

WGAHE

**The Structure of the Arts in the United
States**

**Current Conditions and Next Steps from
the Perspective of Higher Education**

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Current Conditions and Next Steps from the Perspective of Higher Education

A Statement of the Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education

Contents

Abstract

PART I

Three Elements

Overview.....
Creation and Presentation

Education

Support

PART II

Connections

Creation/Presentation and Support

Education and Support

Creation/Presentation and Education

PART III

Stresses

External Stresses

Funding

Education

Values

Purpose

Internal Stresses

Institutional Roles

Funding Sources

Public Relations Content

K-12 Arts Education

Higher Education

American Work

Policy Development

PART IV

Next Steps

Synchronization

Local Control

Analytical Questions

Conclusion

Abstract

The arts in the United States are produced, taught, funded, and governed through a unique structure, developed over many years by the aggregate efforts of numerous builders. This structure is magnificently complex. It achieves much. It could achieve much more.

While the arts in the United States are productive, energetic, and vigorously promoted, artists and arts organizations face continuous financial, and thus programmatic, difficulties. Arts agencies now use the term "artistic deficit" to indicate when presenting organizations achieve "financial stability at the expense of the art form." Many teachers and administrators face with declining optimism each year's battle to maintain curriculum-based arts instruction in the schools. Managers and arts administrators worry about diminishing results from increased expenditures for promotion.

These conditions and others of similar nature demand a review of the structure of the arts in the United States in order to determine what is needed to make our efforts for art more effective. The structure contains three basic elements: (1) creation and presentation, (2) education, and (3) support. These elements form a tripod on which the arts enterprise rests. If each element is not strong in and of itself, or if each is not operationally supportive of the others, the tripod fails and the whole arts enterprise falters.

Naturally, connections exist among these three elements. It is obvious that support must be provided for creation, presentation, and education in the arts. Connections between education and creation/presentation are just as essential, even if less commonly understood.

All operational structures are subject to internal and external stresses. The structure supporting art in the United States is no exception. The external context for arts activities generates obvious and well-publicized funding difficulties. There are also deeper concerns in the realm of values. Problems with defining what art is or in sorting out the various purposes art serves create serious tensions for all three elements of the arts enterprise. These external stresses often place the arts community in the position of having to sell a product it cannot define for the public at large by citing benefits that can neither be defined nor quantitatively justified. Somehow this cycle of public misunderstanding must be broken.

The structure of the arts in the United States creaks with internal tensions as well. To often an unhealthy level of conflict is present over institutional roles, access to funding, public relations philosophies, the purpose and content of arts education for children and youth, repertory, and influence in policy development.

New Mechanisms for cooperation are necessary to reduce the internal and external stresses outlined above. These mechanisms must be centered on the arts disciplines themselves, on works of art, and on teaching and learning the various arts. One of our great challenges is to find a better balance between substance and promotion in the operation of all arts activities. Other issues include the levels of our aspirations for artistic achievement and educational accomplishment, the effectiveness of our policy development mechanisms, and the viability of our evaluative criteria.

Improvements for the American arts enterprise will occur to the extent that representatives of all three elements volunteer to strengthen the tripod and become mutually supportive at local, state, and national levels. Only by understanding the linkages between interdependence and success can the creation/presentation, education, and support sectors expect to improve the conditions under which they are working. Only by addressing this interdependence in operational terms can inherent potentials for the arts in America be fully realized.

PART I THREE ELEMENTS

Overview

The art enterprise in the United States results from the composite efforts of many independent individuals and organization in the public and private sectors. There are three primary elements:

- o Creation and presentation - Making new works of art and performing or exhibiting them along with works of the past.
- o Education -- Teaching and learning at all levels for the general public and for professional artists.
- o Support - Promotion, management, funding, and the development of audiences.

The art enterprise in the United States can prosper only to the extent that each element is healthy in and of itself and to the extent that all three elements are mutually supportive.

Creation and Presentation

Each arts discipline exhibit its own pattern of creation and presentation. In some manifestations, the artist work alone; in others, the artist's endeavors are *always* characterized by intensity, commitment, and the physical application of knowledge and intellectual skill.

Following the act of creation, art is presented by organizations of varying sizes and scopes of activity. Without musical organizations, theatre companies, dance troupes, and art galleries, the public would have limited access to art of the past or present.

The creation and presentation of art are at the core of the arts enterprise, revealing insights about culture and experience that are unavailable by any other means. It is the search for this insight that is the first responsibility of organizations that present art.

Education

Education is central to the creation, presentation, an understanding of art. Artists work with complex symbol systems. The arts disciplines, therefore, require knowledge and skills of their audiences as well as of their practitioners. Access to the intellectual content of art is enhanced by a receiver's knowledge of an art form. While it is possible to gain an appreciation of art through exposure, the deepest understandings are achieved by those who have studied art seriously.

The education component also performs functions that go beyond fulfillment of its central responsibility for teaching and learning: it serves as the primary mechanism for discovering and nurturing those with outstanding capabilities in the various arts; it provides facilities and resources for the presentation of art, for research, and for scholarship; and it is an elemental force for maintaining, regenerating, and enriching the intellectual traditions of artistic endeavor.

Support

No enterprise can exist without an infrastructure of support, and while support involves promotion, management, and a variety of other activities, funding is always paramount. In the United States, matter of culture traditionally have been considered a primary responsibility for the private sector. Thus, the arts must compete for funding. Competition intensifies as developing economic conditions make it increasingly difficult for audiences and private patrons to provide requisite financial support. To deal wit this competition, foundations, arts agencies, school boards, trustees groups in higher education, legislative bodies, and governing boards of presenting organizations provide a complex financial

support system essential to the arts enterprise in the United States.

Support involves not only money, but time. Many individuals dedicate their spare hours to promoting and raising funds for arts endeavors. Without these volunteers, many arts and arts education efforts could not continue. Thus, organizations of volunteers have significant influence on the arts enterprise in the United States. This powerful relationship among applications of volunteer time, funding development, and arts policy formulation is perhaps unique in the Western world.

Since the total arts enterprise in the United States is so large, its management structure is complex at best, and labyrinthine at worst. While most presenting organizations are still controlled at the local level, national organizations in both public and private sectors have developed to serve and often to coordinate local support operations and initiatives. These national organizations now exert significant influence on cultural policy development both singly and collectively. This, too, represents a unique approach.

PART II CONNECTIONS

Creation/Presentation and Support

Artists and presenting organizations are supported by individual consumers through ticket sales and purchases of art works. Therefore, relationships between the artist and the consumer are essential. These involve agent/artist management functions, marketing and public relations, galleries and publishers, and manufacturing related to each art form.

Unfortunately, the creation/presentation of art cannot be totally funded by the purchases of consumers. Most presenting organizations rely on contributions from both public and private sources to meet annual financial commitments. This situation produces a special constituency of those able to contribute deficit-reducing funds. While this financially elite group was formerly located in the private sector, since 1965 it has expanded to include a large governmental support system at national, state, and local levels. Given the financial leverage both public and private philanthropists now have on most presenting organizations, enormous pressures can be exerted on artistic philosophy and content. The power of art to reflect glory on those who fund it as well as those who make it simply compounds the difficulties inherent in this situation.

The relationships among creation and presentation, consumer support, and philanthropic support have all combined to provide relatively high prices for popular visual artists and high fees for famous performing artists. However, for the deserving artist without such recognition, benefits are not so readily forthcoming. This situation is particularly problematic in a society dominated by mass media and by public relations techniques that tend to confuse fame and achievement. This condition reinforces the need to ensure that considerations about relationships between artistic content and support remain appropriately balanced in policy development.

Education and Support

The support system for education in the arts has many features similar to the support system for creation and presentation. However, while overall patterns remain the same, different objectives produce a different context for seeking and maintaining support. This is the case because success in education is measured in developmental terms, while success in creation/presentation is most often measured in immediate terms. Although students demonstrate their short-term progress through tests and other evaluations, education is focused on long-term growth. Each student's particular role in the arts lies in the future when knowledge and skills acquired through education are applied. This differs from the world of professional creation and presentation where immediate judgements are made about quality, effectiveness, and success.

Local, state, and federal funding for education has been a feature of the American scene far longer than governmental support for the creation and presentation of art. Normally, however, creators and presenters of art are the recipients of direct funding: individuals and organizations support artists and presentation groups involved in one of the art forms. Support for education in the arts is quite different. Here, most of the funds are provided for public or private education in general, to a collegiate institution, private school, or school system, for example. These general funds are then divided by professional educators with levels of support for the various arts determined according to their relative priority with other disciplines. Since specific funding decisions are often made by educators with little commitment to art, too many teachers of the arts struggle constantly to convince educational colleagues and public alike that curriculum-based arts instruction is important.

Notable exceptions to this situation exist: independent schools focusing specifically on teaching one or more of the arts, major bequests or funding specified for the support of education in the arts, funds to accomplish special projects in arts

education, and institutions with unquestioned priorities for arts instruction.

Creation/Presentation and Education

Many practicing artists serve as teachers. The reverse is also typical: individuals whose livelihoods are centered in teaching also work as professional artists. At these most basic levels of personnel interchange, connections between creation/presentation and education are healthy.

Creation/presentation and education share another symbiotic relationship. The creation/presentation sector produces or reproduces the subject matter with which the education enterprise is engaged. Education, on the other hand, provides access to this subject matter for professional artists, amateurs in the arts, and the general public.

Despite the obvious personnel and functional connections outlined above, there is a surprisingly little philosophical and operational linkage between the creation/presentation and education elements of the American arts enterprise. Separate efforts move essentially on parallel courses, due partially to a difference in basic objectives. *Artists and presenting organizations are professionally concerned with works of art.* While these individuals and groups teach through presentation of their work, they are not fundamentally involved in teaching the arts as disciplines. *The education enterprise is engaged in teaching subject matter and physical skills in the arts disciplines on a regular basis.* Creation and presentation activity by students and the historical and analytical study that support it is the result of educational work.

The paucity of philosophical and operational linkages between creation/presentation and education is a major factor preventing the American arts enterprise from realizing its full potential. Greater cooperation between the two elements would result in improved identification, education, career entry, and career development prospects for American artists. Greater cooperation would also improve capabilities for developing a more knowledgeable, sophisticated, and committed public for the various arts.

PART III STRESSES

External Stresses

Funding

Funding is an all-consuming problem for almost every element in the American arts enterprise. The funding dilemma creates a number of external stresses. These stresses share a primary source: historically, most Americans have not given high priority to the creation and presentation of works of art, nor have they given high priority to rigorous education in the arts disciplines. Such conditions produce a cycle of neglect. A perpetual result is that most American arts organizations are so busy trying to survive from year to year that considerations for long-term solutions remain in the realm of impossible dreams; efforts to develop funding usually represent a series of vignettes played out over brief time frames. Such efforts are often successful. The organization survives. However, short-term funding concepts, whether applied to promotional campaigns for audiences, student recruitment efforts, or fund drives in the public or private sector, often fail to address problems with the underlying value system that are the major sources of funding problems in the first place.

Education

While some American accomplishments in developing K-12 arts education programs have been outstanding, and while the United States has become a world leader in preparing professional artists, it is clear that our educational system as a whole is not producing the student competencies necessary for the future cultural and social health of our society. In too many cases, the resources to provide sequential arts curricula at the K-12 level are the first to be cut when funding exigencies become demanding. Thus, the majority of students have little or no regular access to sequential study of arts, aspects of human endeavor that will shape their lives as surely as the English, mathematics, and science studies accorded such high priorities in their schooling.

Education in the arts has been defined by some as a series of experiences, a walk through an art museum or arts center, a visit by an artist - a splash of aesthetic water provided by whatever local community resources are available. While such experiences have merit, they do not substitute for rigorous education. When such substitution takes place, it only confirms to students and parents alike that educational policy-makers do not regard the various arts as important as other disciplines. Of course, the worst situation of all is an educational experience completely devoid of art. Unfortunately, this too, is the reality for large numbers of students.

Obviously, the current arts education situation is a primary generator of stress on the national arts structure. In too many cases, approaches to education in the arts disciplines unwittingly reinforce values detrimental not only to future funding of the arts enterprise, but to its quality and productivity as well.

Values

Values held by various individuals and groups include various definitions of art. Given the diversity of American society, attempts to define art in the contexts of policy discussions continue to be difficult. Debates about these definitions are to be encouraged but such exchanges also should be recognized as sources of stress on the arts enterprise as a whole. National debate is growing, for example, about distinctions between art and entertainment, between intellectual and vernacular art, between aesthetic culture and political culture. The conditions evidenced by the presence of such discussions intensify the stress produced by inadequacies in education and funding.

Purpose

Stress from problems with funding, education, and values tend to produce short-term solutions that promote the use of art as a support for other activities. While art exists for its own sake, it can also be used for commerce's sake, for leisure and recreation's sake, for politics' sake, for religion's sake, and so forth. "Art for art's sake" has a low priority in the American scheme of things because most Americans acquire sufficient knowledge and skills to deal with the arts intellectually. While connections among the study of math, the development of technology, and the health of our economy are commonly understood, the cultural parallel is lost to all but a few individuals. Connections among the rigorous study of one or more of the arts, the development of individual culture, and the health of our civilization are too abstract. Thus, to most Americans, the arts seem valuable only to the extent that they contribute to the most superficial enjoyment of leisure time.

Working definitions about the purpose of art are not only *generated* by values about content, education, and funding, but are significant *generators* of operational policies about content, education, and funding. The cycle of influence self-regenerative or self-destructive depending on the values at its center. To the extent that the fundamental purpose of art is understood as the creation and presentation of art itself, stress on the arts enterprise is lessened. To the extent that art is considered primarily a means for supporting other agendas, stress is intensified.

Internal Stresses

The structure of the national arts enterprise is also subject to internal stresses resulting from tensions between and among its various elements. These internal stresses are not necessarily bad; democratic societies thrive best when there is sufficient tension to produce rigorous analysis and informed debate as agents of improvement. On the other hand, an inordinate amount of internal stress can render any system ineffective. Those concerned about the productivity of the arts enterprise must work constantly to keep internal stress at a healthy level.

Present internal stresses originate primarily from strategies and tactics employed by the creation/presentation, education, and support elements to deal with the external stresses outlined above. To date, the plans of each element have been neither sufficiently debated nor coordinated with those of the other elements to ensure mutually supportive approaches and overall understanding of the roles each element should play.

This lack of coordination continues to produce a series of emerging conflicts over appropriate directions for cultural policies as they are developed and practiced at local, state, regional, and national levels.

Institutional Roles

Each of the three elements of the national arts enterprise is highly institutionalized. The creation/presentation element is represented by organizations of creative artists and presenting institutions, museums, and performing arts centers. The education sector is represented by thousands of institutions and by organizations of professional teachers and administrators. The support sector is represented by organizations at all levels, many of which focus primarily on funding.

The context in which the American arts enterprise operates tends to engender institutional protectionism. Perhaps fears about financial support are the most powerful energizers of the protectionist impulse. In an under-funded field, the tendency to protect what influence, visibility, and sustenance one has become paramount. However, this protectionist stance tends to generate myopic precepts that discourage participation in common efforts.

Fortunately, our national capabilities are such that one element of the arts enterprise need not attempt to undertake the basic responsibilities of other elements. Rather, all elements should combine their strengths to expand active participation in arts activities. Cooperation rather than protectionism is in the best interests of art; it is also the best long-term solution to chronic financial problems.

Funding Sources

Internal stresses are also generated by the debate over who should fund creation/presentation and education in the arts. Traditionally, funding creation and presentation has been the primary responsibility of the private sector. In the last twenty years, government has become involved. Education in the arts has been funded by a combination of private and public sources since the establishment of public schools, colleges, and universities. Some argue that government at all levels should take a greater role in funding the arts whereas others worry about relationships between government funding and government control.

There is also discussion about the appropriate role and purpose of private sector funding. To what extent should the arts be supported exclusively by users? To what extent should tax policies encourage individual and corporate support of art activities? Disagreements about these questions may be found at every level of social organization. Wherever they appear, they have the potential to move beyond the level of healthy debate and generate tremendous continuing tension, especially since they are so closely related to the protection of institutional interests.

Public Relations Content

How should the creation and presentation of art and education in the various arts be explained and promoted to the American people? Clearly, promotional efforts must be related to funding sources and institutional images. Yet, works of art and education in the arts disciplines are not the same as cakes of soap. The value system necessary for achieving the highest cultural aspirations is damaged when matters of art are treated with advertising techniques focused only on commercial results.

Stress also develops when the public relations efforts of one element of the arts enterprise conflicts with the operational mode of another element. For example, promoters of artists often fear teachers' emphasis on the intellectual nature of art. Promoters see a strong connection between "intellectualism" and loss of box office. Conversely, teachers fear the public relations efforts of promoters. Hype that reinforces an arts and leisure connection or that focuses on personalities rather than work seems inconsistent with developing public understanding of the need for serious arts education.

Such tensions need not become destructive; however, regular interchange on promotional questions among various elements of the arts enterprise is essential.

K-12 Arts Education

Struggles over the structure and content of K-12 arts education produce situations where institutional protectionism and conceptual debates based on short-term economic needs often rise to counterproductive levels. The basic philosophical split is between (a) those who demand that arts education be serious, rigorous, and sequential, be grounded in the study of specific arts disciplines, and result in knowledge and skills which are testable, and (b) those who believe that the only practical way to achieve arts education is to provide as many students as possible with arts experiences.

Tremendous weight has been given to the experiential side of the debate by actions of governmental arts agencies and their grantees. Arts agency support for artist residencies has been powerfully projected on the public consciousness to the point that some policy makers have accepted them as a satisfactory substitute for curriculum-based education. Arts agencies have neither the funds nor the legislative mandate for arts education, but neither have they or their grantees provided sufficient testimonial support for the maintenance of discipline-based programs as regular parts of the school curriculum. The legacy of this policy is tremendous tension between the mainstream arts education establishment and the institutions and organizations in the support sector of the American arts enterprise. Fortunately, this unhealthy level of stress has been noticed at high levels in the support sector and by many arts agencies themselves. Changes for the better now seem possible for the first time in two decades.

Higher Education

The American arts enterprise in higher education is both large and significant -- large because it involves many thousands of people and millions of dollars, and significant because it serves so many varied functions essential to the operation of the arts in American society. Higher education is the place where both professional artists and professional teachers of the various arts receive advanced education and training. Higher education provides arts education and training. Higher education provides arts education for college student. Institutions of higher education are the centers of arts activities in many communities throughout the United States. Higher education is the location of most scholarly research related to the arts.

Even with all this responsibility and capability, there is no commonly accepted position for higher education with respect to its strategic policy role in the national arts structure. Many see higher education as simply another market for the presentation of works of art, others see higher education as a place to fulfill current and future workforce needs, and some see higher education as having a major role in the education and training of professional artists and teachers of the arts. In other words, most individuals see higher education in primarily a service role. While this role is paramount, higher education is in neither more nor less of a service role than other elements of the arts enterprise. Therefore, the arts community in higher education must become a strategic planning partner in arts policy development. This will reduce current tensions and increase capabilities for the arts enterprise as a whole.

American Work

To many Americans, the word "art" connotes great masterpieces of the past created by someone from another country. However, every masterpiece was once seen or heard for the first time, and not always to critical acclaim. In addition, there are many American masterpieces. If American art is to continue as a healthy and thriving enterprise, new American works must continue to be seen and heard for the first time by many audiences. American masterpieces must also be accorded regular presentation.

The place of American art in our nations' value system is a source of extreme stress, the extent of which often goes unrecognized. Present conditions are intrinsic to the free market nature of non-profit arts activities in the United States. This market produces unique problems for the performing arts because of the particular nature of their support and funding mechanisms. To mount a new or unfamiliar work for performance most often represents a significantly greater investment than showing a new or unfamiliar work in the visual or plastic arts. However, our concern goes far beyond mere economics to the development of greater understanding among Americans about the nature of art itself. If art and artists always seem to come from somewhere else, the long-term effect is a general perception that art is not really "American."

Fortunately, some far-seeing groups in the presentation and support sectors have joined higher education in addressing this problem. Innovative programs for building public acceptance of American artists and works of art are increasing. All elements of the arts enterprise must find ways to continue this favorable trend.

Policy Development

The greatest internal stresses within the American arts enterprise are generated by disagreement over responsibility for policy development, whether for the arts enterprise as a whole or for the various elements within it. This debate has intensified with the growth of governmental arts agencies during the last thirty years. Arts agencies were established and continue to operate under legislation which describes their roles as supportive rather than directive. However, most arts agencies have gone beyond their original mandates to serve as foundations supporting the creation and presentation of art. While such support remains at the center of their activities, arts agencies have increasingly concerned themselves with broader cultural policy issues. Many see this as positive. They point to the importance of governmental policy influence alongside that of the private sector, and reiterate that the symbolism of government support provides particular public relations and funding benefits for the arts in general. Others are not so sure. The specter of a government controlled arts enterprise by even the most friendly establishment of funding patterns and policy initiatives troubles them, especially since the United States has specifically avoided any kind of centralized mechanism for cultural

development.

Both sides in this debate agree that government has far more influence on arts policy than its financial contribution warrants. Both sides also recognize the natural tendency of any organization, whether governmental or private, to produce an image of superior expertise and competence in the public mind as a means of expanding its power and influence. It would be foolish to expect arts agencies to be free of this human inclination. Those with strong pro-government view argue that external stresses on the American structure for the arts are so threatening that uncritical acceptance of a large governmental role in cultural policy development is the best operational alternative. Their intellectual opponents counsel more reliance on the private sector expressing concern that a large government presence will, at best, focus attention on the politics of funding rather than the contents of art and, at worst, stultify the creative process.

Clearly, maintaining a private/public balance in policy development is essential. In the present political climate, continuing to advocate increased reliance on government for primary leadership in arts policy development will increase internal stress on the arts enterprise. Such a direction could also result in severe external stresses: the American people could eventually become even more concerned about the extent of government involvement in cultural matters and the resultant backlash could be severely damaging to the concept of public support and all the positive benefits it has brought.

Fortunately, the democratic tradition of critique and debate has begun to address these and other policy questions. All elements of the arts enterprise are entering this debate. The result is fresh attention to policy issues far beyond the role of government. For example, there are serious discussions about the respective roles of artists and trustees in developing policy for the presentation organizations. There is increasing debate about the strategic role of the education sector in policy development, not only concerning matters of education, but with creation/presentation and support issues as well.

There is also discussion about the extent to which arts policy development, whether governmental or nongovernmental, should be centralized and about the balances necessary to enhance national capabilities while retaining the principle of local control. These issues require new, improved patterns of policy development utilizing resources from the three basic elements of the national arts enterprise.

PART IV NEXT STEPS

Synchronization

The goal of a greater place for art in the United States can only be achieved by improved cooperation. Given the nature and extent of external stresses on the American arts structure, it is essential to develop as many working relationships as possible among individuals and organizations concerned with matters of art. A major concern must be to keep tensions among the creation/presentation, education, and support elements at healthy levels which produce the leavening agent of debate essential to successful enterprises in free societies. Fortunately, the American arts community has the personnel and the resources to accomplish all these objectives.

It is not clear at present what values will govern future development of the national arts enterprise. The three fundamental options are to rely primarily on (1) promotion--art as a commodity; (2) management technique--art as an economic and organization problem; or (3) education--art as a group of intellectual and physical disciplines. The arts enterprise cannot survive without some use of each of these approaches, but the particular distributions of weight and balance among them will produce quite different futures.

Rather than a promotion-based future, a management-based future, or an education-based future, what we should be seeking is an art-based future. To achieve this, it is essential to begin by persuading all concerned to develop greater understanding of the composite structure of the American arts enterprise and the vital interrelationships among its elements.

Naturally, the Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education worries most about teaching and learning, recognizing the close relationship between success in arts education and successes in creation/presentation and support. Therefore, the Working Group and the educational institutions it represents wish to sustain and enhance efforts of the creation/presentation and support elements in every way possible. However, the Working Group is concerned about the continuing erosion of public support for rigorous, curriculum-based education in the various arts. The Working Group is alarmed that many communities have seen fit to reduce school-based arts programs, often with no real opposition from prominent arts presentation organizations, arts agencies, and others in the support sector. The Working Group is concerned about a continuing tendency to discuss arts policy only in economic terms, and short-term economic terms at that. The Working Group is also concerned about the pervasive use of promotional strategies that focus exclusively on the entertainment value of art and artists with little attention to the content of art or its value as an intellectual competence for each individual.

Local Action

The Working Group does not propose or envision the need for some federal or national presence to deliver solutions to these problems. The basic structure of the arts in the United States with its three interrelated elements and lack of central control seems perfectly appropriate for a democratic society. Although federal or national groups can be helpful, synchronization and growth are most probable when the focus is on local action. To achieve such local action, changes of philosophy and values are needed since philosophy and values generate the public context for making, teaching, and presenting art. Fortunately, there is evidence that such changes may be possible: the current serious mood of the American people, new levels of commitment in the arts education community, and revised philosophical directions in certain foundations and arts agencies are encouraging. Fresh looks at internal and external stresses indigenous to the arts enterprise seem more possible now than at any time during the last thirty years.

The Working Group finds such conditions healthy and potentially productive. The stakes are too high for elements of the American arts enterprise to remain as separated as they are at present.

Each American community now has significant resources to pursue significant objectives for art and education in the arts disciplines. Artists, teachers, funders, administrators, and their organizations are all hard at work. While funding will continue to be a problem, the Working Group recommends that funding considerations be placed temporarily in the background for the purpose of analyzing whether the best approaches to cultural development are being undertaken with present resources.

Therefore, the next step is the development of improved mechanisms for analysis and action primarily at local and state levels, but also at regional and national levels. These mechanisms must result in new approaches to partnership involving on an equal basis representatives from organizations concerned with creation/presentation, education, and support. While each element must maintain sufficient autonomy to carry out its essential functions, work must proceed to determine how the various elements can be more mutually supportive. Everyone must think constantly of the larger picture, remain sensitive to the need for strength in all three elements, and believe that long-term progress is possible.

Analytical Questions

Several questions seem essential as means for beginning these discussions:

- o Are our aspirations for achievement in art and arts education sufficiently high? To what extent are they centered in artistic values involving a fusion of emotional and intellectual objectives?
- o Do our operations reflect sufficient attention to the symbiotic relationships among the creation/presentation, education, and support elements of the arts enterprise?
- o Are our evaluative criteria sufficiently centered on artistic values and educational accomplishment? Are our evaluation approaches appropriately balanced between the qualitative and the quantitative?
- o How can more be done to ensure that rigorous education in at least one arts discipline is provided to every student in the K-12 age group so that increasing numbers of Americans can respond to art intellectually as well as emotionally?
- o What new cooperative initiatives are possible to provide greater access to works of art for more individuals?
- o How effective are we in demonstrating to the public our support for and concern with American art both past and present?
- o To what extent are we successful in keeping promotion, management, economic, and educational techniques in the service of art rather than the reverse?
- o Are our public relations efforts sufficiently monitored for their potential impact on conditions necessary for the work of each element of the arts enterprise? How appropriate is the balance that has been achieved between promotion and substance?
- o To what extent do present policy development mechanisms used within and between elements reflect the need for constant attention to the composite needs of the arts enterprise? Is our policy work sufficiently holistic to ensure the steady growth of public understanding and commitment necessary to support quality arts and arts education activities?

Conclusion

The questions posed above are difficult. Yet, common efforts to answer them in local, state, regional, and national

setting can produce the context for new means of cooperation and mutual support. Such efforts represent the best approach to improvement for all elements of the arts enterprise.

Potentials for the various arts in the United States are more than sufficient to justify our goals for higher civilization. These potentials are already evident in the work of American artists, presenting organizations, educational institutions, and those who support them. The Working Group suggests that a search for broader vision, readjustments in priorities, and greater cooperation among the various elements of the arts community can improve both the productivity and the viability of the arts in the United States. The time could not be better. Let us begin in each community of the land.

The Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education is a cooperative project of National Association of Schools of Music, National Association of Schools of Art and Design, National Association of Schools of Theatre, National Association of Schools of Dance, and International Council of Fine Arts Deans. These organizations represent the academic and administrative leadership of over 1,000 postsecondary schools and departments providing professional education and training to artists and teachers of the arts as well as arts instruction for all college students.

SEPTEMBER 1986

Any organization or institution is encouraged to reproduce this publication in its entirety in quantity sufficient for its own use, but not for sale.