art exhibit, and they took control of the media and legislators questions because they felt that it was an issue regarding their granting policies. Wayne Lawson was sure to take control of the information released regarding this issue, and Ohio Citizens for the Arts made no public statements regarding the Mapplethorpe exhibit in Cincinnati, Ohio. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts seems to have the greatest control over changes to arts policy at the state level. The
organization advocates to the MSAB, rather than simply collaborating and relaying constituent complaint or compliment regarding the arts agency’s policies. This is the reason that former director Bob Booker had problems facilitating a relationship between MSAB and MCA.

All three states make significant efforts to collaborate on events, activities, and research to benefit the grassroots advocates. Illinois, Minnesota and Ohio advocacy groups collaborate with the state arts agency to host arts advocacy days, whether it be at the state capitol, or at a local site. The Illinois Arts Alliance collaborates with the Illinois Arts Council on statewide conferences as well as professional development activities, as does Minnesota Citizens for the Arts and the Minnesota State Arts Board. Ohio Citizens for the Arts invites executive director of OAC Julie Henahan to all board meetings, and likewise Donna Collins is invited to all OAC council board meetings and constituent events such as this year’s listening tours, and grants workshops. Donna is also given an opportunity to present facts about the importance of advocacy at such events. All three states host annual lobbying days for the arts and in Ohio the state arts agency and state arts advocacy group does so collaboratively presenting awards in the governor’s honor.

Lessons for other states

Since the relationships between state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups are different in all states, it is important that each state evaluate their relationship within the framework of established roles. Organizations can work together to evaluate their lines of communication and the ways in which information is shared and accessed. Roles can be clearly defined whenever a new staff member is welcomed into a position in which it is vital that they collaborate and communicate with staff in partnering positions. The roles of the state arts
advocacy group and the state arts agency should not seek to control each other but rather work collaboratively to move arts policy forward in their state.

Because many SAAs and SAAGs do not contract their relationships with each other through binding documents, it is best to examine documents produced by the agency or advocacy group that outline specific goals. Strategic plans, policy agendas and other internal documents can strengthen the shared goals of each organization. It is important to incorporate the coordinating advocacy group or arts agency in your statement of actions. This can also avoid control issues if each organization is able to explicitly read in these documents how their partnering organization seeks to carry out activities where their efforts overlap. Concerns can be raised during the planning process and facilitated in a civil, and professional manner.

The most important aspect of maintaining a working relationship between SAAs and SAAGs is communication and role definition. Evaluations of such factors are important in maintaining a strong working relationship. If either organization does not feel supported, or feels challenged by one another, clashes in goals and policy control will occur. Each state must evaluate their own situation based on the arts policy environment, legal restrictions of each organization, and what each organization hopes to achieve through collaborative efforts at the state level.

Implications for the Field

In this research I sought to more clearly define the way in which state arts agencies and state arts advocacy groups work together to push forward state policies in the arts. The three case studies chosen have demonstrated the versatile nature that these relationships can exhibit, as well as how aspects of such a relationship can change over time. Despite the differences in Illinois,
Minnesota, and Ohio, similarities have been identified that help each organization facilitate a strong partnership in the policy process.

The cases in this project allowed me to get an in depth look at three state arts agencies in the Midwest, and the advocacy groups who operate in these states. All three groups maintain some type of relationship, although very different in many ways. The diversity of such a relationship in these cases prove that relationships in other states are likely different from even these three cases. It is almost impossible to create a framework for how such a relationship should be facilitated given the diverse histories of the SAAs and SAAGs. In Ohio, for example, the strong connection at the inception of the SAAG may have continued because of a long tenured SAA director, in combination with a focus on a specific mission of the SAAG. All relationships are based on a specific event or series of historical events focused on increased or threatened arts funding. Relationships have evolved based on their initial collaborations, and changed when leadership changes occur.

The findings from the case studies as well as the review of literature express three facts about the relationship between SAAs and SAAGs. First, there is little literature or research published on the history or makeup of state arts advocacy groups. This could be perhaps because of the diversity of such groups, or because most research efforts have been concentrated on the state arts agency. Second, state arts advocacy groups, like SAAs, cannot be generalized in the United States. Just like all state arts agencies were formed at different times, for different reasons, so too were the state arts advocacy groups. Their histories and current modes of operation are simply too diverse to generalize and thus the need for concentrated research in specific states is needed to gather a more in depth look at the diverse ways in which state arts
agencies and state arts advocacy groups operate together and separately in a given state. This
diverse nature of SAAs and SAAGs stems from the history of the arts constituency. Third,
different states policies on the arts require different modes of operation. In some states, arts
advocacy groups and state arts agencies are struggling to keep their budget from being zeroed
out, while other states are striving for increased appropriations from year to year. The arts policy
environment of each state largely depends on the leaders in the state legislature, and how they
perceive the state arts agency.

Final Thoughts

My research in evaluating relationships at the state level between advocacy groups and
arts agencies has been beneficial professionally, educationally, and personally. I was able to
examine the work that I do in Ohio, in light of the way that others at MCA and IAA coordinate
their advocacy efforts. I have discovered that the diversity of SAAs and SAAGs is unique to their
state, and that it can never be homogenized. Each organization is fortunate to prescribe their
mode of facilitation of such a relationship based on the unique aspects of their state’s arts policy.
I have had the chance to speak with individuals who have worked in the field and have
experienced many significant changes over time. I am confident that my research will help other
states evaluate their relationships in light of my review of existing literature as well as my
findings from the case studies incorporated in this thesis.
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