

9-2008

Culture and Community Development in Higher Education

Arlene Goldbard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/ia>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Goldbard, Arlene, "Culture and Community Development in Higher Education" (2008). *Imagining America*. 13.
<https://surface.syr.edu/ia/13>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarship in Action at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Imagining America by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

CULTURE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION



by Arlene Goldbard

September 2008

THE CURRICULUM PROJECT REPORT

THE CURRICULUM PROJECT REPORT
CULTURE AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by Arlene Goldbard

Sponsored by Imagining America:
Artists and Scholars in Public Life



2008

Cover photo © Appalachian Media Institute/Appalshop 2006
*During a community interview project, Appalachian Media Institute interns
Tommy Anderson and Rachel Chaney follow a field biology team into
Lilley Cornett Woods, the largest old-growth forest in eastern Kentucky.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CURRICULUM PROJECT CORE TEAM AND ADVISORS 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

INTRODUCTION: RIPENING 5

A Note on Sources and Scope 5

SECTION 1: COMMUNITY CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT 7

A DESCRIPTION OF THE FIELD TO ESTABLISH A CONTEXT FOR THE REPORT

What Is Community Cultural Development? 7

Converging Paths 9

Personal Journeys 11

Why Is CCD Education Important Now? 13

SECTION 2: CCD EDUCATION: AIMS AND IDEALS 16

HOW PARTICIPANTS THINK CCD EDUCATION SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED

Contested Elements 17

Arts Training 18 Scholarship 20 Social Justice 20

SECTION 3: THE STATE OF COMMUNITY CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION 23

HOW PARTICIPANTS PERCEIVE THE CURRENT STATE OF EDUCATION FOR CCD

Why Higher Education? 23

From Ideal to Actual in Higher Education 24

Scope Of CCD Education 27 Varieties Of CCD Education 28

Perceptions Of Existing Programs 28 Deepening Community Engagement 30

Resources And Inspirations 31 Outcomes 34

SECTION 4: AN ABUNDANCE OF WORTHY CHALLENGES 35

HOW PARTICIPANTS PERCEIVE THE ISSUES SHAPING THE GAP BETWEEN IDEAL AND ACTUAL

University-Community Relationships 36

Respecting Different Forms of Knowledge 38

Breaking Down The Silos 38

Time and Space Restrictions 39

Faculty Qualifications 41

Community Engagement 42

Curriculum Requirements and Imbalances 43

Preparation For Livelihood 44

SECTION 5: SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION FOR CCD 47

PARTICIPANTS' IDEAS FOR WHAT IS NEEDED NOW

Nurturing The Field 47

Critical Discourse: Meetings, Conferences and Publications 48

One-to-one Learning: Mentors and Consultants 49

Fresh Models 50

Advancing Community Engagement 53

Guiding Aims, Values and Principles 54

Overarching Values 54 Elements of Education and Dialogue 54

The Centrality of Relationship 55 Institutionalizing CCD Education 56

Seizing Opportunity 57

In Conclusion 57

SECTION 6: BACK MATTER 58

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 58

BACKGROUND RESEARCH, INTERVIEWS AND SURVEYS 58

APPENDIX: THE CURRICULUM PROJECT GLOSSARY 60

APPENDIX: A SAMPLING OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS 62

Programs at Art Schools 62

Programs at Other Higher Educational Institutions 63

Individual Courses 65

Community-Based Programs 71

APPENDIX: CALL FOR EXCELLENCE 72

CURRICULUM PROJECT CORE TEAM AND ADVISORS

Ludovic Blain III (Advisor), Director, Project Spotlight at the Center for Social Inclusion. His website address is www.ludovicspeaks.com.

Dudley Cocke (Lead Investigator) is a stage director, writer, media producer and the Artistic Director of Roadside Theater, a wing of Kentucky's Appalshop. His writing can be found online at www.roadside.org.

Jan Cohen-Cruz (Lead Investigator), author and professor, is Director of Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life (www.imagingamerica.org), a national consortium of colleges and universities committed to public scholarship in the arts, humanities and design.

Arlene Goldbard (Lead Investigator) is a writer and consultant whose focus is the intersection of culture, politics and spirituality. Her blog and other writings may be downloaded from www.arlenegoldbard.com.

Jamie Haft (Advisor and Administrator) recently graduated from a community cultural development program at New York University's Tisch School of the Arts. She serves as Program Coordinator at Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life (www.imagingamerica.org) in Syracuse, New York.

Sonia BasSheva Mañjon, Ph.D. (Advisor) is Vice-President for Diversity and Strategic Partnerships at Wesleyan University (www.wesleyan.edu) in Middletown, Connecticut.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Curriculum Project's originators undertook this study in recognition of a unique moment of opportunity for the community cultural development (CCD) field: for the artists, educators and organizers whose work is to collaborate with other community members to express identity, concerns and aspirations through the arts and communications media, while building the capacity for social action and contributing to social change.

All signs point toward a ripening field:

- new writing and documentation are attracting new attention;
- universities across the U.S. are creating scores of individual courses, certificates and degree programs;
- unprecedented numbers of students are matriculating in these programs; and
- social-justice activists are collaborating more and more with artists and cultural organizers to bring cultural awareness into their efforts.

The great news is that many smart, passionate CCD thinkers and practitioners are creating new ventures in higher-education settings, are eager to talk about their aspirations and circumstances, eager to learn from each other and make their own work meet the highest possible standards. From community artists' perspectives, the concerns are that higher education's concepts of knowledge creation may drive out community knowledge, weakening practice; that a field that has always been under-resourced may not receive the administrative and material support needed to secure a meaningful place in academia; and that without resources it cannot garner attention and respect for its values, methods and accomplishments so that they can be taught without undue compromise or distortion. This report—focusing on first-person testimonies from educators, community artists and friends of the field gathered through 28 confidential interviews and 231 online survey responses—is intended as a kind of decentralized conversation that can help to advance the field.

The narrowest view of community cultural development is that it is something meaningful for artists to do—and they can bring their social consciences along when they do it. CCD education creates meaningful job prospects for graduates to put their creative abilities to work for social benefit in the classroom, in social institutions, in community organizations and in businesses. With a wider perspective, there are even bigger benefits to be gained: the skills CCD practitioners prize—keen perception, relationship-building, flexibility, improvisation, creative problem-solving—are more and more the skills needed to survive and prosper in contemporary society, certainly to address social problems and opportunities. As educators grapple with the changing nature of knowledge and work, there has been much discussion of reinventing the university for a globalized world. This conversation often takes place within a market-oriented framework, but the challenges of living together, of advancing the public good and of awakening creativity in the service of civil society are even more immediate and pervasive, and CCD has a wealth of assets to offer in service of that task.

AIMS AND IDEALS: The Curriculum Project was premised on the conviction that excellent CCD programs in higher education depend on three key elements, a balance of community engagement, training in artistic craft and scholarship focusing on the field's history and animating ideas, as well as the economic and policy environments for it.



Among research participants, agreement on this ideal was strong. Naming essential elements of an ideal CCD education, a majority of survey participants found practical work more primary than scholarly work. They prized community engagement above all, with classroom training in skills related directly to community engagement a close second. Within CCD, arts training was most valued when it included both conventional artistic skills and core CCD techniques for devising art collaboratively. Participants called for scholarship in the service of action, rather than distanced or abstract study of subjects that might not affect practice. With respect

to social justice, participants sought a nuanced view incorporating the understanding that the sloganeering and militancy sometimes associated with social-justice activism are not necessarily compatible with a practice that values dialogue, one with a high tolerance for difference and the ability to hold contradiction without forcing a conclusion.

THE CURRENT STATE: Condense Curriculum Project participants' assessment of the current state of CCD in higher education to a few lines, and here is what they would say: More and more people are trying very hard to make it work, with differential results ranging from extremely promising to dismal; few individuals know enough about the entire field to generalize reliably about it; and while both hopes and cautions are on high alert, it's too soon to tell where this may lead.

Greater resources, a larger potential scale, the opportunity to reflect on practice and create new knowledge, the ability to grant credentials and legitimate practice, a range of courses, commitment to critical thinking and intellectual rigor, a livelihood for practitioner-educators—all of these were cited as reasons to situate CCD programs within higher education. Participants also pointed to obstacles and issues that make this integration difficult, and to a widely perceived gap between aspirations and accomplishments. While the moment is characterized by a passionate pursuit of excellence, of those who responded to our survey question about the state of education for the field, the majority ranked it no higher than “fair.” A notable challenge for those undertaking CCD programs in higher education is how to impart in the more structured and formal setting of a university the ideas, practices, skills and sensibilities they themselves learned through on-the-ground experience and self-directed study. Many specifics, including research participants' assessment of core subjects, key organizations, key texts and exemplary programs, are included in the body of this report.

An underlying direction in most programs' development is recognition of the need to deepen the practice of community engagement. When asked what elements make up their current programs, more than four-fifths of educators and students responding to surveys indicated community engagement, the highest percentage for any element; yet more than two-fifths of educators also indicated that current training in community engagement is insufficient. Only slightly more than half of educators and students saw the strength of their own institutions' community engagement as a positive and more than a third saw it as a negative. Both the aspiration and the need are evident, and people are working hard to close gaps.

WORTHY CHALLENGES: Research participants understood that they had taken on an ambitious, sometimes daunting task by attempting to introduce new knowledge and new ways of learning into long-established and tenaciously guarded institutional cultures. Some of the key challenges they face are:

- art-world snobbery permeating arts departments;
- vexed relationships between universities and surrounding communities;
- uncertainty whether community knowledge can be respected and integrated into academic programs;
- uncertainty whether university norms can yield to CCD's commitment to pluralism, participation and equity;
- the problem of respecting the organic time of CCD projects within higher education's time frameworks;
- addressing the tendency to assign faculty without deep CCD experience to teach in new programs;
- fostering reciprocal, meaningful community engagement;
- ensuring that curriculum includes a balance of scholarship, training and community engagement; and
- making professionalization serve the field rather than imposing inappropriate standards or restricting access through credentialing.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE CCD EDUCATION: Participants called for increased resources for CCD; for more critical discourse, reflection and dialogue among peers; and for collaborative learning that embodies the primacy of relationship within CCD. Five characteristics were typical of their recommendations for fresh models of CCD higher education:

- (1) Combining study and practice so that a close cohort of students learns together, applying what is learned within the university before moving out into broader community engagement;
- (2) Bridging CCD out of arts departments, developing programs based on the reality that practitioners come either from an arts interest or a community organizing interest, converging in CCD;
- (3) Deep and sustained community work;

- (4) Far-ranging and various curriculum components, drawing on the resources of many different specialties available within higher education; and
- (5) Hybrid models, whether collaborations between academic departments or between an academic program and one that is community-based.

Grounded in this research, the report puts forward ten key guidelines summing up the most important values and principles participants offered to inform future development:

- All parties should recognize that this is a period of action research, marked by experimentation in program design, curriculum and approach to every element of CCD education, and should engage in a spirit of true collaboration.
- It is essential that the values shaping CCD practice also inform and influence education in the field.
- Excellence requires a balance of community engagement, training in artistic practice and scholarship focusing on the field's history and animating ideas, as well as the economic and policy environments for CCD work.
- Vibrant, participatory critical discourse is essential to the success of both higher education and practice in CCD. Higher educational institutions are best-positioned to seek support for a sustained, iterative discourse from within their own walls and from resource providers.
- Community cultural development in higher education should have an explicit goal of supporting and developing the field beyond university walls.
- Higher-education programs should develop peer relationships with community-based educational programs for practitioners.
- Effective CCD education requires meaningful, equitable and collaborative relationships between educational institutions and community partners, and developing these relationships requires self-critical awareness from both parties.
- While "champions" may drive new programs as they come into being, it is critical to move toward strengthening programs, so that they don't disappear when their founders move on.
- An overarching aim should be to infuse CCD values across institutions and programs, connecting CCD-focused programs with a matrix of related departments and programs by building relationships with collaborating departments and programs sharing similar values.
- Community cultural development practitioners and educators should collaborate in pursuing emergent opportunities that can benefit both higher education and community-based practitioners.

It is evident that no single organization or project has the ability to implement the insights and recommendations derived from this research. It is a large, multifaceted national project, with roles for everyone who cares about educating young people for community cultural development work. The Curriculum Project team invites every reader of this report to seriously consider what steps he or she can take to ensure the harvest of U.S.-based CCD practitioners gains in quality, quantity and impact each year.

INTRODUCTION: RIPENING

This report attempts to capture a phenomenon in formation: the integration of community cultural development studies into higher education in the United States. There is nothing new about artists and organizers using collaborative, participatory, community-grounded approaches to building community and culture; some who have studied this work see centuries of antecedents, and more recent manifestations have been documented for many decades. But the creation of formal academic programs for community artists is a recent development in this country.

Newness was one factor in The Curriculum Project's originators' decision to undertake this research. As Dudley Cocke, Jan Cohen-Cruz and I explained in the working paper we first issued in the spring of 2007, "A Call for Excellence in Community Cultural Development Curriculum in Higher Education" :

We've come together because we recognize a unique moment of opportunity in our field of practice. Four circumstances have converged to produce this opportunity:

- A critical mass of analytic writing and documentation has accrued, bringing new attention to cultural development theories and practices that have been gathering force over the last four decades;*
- In the past ten years, universities across the U.S. have created dozens of individual courses, certificates and degree programs in community cultural development;*
- Unprecedented numbers of students are matriculating in these programs, creating an unusual opportunity to affect the field by affecting their education; and*
- More and more, social-justice activists are collaborating with artists and cultural workers to bring cultural awareness into their efforts, understanding that culture is an essential foundation for community development and social change. At the same time, artists are increasingly seeking intersectoral partnerships for their work.¹*

Our research revealed a field still ripening into academic presence and legitimacy, replete with hopeful new sprouts as well as uncertainty about what will be harvested and when. The great excitement here is that so many smart, passionate community cultural development thinkers and practitioners are creating new ventures in higher-education settings. As a group, they are eager to talk about their aspirations and circumstances, eager to learn from each other and make their own work meet the highest possible standards. The concerns are that institutional values, prizing higher education's concept of knowledge creation, may drive out community knowledge, weakening practice; that a field that has always been under-resourced will not receive the administrative and material support needed to secure a meaningful place in academia; and that without resources it cannot garner attention and respect for its values, methods and accomplishments so that these can be taught without undue compromise or distortion.

Our hope is that our research will be understood as a kind of decentralized conversation among those most involved, that people will find inspiration in their colleagues' efforts and aspirations, and that this report will contribute to an ongoing critical discourse that will connect all participants even more deeply to their wish to make higher-education programs serve the core values and aims of community cultural development.

A NOTE ON SOURCES AND SCOPE

Throughout this report, extended quotations appear as indented and italicized paragraphs. Each new paragraph indicates a new speaker. Those quotations for which no source is cited either in the text or via a footnote are taken from the 28 confidential interviews and 231 online survey responses compiled during the research phase of the project and in a few cases, from transcripts of story circles with educators, students and community artists conducted at the March 2008 Community Arts Convening and Research Project at Maryland Institute College of Art in Baltimore. Interviews and surveys were confidential to encourage interviewees to speak frankly about issues and obstacles to their work, sharing criticisms as well as praise without risk to themselves. A list of interviewees appears in the "Acknowledgments" section of this report.

¹ "A Call for Excellence in Community Cultural Development Curriculum in Higher Education" appears in its entirety as an appendix to this report.

Online surveys were available to five different self-identified groups of respondents: community artists and cultural organization leaders (who completed 124 of the aggregate 231 responses); educators (who completed 46); friends of the field (such as consultants and funders, who completed 31); students and recent graduates (who completed 22); and community-based organization partners of higher education (such as groups receiving placements from university programs, who completed 8). When citing percentages of survey responses, we've rounded up or down to the nearest full percentage point.

Taken together with the confidential interviews, the representation of educators, community artists and other professionals relating to the field includes participation from the vast majority of extant academic programs and from a great many thoughtful and leading voices who share our interest in the field's well-being. It is difficult to interpret the low level of participation by the last two groups. We were assured by key people in academic programs that they forwarded invitations to take part to their own students and community-based partners. Did so few of them respond on account of lack of interest, lack of time, the pressure of other demands? Does this indicate that students and community-based partners have not been brought fully into the dialogue on CCD education by those in the academy? Is the discourse not sufficiently developed to support participation in this type of research, particularly by students? Do students lack sufficient information to generalize about the field? Without more data, these questions remain open.

Because of the small sample of students and community-based partners, we have not relied on survey data to draw significant conclusions about these groups, but have included information on their responses and comments wherever appropriate and have also included them in general statements reflecting overall response to similar questions across the multiple surveys.

Finally, this report does not extend to CCD higher-education programs outside the United States, where (as several interviewees pointed out) one can find older and larger programs that are well worth the attention of their U.S. counterparts, who will discover there useful examples, real inspiration and a body of instructive experience for those starting domestic programs. (A number of these are listed under "Places to Study" on www.communityarts.net, which is recommended as a starting-place for anyone wishing to explore international programs.)

This report comprises six main sections:

- The first section provides the context for the project, describing the field and offering some key features of its history and development;
- The second sections turns to the ideal, capturing what research participants told us about how they think higher education for community cultural development should be accomplished;
- The third section summarizes what participants shared about the current state of the field, how they perceive the reality as opposed to the ideal;
- The fourth section presents the challenges research participants flagged when asked what contributes to the gap between actual and ideal;
- The fifth section shares participants' ideas about what is needed to close that gap; and
- The final section includes back matter such as a glossary, a sampling of courses and programs and a list of interviewees.

SECTION 1: COMMUNITY CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Community Cultural Development describes a range of initiatives undertaken by artists in collaboration with other community members to express identity, concerns and aspirations through the arts and communications media, while building the capacity for social action and contributing to social change. Sometimes abbreviated CCD. The Curriculum Project uses this term because it seems to encompass all the key elements of the practice: community, culture and development (or as in the title of this report, culture and community development). (From the glossary for this report.)

One indicator of a field in formation is its nomenclature. Curriculum Project research showed that neither “community cultural development” nor any of the other terms sometimes used for facets of this work (such as “community arts,” “community-based arts,” “community engagement through the arts,” “arts-based community development” and “art and social change”) dominates current usage.

Some scholars and practitioners prefer more narrowly descriptive labels for their own specialties, such as “teaching artist,” “theatre in education specialist,” “muralist” or “joker” (the term for a facilitator of Forum Theatre as originated by Augusto Boal). In addition to the multiple choices we offered respondents to our online survey—artist, community artist, community cultural development practitioner, teaching artist, community organizer and arts-based community developer—here are some of the dozens of terms people used to describe themselves:

artist/educator/tool-maker	culture worker
community-based artist	creative arts specialist
social artist	artist facilitator
arts administrator	activist or socially engaged artist
artist-in-residence	cultural organizer

Or as one respondent put it, “No usual term; perhaps facilitator of community art production and community action. Agh!”

Many labels are seen as too complicated or unfamiliar to enter into easy usage: whether one says, “I’m a community cultural development practitioner,” “I’m a socially engaged artist” or “I’m an arts-based community developer,” the next part of the conversation will include lengthy explanations. It appears the largest number of practitioners describe themselves simply as “artist,” choosing to carry out the artist’s task in the deeply democratic and socially conscious mode of the community cultural development practitioner. “Artist” is the preferred term of nearly 40 percent of those who responded to this question in our online surveys and of 68 percent of the artists and arts organization representatives.

Until the nomenclature has ripened into consensus (if it ever does), we will refer to the work by the label that seems most fully descriptive, “community cultural development,” and will most often describe its practitioners as “community artists.” Where “community cultural development” has become the dominant term (for example, in Australia), the conventional shorthand is CCD, far less of a mouthful than the full term; for convenience’s sake, it is used frequently here.

WHAT IS COMMUNITY CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT?

There is no archetypal or definitive community cultural development project, no manual that dictates practice. Community artists have used every arts medium and many different approaches to create projects designed for the unique circumstances and assets of a particular group of participants. Some projects turn on the creation of public art works, others use dance or theatre, some employ community gardens, some generate videos or computer-based multimedia: every art form can be an instrument of community cultural development. Similarly, “community” has been defined in geographic terms (such as a small town or an urban neighborhood), in terms of common interest (such as a shared desire to address environmental concerns or have a voice in local economic development efforts) and in terms of many other affinities (single mothers, Latino elders, incarcerated youth).

To begin to comprehend the range of activity, consider the following brief descriptions of just three chosen at random from thousands of projects. (For anyone interested in exploring a range of recent CCD projects,

an excellent online resource is CAN, the Community Arts Network <www.communityarts.net>. The first two projects below are profiled in greater depth on CAN and may be accessed by searching the site for the project's name.):

- **zAmya Theater Project**, based in Minneapolis, is an ongoing collaboration between homeless community members and community artists. They use story circles and other participatory methods to co-create performances designed to pierce the denial and objectification attaching to the idea of homelessness. Meetings, rehearsals and performances are held at shelters and churches; within performances, the barrier between performer and audience gives way to interactive experiences that personalize the work's message. As Rachel Chaves' essay on CAN puts it, "zAmya is not about the change that the housed can bring to the homeless, but the transformations that occur across the board when people engage in a personal and creative endeavor with the common goal of raising awareness."
- **The Great Wall of Los Angeles** is the longest mural in the world, the product of a decades-long (and continuing) collaboration between the Social and Public Art Resource Center (SPARC) and diverse groups of young people who have taken part in the creation of each segment of this "pictorial representation of the history of ethnic peoples of California from prehistoric times to the 1950's, conceived by SPARC'S artistic director and founder Judith F. Baca. Begun in 1974, the existing segments were completed over five summers, employing over 400 youth and their families from diverse social and economic backgrounds working with artists, oral historians, ethnologists, scholars and hundreds of community members." (Go to www.sparcmurals.org and search for The Great Wall to read more and view images.)
- **The Empowered Fe Fes** is a Chicago-based group of teenage girls with disabilities who create videos about their own lives and journeys. They've been collaborating with Access Living ("a non-residential Center for Independent Living for people with all types of disabilities") and Beyondmedia Education (the mission of which is to "collaborate with under-served and under-represented women, youth and communities to tell their stories, connect their stories to the world around us and organize for social justice through the creation and distribution of media arts"). Alysha Kostelny, one of the Fe Fes, reported on CAN that as a result of this experience, "I feel much more confident than when I started with Beyondmedia. I am smart. I can do stuff. I can help people more than I think I can."

How can projects so different in medium, style and results all be expressions of the same phenomenon? Community cultural development work is characterized less by commonalities of form or style than by informing values. The following description of core values is from my own primer on CCD and related subjects, *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*:

Over time, practitioners of community cultural development have adopted certain key principles to guide their work. There is no universal declaration or manifesto. Rather, each of these seven points has been given a multitude of different expressions in practice.

- 1: Active participation in cultural life is an essential goal of community cultural development.*
- 2: Diversity is a social asset, part of the cultural commonwealth, requiring protection and nourishment.*
- 3: All cultures are essentially equal and society should not promote any one as superior to the others.*
- 4: Culture is an effective crucible for social transformation, one that can be less polarizing and create deeper connections than other social-change arenas.*
- 5: Cultural expression is a means of emancipation, not the primary end in itself; the process is as important as the product.*
- 6: Culture is a dynamic, protean whole and there is no value in creating artificial boundaries within it.*
- 7: Artists have roles as agents of transformation that are more socially valuable than mainstream art world roles—and certainly equal in legitimacy.²*

Participation, inclusion, collaboration—whatever terms are used, this is the essential marker for the work which is our focus: projects are conceived, defined, executed and assessed collectively. Different participants may have markedly different skills and strengths to bring to the enterprise, with one person providing knowledge

² Arlene Goldbard, *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*, New Village Press, 2006, p. 43.

of community relationships, another of cultural heritage, another expertise in relevant social issues, another artistic skills and so on. But all are essential stakeholders.

Artists and community organizers employ a range of vocabularies deriving from practice to describe their criteria for success, but their message is similar. Each project's ultimate value is something that can only be judged by all, typically by something very like the following standards:

- Practitioners and participants develop a mutually meaningful, reciprocal and collaborative relationship, one that useful and instructive to all;
- Participants enter fully into roles as co-directors of a project, making substantial and uncoerced contributions to shaping all aspects of the work and setting their own aims;
- Participants experience a deepening and broadening of their cultural knowledge, including self-identity, and a greater mastery of the arts media involved, leading to further learning and practice as desired;
- Participants feel satisfied with what they have been able to express and communicate through a project;
- Participants' self-directed aims for a project have been advanced and they have met their own aims for external impact (e.g., through sharing or distribution of project results); and
- Participants demonstrate heightened confidence and a more favorable disposition toward taking part in community cultural life and/or social action in future.

While there is ample room for variation within the category "community cultural development," the essential parameters are well-established: CCD projects are collaborative and participatory, egalitarian in style and outlook, self-directed by all participants, oriented as much to process as to product, linking each individual's development to the development of community. Although not every practitioner defines his or her work in terms of social justice, the underlying goals are intrinsically linked to bringing about pluralism, participation and equity, sometimes characterized as "cultural democracy." It was put very beautifully decades ago by Francis Jeanson, a French philosopher and advocate of the Algerian struggle for independence from France who took part in important twentieth-century European cultural policy debates. Jeanson defines cultural democracy's aims as follows:

...to arrange things in such a way that culture becomes today for everybody what culture was for a small number of privileged people at every stage of history where it succeeded in reinventing for the benefit of the living the legacy inherited from the dead; that is to say, each time it was able to assist in bringing about a deeper sense of reality and closer bonds of communication.³

Preparing to do this work is The Curriculum Project's subject.

CONVERGING PATHS

The history of CCD can be told from many angles. In terms of large-scale social phenomena, CCD can be seen as a response to the rapid, massive and dislocating social change of the twentieth century. Independent nations and distinct, self-aware and self-determining liberation movements have proliferated as a colonial world order has given way to fresh ideas of beauty and meaning, including attempts to preserve and renew ancient legacies for the benefit of future generations. The rapid penetration of mass media and light-speed transmission of information have opened vast new arenas for dialogue across every sort of geographic and cultural boundary, even as they have threatened much that is distinctly local, place-based and grounded in tradition. National borders have less and less relevance and national character a more complex and fluid meaning as record-breaking numbers of immigrants and refugees from the global South move North in search of safety and livelihood, catalyzing new cultural syntheses wherever they go.

Some commentators attempt to parse these interconnected phenomena into distinct categories: here we see the impact of economic forces, there technological developments, there educational challenges. But from a community cultural development perspective, they add up to the necessity of understanding culture as society's crucible, a theme former French Cultural Minister Augustin Girard wrote about more than 30 years ago in *Cultural Development: Experiences and Policies*, his foundational book on cultural development and policy. "Culture concerns everyone," wrote Girard, "and it is the most essential thing of all, as it is culture that gives us reason for living, and sometimes for dying." Those who live on the bleeding edge of cultural

³ From Francis Jeanson's "On the Notion of 'Non-public,'" quoted in *Cultural Democracy* Number 19, February 1982.

change have understood this far more quickly and deeply than many of those whose work is to observe such phenomena, as should be evident by now from headline-grabbing controversies over immigration, language rights, religious freedom and other cultural issues.

As culture has moved toward center stage within the United States, artists and community organizers have devised many ways to engage community members in exploring their own relationships to culture and community, from the earliest settlement houses founded in the late 19th century to the Popular Front artists' movements focused on working-class culture in the 1930s; from the unprecedented New Deal cultural programs of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—preserving slave narratives, turning the day's headlines into theatre, putting large numbers of artists to work for the public good—to the largely rural arts extension programs of universities, such as the remarkable theatre work done beginning in the mid-forties under Robert Gard at the University of Wisconsin.

By the 1960s, artists and community organizers were central to a national process of cultural awakening and conflict over the right to a self-determined cultural identity, a domestic process informed by the global awakening from colonialism. Civil rights movement slogans such as “Black is beautiful” grew out of a complex and passionate debate about culture as a medium for both insult and pride. Insurgent cultural practice flourished wherever social upheaval created fertile ground: community murals, street theatre and topical music were regular features of liberationist movements. In the wake of urban riots following the assassinations of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, community arts activists made use of public funds created to employ youth and stabilize communities, setting up workshops, public art programs, performing troupes and other initiatives designed to engage those who had been disenfranchised in asserting their cultural citizenship, celebrating their heritage and envisioning a positive future for their communities. By the early 1970s, when public service employment was widely seen as a partial solution to social unrest and economic pressure, thousands of jobs were made available to community artists and organizers across the country through the Nixon and Ford administrations' investment in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

Many of the senior faculty members involved in CCD education today were first supported by CETA jobs, modest grants from the “Expansion Arts” division of the National Endowment for the Arts and other taxpayer-funded investments in community cultural development. The advent of the Reagan administration in 1980 heralded the decline of U.S. federal support for CCD, creating a generational divide. Many young CCD practitioners today have never received public funding. Those whose work does not attain the scale necessary to attract support from the few major foundations active in the field typically cobble together a range of support sources, from “day jobs” and credit cards to small grants from local public and private funders to income earned through sales and fees.

Under current conditions, therefore, the field encompasses remarkable variety, from long-lived organizations supported through major grants from national and regional public and private funders to community centers emerging from civil rights movements, strongly rooted in their own communities, to a range of hybrid projects where artists produce conventional offerings (such as concerts or exhibits) side-by-side with collaborative, community-based work, or where groups with primary identifications in education, health or community development (rather than the arts) use CCD approaches to further their work. There are always niches for individual practitioners without organizational affiliation: some who define themselves as part of the growing category of “teaching artists” employ CCD methods in their classroom work; others pursue project-based contracts with social agencies and nonprofit organizations; still other community artists earn their livelihood by applying CCD techniques (if not the insurgent intentions that generated those techniques) to commercial work, designing retreats, training courses and planning initiatives intended to enliven organizations and businesses.

Over the last few decades, the avant-garde art world has adopted some community cultural development practices. Avant-garde artists with art-world bona fides may incorporate testimonies and images from community members into works that refer to local social conditions. This migration has blurred categories within higher education, sometimes casting as teachers of CCD politically progressive studio artists with little or no experience with grassroots work, whereas CCD is premised on a very different relationship of art to community. In some of the newer courses adopted by higher educational institutions, the relationship to community cultural development is therefore sketchy: when a syllabus focuses on public art installations commissioned through the usual top-down processes, for instance, and the assigned readings are all from art

critics and avant-garde theorists, the convergence of subject matter—the fact that a work of art incorporates critical or democratic messages—is not sufficient to categorize it as CCD.

Instead of a sharply defined field, what we now see is a continuum of practice, with individual practitioners and scholars deciding where to draw the line. At one end are those whose methods are shaped by CCD's core values of pluralism, participation and equity. Their work is grounded in relationship between artist-organizers and the other community members with whom they collaborate. They employ a process of action research in which all stakeholders collectively determine what they wish to do together and why, in which all take part in reflecting on and assessing what has been learned as preparation for each successive stage of action. At the other end of the spectrum are artists who want their own work to reflect and connect to a greater social reality, to resonate with others affected by the same social forces, and who as part of their personal creative process gather stories, images or artifacts from others, incorporating them into a finished product. For example, at one end of the range might be a group of artist-organizers assisting people affected by Hurricane Katrina to tell their own stories through a collectively-created work of theatre, with all participants aware that the whole process of learning, interaction, expression and reflection constitutes the work, that the process is not just a way of achieving a finished product. At the other end might be an artist moved by the plight of those displaced by Katrina who crafts a play informed by the stories people share, then submits it to theatres and competitions in the hope of seeing it produced, with no expectation that those who shared stories will have a continuing stake in the way their stories are used.

I believe it is safe to say that the vast majority of CCD practitioners are happy to have people making art that speaks to social justice and cultural development, whether or not they employ deeply collaborative methods in doing so. There is a big-tent spirit abroad in the field, a gratitude that so many people want arts work to matter as more than a commodity or a road to glory. But welcoming fellow-travelers doesn't necessitate remapping the journey. Just as there is concern about CCD courses being taught by faculty lacking on-the-ground experience with the practices they are to impart, there is concern about the degree to which techniques are taught without reference to the social-justice roots of community cultural development practice, to the deepest reasons to deploy those techniques.

In the context of this report, the essence of our subject is the study in higher educational settings of what might be called "strong" community cultural development, with core values and methods intact. We have eschewed a too-diffuse definition in which any connection to CCD, no matter how tenuous, is good enough for students.

PERSONAL JOURNEYS

Just as social movements and conditions have interacted to produce the current CCD field, from an individual perspective, choosing a life of CCD practice has involved two converging paths. The larger group of practitioners comprises individual artists inspired to pursue CCD's greater scope, social relevance and potential impact rather than the more isolated and often materially competitive path of the conventional artist. Almost always, they awaken in childhood to their own artistic gifts and desires, then experience a second awakening when they discover CCD and its core values. In our own project team, for instance, with one set of professional intentions in mind, Jamie Haft enrolled in a prestigious degree program for actors; soon she was thrilled to discover community cultural development practice as an antidote to her formal education's disconnection from questions of social justice. Decades earlier, Jan Cohen-Cruz, embarking on a career in theatre, was drawn into a project making plays with prisoners, changing the course of her own professional life.

The other path begins in organizing, in a passion for social justice. Intersecting with CCD practice ignites the dawning realization that lasting change is cultural change, that the values and techniques of community cultural development can engage people more deeply than many of the conventional means of protest or organizing for social change. Curriculum Project team member Dudley Cocke was passionate about civil rights and antiwar activism from his teens, but didn't get involved in arts work until his thirties, when he was drawn by a friend into helping to write the first local history-based play created by the group that became Roadside Theater, and from there, into helping to create the organizational infrastructure that would enable the play's production.

Many of the stories provided by interviewees and survey respondents when asked “How and why did you get involved in this work?” are truly remarkable: inspiring, charming, revealing. It would take a book to reprint them all, but here is a small selection from survey respondents that suggests a typical range of paths into the work:

I came to [this company] in 2004 as an apprentice, eager to merge my dance and theatre backgrounds at this physical theatre company and to learn how to teach that to students of all ages and backgrounds. When I got here, I discovered this incredible, new-to-me branch of theatre called community-based theatre, which I have grown to love and value as a creative outlet for me in conversation and collaboration with others (rather than just me talking to an audience).

I got involved in this work as a spiritual act, as an act of self-fulfillment, as a way of making a “broken person” useful in this world, as a way of advancing my community; I got involved out of a deep love for theatre, for the actor and for justice.

Working with social justice groups in the southeastern U.S., I had the recurring experience that activist and organizing groups seldom practiced within their institutions the egalitarian and democratic values they preached to the world. After all my attempts to explain it away failed, I came to realize that most community-based groups bring into their work all the dysfunctions of the dominant culture. Several years later, I was introduced to the work of Augusto Boal through several Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) workshops. TO games are very subtle and powerful tools to help people explore their reality in a playful and non-threatening way. They fit very well into popular education programs, both as tools to help in group analysis and reflection, and as tools to rehearse actions. The brilliance of the games, in my experience, is that these complex activities happen by getting people to “tell” stories—primarily with their bodies—instead of through more traditional methods that, intentionally or not, recreate oppressive power relationships among participants.

Experience in the Peace Corps in two countries in Africa gave me a start at understanding the integrated role the arts can have in a community and provided a different model for community participation. I began developing programs to teach world music and related art forms inspired by this African model, adapted for the settings I worked in (schools, youth detention, community centers). I got involved in this because I saw a huge gap in the rhetoric of the U.S. as a “first-world” country and the realities of homelessness, violence and other social indicators of lack of community, and thought that some useful models for building (and maintaining) community were being ignored, either because of ignorance or ethnocentrism/cultural superiority complex.

I’ve been a professional actor, director, writer, designer and theatre consultant for more than 30 years. I found my way to this work because in it I found a kind of power and beauty I’d not often seen or felt in more standard theatre fare, no matter how avant-garde.

I was frustrated in the life of a theatre artist and began working with arts organizations as a teaching artist on the side. I found it so rewarding, I give it more and more of my time and focus. I moved into program design, leadership, consulting and taking on every different kind of expression I could for connecting “the arts” and “people.” I have been very frustrated with the way arts organizations relate to, listen to, respond to and dismiss the public. My work has been to close the conceptual and practical gaps, and I have spent many years training artists who see their communities and artistic responsibilities in broader ways.

Here again, there is a continuum of self-definition and practice: at one end, skilled and trained artists who have learned—even helped to invent—community cultural development work, bringing high aesthetic and social-justice standards to their work; and at the other end, able and committed activists who have learned CCD approaches, but for whom the process takes overwhelming precedence over any artistic product, and who measure success by participation and impact much more than aesthetic achievement. Although work at many points on this spectrum can be valid, powerful and filled with meaning, the best has always integrated all these elements, seeing no conflict in embracing the goal of excellence in all dimensions. In this study, our focus is on this integral approach, one that prizes equally artistic skill, organizing skill, study and reflection as the encompassing ideal to which higher education-based programs should aspire.

It is impossible to say precisely when higher education and CCD began to interact in the United States, because the first initiatives were driven by individual desires, passionate advocates who created opportunities wherever they could, without much institutional backing. Some of the oldest community cultural development programs, such as the San Francisco Neighborhood Arts Program that flourished most strongly during the 1970s, were begun by academics. (SFNAP was first conceived in the mid-1960s by Art Bierman, a community activist and philosophy professor at San Francisco State College.) Other programs were sparked by the interests of individual faculty members (such as the Prison Creative Arts Program, founded in 1990 by Buzz Alexander, an English professor at the University of Michigan). And still others started with stellar CCD practitioners being invited to bring their skills and wisdom to faculty positions (as with public artist Judy Baca's joint appointment in Chicano Studies and World Arts and Cultures at UCLA). In recent years, enough of these idiosyncratic appointments and initiatives have emerged to begin qualifying as a trend. That trend has begun to take shape with the advent of new degree programs at institutions like the California College of Arts (a B.F.A. in Community Arts originated by Curriculum Project advisor Sonia BasSheva Mañjon) and the newest program we're aware of, the City University of New York's M.A. in Applied Theatre, originated by Chris Vine.

Thus the emergent phenomenon of CCD in higher education is not so much a movement as the aggregation of individual stories, only recently connecting. Our wish and intention is that this report helps to extend and strengthen those connections for the benefit of all, helping to engender a vibrant critical discourse.

WHY IS CCD EDUCATION IMPORTANT NOW?

The narrowest view of community cultural development is that it is something meaningful for artists to do—and they can bring their social consciences along when they do it. Leaders of arts schools and departments have for years faced the disheartening reality that they are preparing students for work most of them will never obtain: few drama graduates wind up in professional regional theatres or on Broadway, few visual arts graduates have successful gallery careers, few film graduates make it in Hollywood. A more common career trajectory for graduates of conventional arts programs entails waiting tables while waiting hopefully for a break. So from this narrow perspective, CCD education creates meaningful job prospects for graduates to put their creative abilities to work for social benefit in the classroom, in hospitals, prisons and other social institutions, in community organizations and in businesses, and that adds real value to an arts degree.

But in truth, there are much bigger benefits to be gained. Many observers have pointed out that the skills CCD practitioners prize—keen perception, relationship-building, flexibility, improvisation, creative problem-solving—are more and more the skills needed to survive and prosper in contemporary society, and certainly to address social problems and opportunities. This is from a 2007 *New York Times Magazine* piece on university education:

In recent decades, the biggest rewards have gone to those whose intelligence is deployable in new directions on short notice, not to those who are locked into a single marketable skill, however thoroughly learned and accredited. Most of the employees who built up, say, Google in its early stages could never have been trained to do so, because neither the company nor the idea of it existed when they were getting their educations. Under such circumstances, it's best not to specialize too much.⁴

Both of the next two speakers are based in higher education:

No longer can the university just proclaim that by its pure knowledge it serves the universal interest in society. It has to deliver the goods. Most of those goods are commercial goods, there's no doubt about it. But also, if you will, it's a set of civic goods. People concerned about these matters within the university have to be in alliance with people outside the university who are now finding reasons to come back in.

We're in a period when it's just so important that universities redefine the civic compact about what we do as institutions, whether it's innovation, whether it's preparation for citizenship, or whether it's education. What we do as institutions is at the heart of the future of this country and of all the specific communities that are constituents of it. My sense is that being tuned to the world and having permeable boundaries with the world is so much a part of what has to happen

⁴ Christopher Caldwell, "The Way We Live Now: 2-25-07: What a College Education Buys," *New York Times Magazine*, February 25, 2007

for universities to have credibility in a knowledge economy. Here we are sitting in an economy in a world that is so dependent on sharing knowledge generously and finding ways to cross boundaries—whether those boundaries are intercultural, of race and ethnicity, or geographical. For me, whether you're doing "basic work" in the sciences like thinking about disease, or whether you're working in the creative arts and thinking about cultural expression, community empowerment and social justice, there is an important connection to the larger world, and it's incumbent upon each of us to make that connection.

This emerging reinvention of education's task has manifested in many ways. Here's one higher-education interviewee talking about the remarkable number of medical students who've taken part in community cultural development projects at a particular university:

A large number of medical school students come over to our department because they are so regimented in the sciences, they're trying to find courses that are engaging and actually help them to deal with the other side of the brain, the other issues that they want to learn more about. We write recommendations for them, because a lot of the medical schools want to know what else you know aside from science. How much can you contribute to society? If it's just medicine, then we can get a lot of that. Tell me what else you can do, you know? And how are you a citizen of this world? We can help advise them on what kinds of experiences they should be having in order to answer that question. It's not just volunteering, not just doing community work, but actually engaging in community work, developing relationships with people, not just giving out Thanksgiving turkeys.

Here another interviewee describes how CCD practice is intrinsically educational and enlarging, qualities that are assets within and beyond higher education:

To me, what's most exciting about this work, whether it occurs in schools or in community settings, is that the artists invite people to cross boundaries and they legitimate it. They give people permission to do things that they normally don't do. Learning is all about boundary crossing, it's moving from your safe and familiar comfort zone into another. Learning is about stretching, growing is about stretching. And whether you're doing work that you think of as community cultural development or arts integration in a public school classroom, that's what you're helping people do.

One challenge to the integration of CCD into higher education is the difficulty educators encounter in obtaining institutional validation for community-engaged work, as opposed to the conventional path to tenure and promotion via academic publishing and related activities. In *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*, Imagining America's recent report on promotion and tenure, the problem is clearly described and solutions are offered:

Publicly engaged academic work is taking hold in American colleges and universities, part of a larger trend toward civil professionalism in many spheres. But tenure and promotion policies lag behind public scholarly and creative work and discourage faculty from doing it....

[E]nlarging the conception of who counts as "peer" and what counts as "publication" is part of something bigger: the democratization of knowledge on and off campus.⁵

Speaking with students and practitioners, one striking point of commonality is how meaningful they find CCD work, how they experience a wealth of higher meaning in the practice. This speaker is a student:

[A particular] project really fueled my sense of spirituality in that way of community, facing in the same direction, common goals, common purpose and the sort of support and kind of relationship that I had as a child in church, feeling that safe place and a sense of belonging and also power in numbers. It was around those years that I felt like my theatre art became more like a practice; I thought of it like a martial arts practice, more than a spiritual practice, though martial arts is very spiritual. More than anywhere else in my life I experience a sense of spirit when I work with someone who maybe doesn't think they have a story to tell and has a transformative journey in which they surprise themselves, and they do have something that no one in their life told them

⁵ Julie Ellison and Timothy K. Eastman, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*, Imagining America, 2008, p.iv. Download from <www.imagingamerica.org/TTI/TTI.html>.

they should be able to do, but there they are on stage, and they're doing it. Being a part of that for me is really transformative, is a reciprocal kind of opening up. For me, that's where my spirit lives, when I get a sense of being a spiritual being.

As educators grapple with the changing nature of knowledge and work, there has been much discussion of redefining the university for the challenges of a globalized world. This conversation often takes place within a market-oriented framework. But the challenges of living together, of advancing the public good and of awakening creativity in the service of civil society are even more immediate and pervasive, as these educators and activists describe:

The 19th century university, the German-style university, that [many] American universities are based on, is premised on a certain Eurocentric division of knowledge and labor. That, as all paradigms, has its limits. In this globalized world, this kind of hyper-specialization has its severe limits. The new paradigm is cross-cultural, is interdisciplinary without necessarily giving up benefits of certain kinds of specialization. It's decolonized, because racism and colonial mentalities have really hit the limit, have really limited the ability of all people who subscribe to those approaches to actually gain a more accurate understanding, a more resonant understanding of how things work. This gets back to the epistemic insight that people who are not deeply imbedded in these systems and have subaltern relationships of various kinds to the way the dominant structure operates have these insights, they know these things. They have different reasons why they know these things. A lot of them are academics and intellectuals who know those things. It's very simple to change that by opening the doors to this new kind of knowledge that has a deeper insight about how things actually work.

We're number one with our incarceration rates, right? I heard that the other day and it chilled me. We see the disparity of wealth and people getting poorer and people getting displaced and communities getting destroyed. Many artists are saying they can't afford to live in East Harlem anymore. Can't. It seems to me that the university has to decide what is the consciousness of a nation, that's the product you're giving out into the world. The university is supposed to have some sense of contributing to that consciousness, that quality of a nation. I think we as citizens of this nation are realizing how wanting of value, of consciousness, of caring for our community, caring for people, our nation has become. We've lost it. And people are losing their homes left and right. People who work every day can't pay insurance, can't pay their medical bill, and can't have a quality of life in the richest nation in the world—what are we talking about? What are we doing and what are we producing? And that's frightening. That's really frightening. Universities have a responsibility to put people out in the world with a sense of consciousness, a sense of the quality of life that everyone should be part of.

We hope that readers of this report will forgo the narrowest view of CCD in favor of this exciting prospect: that in integrating community cultural development studies into institutions of higher education now, new vistas of possibility will be opened for higher education premised on the values of pluralism, participation and equity, with universities and communities as valued and reciprocating partners in cultural development.

SECTION 2: CCD EDUCATION: AIMS AND IDEALS

In the “Call for Excellence” that heralded this project (the full text appears as an appendix to this report), we stated that excellent CCD programs in higher education depend on three key elements:

Excellence requires a balance of community engagement, training in both aesthetics and community organizing, and scholarship focusing on the field’s history and animating ideas, as well as the economic and policy environments for it.



Our assertion was based on the understanding that community cultural development is an integral practice, engaging the full person. From decades of observation and practice, we’ve seen that skill, sensitivity, knowledge and an embrace of critical reflection are all required to bring the work to its highest level; and like many professions considered both as art and craft (such as medicine), effective preparation must be shaped by the very same values, understandings and experiences that inform good practice.

This interviewee, who has worked in both community and higher-education settings, makes the same points in very different language:

The teaching artist—cultural worker, whatever we want to call them—has to understand how to do the research to understand the community that they’re working with, what the issues are in that community. For the art to be meaningful and purposeful, I would say that’s the number one issue. And often that’s not what you’re taught in technique class.... Then of course, the teaching artist has to come with a history of understanding the art form they’re dealing with. So they have to be well-trained in their own art form, and have to be practicing it in some way. Then comes the third criterion, which is how are they trained as a facilitator? Ultimately for it to be a community-based arts piece representing a community, if we are empowering the participants to share their views and share their way of working, that’s another criterion. I think these criteria are very distinctive to community cultural work as opposed to going into what I would call the canon, the traditional ways people learn art. There are a gazillion art classes out there. There are very few that really address how the arts have empowered community.

Although our research revealed remarkable variety in almost every element of existing CCD higher-education programs—from course offerings to scholarly resources to teaching styles and modes of practice—among research participants, agreement on this ideal was strong. In our surveys overall, 49% of those responding felt that all three elements—community engagement, training and scholarship—should receive equal weight in a properly balanced CCD education. The figures were highest for those currently outside higher educational environments: 62% of friends of the field and 51% of community artists and organizational leaders indicated equal weight was best. When one element was deemed primary, 35% of community artists and 29% of friends of the field chose community engagement.

Students, on the other hand, stressed training in craft, a choice made by 56% of our small sample of student respondents. In undergraduate studies, it appears that students’ desire to learn their own art forms is as strong as their wish to learn CCD practice. This educator explains how craft training emerged into priority in one program of higher education for community cultural development:

Students wanted the opportunity to do more art-making that wasn’t connected to collaboration, that wasn’t connected to a project in community. I changed and moved around some of the units to give students the opportunity to do more studio classes. They say they’re making and they’re in the process of making, combined with what they’ve learned from a historical and

theoretical perspective, it gives them an opportunity to really clearly identify how they want to work as a community artist. That was very, very helpful, because most of their studio classes were community collaboration studio classes and not a lot of individual—just a sculpture class, or just a painting class. So we've tweaked the curriculum to give them the opportunity to focus on their own art-making. But also coming out of that, what does that mean? What does that mean as you go through this process of individual art-making in terms of the work that you want to do in the world?

Consider the following sampling of comments from survey participants.

From friends of the field:

In the ideal they are equal, but engagement must be primary and constant, simply because the community is never stagnant and is always in flux.

I'm not aware of anywhere where they are truly equal; this seems essential.

Nobody with a degree, certificate or proof of training in community arts can pretend to operate effectively in the field without all three.

I feel that they all are equally important because each element works hand in hand. You may have a very engaged community worker but if they are not skilled in their discipline, how high is the level that they can engage the community? The artist needs to be able to constantly meet the challenges of what the community asks for and needs.

From community artists and organizational leaders:

It's having a good understanding of all three elements and then learning how to balance them that provides the right foundation for community cultural development.

In an ideal world all are equal. But a passion for the arts—a passion for social justice and a thirst to learn—these are most important.

All three are essential for creating a healthy creative environment. Without community engagement the work is not relevant, without scholarship or education to audience and artist the work will not be comprehensive, without training in craft the work will be juvenile.

You can be a successful scholar or artist, but unable to engage a community in a project. So I believe that community engagement should be at the center of the curriculum. You still need scholarship and training in your craft, but these skills are useless if you can't effectively connect and motivate people to participate and commit to a project. Facilitation and communication are crucial skills to learn and hone.

From students:

We not only have a duty to facilitate the art of an artist but their preparation in entering the field. Art should be integral, though I would rate everything else equally on the second tier.

While I think scholarship is important, I personally am less interested in being really great at writing about the work than I am making really good work and engaging really well with my partners. If you are grounded in your craft and have the tools for engaging with others, then I'm not sold on the merits of scholarship as being a primary focus. I would rather make the work and talk with folks about it—than write essays about it.

CONTESTED ELEMENTS

When asked to indicate essential elements of an ideal CCD education, a majority of survey participants found practical work more primary than scholarly work. Most survey participants prized community engagement above all, with classroom training in skills related directly to community engagement a close second.

Three of the elements listed in our survey were most strongly contested: arts training, scholarship and social-justice related courses, all discussed below.

Elements of Ideal CCD Education:	Essential priority	Important but optional	Non-essential	Don't know
Hands-on community engagement projects	91%	6%	2%	1%
Classroom training in group work, facilitation and other community engagement practices	80%	16%	2%	1%
Technique classes and studio work in arts practices	66%	25%	6%	2%
Classes and seminars in social change and social-justice topics	49%	37%	10%	2%
Classes and seminars in cultural policy, relevant arts history, theory and criticism of the field	48%	37%	8%	2%

What does this mean? Not that there is no value for CCD practitioners in classroom or studio work: indeed, only a tiny minority of respondents to each survey found any of the three categories non-essential. Above all, the valorizing of hands-on community engagement means that there is no substitute for placing one's body, mind and spirit in the crucible of community work. No learning experience yields its full meaning until it has been tested in this way. No form of knowledge is valid that does not withstand the challenges that hands-on work presents, as expressed by this educator:

Experiential learning is the approach that seems to be more successful when we talk about how to get information across to students. How do we get them to actually think and to learn and how to make decisions based on that? I'm getting to the point where learning just the facts, it's just not good enough. I get really concerned when a student gets the facts but does not know how to do things. We need to have students go out and actually figure out what are the problems and also be able to work with those individuals who are also struggling with those problems, and understand that there's not just one solution. How do you think on your feet, you know? How do you figure out what's the next step and work with people and understand that failure is not a bad thing? There's a stepping-off point that the students need to have: these are some of the things you may experience and these are the theories behind it, so once they get out there or once they come back from it, they get in touch with other people's experiences through the literature and the theory. I think you need both. You can't just do hands-on, but you also need to understand the context of that. I would never send students out there in the community without understanding the community first. How do you say hello in that community? Who are those people and how do they differ from you and how are they similar to you? What's the jumping-off point? Come in with something to offer and come in ready to listen.

ARTS TRAINING

Each of the three contested elements was subject to interpretation by participants, of course, and each was seen in slightly different ways by different individuals. For instance, how central is training in artistic skills to the best preparation for CCD practice? There was considerable variation among interviewees on that question. Consider the range of views in this selection from interviewees:

Students need a grounding in the conventional aesthetic skills. And I think they need to know how to function, they need to know what those art languages are. And there are good things about those art languages. Then there's also the aesthetic craft of community-based work which is its own set of skills that have to do with listening, observing, facilitating, digital applications, where more experimental and conceptual work, more abstract work comes into play, the kind of interdisciplinary installation performance skills that tend to build upon more conventional craft skill-sets. So you have someone who's a sculptor and that's what they're taking their studio classes in and that's good, and they need to master that. That's one kind of practitioner who's

mastered those skills, there's nothing wrong with those skills. But then they have to extend those skills, and that's where the community-based artist is born. They take those things and can think conceptually or think interdisciplinarily.

I'm very torn about teaching artistic techniques. I often think that they would develop those skills as they work in communities, learning from masters who are already out there. But then I'm saying, "Well gee, what would they have to offer if you just send them out there like that?" So, they have to have some basic skill level in terms of studio, some sense of at least what is the language that you're trying to communicate through, before they're sent out there. And then that development can come through the need for something to say and in finding that something to say. But I think we do them a disservice if we just send them out without having a foundation.

We are training artists. This is an art college, we're training practitioners and so we're training practitioners that also understand teaching philosophies, they also understand community activism, political activism, they understand social justice, they understand diversity. So I like to think that we're training practitioners that come with a cause. They're thinkers—not that other artists aren't thinkers—but I mean they're thinkers in terms of yes, I'm a really good ceramicist and then what is the commentary of the work that I'm making in terms of dealing with the issues that I feel are important in the community? So it's taking it that one step further: yes, we want to develop really good practitioners, but we want to create good practitioners with a consciousness and a responsibility.

When you talk about artistic excellence, the question for me always goes to what is the intended purpose of the work? How well does this work meet that goal? Outside of that, everything else is me saying, "Well I don't like that because of this, that and the other" or "I loved it because of that." That is the most important part of really looking at training.... A lot of people have talent. I know people that can dance but they've never been to school for it. People that can act, people that can tell jokes, that have never been trained, but are some of the best actors and comedians that I have ever met. So, does their value diminish because they've never been formally trained? In the community, no. But then, this commercial capitalist world that we live in, yes, if you don't go through the proper channels you're not going to get the validation and respect that you need in order to be able to make a living from your talent. And so, my theory is that all these people will be coming from these institutions that will be getting the validation but may not necessarily know how to do the work, and not really be grounded in the community and really understand what all this stuff means.

Interviewees stressed aspects of CCD values and practice that must be brought to the broad category of training in arts skills. For instance, these explanations of what artistic training means in a CCD context are from two practitioners who also work in higher education. The first emphasizes the two-tiered nature of arts training within CCD—conventional technique and the techniques of devising art so essential to CCD; the second stresses the centrality of cultivating an artistic voice:

Any of the major kind of veteran practitioners that we look up to will say you have to be an artist. You know, Joe Shmo can't do that effectively, you have to be an artist, and you have to know how to make art. And the other thing about most training programs is, they don't teach you how to make art. I mean even at [my university drama department], almost everyone was just telling you how to follow directions as an actor, and maybe how to be creative within your own realm as an actor in relation to a playwright and a director, but not really how to make art from scratch, which is what community-based artists have to do. When I say there has to be regular technique training, it also requires the redefinition of what techniques we're talking about. You have to have some basic skills in your art form, but you also need to know how to create work and you need to know how to collaborate, all of those are part of the techniques of a community-based artist. And that's different from theory and history and policy and those other things that can happen in a regular classroom or studio room.

As someone who has come to the work as an artist, I worry about the political approach that makes certain that advocacy and message takes priority in a curriculum over also making sure that the skills and the cultivating of the artistic voice of the student is absolutely as important.... My

dream curriculum doesn't put the artist there and say that the other stuff is less important, but it absolutely has to be more important than—like if you're training to be a community-based worker or an organizer, there's a whole world you have to learn. If you're training to be a theatre artist who's going to work in community-based settings, or a community-based theatre artist, the artist part has to be really solid and strong, or I'm not sure what you have to bring to those projects.

SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship too has different meanings depending on perspective. The strongest impression that came through multiple responses was a desire for scholarship in the service of action, rather than distanced or abstract study of subjects that might not affect practice. To the extent that scholarship was seen to serve action, participants valued study that incorporates critical reflection, that engages with complex questions an engaged observer might ask about the community realities faced by practitioners. For instance, this practitioner emphasizes the need to engage local communities in understanding how they have been affected by larger historical forces, to avoid abstracting that inquiry from grassroots realities:

Scholarship is important, it's important for us to understand.... When you look at the academic aspect of it, there's so much knowledge to be absorbed out there that that is a very important piece of understanding historical context and being able to look at and analyze the community situation that you're in. What does it mean that this community has been facing the same particular plight for 160 years? What does it mean for this other community over here that faced the same situation over a hundred years ago but is no longer there? When did the transition happen? We have the experiences in our own community to really be able to point all that stuff out. It's just acknowledging that and taking it to heart and not taking it for granted. So I wouldn't want to confine even that academic and scholarship part of it to a classroom. The classroom becomes one small piece of a much larger community-based puzzle.

The following elaboration of scholarship, from a friend of the field with many years of both organizational and educational experience, stresses willingness to interrogate one's own assumptions, avoiding the orthodoxies that can restrict even as innovative and improvisational a practice as CCD:

Part of scholarship is not just the history of community arts. It's understanding what it means to be a community organizer if you're saying you're one or, if you're saying you're anti-gentrification, it's really understanding what gentrification means in its complexities. There's a scholarship component about what it is you're trying to change in the world, if it's about social change, and why, and the history of those social movements that give you an analysis. It's learning how to develop an analysis and understanding enough content to be able to do that, so you're not just dropping yourself into campaigns, but you have a theory of social change and you know how to act within it.

So that would be one piece, and then the other piece is the part that keeps you from becoming complacent. It's the challenge from younger generations in the work and saying, "Well, how do you institutionalize risk-taking?" and challenging yourself constantly. And I think that needs to be built into it. As I've experienced this, there is a sort of canon for community arts that in the past has left out a lot of work. So as a result, the sort of white community arts world hasn't interacted with some of the other worlds, and the people in the other movements, like the hip-hop movement, may not get to study their history because it's not included. There's got to be some mechanism where there's a constant critique and renewing and rethinking that makes it not get rigid.... It's not just young people, it's immigrant communities. It's communities who are talked about in community arts, but I don't feel like are really part of creating the curriculum. And there needs to be a way that they are on their own terms.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

To articulate the underlying goal of CCD, The Curriculum Project's creators drew on the inspiring words Reverend James Lawson wrote nearly fifty years ago for the founding statement of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee: "a social order of justice permeated by love." When it comes to the social-justice

underpinnings of CCD, people seem to be trying for a nuanced view incorporating the understanding that the sloganeering and militancy sometimes associated with social-justice activism are not necessarily compatible with a practice that values dialogue, one with a high tolerance for difference and the ability to hold contradiction without forcing a conclusion. This practitioner is also involved in educational programs:

It's not exactly a direct question, but when we're interviewing for applicants, why you're doing this work is definitely part of what we're looking at. But the answer isn't necessarily a treatise on social justice—that's not the answer that people are giving. But when we're hearing answers that have to do with helping the disadvantaged or something like that, that's not usually a person we're going to be interested in. It's not that every value is shared, and it's not even that it's all explicit. I'm not so concerned about the vocabulary in which they would state their values or that we have to talk about it in a language of social justice. But I do think that there's almost an assumption that that's there in the ways that we talk about things.

Explicit or not, the underlying value persists and many practitioners continue to grapple with it, as this educator describes:

I struggle to make sure that the debate remains current, not a debate about whether we should have a social-justice perspective or not, but my assumption has been one that the work must be grounded in some broader perspective and central purposes which go beyond the creation of art itself. To bring that perspective sharper and refine our policy was something that was a challenge to me and something we continue to do.... One of the things that we certainly ground people in is a Freirian perspective on art and education. And look at constructivist theories of education more broadly and introduce people to those areas in the less traditional theatre world of practices such as Boal, of people who were saying we should not be divorcing arts and politics, and what we're doing and why we do it is as important as how we do it. It's not like we want to impose this on our people. But there are histories that coincide, there are perceptions that you share and aspirations that you share, then you find ways of relating this to successive generations' advances and at least asking them to address questions that I think ought to give them answers.

Several interviewees pointed to the necessity and challenge of engaging students with a critical perspective on their own motives and roles in doing this work:

I feel like there is this great untapped mass of young people who really, really want to change the world that we're living in. They really do, they believe in it. They have no idea how to do it. They have extremely naïve, possibly racist beliefs. They don't have any framework: like a lot of students call me up and say, "I want to bring art to the poor children of the inner city." I cannot blame them. They have been badly educated. They don't know, given where they've grown up. They don't have the same contacts as I do. It doesn't make them bad people. They have an actual burning passion to try and make the world a better place. They feel they have very few resources. Where to go to do work that is meaningful, that means something to them and makes them feel like they're doing anything to make the world better? And so what do they start doing? They start cruising for graduate programs because that seems like what you do when you want to make the world better. In my ideal world, we would figure out other ways of channeling that energy besides going to get a Masters degree, because that's not always the answer.

The speaker below is a friend of the field who sees social-justice values as deriving from encounters in community, rather than leading to them:

I am currently a little bit less concerned with starting from an explicit social-justice perspective. I would expect that perspective to develop in ways that might even surprise us through the work directly. I admire [a particular person's] work. It did not start out with any pretensions of building up a program that was all about social justice or for that matter any pretensions about building a program that was about youth development. He wanted to make theatre with teen-agers, period. They have engaged a wide range of social-justice issues in all of their shows on a consistent basis because they have committed to the rigor of an artistic process that evolves with engaging the world around them. It's sort of unavoidable. I admire that. It's an honest way to get there. Sometimes I'm just a little bit afraid that our generation has partly failed to change the world in the ways we hoped we could because we embraced political methods that were really kind of old

school. There was a way in which we never managed to articulate a genuine American expression of social justice and critique. We never managed to articulate it in an American vernacular.

This speaker is a practitioner and educator who perceives a dialectical relationship between making art and making social justice:

It's very, very naïve for a group of artists to say, "We're going to do this play and it's going to change the world in this way and we're going to make everybody feel this way about this issue through our play." That's hopelessly naïve. But it is equally naïve and even more dangerous to think that art does not change the world and does not change people's lives. So you can't be naïve about how you think it's going to change people's lives but you cannot be naïve about thinking, "Oh, it's just art, it doesn't change people's lives," because we know it does, because we know our truth is informed by the works of art that we've experienced as audience members as well as participants. I've seen really misguided attempts where the social-justice aims are on the sleeve of the project or of the artist and where I feel like actually this project is not as effective as it could be. And I've seen projects where people say, "We're just trying to create the most beautiful work of art we can," but through social engagement, in order to create something more beautiful, there's actually profound movement. I think it has to be part of the dialogue, but I don't subscribe to there's only one correct way to go at this kind of work, and if you don't clearly state what your social-justice goals are then the work is invalid or the work is not significant. I don't feel that at all.

The question of where a program's center of gravity is located is crucial for the next practitioner/educator: is the educator accountable to an institution or a larger community—or both?

Social-justice consciousness is stronger in the community organizations than it is in the university-based projects. You have more of a grassroots organization, that that's their mission, they're in the community, and they're arts organizations that are advocates for their community, and they're activists, they have that activist consciousness. It is about self-determination and power relations on their constituents' behalf. There's a danger when you get into the university that you're removed from that: even if you used to be that, suddenly you find yourself a service provider. That's really the work of transforming a university. So I don't see much of it yet in the university, and I think there's deep work to be done there as artists in the arts faculty.

In sum, Curriculum Project research revealed a fairly broad consensus that ideally, education for community cultural development must incorporate a balance of community engagement, training in artistic skills and CCD methods and scholarship focusing on relevant history and social context. Moreover, there is a real hunger for depth, the expressed wish that educational opportunities be informed by social awareness, self-questioning and a critical discourse that encompasses both university and community realities. The next section explores how people compared the present state of development with these ideals.

SECTION 3: THE STATE OF COMMUNITY

CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Condense Curriculum Project participants' assessment of the current state of CCD in higher education to a few lines, and here is what they would say: More and more people are trying very hard to make it work, with differential results ranging from extremely promising to dismal; few individuals know enough about the entire field to generalize reliably about it; and while both hopes and cautions are on high alert, it's too soon to tell where this may lead.

Summarizing what interviewees and survey respondents told us about their own programs and others, this section of the report explores their assessment of the current state of CCD education, focusing primarily on the higher-education context: what we learned about current programs and what people thought about them. (Note that the appendix entitled "A Sampling of Courses and Programs" includes descriptions of a range of existing programs and courses.)

WHY HIGHER EDUCATION?

In this moment of great potential and great uncertainty, interviewees explained why they are working so diligently toward the creation of excellent CCD programs in higher education. Some of their reasons relate to social trends, as one practitioner/educator put it: "We're in a different phase of history when having an academic training makes people feel more secure." Some are personal: another noted that as an educator, "You get a pension." Some are grounded in the advantages of the academic framework: greater resources, a larger potential scale, the opportunity to reflect on practice and create new knowledge, the ability to grant credentials and legitimate practice, a range of courses, commitment to critical thinking and intellectual rigor. But most expressed a passionate wish to help legitimate CCD, to bring it into the mainstream, creating access to the social and economic advantages academia confers—for example, this educator:

For the longest time I felt there was a big need to pull experiences together and to offer opportunities in a more coherent way. The most important reason is raising the standards of practice in a very important area of artistic and social intervention. But along with that, there are subsidiary aims such as legitimizing the work in the eyes of the world. Throughout a lot of my professional career I've encountered the attitude of "You only do this because you can't do something else," not really understanding or respecting the wealth of talent and achievement that exists here and across the world in often hidden corners. It's building networks as well, contacting other people, finding time to reflect with other people. I know how hard that is if you are a practicing professional for whom one of the big pressures is always how do I do the work, and how do I sustain myself when I'm doing it? And I guess that's why it has been easier for development to take place inside the academy, because that is somewhere where people have at least some sort of job security, which does not always exist in the world.

Implicit in "raising the standards of practice" is developing a useful analysis of the cultural landscape to inform practice, achieving a critical perspective on the large questions of cultural development CCD addresses:

One of the things that's important about the university is, even though it's subject to all kinds of pressure of commercialization, of privatization, of everything that everything else is subject to from prisons to hospitals to everything else that was once considered part of the public sphere—it is at least a place where one can make a claim on the necessity of a critical orientation to the world. Even now in business, it's common practice to say, "Oh yes, we have to be self-reflective, we have to be self-critical, we're not just embracing diversity, we also have to reflect on what went wrong in order to do it right." Having a focus on that critique is one of the things that is important about the university as a site. The nature of the program you craft, and how you teach, and what you teach, and who you teach, matters a great deal if you're going to keep that space open.

What keeps sending me back to academia and higher education is that I felt like, in our nonprofit social-justice organizing work there isn't enough reflection, critique and critical analysis. People spend so much time trying to implement or manage a project, or raise funds for the next

project, or support and promote the general operations of the organization, and never sit back and take a look at what is really going on.

When the university functions as a collaborating partner, entering into equitable and reciprocal relationships with community organizations, people believe the partnership can enrich both parties:

You bring young people with the commitment and the desire to learn and grow, and you've made sure the community workers can have more peers, especially if it's well done. The university also brings access to libraries, resources, networks, all that kind of information that the university knows how to tap. The ability to help find grants and fundraising: universities and colleges have money for this kind of thing, to get that brought into the community organization. A lot of the writing courses that go on, even if they're not deeply analytic, they come out and they can help people prepare materials and write newsletters and publicity and grants and so on. There's a tremendous amount that the university has in resources that the community organization doesn't have as easily.

In short, many reasons were cited for situating community cultural development programs within higher education. For the determined advocates who have driven this movement to integrate CCD and higher ed, the promise outweighs the challenges discussed in the next section of this report. And they see very real progress, as this educator described:

I'm seeing the times are kind of changing. I'm seeing that they're beginning to—there is legitimacy that I don't believe that we need, but there is legitimacy that is kind of needed particularly in higher ed, that says, "Yes, this can be accepted into the canon. This is worthy." That's always a slow process. It's going to be a long time before we get to the point of where the sciences have been regarded, sciences and literature, in terms of resources needed to educate students the way that they feel they need to be educated and the access to resources that they need. I think we're a long way from obtaining equity on that level, but I do see it coming.

FROM IDEAL TO ACTUAL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

But as yet, there is a widely perceived gap between aspirations and accomplishments. Of those who responded to our survey question assessing the state of the field, the majority ranked it no higher than "fair": 4% excellent, 26% good, 38% fair, 14% poor, with the remainder indicating "don't know." Within these numbers, observers from outside academia were most critical: 45% of friends of the field rated it fair and 21% poor; and 44% of community artists and organization leaders ranked it fair, with another 17% ranking it poor. Ambitions are high, many programs are just beginning, and almost no one felt that current higher educational programs have yet achieved their aspirations.

Education for community artists still feels rather limited, especially for theatre. Very few degrees, courses here and there, and faculty who take on these classes because it's a "hot topic" but are not versed in the field. It's growing, but it doesn't seem to be growing as fast as the community arts ed programs in the visual arts.

It's a new and growing field. Artists today are getting a better education than those who preceded them, but I would expect continued improvement as the field matures.

Scattered programs with nominal field infrastructure.

Many fine people are working on programs, but as far as I know, this is the first real assessment of how they are in relationship to a vision of what they could be. I don't know of any with a great balance among the three components, and few with enough time to do it all well, and none that link students to jobs in the field as a rule.

Oh, it's poor. Almost non-existent. Certainly not at the level of systems change and sustainable. Nowhere near, not even close. Maybe just beginning. We still have the champion who's an exception, not the rule at an institution. It's champion-driven, not value-sustainable, you know, it's not at a point where it's something that is considered like if you take arts classes, taking landscape or portrait, it's not a canon yet. There's a lot of technique training going on. But I see very little real scholarship. Nor are they getting the skills and techniques they need in order to be able to sustain their work.

There are many more programs these days than in my student days, and I am excited by the growth in the field.

Indeed, research participants expressed persistent doubts about higher education's ability to provide a foundation for community cultural development practice. Slightly more than half (53%) of survey respondents who replied to our question about the best mode of undergraduate-level education for CCD chose higher educational institutions, while 78% chose community-based apprenticeship or training. (Respondents could provide more than one answer.)

I'm frankly an agnostic about does this really belong in the colleges and universities. I'm not absolutely convinced of it. I worry that it can be academized and denatured. I'm deeply worried about kids investing a lot of time and money in school to go out into a job market that doesn't place much value on this kind of work, and it's a hard life. There are obviously a few folks who figured out strategies to make it work for them in the country over long periods of time, but I dare say that there's an awful lot more who haven't, and for whom it became a burnout or a sort of sad chapter in their lives. And it's such joyous work to do when it's done well. I find it so sad that so much of it is tainted by the dead hand of the bureaucracies that dole out the money or the dead hand of the bureaucracies that engineer the programs so that they are so much less than the artists could make them.

I think the models where people bring community artists-in-residence, where they're functioning as university extenders into the community, that you're going to get more depth. What happens in many of the different programs I see is someone in the university teaching a course in something called community arts, and the whole thing happens often in one semester or two, and the faculty person is kind of doing an introduction to the field and maybe supervising an internship. But what I want more of is others who are really doing the work on bridging teaching in the university and doing work out in the community—whose artwork, so to speak, is doing that work.... When you bring in people who really do the work in communities and make a space for them in universities, I think what you get is the apprenticeship learning that is required. What we need to be doing from the university side is the meaning-making and self-reflective work, which is about a depth of development of social-justice skills, awareness, exploration of identity, and we can do a decent job with that in the university. And then take students who are having a chance to do that to apprentice with artists in the community, at least on the undergraduate level.

I certainly don't think that it's impossible in the university. I think there could be a lot of really good things about it being part of a university. But things that scare me are: is somebody going to have to have a credential in order to do this work? That scares me both in terms of what a credential conveys, and also not everybody goes to college, it doesn't seem the necessary way. I don't want the field to narrow down in bad ways. I think that it's very good to have conversations about what training is and what needs to be learned. But I think that sometimes in my work, somebody who's just completely come from the streets—there are certain skills that they're going to need, but they can really come in to just work and be way more effective.

Universities are really under-utilized resources with space and technical assistance and housing and all kinds of things. But I also think we need to look at other models. I think both are really important.

Whatever we're doing with the community-based work in the institution, the institution has to begin to reflect the community, and it has to be more engrained in community, it can't be seen as an outside opposing force while trying to teach the principles of community. The education system as it has been for so long is used as a validating system, and it inducts the so-called educated as the leaders of a civilized society, whereas on the underside of that, when you're talking about community, especially community development through the arts, you're talking about institutional practices that have been forged by those on the ground floor. And those people are usually the poor and uneducated. So you're talking about two opposite ends of the spectrum, and one is trying to teach these principles and practices that are basically grounded in the community in an institution that is not grounded in community.

In this context, it's interesting to note that by far the largest percentage of community artists and organizational leaders taking part in our surveys describe their own mode of education as "self-taught" (60%) and/or "apprenticeship" (47%). Although the percentages are lower, the ranking is the same for educators: 44% indicated "self-taught" and 35% indicated "apprenticeship." In the aggregate, more than half (56%) of these two categories of respondents also attended undergraduate art school or liberal arts college, and 40% indicated postgraduate work at either type of institution, with educators' greater formal education pushing up the totals. While it's impossible to know the precise extent to which higher education enhanced their ability to teach CCD, this points to a notable challenge for those undertaking CCD programs in higher education: how to impart in the more structured and formal setting of a university the ideas, practices, skills and sensibilities they learned in very different ways, through on-the-ground experience and self-directed study.

As we spoke with interviewees about the value of higher education for CCD, most expressed the wish that education for this field include both modes with equal legitimacy, rather than privileging the university on account of its ability to confer credentials. Both these speakers are educators:

They're both leading to the same sort of end. I have hired community artists, practitioners that don't have formal educations but are just as stellar as artists. The faculty that I've hired with M.F.A.s, Ph.D.'s aren't all that matter. Education does not mean that you're more learned. You can have just as much knowledge in terms of theory and history by not going to college that you do get going to college. I think the one thing that college gives you, it's sort of a directed study. You have people saying, "You know, you should read this and you should try to do it this way." They're directing your learning, as opposed to someone who is not educated. Their learning comes from a different place. It comes from trial and error, it comes from who they're introduced to and what they're introduced to, it comes from a sense of agency, sometimes it comes from because I have to understand this. But I don't value one over the other. I think they're just different roads and they're different mechanisms.

The universities have the luxury of time and resources. I mean, we feel rushed all the time, and we are rushed and crazed all the time, but we have incredible luxuries. You know, just the fact that I have a budget to buy books. Just the fact that I can work with students and talk about ideas. It's a luxury. In the global scheme of things, it's an expectation among academics, but it's really a luxury to be able to do this as a way of making a living; it's a luxury be able to work with students and to be able to learn from them. I see working with students and working with community folks as both collaborative processes. It becomes a question about how you create linkages between these two sites of work, that then can be really beneficial in terms of building something larger other than reproducing academia.

Almost as many participants as have opinions about the overall state of CCD in higher education feel unable to adequately assess the field, saying they lack firsthand knowledge. Among educators responding to our survey—by definition those most closely involved—42% replied "don't know" to our question concerning the overall quality of higher educational offerings for the field. Few of those attached to any specific program have had in-depth experience of programs at other institutions. There has been very little critical writing (as opposed to promotional writing about one's own or one's colleagues' work). People are understandably cautious about generalizing based on things like presentations at conferences or a review of written program descriptions, as indicated by many participants' responses to our question about the overall quality of the field in the United States:

There's ways that we all talk about our programs and then there's being inside of it and living it. So it's hard for me to get a sense of what all of our goals are, how that translates into the reality for our students.

This is one where I will beg off and say I don't consider myself an authority, but I what will I say is that the stuff I know the best is the stuff that is here at [my own institution].

I feel a need to know a lot more about many other educational institutions and programs before I could possibly come to an assessment.

I have only a vague sense of the educational opportunities out there, but I know some are excellent, and certainly there are more opportunities than before.

I can't say that I have a really good current sense of that, but just from hearing colleagues talk about it over the past few years anyway, my own experience both as a student and as a person/educator in higher education, I think it's pretty bad.

The large percentage of respondents who feel they lack adequate knowledge to assess the field points very clearly to a need for infrastructure—the ways and means for constituents of the field to become acquainted with each other, to become colleagues and to enter into a mutually supportive discourse. These topics are explored in later sections of this report.

SCOPE OF CCD EDUCATION

There is no central body awarding credentials or offering an imprimatur to CCD programs; indeed, at this point in the ripening of the field, self-identification is the only recognized criterion. What seems apparent—not only from Curriculum Project research but also from other indicators such as participation in community arts-related dialogues and Web sites—is that many more educators feel an affinity to the field than have as yet succeeded (or even endeavored to succeed) in creating substantial programs.

Consider the appendix to this report entitled “A Sampling of Courses and Programs.” It contains information on many courses and programs, but omits some of those whose creators submitted listings to the Community Arts Network’s places to study (<http://www.communityarts.net/training/index.php>), which includes degrees in arts tourism, public administration and other subjects bearing some relationship to art or community, but not conceived as preparation for CCD per se. Similarly, some of the syllabi educators have submitted for CAN’s collection (<http://www.communityarts.net/canu/syllabi/index.php>) focus on art and social issues, but don’t specifically address CCD.

As a result, it is difficult to quantify the phenomenon of CCD in higher education. More than four-fifths (81%) of the educators who responded to our survey checked a box indicating that they offer one or more CCD degrees. But in their explanatory notes, half of them said they did not, and many of the remainder listed degree programs that may include some reference to CCD but are not focused on that practice, such as: “interdisciplinary individualized college degrees,” “M.A. in Theatre Education,” “Arts degrees involve the community,” “we’re developing an arts management program,” “M.A. in Cultural Studies and B.A. in Interdisciplinary Arts.” However, it is clear that CCD has made inroads: of the 85% who indicated they offer individual CCD courses, most listed subjects that are inarguably core to CCD education, such as: “Theatre for Development,” “Community-based Theatre,” “Building Community through the Arts,” “Interactive/Goal-Based Theatre” and “The Artist as Organizer.”

Some educators suggested that this is the way new knowledge becomes part of academia: it starts with a course or two, aggregates into a minor or certificate, and eventually a major is formulated, proposed and approved. Focusing just on those higher-education offerings that meet the criteria suggested earlier in this report—those that intend to prepare students for work that is “collaborative and participatory, egalitarian in style and outlook, self-directed by all participants, oriented as much to process as to product, linking each individual’s development to the development of community”—reveals a relatively small crop of offerings in various stages of ripening, a developmental trajectory that seems to fit this pattern. At some institutions, one or two courses function as an introduction to the practice; at others, a minor, emphasis or certificate program has started in the last few years; and as the work of dedicated practitioners and educators begins to be harvested, undergraduate and graduate degree programs have come into being. For instance, these survey respondents report on their own progress on the path to developing CCD programs:

Right now there are just two classes that I teach under special topics numbers. But I want to create a stronger series of courses for a “thematic sequence” (kinda like a minor) and I’m looking for ways to connect to other interdisciplinary programs on campus that have a focus on community engagement.

I inherited an M.F.A. program in Directing when I joined the faculty. I used the existing framework (which was pretty much a generic “directing for anyone in any context” approach) to begin to build my own approach, seeking students who wanted to work on grass-roots, community-based, ensemble theatre making.

We were given funding to create the proposal for a major. It received approval from all the campus committees save one. There is no funding for a facility to house the program, and currently we are teaching all of our classes in one room. In other words, the students that take socially engaged art as an elective each quarter are all working in one classroom. We cannot grow the program without administrative leadership, and the final campus committee put our program on hold until there is a clear decision to give our program the space and funding it deserves.

We don't have a sanctioned program. Working on developing a possible certificate program in community arts, through the Office of Academic Service Learning.

For the present, in addition to creativity, determination and endurance, educators and their allies need to engage critically with questions of scale. How much impact can one or two courses have on preparing students for CCD practice? If what is available leaves out some of the three fundamentals of CCD education—training, scholarship and community engagement—is it premature to make claims of efficacy? This educator counsels a long view, high standards and perseverance:

It's a long haul. And the advice I'd give to somebody else is do the course, do the work and do it really, really well and responsibly and you're going to get great evaluations from students and it's going to get recognized because you've done it well. And think hard about how you articulate it, because there are ways to articulate that are convincing to an institution, but the main thing is to articulate it through good work.

VARIETIES OF CCD EDUCATION

One factor that helps to account for the large variations between programs developing now is institutional context. For example, programs sited at visual arts-oriented colleges tend to reflect that orientation, rather than providing training for a range of CCD practices that might draw on music, writing, dance, theatre and so on:

[One program] is much more for practitioners, especially visual artists. Students are going to talk a lot about aesthetics. They're also going to talk about community development, but they're going to do art projects in communities or with people in communities; they're going to do artistic projects that are going to be focused on aesthetics and making. [Another program] addresses issues of like social justice, economic justice, and there's definitely a high level of engagement in practice in the community.

This higher education-based interviewee also sees differences that seem to be shaped by institutional character, arts schools versus liberal arts colleges:

There are characteristic gaps. I see liberal arts institutions tend to be doing more of the research and the writing, because the classes are situated in sociology or political science or even anthropology. And for the art colleges, it tends to be more practical hands-on and less of the writing and theorizing. That's the reason why both liberal arts and arts higher-ed institutions really need to be interacting more with each other, so that we really do begin to understand the value for arts students in training them on both sides.

No one who took part in this research suggested that these differences should (or even could) be erased. Instead, as will be evident from the section on “Sustainable Education for CCD” later in this report, people are searching for flexible modes of curriculum design that convey the essentials while allowing for significant variations conditioned on institutional character.

PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

The educators and students taking part in Curriculum Project surveys ranked aspects of their own programs in terms of positives and negatives, as follows:

	Positive	Negative
Quality and amount of emphasis on reflection and analysis	83%	11%
Commitment to social-justice values	75%	17%
Faculty quality and community arts experience	67%	17%
Length of program	61%	22%
Quality and quantity of studio work	56%	31%
Quality and amount of emphasis on scholarship	56%	31%
Strength of community engagement	53%	36%
Balance between community arts and other requirements	50%	25%
Affordability	47%	39%

Race and class studies were the most widely taught subjects under the general heading of scholarship: 81% of educators listed them; 73% percent listed the history of community arts; 69% listed community arts theory; 62% listed Freire- and Boal-inspired studies; and 62% listed principles and ethics of practice. The remaining subject areas—community organizing history and theory, community development history and theory, cultural policy, feminist studies and post-colonial theory—were listed by no more than 39%, and most by significantly fewer.

Under training, collectively created performance was listed as part of programs by 59%; studio arts and Boal-inspired performance and workshops by 44% each; oral history–based work by 41%; collectively created media (film, video, audio, etc.) by 33%; group dynamics by 30%; and public art and community organizing techniques and approaches by 26% each.

The emphasis on performance reflects the field’s profile: it is generally accepted that in the U.S., there are more community artists active in theatre than any other type of arts work, and superior infrastructure exists to facilitate their work and bring them into contact with their peers, such as annual conferences and international associations focused on Theatre of the Oppressed (Augusto Boal’s work).

When we asked educators to situate themselves within a field by naming their colleagues, the largest group (84%) listed “others in higher education working on community engagement” and behind that, 78% listed “artists and non-artists working in community organizing or development.” Indeed, the categories associated with community activism consistently ranked higher than others: 64% listed “all other artists working in community”; 60% listed “other social activists”; 49% listed “other artists in my discipline working in community” and “other community-based artists working in my specific area (e.g., in prisons, schools, or with elders)”; and just 36% listed “other artists in my discipline, however they work.”

When we asked survey participants to name the associations to which they belong or the conferences they attend, the responses were quite different for educators and community artists/organizational representatives. Imagining America was by far the most common affiliation for educators (with 16 mentions), while Alternate ROOTS (a performing arts service organization focused on community and activism) was the most common affiliation for community artists (12 mentions). The range of groups mentioned was impressive: there were 223 listings in addition to those tallied below, including many regional groups (e.g., Arts Wisconsin, Twin Cities US Social Forum, Vashon Allied Arts) and professional specialty–related groups (National Council for Educators of Ceramic Arts, Grantmakers in the Arts, The Asia Society). The following list includes all those mentioned three or more times. Once again, the list conveys the predominance of performing arts interest in the field. Although most of the list reflects mentions by both educators and community artists, several groups were mentioned only by community artists, as indicated:

- **Imagining America** (20 mentions)
- **Americans for the Arts** (18 mentions): Of the 18, 8 referred specifically to Animating Democracy.
- **Alternate ROOTS** (15 mentions)
- **National Performance Network** (10 mentions)
- **Pedagogy and Theatre of the Oppressed** (9 mentions)
- **Community Arts Partnership** convenings (9 mentions): These refer to conferences by a consortium of higher education programs held at the Center for Art and Public Life at California College of the Arts in 2006 and the Maryland Institute College of Art in 2008.
- **Network of Ensemble Theatres** (7 mentions)
- **Community Arts Network** (6 mentions): CAN is a Web-based portal for the field, not a membership organization or a conference presenter, but because it was listed so often, it is included here.
- **ArtServe Michigan** (5 mentions, community artists only)
- **Association of Theatre in Higher Education** (4 mentions)
- **Association of Performing Arts Presenters** (3 mentions)
- **College Art Association** (3 mentions)
- **National Alliance of Media Arts and Culture** (3 mentions, community artists only)
- **Theatre Communications Group** (3 mentions, community artists only)
- **National Guild of Community Schools of The Arts** (3 mentions, community artists only)

DEEPENING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Despite the significant differences between higher educational programs grounded in different art forms or types of institution, an underlying direction in most programs' development is recognition of the need to deepen the practice of community engagement. As noted earlier, only 53% of educators and students saw the strength of their own institutions' community engagement as a positive, and 36% saw it as a negative. When asked what elements make up their current programs, 82% of educators and students responding to our surveys indicated community engagement, the highest percentage for any element; 42% of educators also indicated that current training in community engagement is insufficient. Both the aspiration and the need are evident, and people are working hard to close gaps.

The educators who took part in our survey choose commitment to community engagement as the strongest value animating their programs (82%), with pursuit of social justice second (68%). Most of the community engagement projects described by participants are one semester long, although a few were as short as a week or as long as several years. A few responses to a question about the goals of community engagement focused on community impact, like this one:

To make publicly visible the intersection of the art and the art-making processes with community concerns and conversations. To increase public visibility of concerns and perspectives of specific communities. To join in the activism for social change forwarded by specific organizing groups.

But the majority of the goals described were educational and experiential aims for students: "students to experience entering, engagement with, and leaving or continuing with group," "the goal is to teach students that they can make a difference in the lives of others in the community," "our project goals are mostly content/educational in student outcomes, but all of the projects have engagement, elaboration, self-efficacy, partnership goals as well," "enhancing problem-solving skills," "student experience with community organizations," "deepening knowledge of the course subject while serving the community."

Educators shared what had been most positive about these experiences:

Students feel a sense of accomplishment; community appreciation; some projects have continued outside of class.

Students have strong educational and personal development opportunities.

What students learn and stated self-esteem gains by people in group.

Generally, the projects have provided the students with fertile learning opportunities and the community partners have likewise gained around specifically identified goals: vibrant exchanges, new learning, steps in building community (deepening and expanding).

Students get day-to-day hands-on experience.

For the students, finding new meaning to making art. For the organizations, expanding and deepening creative approach to their agenda, plus just more young adults helping.

Educators also described what had been most problematic, focusing again and again on the difficulty of giving community engagement adequate time and resources within a higher education framework:

Trying to do a project in one semester; scheduling; transportation; community trust.

Lack of university support for sustainability.

Team dynamics (inside our student teams) varied. Could use more prep on how to be a great team member in future.

There is a need for more paid internships. Those who supervise students in community organizations are not always prepared to do this in a constructive way.

Not enough time at placement, or planning, or working with students outside of class. Not important enough in department to give it the time it needed.

Limited time for student engagement, short-term projects without long-term perspective, continuity and growth, understanding and commitment to community engagement.

Interviewees described precisely the same barriers to optimal community engagement practice as were listed by survey participants. Some of them have been able to address the problem. For instance, this interviewee describes an academic department's shift in self-understanding, leading to investing more effort and value in community engagement:

A recognized part of our essential work now is getting the department as a functioning, theatre-producing, teaching institution overtly aware of groups of people in the community (organizations, churches, civic groups, political groups, particular populations) that have voiced themselves. And for allowing that knowledge, from practical knowledge of data bank and who's who, and what's going on and how do you contact this person, etcetera, to a more socially aware comprehension of what this means. On campus, we think about the campus community. Well, there are lots of communities on the campus, and as we become more informed about those particular aspects of the community, we can make much more informed decisions about what kind of theatre we're making. If community is simply the students, we make plays based on our own aesthetic judgments—and not to fault our own aesthetic judgments, but we just might not be connected with anybody around us! We can also make far more informed decisions about not only the plays we decide we're going to make, but what projects we might be interested in becoming involved with, either as play-makers or simply as citizens.

In the section of this report entitled "An Abundance of Worthy Challenges," reasons for these reported difficulties are explored.

RESOURCES AND INSPIRATIONS

Given the notable internal diversity of this developing field, it is unsurprising that there is no single program, text or topic deemed integral to all existing programs. Curriculum Project surveys for community artists, educators, friends of the field and students all asked participants to list up to five essential resources for students in CCD. The vast majority of resources were books (rather than videos). In addition to books about community cultural development, listed resources ranged from studies of history and ethnicity to fiction to classic books on specific arts techniques. In addition to the 11 resources listed below, 134 other writers and resources were mentioned in all. The list that follows includes all the resources that received three or more mentions:

- **Arlene Goldbard** (20 mentions): The specific book titles mentioned were *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development* and two precursors co-authored with Don Adams (*Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development* and *Community, Culture and Globalization*).

- **Community Arts Network**/www.communityarts.net (17 mentions): In addition to noting the CAN Web site as a rich source, participants mentioned two anthologies published by Art in The Public Interest, CAN's parent organization, *Performing Communities: The Grassroots Ensemble Theater Research Project* and *The Citizen Artist: 20 Years of Art in the Public Arena*.
- **Paulo Freire** (14 mentions): One specific book title was mentioned, *Pedagogy of The Oppressed*.
- **Jan Cohen-Cruz** (13 mentions): The specific book titles mentioned were *Local Acts: Community-based Performance in the United States* and *A Boal Companion: Dialogues on Theatre and Cultural Politics*.
- **Augusto Boal** (12 mentions): The specific book titles mentioned were *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* and *Theatre of the Oppressed*.
- **Animating Democracy series** published by Americans for the Arts (8 mentions): no specific titles were listed.
- **William Cleveland** (6 mentions): The specific titles mentioned were *Art in Other Places, Artists at Work in America's Community and Social Institutions* and *Making Exact Change* (a report published by the Community Arts Network).
- **Michael Rohd** (4 mentions): The specific book title mentioned was *Theatre for Community, Conflict, and Dialogue*.
- **Suzanne Lacy** (4 mentions): The specific book title mentioned was *Mapping The Terrain: New Genre Public Art*.
- **James Bau Graves** (3 mentions): The specific book title mentioned was *Cultural Democracy: The Arts, Community, and the Public Purpose*.
- **Robert Gard** (3 mentions): The specific book title mentioned was *Grassroots Theater: A Search for Regional Arts in America*.

Survey respondents were also asked to name "exemplary programs you feel are educating community artists effectively today." Many of them had difficulty doing so with certainty: their lists are peppered with phrases such as "I only know programs by hearsay" and "I've heard that..." Only one-third of the educators who completed the survey responded to this question, also indicating difficulty in making assessments based on scant or secondhand knowledge (understandable, as some of the most widely known programs are new and have been completed by only a handful of students thus far). Community artists and friends of the field were much more likely to list community-based programs than were educators and students: short-term institutes offered by well-respected nonprofits were also frequently mentioned by interviewees. Several programs were included only by those outside academia, as noted below. Apart from the programs listed below, which received three or more mentions, 105 other academic or community-based initiatives were listed, from specific degree programs such as the Cultural Policy Program at The Ohio State University; to programs focused on a small number of courses or a unifying project, such as PCAP: Prison Creative Arts Project at the University of Michigan; to non-academic programs such as Alternate ROOTS' Resources for Social Change training initiative. Many individual mentions were made of training elements within particular community-based organizations, either those devised for their own staff members and volunteers or those they conduct as part of community residencies.

- **California College of the Arts**, Oakland, CA (14 mentions): Participants made specific reference to programs associated with the Center for Art and Public Life.
- **Columbia College Chicago**, Chicago, IL (7 mentions): Participants who listed specific initiatives referred to the Master of Arts Management Degree in Arts in Youth and Community Development and the Center for Community Arts Partnerships.
- **Cornerstone Theater**, Los Angeles, CA (7 mentions): The Cornerstone Institute Summer Residency Program was specifically mentioned.
- **Maryland Institute College of Art**, Baltimore, MD (7 mentions): The specific program mentioned was the Master of Arts in Community Arts.
- **Virginia Tech**, Blacksburg, VA (5 mentions): Participants made specific reference to the Master of Fine Arts in Directing and Public Dialogue.

- **California State University, Monterey Bay**, Seaside, CA (4 mentions): Participants specifically mentioned the Bachelor of Arts in Visual and Public Art.
- **City University of New York**, New York, NY (4 mentions): The specific program mentioned was the Creative Arts Team, located in the School of Professional Studies.
- **Otis College of Art and Design**, Los Angeles, CA (4 mentions): Specifically mentioned was the Master of Fine Arts in Public Practice.
- **Tisch School of The Arts**, New York University, New York, NY (4 mentions): Specific reference was made to the Minor in Applied Theatre and the Interactive Telecommunications Program.
- **Intermedia Arts Institute for Community Cultural Development**, Minneapolis, MN (4 mentions, non-academics only).
- **Liz Lerman Dance Exchange**, Takoma Park, MD (4 mentions, non-academics only): The specific program mentioned was the Summer Institute.
- **Tyler College of Arts**, Temple University (4 mentions, non-academics only): Participants made specific reference to the Cross-Disciplinary Arts in Community Program.
- **Sojourn Theatre Summer Institute**, Portland, OR (3 mentions, non-academics only).
- **Urban Bush Women Summer Institute**, Brooklyn, NY (3 mentions, non-academics only).

Recognizing the newness of CCD as an academic specialty in the United States, we also asked survey respondents to name “any other fields, institutions or organizations that handle education in a way that community cultural development education could effectively adapt.” Our aim was to elicit models, or at least inspirations, but the responses revealed that most participants were not thinking along those lines. Fewer than one-third of survey respondents chose to answer this question, and many of those who did again mentioned the same programs listed above, rather than looking to other fields. From the balance of responses and comments of interviewees, it was possible to discern certain commonalities.

- **Study leading to action, rooted in community:** For example, the Highlander Center in New Market, Tennessee was mentioned more than once: modeled on the folk-school concept, Highlander’s program started in the 1930s as “a residential educational program designed to help build a broad-based, racially integrated, and politically active labor movement in the South.” That mission morphed and expanded over the years, but it has always been premised on a principle highly consonant with CCD values: “The founding principle and guiding philosophy of Highlander is that the answers to the problems facing society lie in the experiences of ordinary people. Those experiences, so often belittled and denigrated in our society, are the keys to grassroots power.” (The preceding quotations are from Highlander’s Web site, www.highlandercenter.org.) Other community-based and action-oriented educational centers and initiatives were also mentioned.
- **Flexibility and individual attention:** Several participants made mention of independent-study programs, such as the Master of Fine Arts in Directing and Public Dialogue at Virginia Tech and a Masters program at the University of Chicago, that allow each student to shape a course of study that fulfills individual interests and aspirations.
- **Community engagement and hands-on learning:** Several participants spoke of leadership training programs, mostly designed for young or mid-career professionals. For instance, the Coro Fellows Program is “a nine-month, full-time, post-graduate experiential leadership training program which introduces diverse, intelligent and driven individuals to all aspects of the public affairs arena. Field assignments, site visits, interviews and special individual and group projects prepare Coro Fellows to translate their ideals into action for improving their own communities.” (The preceding quotations are from the Coro Foundation’s Web site, <http://www.coro.org/>.)
- **Activism taught by activists:** There were frequent mentions of projects such as the camps and institutes of Wellstone Action in St. Paul, Minnesota, where those experienced in particular forms of organizing create short-term intensive learning opportunities tailored to specific settings and constituencies (such as Wellstone’s initiatives on labor organizing and Native American organizing).

OUTCOMES

Educators who took part in the Curriculum Project survey were asked what outcomes students in their programs could typically expect. The two most-chosen answers led all others by a wide gap: “satisfaction with the experience” and “combining their passions for art and social change” were each checked by 83% of those who responded. “Finding a community of colleagues” was chosen by 57% and “participation in a network of graduates and faculty,” “finding their life’s work” and “solid grounding in community cultural development practice” by 45%. The most concrete outcomes had the lowest scores: “viable job prospects” was chosen by 35% and “effective job placement assistance” by only 17%.

Response to our student survey was too small to support generalizations, but it is interesting to note that while “satisfaction with the experience” and “finding your life’s work” ranked highest, at 60% each, 60% also expected viable job prospects, and not a single student participant expected effective job placement assistance. As discussed earlier, the challenge of finding employment in an under-funded field affects community artists as a class, and by extension, educational programs. Overall, 13% of student respondents were very satisfied with their CCD educations, 57% were satisfied, 6% somewhat satisfied and 13% unsatisfied (another 13% indicated “don’t know”).

Every facet of the current field reinforces the same impression. Through our interviews, surveys and review of existing documentation, we saw a field with three salient characteristics:

- It is champion-driven, with highly varied courses and programs shaped very much by the differing sensibilities and outlooks of their founders, passionate and committed advocates, and by the characteristics of their host institutions.
- It is still in formation—ripening, but still far from ripe—with many courses and programs too new to have produced a sufficient body of results for assessment.
- It is in need of encouragement and support for a deep, collaborative discourse on key questions that can help it take shape in the most positive way.

The preceding snapshot of the field was assembled from participants’ and allies’ own self-descriptions and observations of existing practice. The next section explores some of the challenges to be addressed as the field continues to ripen into its full potential.

SECTION 4: AN ABUNDANCE OF WORTHY CHALLENGES

Educating community artists at colleges and universities has something in common with the process immigrants go through in finding a *modus vivendi* with those already living where they make their new homes. The difficulty is cultural: entering a milieu in which values and practices are strikingly different from one's own. Both higher educational institutions and the CCD field have their own values and ways of operating, which sometimes conflict. Interviewees understood very well that they had taken on an ambitious, sometimes daunting task in attempting to introduce new knowledge and new ways of learning into long-established and tenaciously guarded institutional cultures.

For example, because it aims for broad social and cultural change rather than mastering a particular specialty, community cultural development cuts across conventional specializations and categories of knowledge. Many practitioners and educators can imagine CCD programs situated in schools of social science, education or anthropology, in programs focusing on community development, ethnic studies or planning. But in fact, most of the existing programs are based in arts departments, where arts training, internship opportunities and other relevant studies may be available, but where they also often encounter tremendous resistance. It's a challenging problem: having valorized individual creative genius, conventional artists often perceive the sense of specialness and separateness it confers as a kind of compensation for the material struggles of the professional artist. In this climate, not all arts departments' faculty and administrators may welcome what they see as an insurgent practice calling this fundamental premise into question. Consider these stories from practitioner-educators:

I was invited to come back to my old school and give a talk for an afternoon. I was asked to meet with the theater department's chair about what I was doing. Now he was a guy who, when I was here, although I was a very active theater major, I wasn't doing the stuff he cared about, which was the musicals and the big plays. He was very, very committed to the old world of teaching theater. I described what I was doing, and he said to me, "This is [name of institution]. Your little fads, your trends, your sort of social stuff, things come and go, but this is [name of institution]. This is the place where we have always been and always will be committed to the traditions of what is really important in our field—acting, directing, design. These other things will happen here and there, but I can't have you back here to teach a trend, which doesn't have a place here." And right now, I'm actually sitting in his old office.

I'm looking at other departments because the theatre department is for the most part more conventional in what it is training people for. But [this university] has a fantastic social justice education program. And they actually require practicum so I'm trying to talk with them more and other colleges in the area to identify some students who already have some framework that they're bringing.... I've actually had someone higher up at the university say to me about [one community engagement] project, "You know we're not a social service agency, we're an arts program. Why are you doing this?"

As with any subject, there are indeed trends in teaching art, and some of them come wrapped in assertions of their own timeless superiority. This practitioner-educator describes the evolution of visual arts teaching, pointing out the missing pieces that CCD seeks to add:

The major focus of studio arts is to send people prepared into a commercial gallery system; to get them into the Biennale would be like an ultimate goal. A successful career would be to get major wealthy collectors and be in a major museum collection. So, they're object-makers, and even that they're failing because they're doing 19th-century education for students who are trying to live in the 21st. So that means they're discipline-specific, which is a growing fallacy. With that European bias, the fine arts departments have developed into a sort of segmented teaching: we would teach line, we would teach form, we would teach color, we would teach rhythm, and the sum of it all would in the end be a perfect composition.... None of these things taught people what to say or how to say it or what was important to say. The only thing we did do well was self-expression. And so that became increasingly self-indulgent and bred these art-for-art's-sake sort of notions.... It still did not leave you with the winning ticket to a creative approach.... Now we don't even teach them craft: it's conceptual. Like all the other problems with education, we've segmented things, we break it down and we don't teach, treat the whole person. We're not treating

them in a holistic way. We don't look at what they bring to the table, what they have inherently in their history and their nature that could be incredibly powerful tools with which to act on the spring of the creative life.... I'm not talking about self-expression. I'm talking about what is the inherent nature of being a human being and treating ourselves as a whole, teaching the whole thing. So that is exactly why I had to do my undoing from all of my training when I came out of the university, precisely because I wanted to speak to my family, the people I grew up with.

Bridging these differences is recognized as a worthy challenge, one that manifests in many different areas of institutional culture and custom. Some of the key aspects of this challenge are explored below.

UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

Many interviewees for this project find themselves caught up in a love-hate relationship between university and community. Ideally, the university embodies the application of artistic and intellectual power to improve society, which goes to the heart of CCD. Educators are community members and citizens as well as academics, and they can be important partners in positive social change. Practitioners value how much universities as repositories of knowledge have to offer and how badly they are needed. At the same time, they share many community members' critiques of resource-rich and often self-involved institutions. They see the barriers that can constrain a reciprocal and mutually respectful relationship between university and community, that lock some higher educational programs into a too-narrow notion of teaching and learning and into power relations that skew towards the institution. As academics, participants understand the slowness and complexity of institutional culture, the obstacles that make it difficult for even the best-intentioned members of the university structure to act on their deepest desires for social justice; and at the same time, as activists, they understand community members' frustration and impatience. By and large, the educators we interviewed and surveyed see themselves as agents of change, yet may feel their power to make change in their own institutions is severely limited:

There's something about the way that universities function that places theory before practice. And then there's the problem that very often the universities themselves have been imperialist in communities. In [this city], the working-class Italian communities got knocked down to build [one university] and [another university] took over blocks of black neighborhoods, so the real estate issues around universities set up a bad dynamic with communities. I'm not trying to make a simple-minded case: university bad, community good. It's much more complex than that. But we haven't figured out good dynamics between academia and practice. The community work doesn't get theorized enough, and then the theoretical academic work isn't basically practiced enough. And so policy and research get disconnected from work experience, and community folks don't theorize their own work. Yeah, there's a failure to create praxis.

Community agencies, their perception of publicly engaged scholarship is different than our articulated description. Their perception is that we have resources to give them. I'm helping them understand we do have resources, but our resources—at least in the work I do—are connected to active outcomes for our students. So we do have resources, and we do very much want to work on the community issues, but there have to be reciprocal outcomes for everyone. For us the outcome has to be a learning outcome of some kind. That can be developed to fit more with the social issues, but that's what we are as an institution of higher ed. That's something that needs to be constantly shared with our community partners in a way that they can begin to understand what it is we're really saying we're going to do, so that we all align our expectation and our visions about what this is going to be.

That's one of the obstacles I see: this kind of work is all relationship-based, and so you have to build relationships with students and faculty, with staff members on campus to help you facilitate things like fund transfers and paying people and all those kinds of things. And then you have to have similar relationships with community members, and relationships take a lot of time and they're ever-changing. If you don't have those as the foundation, things don't often work very well.

Universities are kind of structured to resist what needs doing here in terms of authentic relationships with communities. So, in view of some of the inertia and intransigence, you have

to build authentic alliances of networks as a way of rethinking and destabilizing some of that rigidity.... if the DNA of the university doesn't have a disposition towards this sort of work, then we have to create a counterforce that moves its disposition.

Often, we heard that CCD groups wanted collaborations with institutions of higher learning, but the best they had been able to achieve was entering into relationship with individual academics who were interested, sympathetic and willing to engage. Some feel exploited by university programs led by those who seem quite happy to take advantage of community programs without offering much in return:

If you're asking whether the relationship is equitable in terms of funding, no. We've always had to find our own funding; we've never been funded through higher ed. So let's say, for example, the college students find using our facilities is wonderful, but we don't get paid for it. They just use it, and we feel that that's a service that we want to give because we want this information to get out. There is an informal relationship amongst us all [activists and professors]. I think they've learned a lot from our work and from communication with a lot of the international people. So they're beginning to incorporate them into their programs and invite them. Or, for example, if we bring someone, they'll invite them to [their campuses], so there is that relationship. But there isn't a relationship where the university says, "Thank you for contributing, here's a pot of money, or a grant." That doesn't exist.

An institution this size is definitely difficult to partner with. It's really hard to get your arms around the idea of the institution to begin with. Generally speaking, it's partnerships with people but there's a huge inequity and imbalance.

What causes the distance between university and community? Is it a problem of scale in connecting large institutions with much smaller community groups, is it intrinsic to the educational system, is it imposed on colleges or co-created by them? One educator recognizes external pressures, yet sees universities as being led too much by their internal needs:

There's a lot of pressure on higher-education institutions, particular the universities, but I think that to a large extent academics have created the culture themselves. Higher-ed administrators have contributed substantially to developing these isolated, protected enclaves that really don't want to talk to anybody outside of their small ivory tower... My experience in dealing with these people is that, sure, they will give lip service to a philosophy, and they may have a chancellor or somebody who gets up and gives a talk about how we're all relatives, how we're all connected and how the university needs to reach out to have a better understanding and how we need all of this stuff. But they only do it on their terms. They don't listen to anybody, and that's a problem. They will talk to industry if industry helps to push forward their research agenda and helps bring in more research dollars, or if there's some other tangible sort of thing that's going to advance some of their own interests, but in terms of actually really talking to communities, they don't. I'm speaking very broadly, because there are individuals that you can talk to that are very sympathetic to the idea of really caring about community and in fact rebel against some of the more subtle quasi-authoritarian tendencies universities have. But in general, universities don't really talk to the communities.

As we spoke with thoughtful people who've been observing the field, they raised the question of whether the development of new academic programs always serves the communities CCD exists to support. Who benefits from the association of university and community?

I am really interested in how we continually reevaluate the appropriate role of the academy within the field of community cultural development or community youth arts. What are we doing to strengthen the actual field that we are trying to train people for, not just strengthen our own institutions and our own academic programs? We need to always be in dialogue with people who are working in the field, whether they're community partners or not, and we really need to listen to them about what the needs of the field are and how we might be able to serve those actual needs, possibly instead of our own—whatever is going to make our own institution more famous. You could get into this kind of honest dialogue with community partners and develop some level of trust. There is an articulation there of what role the academy could appropriately play. Maybe it

is a research role and maybe it is a training role, but we really need to listen to practitioners telling us what kinds of training people actually need that are going to be of use.

I tell my students, "Every time you think that only you are doing this, that this is you alone, you're making a mistake." That's exactly what's wrong with most programs. If the program is designed simply for the benefit of the student, then it doesn't work—if the program doesn't actually have a reciprocal thing for the community that goes back and forth between them, so that it benefits both sides, and that the larger vision is one that is an agreed-upon vision. That's why [a particular] program fails: these graduate students have no relationship with the community they were teaching. Somehow there was a thought that education would give them an advantage that they could share with the community. But in fact, really they were being educated. They don't respect other ways of knowing. So it's a very, very basic problem. There isn't one group empty, another one full. The teacher is not a purveyor of knowledge. You're basically setting up a learning environment, and you are all in the process of learning together.

RESPECTING DIFFERENT FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE

A core principle of CCD is reciprocity, that all partners in the work give and receive over the life of a project or working relationship in a way that feels mutual, equal and respectful. Community cultural development work is conditioned on the notion that communities accumulate wisdom and resilience through experience, but that one obstacle to social change is a sense of internalized powerlessness that devalues this knowledge, impairing people's ability to mobilize it in the service of their own aims. In contrast, higher education has often functioned as a sorting mechanism, elevating those with certified knowledge, providing an imprimatur and entrée. This is a critical question for CCD in higher education, as these educators explain:

Institutions of higher education tend to have knowledge—we hope some wisdom, but quite often knowledge is the larger piece of what they're bringing to the table. And the community folks, people who are practitioners, tend to have an awful lot of wisdom that may be supported by an underlying knowledge base or not. It depends on where you're working and who you're working with. You have to really have respect for all of those different types of knowledge. For me it's all knowledge, and it's learning how to listen for the wisdom that people are sharing with you, and that takes a little time.

In the education system that we're working in, you have a teacher, you have some sort of master, some person who has the knowledge and has a very rare duty to then teach everyone who doesn't have the knowledge. My philosophy is that everybody in the room has the knowledge, whether it's your first time in the room or whether you've been in the room 25 times. There's something to be learned from everyone within the community. That's not the way that our education system works; but when you're talking about community-based work, it has to work from the standpoint that coming out of the school or coming from this institution, you are not the one who has all the answers. A part of the job is about sitting down and extracting the answers from the collective, because that's where all the answers are.

If you don't empower people with their own knowledge, it doesn't mean anything, because you have to know that you come with knowledge, your experience is knowledge.

BREAKING DOWN THE SILOS

Given the extent to which integrating CCD into higher education entails challenging longstanding customs and attitudes in academia, educators shared frustrations and dilemmas about how to go about this pioneering work, and even whether it is quixotic to try.

The barriers and obstacles are many-faceted and worth thinking about. Universities are not structured to be permeable; so, in a sense, if not a gated community, we have our own metaphorically gated community in terms of our rules and structures and our ownership of our intellectual property. It is the way that we structure disciplines to the way that we make a very sharp division between scholarly and creative pursuits on the one hand, and teaching and education on the other hand.... We have real issues in knowing how to evaluate the quality of

this work of public scholarship, how to make sure that the right people are at the table doing the evaluation, and then that we're rewarding it. There are also some very practical problems of calendars and transportation and sharing of financial resources and legal liability. All those issues are also there. They are, at one level, very important, and it is easy to underestimate their impact. At another level, they're perhaps more soluble than the other issues that go to the heart of faculty and students' disciplinary training.

I've been here for years now, and I don't understand where the levers of power and change are here. I just don't understand it. All I can tell is that I get this sort of toxic smell from the few meetings I've gone to. It's kind of like the academic senate where people argue incessantly and endlessly about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. They just don't seem to be able to get anything done. So it's just not an inviting prospect to try to push stuff through that way.

The obstacle is tradition, doing it the same old way. Comfort zones for people, comfort zones for administrators, tracks with accreditation people. We already have problems with them looking at our credential, having to be 18 hours in a particular subject and all this stuff that gets in the way of doing a more thorough job at preparing a student through a course of learning. But we've been able to figure out ways to manage the capacity that we have to make an impact on students. It's with a lot of hard work and a lot of dedicated people both at the administrative level and at our level. But we've been able to, and the university has been willing to allow us to discover what we're trying to work out.

The irony is these programs are prestigious because they stand for something and they attract more creative people and they are more competitive to get into. Yet they are marginalized within academia.... So in order to build a really vibrant curriculum, it seems like it's been all these gaps and political battles to keep these programs afloat. Then they've been consumed by these battles, that then graduate students come in, and I swear five generations of us students in my current program spent all our time being political activists to keep the programs alive when we could be spending our time learning or building scholarship or working with community.

TIME AND SPACE RESTRICTIONS

Universities are almost always organized around standardized units of time—semesters or quarters. Typically, students have a substantial summer break that usually takes them away from the campus community. In contrast, CCD projects evolve organically, sometimes through several successive iterations over a period of years. Funders and contracts may require breaking the work into distinct periods for planning purposes, but no one can predict at the outset when a project will be over. This challenge affects students, to be sure, but also the community groups students work with in what higher education calls field placements, community engagement or service-learning experiences. Sometimes the academic timeframe pushes for a premature result or conclusion, rather than respecting the work's organic time; sometimes students are plucked out of a community relationship at semester's end, leaving community members to feel used and abandoned. On the surface, considerations of time and space seem merely practical, but in a CCD framework, they also symbolize institutional control of community expression, as Kenyan writer Ngugi wa Thiong'o wrote: "the struggle for performance space is integral to the struggle for democratic space and social justice."⁶ These interviewees are based in higher education:

Many of these projects don't fit neatly into our semester schedule because these social issues don't. One of the mechanisms that helps the most is if there are flexible academic opportunities. So if students really are committed to a particular community project and they want to continue it, that they have an academic option to continue that, to get academic credit. And on the faculty side, that there's some type of support for the faculty either, whether it's release time, or some type of additional support for them so it really becomes a resource issue. Some faculty for a variety of different reasons are able to manage that because of whatever their curriculum requirements are and some just are not because of the program. So I don't think there's a one size fits all.

The university's not set up in terms of place or in terms of its schedule of truly collaborating with community-based organizations. Just to be clear about that; the semester works on a 14-

⁶ TDR, Vol. 41, No. 3 (Autumn, 1997), pp. 29

15-week schedule and we have to begin and end a project in that amount of time. At a certain point there's a great demand for the community-based partner to somehow become a resource for all these needy students who come to expect an archive is pre-made and prefabricated and just there for them to exploit. Nothing works that way. There are fundamental questions of trying to figure out what's possible to do within a 15-week schedule.

I think breaking down the schedule and changing it so that it's over a longer period of time would make a big difference. So if there were eight months as opposed to half that period of time, that would make a big difference. If the resources of the university were not simply for the classrooms and teachers and libraries, but also to partner organizations, and help with staffing so that substantial work can happen over eight months, that also gives you a very different picture.

Community cultural development education is most complete where there is real continuity of relationship, producing deep learning, and most problematic where students are offered superficial placement experience and the larger community suffers the results.

There's some really good service-learning programs that are happening in liberal arts education—but a lot of what I'm seeing, particularly what I'm seeing at different conferences and symposiums, is that it tends to be more of the in-and-out: the student goes in, we do this good deed, we do it for a semester or a year, and then we're out, and then we continue on with the rest of our education so that we can graduate. What I'm trying to produce in students is that it's not an in-and-out process: it's if you're going to come do this work, this is life's work. This is really about making sustainable change and making impacts that happen over a long period of time. I'm looking for the students that are saying things do need to change. I see my power as an artist in producing change and looking at issues around social justice and community development, and I want to see change happen. And that means it's not a one-semester hit.

We like to work with a community for several years, and we like to have the students working with us, apprenticing with us, because we're the through-line. We don't like to send students out to do "internships" or placements, because mostly we don't feel that there's enough, that the art can go deep enough, and that the relationships could go deep enough. The internship structure is based on a service paradigm and then because the students and the community groups are kind of using each other, there isn't an overarching relationship where questions of power could be constantly looked at and made more transparent, and also, where genuine relationships can be developed.

Of the artists and arts organization representatives completing the Curriculum Project survey, 42% had experience serving as community partners with a higher education-based program. Time considerations were among the most frequent answers to our question about what had been problematic:

Coordinating with professors, working around class hours.

They leave after short stays.

Time and transportation.

Not enough time in a semester to do history, interviews and create a project.

Their terms end and we are left with a gap in employment. Taking time to train with our small staff.

Time: we needed more on the front end and the back end to get more out of the engagement.

At some institutions a degree of continuity and flexibility has been possible, suggesting that over time, others will follow suit. For instance, at Columbia College Chicago, students in the Arts in Youth and Community Development concentration of the Masters in Arts Management have a four-semester intensive practicum in which they work up to 20 hours a week in a community-based youth arts organization. This usually unfolds as a year and a half of work with one organization, bridging a summer. But for now, this approach is exceptional. As noted in the summary of survey responses in the previous section under "Deepening Community Engagement," time restrictions are a common and frustrating complaint.

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

Throughout Curriculum Project research, participants told us that too often, faculty members in newly emergent programs lack adequate depth of direct experience in community cultural development.

There just aren't that many people who have both field experience and are inside the field and are in academic positions or higher education.

I think universities are great place for people to get the training if the institutions have committed to faculty. Like how many calls a month do you get? It's got to be more than me, from people who are teaching the first community-based course that their school has ever taught, and they want to know what they should teach, and what should they read and how should they teach it. I'm glad those classes are being taught, but a place that's really offering focused training should gather faculty from the rich field of practitioners that exist. A bunch of them could desperately use the insurance and the ongoing salary.

For the most part, I see people talking about or teaching "community" education with little or no direct experience, other than academics. This is not helpful, as direct experience, I believe, is the only way to impart this type of information.

Some have suggested this is a systemic problem for any field ripening into academia, as noted earlier, a predictable point on a familiar developmental trajectory:

That's going to happen with any emergent field, because the institutions do not see it as an investment yet. I had to literally launch an all-out campaign to get my administration to finally agree to hiring several people out of one search. But I knew that it was an opportunity because of the pool that I had generated, and it was an opportunity to really make a statement within higher ed that yes, there is a place for tenured faculty to do this kind of work. And hopefully because of the work that will come out of them, other institutions will see that as a worthy investment.

But at its most serious, the problem can go beyond qualification for the task to a lack of respect for it, which the second speaker believes to be grounded in art-world snobbery:

[My program] started in an already existing arts management program that has faculty with no background in community cultural development. It just was never a requirement, it was never anything anyone asked about. In my ideal world, our students would be learning accounting from somebody who had some idea of how a small community-based organization worked, not just how like Disney works. That might change over time, but it's not the way it is now, and so it's a little bit of a disconnect. They have some strong faculty that really are professionals in the community arts field, that have worked in the field for a long time, who really know the score, but they're also taking classes from people who not only don't even understand anything about their field, but don't necessarily even have what they would feel like is respect for their field. It's really challenging.

One problem that's still just enormous is that the professional art world—especially the upper echelon of the professional world—continues to turn their back on this stuff pretty consistently. And if they have programs, the programs are connected to the professional side of the organization very skimpily. So you might have a professional theatre company that has a community arts program, but it's run by an entirely separate staff, and there's never any overlap between who's doing work in the community and who's on stage, hardly ever.

As the following comments suggest, in a field that has no special love of credentials, a practical obstacle in many academic settings is the requirement of a terminal degree. Most expert practitioners have gained stature through on-the-job training, a form of preparation which the university may not value. As these speakers point out, it is difficult—sometimes impossible—to surmount this obstacle:

We had some adjuncts who were really great and they were community organizers and activists, but most of them do not have Ph.D.'s. As we hired the Ph.D.'s, they're great Ph.D.'s in the academic sense, but their commitment to the same kind of community-based work and all these other things was different. Their investments were different. [With the adjuncts,] students were getting the best education they could have gotten. The university on the one hand has a limit as to the role that adjuncts can play, but also as we began making the case that a lot of

these adjuncts were lawyers and filmmakers and poets who won national awards [abroad] and all these things were as good if not better. But as far as they were concerned, unless they have the credential, they cannot be part of the pool of possible candidates for the jobs. It's a typical limit.

I would love to have other people come to the university as professionals or as teachers or whatever you want to call it, even in a nice reciprocal way that someone who is not a "doctor of whatever," but has more information and knowledge than I could ever have, to come in and be able to teach with me or with the students.

Several research participants mentioned Imagining America's Tenure Team Initiative (TTI), referenced earlier, as well as other efforts to legitimate public scholarship and community engagement as valid work toward academic employment and tenure for practitioners. The TTI report suggests that universities value community engagement in promoting publicly engaged scholars:

Developing protocols to advance public artists and scholars to full professor rank should encourage retention, develop faculty leaders, and test policies for evaluating public scholarship and creative work in a less risky atmosphere than that surrounding tenure decisions.⁷

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community cultural development practitioners see the relationship with community members as primary and sacrosanct: every aspect of the work is grounded in a collaborative, reciprocal, mutually respectful working relationship, which takes time and effort. In effect CCD relies on one-at-a-time relationship-building, without shortcuts. Although individual faculty members and even whole departments may respect these values, as noted earlier, universities often have vexed relationships with the surrounding community. Whatever the causes, it can be slow going to foster real meetings and real goodwill between higher educational institutions and community-based organizations, and this can affect community engagement opportunities for students.

In recent years, many higher educational institutions have become more engaged in service-learning, defined as follows by Campus Compact (a national nonprofit organization founded in 1985 and dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service-learning in higher education): "Service-learning incorporates community work into the curriculum, giving students real-world learning experiences that enhance their academic learning while providing a tangible benefit for the community." Wherever service-learning is understood as conditioned on equal partnerships, it can be strongly compatible with CCD values. Where it is not—where it is unidirectional, like serving in a soup-kitchen—real community engagement can be watered down to little more than field experience or extra credit for students, without much regard for its larger impact. Several educators expressed concern:

In many places, there's this huge emphasis on community service-learning. In many places, there's such an emphasis on drawing students into this, that there's a de-emphasis on social-justice work and on really critical analysis. The point is to send people out and give them experiences, and that by itself sometimes doesn't work well because of inadequate training, and it doesn't work well because there's no real reflection from a social-justice point of view.

As faculty, we're certainly supported. We get sometimes internal university grants, sometimes we've gotten some development assistance from our dean. There is a general positive regard for the work among many of our colleagues, both in arts and in liberal arts. What hasn't translated yet is things like graduate assistantships or other kinds of infrastructure needs. And so, often when we're going for external funding, we're going for operating expenses for those kinds of things, for administrative coordinators and those kinds of things, so we don't have that and we need it sorely. And to my mind that would certainly help the program develop much more quickly. I think that we're lagging behind some other programs who have that kind of administrative support. Those programs tend to be more internship-oriented programs that are getting support from centers based at their universities like community partnership offices. When it's understood as service within that model, the universities pay up. Oddly, when it's understood as research, which is the model we're working with, you're on your own to do the fundraising. I think it's actually skewing the field in a way: university public relations, it is definitely a feather in their cap to have these

⁷ *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*, p. 3.

things happening, so they'll give infrastructure support to that. But I think we sacrifice something in the field when that proliferates.

The academic frame can also limit the degree of genuine community participation in higher education–related projects. This speaker is reflecting on Ph.D. requirements in an allied department:

A lot of students end up doing like a quasi-participatory community-based project where they bring folks together to analyze a topic. You know, they bring in parents in a school community to talk about how they would change the school, and that parent group lives for that life of that student's doctoral dissertation. The student still theorizes and writes up the dissertation, because that's the way it's got to be written, so it's not in the voices of the participants. And the Ph.D. goes on to get jobs because the community-based work is marketable in academia, but you can't do it fully.... That's not to say we can't change things around where from point one you don't have to do three position papers, you have to do three big stakeholder meetings instead. But I think you'd have to change more than just the kind of project you can do. You'd have to change a lot of these requirements and benchmarks for the Ph.D. You know: is this objective, is this scientific? You have to go through the process of scientific discovery and have certain kinds of data and categorize your data in a certain way. What is the whole scientific method, what is scientific research and how is it theorized would be a critique.

Often, there are also gaps between students' own experience and knowledge and the community groups engaged in partnering with higher-education programs. Several participants talked about the need to recognize this in aid either of bridging the two, or of redefining community engagement to bring it in line with the field's deepest challenges.

One of the things that happens is with white students in a community like [this one] and with the ways that race and class are configured in the field, that the student's going to come in and it's a kind of a touristic relationship. Many of my well-meaning white students come from very segregated white communities, and they come [here] because they really want to figure something out about racism, and they really want to be around communities of color. That's great, and I think there's roles that they can play there. But if the community arts field is then just tilted toward lots of white young artists trying to figure out what to do with communities of color, then we're stifling something in terms of what they could be doing with their communities of origin. I think that's really where a hundred flowers could flourish.

If we're looking at apprenticeship and we're looking at the community-based, arts-based community development, then the best place to start is in your own community. That's the place that you know the best. For instance, this morning [at an event] about six or seven people came up to us and introduced themselves. "Where are you from?" "We're from Boston" or "We're from Massachusetts" or "We're from Vermont," or Maine, or somewhere—people coming in very much like the civil rights movement, coming in from the north to learn from the people in the communities that are still being the hardest hit. Study those things and then they're gone. But where are our people that are being educated? Where are they studying, what communities are they getting involved in and what are they doing to put back into where they come from? So I think when we're talking about community development, it has to start in our own communities,

CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS AND IMBALANCES

As noted earlier, most current CCD courses and programs are attached to arts departments, some having been grafted onto existing majors with their pre-existing requirements. CCD students may be expected to spend as many hours in studio courses in particular art forms as fellow students studying to be gallery artists or professional actors in mainstream theatre or cinema. Faculty members consistently report how difficult it is to win approval for new courses—and how much more so to drop prior requirements or add alternative tracks to make room for new studies. Some of our higher-education interviewees explained how these imbalances have skewed their own programs. Inherent in their remarks is the sense that at the moment, they feel they can do little to address the problem:

These institutions are rarely set up in ways that accommodate us. The way that you're expected to work and speak in these institutions rarely accommodates what it takes to do this kind of work well, and therein is this difficulty. As much as institutions of higher learning are desperately seeking something to break down their silos and their disciplines and their requirements, in fact, the entrenched divisions are so strong on campuses, it's very, very hard to do that. And that entrenchment isn't all negative. Say you're in the dance program, and they are trying to make dancers, it does take a lot of time, and there aren't a lot of hours left over. I see a lack of awareness that's been going on forever about how community-based practices could inform artistic life and how that could really change the requirements.

I'm glad that this is a graduate program, and I'm glad that we can be pretty selective, because we cannot afford to admit anyone to our program who does not come with a certain level of social competence, economic awareness, awareness of race, class, gender. They have to already come like that, because there's nothing in our program that really prepares that. We don't have that in our curriculum. If I could offer it, I really would.

By the time each of the disciplines has taken their students through their requirements, there is no time for interdisciplinary work. And that's just in the arts. Looking beyond the arts on campus, or beyond the campus into the community, that's my concern. The disciplines have such a stranglehold on the requirements, and the university calendar is the system by which courses are established and the means by which you can do some of this innovative sharing. It gets deadly. I don't know what's going to change that, but it's almost like you'd want to start them with a separate program and just say, "Here's four years and here's how we're going to do it, and you can take one course a semester in English or Science." Almost reverse it. It's really sad.

PREPARATION FOR LIVELIHOOD

The U.S. community cultural development field has been perpetually starved for resources. Most funders active in the field tend to come and go, trying one type of initiative for a few years, then moving on to something else. Because it can be difficult to secure university investment in new programs, educators told us they were forced to seek outside funding even for basic expenses, often putting them in competition with other educators and practitioners:

I hate it, but we're dependent on these foundations. Luckily there's a Cummings, and there's a couple of other very progressive foundations that can see it, but it's hard. There is a very tight spot about that question of functioning within capitalism. We are functioning in that economy, it does become proprietary, and I think we actually have to forgive ourselves for when it happens, but we have to be honest about what those dynamics are when they're happening. I don't know how we can really interrogate what it is to be in this economy that is grant-funded and that's what allows things to happen. It's an activism that I think is happening more and more where owning-class institutions can determine when people get to talk to each other and about what. It's a very odd activism. It scares me.

Indeed, many practitioners are frightened by the steady decline in funds for community cultural development work:

I think we're in danger. I know that the groups that we've been organizing with are all feeling the same thing—that our institutions are in danger. Our funding is less and less, and if it remains static, which ours has, it means that we're in a deficit, because the cost of living, of everything, has gone up. Even if you get the same amount of funding, you're functioning basically with less.

As CCD programs take root in higher education, the general scarcity of resources has implications for academia. Although some of the field's long-lived flagship organizations have been able to secure ongoing grants through diligent effort and the cultivation of relationships with funders, there have been no programs of general operating support comparable to the annual revenue grants available to CCD groups in other countries through national and regional public agencies. So job prospects are very different from those in fields with more stable financing (e.g., not all newly graduated lawyers will get wonderful jobs, but there is a steady stream of opportunities for recent graduates). There are some entry-level jobs in existing CCD

organizations, some opportunities to sell schools, prisons, hospitals and other social institutions on employing CCD practitioners, and some potential entrepreneurial opportunities for free-lancers. But questions persist: are programs preparing people for jobs that ought to exist, but don't as yet? Is higher education's knowledge and creativity being brought to the challenge of expanding CCD employment?

To the extent that CCD education is preparing students to earn a living, it may be that the academic field's ultimate success or failure is tied to conditions beyond the academy. What would it take to create more jobs in the field? In other regions of the world, public entities are the major sponsors of community cultural development work: throughout Europe, for instance, municipalities and neighborhoods employ community arts officers whose task it is to plan and coordinate program offerings for that area. In the developing world, educational and aid agencies employ community artists to engage people in envisioning and directing local community development efforts, or to take part in public campaigns such as health promotion. In a market economy, though, with public funding flat or shrinking and few private foundations involved in supporting CCD, economic insecurities may conflict with an interest in this work.

Is professionalization being imposed from outside the field? Is it raising income expectations beyond supportable levels? Is it channeling resources away from already hard-pressed community-based cultural organizations? From the broadest perspective, is it a good thing?

They always want to know how much money can I earn? And I had a heartbreak. I had a teaching artist that came to me who was really extraordinary, and I hired her to be an associate director, and she worked with me for years. And she said to me, "Is this as much as I'm going to make?" and I said, "Yeah, around this, around \$50,000. It's what you are going to make in this area," and I said, "You're probably doing very well." And she said, "Well, I have to go." She's doing corporate training.

What I'm noticing from our students who are graduating is that—maybe because they've just spent a lot of money on a Master's degree—they cannot accept jobs at community arts organizations for 25 grand a year. They're not working there. There are not that many jobs in the field, you know, people aren't moving. I've seen a lot of the pressure for this whole professionalization also comes from the foundation world, because the foundation world increasingly wants staff members of community arts organizations or community organizations in general to have credentials.... And what are your credentials, like is it good enough to say that this is a person who grew up in the organization? I definitely think that pressure exists. Whether we're responding to that pressure or contributing to it, I don't know. Maybe both.

One of the issues that I hear from funders as I talk a little about teaching artists is, "Well, don't you think there needs to be some sort of certification so that we know these people are competent?" There are a lot of funders whose model is the school model: the teachers can't stand in front of a classroom full of kids in a public school unless the state has certified that they've taken the appropriate classes and passed them and have appropriate practical experiences to be teachers in a school. When we talk to the teaching artists about that, they get out the garlic and crucifixes. And that's a tension, I think, because if you want to expand the field, the opportunities that people have in it, they have to expand on it by orders of magnitude, the opportunities that are available for work in it. We've got to engage big systems like the schools or YMCAs and Boys and Girls Clubs. We've got to engage big systems and institutions in the work, and we are concerned about this certification business. One of the things that makes [this study] so important is because it strikes me that if we don't define meaningful standards for this field, they will.

I can't imagine a way to really know what the values are behind a certification, and so even if you get a piece of paper that says that somebody certified you, you're not getting what the values are behind it, who the people were who were making that. It means nothing for me in terms of knowing that somebody's going to be good in doing the work. Another reason against it is that not everybody who can do really good work is going to go that route, so you're just leaving people out. I do want training to include all the skill stuff, but just like with any good work, the essential thing is something else. And that something else can develop in a whole lot of different ways, and that something else is a certain kind of heart and intelligence and commitment and curiosity and a million other things. It's hard because we're living in the world that we're living in,

where everything has to be measured in a certain way. But the true heart of doing this work is not measurable in those ways, and it's not efficient in those ways.

In recent years, members of the CCD field have observed the growing popularity of the term “teaching artist” to describe a type of work that often overlaps with community cultural development. Most teaching artists work in classrooms, but some operate in other types of social institutions—community centers, medical facilities, prisons. As distinct from art teachers, their core expertise is in one or more art forms (rather than education per se). Social-justice motivations are not necessarily at the heart of their work, though for some teaching artists, they may be powerful and integral. As arts classes fall by the wayside in an era of test-driven primary and secondary education typified by No Child Left Behind, some communities find resources to bring teaching artists into the classroom to fill the void. In short, “teaching artist” has come to describe a viable job prospect for a growing number of arts students, as this interviewee described:

Young artists, and particularly artists in art school, are really feeling pretty isolated and alienated. You know, there aren't too many options when you get out of art school to make your own work and somehow survive. I think that the options that do exist are kind of unappealing to a lot of younger artists. So they find out through whatever means that you can practice your art in a context in which you're also contributing in some moral, less explicit way, making some sort of what people view as a social contribution. I think that a lot of people these days who are of college age think about teaching and education as a way of giving back or participating socially. But also, doing those things is their way of practicing your work in some kind of collective context, or drawing on some kind of collective experience for your own work. When they think about the fact or hear about the fact that you can at least make part of a living, however meager, from doing that, it's not only exciting, but kind of a relief. At least that's been my experience talking to kids who come in college—or at other places around here or even to high school students—who are looking forward to being artists of some kind that are concerned about how they're going to make that work. And when they see or hear about what teaching artists do, it suddenly makes a lot of sense as something to do. But I don't think it's any mystery that one of the other main reasons why teaching artistry is suddenly all the rage, even though it's been around probably since the dawn of humanity's art-making, is because the arts along with everything else have been ripped wholesale out of the public schools and pretty much everywhere else where young people used to experience them. There's some sense that this is not really a good thing, at least not to the degree that it happened, and that some things should probably be done about it.

SECTION 5: SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION FOR CCD

Despite the challenges described in the previous section, many participants in this research see the ripening of CCD into academic viability as a certainty: as people continue to carry out and document excellent work, as it becomes clear that cultural development is an essential focus for both community and university in these times, community cultural development practices and principles will infuse even conventional arts training:

I think it's happening. How can we continue to have it happen, that it becomes an indispensable part of any serious program, that community development work has to be part of any serious theatre program, because it is a vibrant way in which people are working in our field and it must be studied?

The key question driving this research is one of cultivation. What is the best way to nurture the ripening crop of CCD programs to ensure that they thrive and yield their full potential? People are ready to talk about this:

What are the mechanisms by which we can spread the word and spread the study more? That's what interests me. What about training teachers to be able to teach this work? Can anybody teach this work who hasn't done that as a practitioner? This is a question we ask but boy, what I would love to do is to just jam, jam, jam on what are specific mechanisms for getting it out there. Of course, then there will be the purists saying it's watered down if it's taught by this person or if it's taught in this way. But I believe the movement is important enough and vibrant enough that for me, it's an all of the above. I think that there should be hardcore practitioners and specialists who are teaching it, but I absolutely think if it starts popping up in places where one would not expect it to pop up, I feel like that's all to the good.

The field is diverse, encompassing many different artistic practices and cultural vocabularies, many different approaches to coursework, community engagement and credentialing. Reviewing the great quantity of thoughtful, earnest and creative reflection and analysis participants contributed to this study, the Curriculum Project team concluded that rather than attempting to assert models or “best practices” in community cultural development education, it would be most useful and consonant with the field’s own culture to propose values and guidelines that might inform anyone striving for excellence. Below, participants’ ideas are summarized and discussed, and in the final section, guiding aims, values and principles are proposed.

NURTURING THE FIELD

Survey respondents were asked to say what is most needed to support and improve community cultural development education, checking multiple answers if they wished. Here is what they told us:

More funding	81%
Peer-to-peer networking	70%
More flexibility in scheduling community work (e.g., project- rather than course-focused)	66%
Small regional or topical meetings	58%
More opportunities for graduates to practice what they have learned	56%
Support for consultation from experts in the field	51%
More support from academic decision-makers	48%
More legitimacy as social change work	46%
More outlets for writing and documentation	45%
More logistical support in community engagement (e.g., transportation)	42%
More art-world legitimacy	41%
National conferences	31%

“More funding” was the leading choice within each of the individual surveys, as well as in the aggregated results. This answer speaks for itself, and if it doesn’t speak loudly enough, the many testimonies to scarcity

of resources throughout this report should amplify it sufficiently. In the context of The Curriculum Project, one point was underscored repeatedly: that higher educational institutions must invest their own resources—space, time, faculty—in CCD programs to ensure their success and to demonstrate to external funders that they are really on board with these programs, and not just seeking a new revenue stream.

Other popular choices also reflect the findings discussed in previous sections of this report, such as “more flexibility in scheduling community work,” treated under “Time Restrictions” in the previous section. Below, specific ideas to nurture the field are discussed, augmented by quotations from interviewees.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE: MEETINGS, CONFERENCES AND PUBLICATIONS

Many participants in this study expressed appreciation for the opportunity to talk about the questions we raised, saying they wanted more reflection and more opportunities for dialogue, such as retreats. As with survey respondents, there wasn't a great deal of interest in major conferences, which were seen to have a low cost-benefit ratio, but appetites were avid for sustained face-to-face dialogues on a manageable scale, dialogues shaped by participants and not bound by the conventions of academic discourse:

I think people need to be away from their place, it needs to be a place where people are fed well, they get a nice comfortable bed. There's drink. Even just a few weekends in a row or ten days—two weekends and the five days in between—can make all the difference in the world for somebody. I think I would take a dialogical approach in trying to figure out how to formulate it. Once you have a group of people in mind, then you begin to formulate it out of that actual group and see where they're at, what their needs are, and then think about spaces that are created, films to show, an essay to read—nothing long, but an essay to read that would just open things up, just trying to open spaces up, release all those things that people want to talk about that usually feel too pressed to be able to deal with and unpack. I think that's why food is important; it's why music is important. All these things help to unleash...so it can't be simply textual, it can't be privileging an academic mode of discourse, it has to be using all the senses, because that's where community-based organizations really are, using all the senses.

To enter into dialogue with people in the wider field, I think would be absolutely essential. I'm aware of and I have been an attendee of conferences such as the Pedagogy of the Oppressed Conference, specific educational theatre conferences like ATHE, but I think moving into relation with people in the broader sphere of community arts, that would be enormously useful. And then there's the more pragmatic reason in terms of making connections and opening up possibilities for students to visit and see other examples of practice, etcetera.

When dialogue goes through the filter of everyone's going to write something, and then they're going to peer-review each others' things, it gets so removed from actually what we're doing. And for these kinds of issues, I just want to talk to people about what my closest peer colleagues are doing and coming up against. That's really what I need to do. What are you doing? And how are you doing that? I want more community-based models of story circles and those kinds of structures that are much more responsive and immediate.

Given the premium on people's time—often overwhelming responsibilities come packaged with too-scarce time and other resources—they want such encounters to yield maximum value:

I've been part of things where you have the opportunity to come together, and you go really deep, and there's a lot of dialogue, but there's no action plan afterwards. I think it's a real challenging part of that, because it's great to have that time to really go deep into issues, and I think we don't have that enough, where we're able to come together with like minds and to really have that type of discourse. But what is missing from that is when there isn't the next step. So we have these great discussions, we have all of this wonderful information that is produced, and then we go back to our institution and we're back in the grind, and it's like, okay, so what changes as a result of that? So I think institutes are good, but there needs to be implementation money for something to actually come out of it.

An abiding complaint among CCD practitioners is the scarcity of constructive criticism that respects the field's values and emerges from the wish to improve practice. Every practitioner who engages in projects

that feature public events (such as staged performances, screenings or exhibits) has faced the discouraging experience of being publicly judged by a critic whose entire frame of reference comes from very different practices. Liz Lerman's "Critical Response Process" has been adopted by some practitioners as a compatible framework for criticism. Perhaps because of a widespread perception of the field's fragility, there hasn't been much writing along these lines, and apart from relationships fostered between individual practitioners or companies, not much face-to-face dialogue of this type. This educator looks to other academic fields for examples of the type of discourse needed:

I look at American Studies, ethnic studies programs. Sometimes I find institutions that are doing really engaging work in communities coming out of sociology or political science. That's one thing that we're able to ascertain as we're going to different committee meetings and symposia and conferences. You can tell by people's presentations what work is engaging. I think even being able to critique presenters that are doing fabulous work, but it's missionary work—it's more to the benefit of the students than for the community that you're working with, as with a faculty member who might not realize it, but isn't thinking beyond, "I'm taking my students to South Africa every year and it was this great project." And then when you really start to look at it, what is the project, and what are they getting out of it, and what's the impact, and what's the sustainability? And being able to have that, the discourse with the faculty saying, "Oh my, I am doing missionary work!"

ONE-TO-ONE LEARNING: MENTORS AND CONSULTANTS

As noted earlier, most participants in this research, even those with advanced degrees, indicated that their own skills in CCD had been self-taught or acquired via some type of apprenticeship. The underlying truth is that the best education for community cultural development addresses the whole person, values relationship and cannot be entirely contained by a limited-term course, a semester or even a multi-year program. Lifelong learning is the hallmark of the most committed and respected practitioners. This speaker is a practitioner and educator:

The most essential thing to me is that you really look at training as something that's going on completely over time, all the time. That's the essential thing, that's the number one thing I'd say. A commitment to space in the design of a program for asking questions of the work, the questions that even go to places like value, but certainly cause and effect. I think a lot of places don't necessarily have that.

One thing that participants looked for, therefore, was a way to build mentorship—deep, reciprocal relationship with a senior practitioner—into CCD in higher education, for example:

The people of the university are the most visionary and most committed to this, and they believe it and they understand it and they will give students creative license to do this work. If it's in geography, environmental science, the arts, bring them all together, and guarantee that at least the students will get one of these people as a mentor or advisor and someone who will buy into their work. So, maybe [the way to design a program] would be interdisciplinary, a hub, it might float somewhere, it might have a home, it might not. But it has commitment and buy-in from people who really like to work interdisciplinary naturally in their own work, they work this way and believe in it. One of the biggest problems in grad school is finding an inspired mentor who will believe in your work. Once you have that, I think a lot of these barriers kind of dissipate.

The first year really does have to be apprenticeship, and I like this apprentice thing because I want them to learn humility. I like the apprentice model, I've been an apprentice. It was really some of the most wonderful period of my life, to be an apprentice who washed the brushes. To be the one who couldn't make the mark. When I could make the mark, it was incredible, because I earned my place on the scaffold. I think of that now, for my students, when I'm watching them go through the process.

The idea of mentorship extended beyond degree programs too. More than half of survey respondents indicated that support for consultation from experts in the field was a priority. Some pointed out that given the goodwill and enthusiasm of people in the field, it could be done with relative ease (though perhaps not so inexpensively as thirty years ago):

I did consultations with community colleges for a long time for NEH in the Carter years, and every small community college has some amazing people who are not alone, they have colleagues, and the colleagues organize good work and do things. I loved it. I was able to go in and listen to the faculty who had written the grant and then especially interaction with the faculty who were engaged and adventuresome and looking for social-justice work. I didn't even have to do that, it could be people who were really engaged as teachers and I would find ways to reinforce that. We were paid \$150 a day or \$200 a day or something and travel expenses. People who do the work that you and I and so many great people do have to go to places where people are kind of starting out, or where people even have an idea. That would be a great thing, if it could be financed even for awhile. It would seed so much good work.

FRESH MODELS

We asked interviewees to describe the ideal CCD education, the sequence, balance and shape of a program that would address what they perceived as shortcomings in current offerings and embody all that they found essential. Answers differed in significant respects, but they had a great deal in common. Five points stood out as especially characteristic, fresh and suggestive.

First, there was considerable interest in combining study and practice, so that a close cohort of students learn together and apply what they learn to another realm of knowledge within the university before moving out into broader community engagement:

I was thinking in terms of the college curriculum that maybe, for example, I might spend a semester giving them the tools that I've spent thirty years developing and then I might say, "Now I want you to take these tools and in the second semester, apply them to some other subject matter that you're already doing on campus, whether it's science or social science. Pick one of your courses—I don't care which one—and you're going to spend the whole semester learning how to apply these things to something else." And then maybe I would trust them in communities. Meanwhile, maybe there'd be another semester where you're working on the tools that have been uncovered so far for working in the community, and then you could actually go into communities and spend some time working together and developing that, the give and take, absorb difference, live in disagreement, embrace paradox and all that stuff.

When a student comes in, they don't necessarily immediately theorize, "This is what I want to do, and this is a project that I want to develop in the community," but there's almost a menu of issues, themes of the year or maybe even themes for every four years, themes for every cohort that goes through. When you start, and even apply, it's this cohort is going to look at the arts and environmental justice, and that's something that this collaborative committee has decided is a pressing issue and radically interesting and a topic that people are talking about, and so then that whole cohort focuses on different realms of that issue.

We will be bringing in a cohort of people who are interested in global warming. And they will be dancers, musicians, whatever. They probably will be interdisciplinary, looking at an approach to how they will create a project, the graduate thesis based on applying multiple disciplines to the concept and setting goals for them. The first year is pretty much apprenticing with someone else in the field. What I'm hoping to do is to allow for these people to be mentored by various people. The focus is always the same, it's project-based, it's learner-centered, it's diversity-driven, it's driven by what the art work is to achieve and it's measured by that. So, we're completely taking away the very essence of the valuing of the art that is currently in the system. In other words, you're not going to take one of these pieces and evaluate it as a piece. It is going to be a piece that's going to be evaluated by its relationship to the public, it's carrying out the goals that students set for themselves, which might be changing the world. Or it might be simply lowering the carbon footprint in one neighborhood. But the measurement will be, "Is this the effective way to approach this?" and we'll create a cohort of people who will come together in a low-residency program.

Second, there was interest in bridging community cultural development out of arts departments, developing programs based on the reality that practitioners come either from an arts interest or a community organizing interest, converging in CCD:

In an ideal curriculum, a Master's program, you can enter in one of two tracks. You can enter with a bunch of experience as a theatre artist interested in moving more into the community related fields. Or you can enter as a community worker without a lot of arts experience, more interested in entering into the theatre practice in relation to your work. Whatever one of those two streams you're in, there is a fairly intensive screening/application process. And if you're coming from the theatre place, great, you better be really solid there, and then the screening and application process is about who you are and your values and your goals and why you want to move into this kind of work. If you're coming from community work but not arts, great, you have a really strong background in that community work and a real willingness in the basic body, voice, mind and heart to move into this theatre practice. And then those two streams in the program happen parallel to a certain point and also cross over in certain ways, and the third year is completely together.

Third, deep and sustained community work was essential to most of these ideal visions. The people who offered them focused on reciprocity and permeability, on engaging the whole person, embedding their imagined programs in a matrix of relationship:

The ideal program would first of all have to recognize a really wide range of aesthetics. If we're going to talk about work that engages with communities, the aesthetics of practice are really, really important: to not just be replicating at a poorer level something that people don't have access to, but really finding the artistic catalyst behind this creative work. There's a really wide range of practice, and the narrowness of not having enough inclusion limits those artistic possibilities, because we aren't engaging with contemporary indigenous practitioners, not being represented by somebody else who's worked with them for twenty years, but having them speak for themselves. So aesthetics would be the first thing I would imagine as the core. And then I think accessibility of the curriculum, that methodology and context and history be accessible on many different levels. If it's about communities, then communities should be able to access and use this material, should be able to get into an archive or should be able to have handbooks or methodologies, pedagogies that are practicum. And then also scholars who are involved with academic theory and acting theory and directing theory should also be generating materials that enter into those discussions. Archiving is part of this, you know a lot of this work disappears. Regeneration is really important. When you work with the community, you're working with at-risk youth and people, you have to be there, and I think that can cause an extreme amount of burnout, personal burnout or just really stale artistic ideas. Ideally, how does it become also something that is spiritually renewing and physically renewing? Also, academic standards of qualification would need to change, because there are so many people who are absolute crap who have academic appointments, and there are people who are unbelievably great public intellectuals and artists who are in this serfdom of teaching as lecturers or instructors and never can get promoted.

Ideally, we would understand the program as community artists-in-residence and we would understand our faculty positions like that. You would essentially be able to develop kind of a company-in-residence and have the technical resources and the personnel to be doing that—in my field, it would mean I would have a technical director and administrators, so that we could function as a company. I don't know that we would necessarily want that space on campus. We might, but it would be more people who were trained in site-specific technical stuff, so we could go out and be on location over a couple of years and have the capacity to do that. I think if we were a department, we would have a scholar/academic person, we would have a technical director in performance, a technical director in digital and visual media, and then someone to be nurturing those relationships: in all the projects we have that kind of position, a community coordinator who is on it with scheduling or orchestrating interviews or coordinating when we're working with after-school programs, all the church and service work, partnering with them. Those kinds of roles are really different than the internship service model. And it means that living there as an artist for a period of time, that we would have the capacity to have those kind of residencies in community or organizations that are very different than the internship model. We would be able to develop those kinds of relationships and just do them as an aggregate. Like, you'd have a few students who are the artists-in-residence at a school or a social service organization, and able to

develop something in their own terms, not just leave it to interns to do service. If you put artists there or a group of artists, what could happen? We would get to pioneer those approaches in different kinds of communities.

Fourth, elements of ideal curriculum were far-ranging and various. The types of knowledge research participants said were needed would require drawing on the resources of many different specialties within higher education as well as learning how to be present and kind and treat others with full dignity:

The basic skills are organizing, power analysis, facilitation, understanding how communities come to be, some basic sociology, social networks. Basic things about how communities form and the nature of them. For me it would be like anthropology, it would be a combination of understanding communities, certainly understanding whatever art forms you want to do in them, and then basic skills and facilitating and organizing.

The art world overemphasized the personal to the extent that nothing else mattered. I don't want to throw the baby out with the bathwater, I think that one needs to have an individual mind. And then there's all the other stuff about learning how to work in relationship to others and discover subject matter through others and to be respectful of others and ultimately to turn all those skills that you know how to use to develop your own voice, to in effect be generous and to use those skills to make it be of use, that other people want and need their voices.

The point was made that roles that might in conventional arts practice be considered technical or secondary are also value-laden; the way they are exercised can have significant impact on CCD projects, so preparation for such roles ought also to be part of education for community cultural development:

The basic premise of the program in arts management [at a particular university] was that the managers and the people who were studying management had to be engaged in the work. It is intentionally an M.F.A. program, not an M.B.A. program. I would like to put it in terms of cultural development, to recognize that the organizing is a very sophisticated set of problems, to bring art and community together in a healthy relationship around things that make a difference to people. It would be very useful just practically inside the department, in getting the department more coherent. But I also think it would provide a very much needed source for informed people for the field. I don't think the field has a lot of management programs that have a specific focus with this work and integrate it with the making, not separate it here, but to integrate it with what we call management production or artistic as a whole unit, and everybody's engaged with that. That would make the program work better and would make the department be much more coherent around these issues.

Fifth, hybrid models had great appeal for many participants, whether collaborations between academic departments or between an academic program and one that is community-based:

It's not just in the arts schools, you need to do it everywhere. You could have arts working with legal training. I don't know where to begin, certainly the arts field needs to take this more seriously, but I know that there is ground in other disciplines. There are social-change social work schools, where they really value people in their communities, and making communities have resources accessible to all people. And the arts must be infused into these kinds of programs, as a wonderful, quote, intervention. And I think that a lot of the students, whatever population they're working with, disabled youth, it doesn't matter, that the arts have so much to contribute, and they usually are very hungry, actually hungry for understanding the relationship better.

You need to just infuse classes in every art department or every education department in use of community-based arts. On the other hand, I think the people who could best inspire and educate might be the people who are doing the work. You know, there needs to be some collaboration—I think in my ideal envisioning, it would be collaboration between an institution of higher education and the people out there in the field doing the work.

First of all, I'm very much for a hybrid model. And I know that they have problems as well as offer solutions, but I just think that's the way the world works. I have the inkling that anything separate and rarefied isn't going to work, not in community arts, it doesn't make sense to me. I think there's a lot of ways to be hybrid, and in my mind the pieces of a hybrid model would include

a university and something community-based, an artist-driven thing. They would be something that bridges the two, and how those pieces get put together, there's a lot of different ways.

ADVANCING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Throughout this report, participants stressed the centrality of community engagement to CCD learning, seeking ways to extend, deepen and improve the practicum elements of current higher education programs:

There's no way that students are really going to understand what the field is like by being in the classroom. There's something that happens when they are working in the field. I love the fact that [in this program] they're there for [an extended period], because I think that they understand something about an organizational cycle that you can't learn in a semester. When you're only there for a semester, you don't even have time to fall out of love with the organization. You get so enamored with it, you think that this is the greatest thing in the world, and it's an important learning step to be able to have the crush and then stay there long enough to realize like, oh man, that person's really kind of crazy, it's kind of disorganized here, maybe we're not going to solve the world's problems from this particular organization. And then find a way of reconciling a little bit of that disappointment, the reality that these are human beings working hard, in a field that is under-resourced. They're doing the best they can. They have to experience the whole journey.

The essential equality of relationship required for optimal CCD education was strongly stressed, over and over again, without ignoring the difficulty of achieving equality between partners very different in scale and in access to power and privilege:

I want my students to understand that there's a responsibility to look at the vast amount of information, both published and unpublished, documented and undocumented, that has happened in our country over the last century, to really understand that before you even begin to go out into the community to do anything. That gives you a sensibility that you're not the saviors, you don't know it all, you're not coming in to help those people do something that you think they should be doing. You enter the field from the perspective of "What can I learn from the communities that have been in this struggle historically for years?" Then it's "How do I collaborate and partner with this community or with this group of people or with the school to make change happen?" A lot of it is around the student really understanding that sometimes you're going to have to suspend your way of thinking about how you're going to produce this art project or how you're going to produce this collaboration. Maybe you're coming in and the train is moving already: if you're going to get on this train, yeah, we welcome you on the train, but what are you going to bring to it?

Everybody approaching this kind of work has got to understand that the partnerships are equal. That's not to say that there aren't dynamics of privilege and dynamics of inequality that have to be acknowledged and have to be addressed. But I think what's made [one group] tick so effectively for so long is that there was genuine humility from all of us that what our community collaborators had to bring to the table in terms of their life experiences was not only equally valuable but sometimes we felt more valuable than the skills we had to bring as professional theatre artists. And yes, we're bringing these precious skills to the table: we know how to craft a play, we know how to write a scene, we know how to build a piece of scenery, but the people who've lived the story that we're trying to tell together, that is unbelievably important and valued. And the constantly trying, in our talk, but also in our actions, to reinforce that—I think that allowed people who would be huge skeptics, both within the community and outside the community, to be won over. Because it's just that absolute rock-bottom sincerity. That's a very, very tricky thing to teach, but it's so important.

One of the most common ideas for improvement was putting control of community engagement initiatives in the hands of a group composed equally of educators and practitioners:

One of the biggest challenges in community-university partnerships is that there's always this slogan: "You're in the ivory tower, you don't know what we need." And from the university level it's, "We're experts and we can give, give, give, give, give." So there's that natural divide. So, maybe if a hub, a committee was equitably formed of academic advisors and community leaders, they

would almost act like a board of directors, and there would be a number of issues at the table, which would be: What is the scholarship on this topic to date? But also, what are the pressing needs and interests in the communities? It would be a more organic or holistic way that they were together.

I think we should develop a program in partnership with community-based organizations that might not be perfect, but that could really use the brain power, the resources and the energy and creativity of grad students to improve upon what they're doing already. I think long-term partnerships with community organizations or institutions or even a loose affiliation of people doing this work that could benefit from grad students or undergrads that aren't going to be there forever. Because at least there's some consistency, and some life, and some way to implement the work so it just doesn't disappear when students leave.

GUIDING AIMS, VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

For the Curriculum Project team, ten key guidelines sum up the most important values and principles that participants told us should inform future development.

OVERARCHING VALUES

In a famous passage of Talmud, Rabbi Hillel responded to the challenge of conveying the essence of Jewish teaching while standing on one foot. “Do not unto others that which is hateful to yourself,” he said. “All the rest is commentary.” Taken together, the two points below pass the one-foot test, conveying the essence of our recommendations based on Curriculum Project research. Like Hillel's message, they may need elaboration, but they form the spine of the body of learning and practice at this moment in this field.

All parties should recognize that this is a period of action research, marked by experimentation in program design, curriculum and approach to every element of CCD education, and should engage in a spirit of true collaboration.

No one has a patent on the definitive CCD curriculum. Even the most promising programs have relatively short track-records. With an open spirit of inquiry and support for field development, all can function as co-learners, benefiting from each others' mistakes and successes. In its search for renewal in changing times, the university needs CCD's commitments to pluralism, participation and equity, its creativity in the service of social justice. In the search for excellence in preparing young people to do the essential, exciting work of creating civil society, CCD needs the university's commitment to rigor, reflection and open inquiry.

It is essential that the values shaping CCD practice also inform and influence education in the field.

This is a consistent through-line on almost every page of these findings: you can't teach people how to enter into democratic dialogue through undemocratic means without canceling the deeper meaning of what you wish to impart; you can't effectively transmit commitments to pluralism, participation and equity in programs shaped by institutional practices that are exclusionary or elitist; you can't fully convey the skills of looking fearlessly and understanding deeply in a situation where inquiry is bounded by customs and prohibitions that have the effect of protecting privilege.

ELEMENTS OF EDUCATION AND DIALOGUE

Excellence requires a balance of community engagement, training in artistic practice and scholarship focusing on the field's history and animating ideas, as well as the economic and policy environments for it.

This statement was consistently supported by research participants' views and experiences, and deserves to be stated as an aim. Indeed, while programs are in this period of development—some of them at the very beginning stages, with just a course or two—achieving ultimate balance may sometimes be little more than a goal. But unless it is kept steadfastly in mind, program development will be distorted, obstacles and expediency combining to skew things toward one or another leg of the triangle of scholarship, training and community engagement. If this is allowed to happen, the result will be programs that are very good at techniques but

poor at preparing students to grapple with why and how to use them, or programs where people talk about community without truly engaging it. All three legs of the triangle are crucial to deep and effective practice.

When research participants indicated the courses they currently deemed essential to CCD education, only about half of them selected classes and seminars in social-change and social-justice topics or in cultural policy, relevant arts history, theory and criticism of the field, although an additional 37% judged these topics important if not essential. When the Curriculum Project team considered the question of balance, we interpreted these findings in light of the newness of so many higher educational programs: building a curriculum, educators would naturally start with courses that focused on arts practice and community engagement, adding other topics as that became possible. We want to emphasize our conviction that good CCD practitioners need to be skilled in the arts of citizenship, regularly raising their gaze from the little world of the classroom or project to engage with the larger polity. Policymakers' actions affect resources for CCD as well as vital cultural questions such as whose contributions will be valued and enshrined in a nation's museums and history books, whose voices will be carried by our enormous, influential commercial cultural industries and whose values will shape education—and such questions are of great moment to the communities CCD practitioners engage.

Vibrant, participatory critical discourse is essential to the success of both higher education and practice in CCD. Higher educational institutions are best-positioned to seek support for a sustained, iterative discourse from within their own walls and from resource providers.

As described earlier, CCD's characteristic process entails reflecting on and assessing what has been learned from each stage of a project as preparation for each successive stage of action. The same principle applies to the process of defining a field and working together to improve field-wide practice. Within many realms of learning, resources are set aside for elements of intellectual infrastructure conceived with this aim: case studies, other research projects, workshops, critiques shaped by appropriate criteria, databases—all these things embody a commitment to and investment in critical self-reflection and shared aspirations. Some practitioners look back fondly to a period before the major arts funding cuts of the Reagan era, recalling an abundance of opportunities to meet, share and discuss key questions with peers. Whether this existed in the past is not so important as whether it can be supported now.

There are encouraging signs of growing interest, such as many of the conferences listed in the earlier section on “The State of Community Cultural Development in Higher Education.” Recently, the Community Arts Network has begun online publishing of *Community Arts Perspectives*, sponsored by the Community Arts Convening and Research Project, described as “a national platform for the work of the universities with degree-granting programs in arts and community building.” An editorial review board of educators oversees publications. This is all to the good, but a multi-directional, interactive, critical discourse controlled and created equally by community-based practitioners and educators has not emerged, and sustained support would be essential to its flowering.

THE CENTRALITY OF RELATIONSHIP

Community cultural development in higher education should have an explicit goal of supporting and developing the field beyond university walls.

Tensions between community artists and educators are evident throughout participants' comments in this report. Underpinning these tensions is perplexity that CCD is beginning to take root in academia just when many of its longest-lived community manifestations are especially starved for nourishment. Recognizing the very real power and resource differentials that exist between these two sectors, how can they help each other? Educators and practitioners repeatedly point to things each sector does best. Higher education creates room for reflection, supports critical discourse and enables study that is not constrained by the daily demands of practice; community-based practitioners have knowledge grounded in local wisdom and self-awareness, deep understanding of the stories that create community, expertise in the subtle skills of relationship that enable the best work. The field prizes most highly forms of study leading to constructive action: practitioners outside the university should be brought on board as respected advisors to help shape learning and research agendas so that they serve actual practice. Conferences, dialogues and critical writing should be open to non-academic participation, valuing knowledge grounded in practice as highly as academic knowledge.

Higher-education programs should develop peer relationships with community-based educational programs for practitioners.

Naming exemplars and inspirations, research participants singled out leading CCD organizations that mount educational programs, such as Alternate ROOTS, Cornerstone Theater, Liz Lerman Dance Exchange, Sojourn Theatre and Urban Bush Women. None of these programs leads to a degree; indeed, most are short-term, intensive workshops and summer camps, a few days or weeks at most. But because they are ongoing, continuously improving, rooted in actual practice and offered by thoughtful and respected practitioners, they are perceived as delivering a great deal in a short time. Over and over again, participants in this study named academic reluctance to validate non-academic knowledge as an obstacle to meaningful, reciprocal relationship. We take this very seriously indeed: unless a fluid exchange between academics and other practitioners can be valued and supported, unless the knowledge and skill of practitioners without academic credentials can be legitimated as a resource for higher education, unless there can be reciprocity grounded in mutual respect, we strongly doubt that CCD can reach its full flowering in higher education.

Effective CCD education requires meaningful, reciprocal and collaborative relationships between educational institutions and community partners, and developing these relationships requires self-critical awareness from both parties.

Anyone undertaking to offer CCD education must address the cultural challenges and institutional obstacles discussed earlier, devising approaches that respond to the realities of both community life and of higher education. Standardized or superficial modes of relationship won't work: an existing service-learning requirement or a program of short-term placements can never stand in for the ongoing, mutual process of relationship-building that is community cultural development's heart. Participants told us that higher educators must treat community partners as equals in negotiation, ensuring that community engagement projects serve communities as well as they do students. Where resource differentials exist, educational institutions must extend resources to community partners in recognition of the roles they play in educating students. It is also important to recognize that at this point, most community-based organizations are more accountable and transparent than universities, and that a trusting and mutually satisfying working relationship demands openness.

INSTITUTIONALIZING CCD EDUCATION

While “champions” may drive new programs as they come into being, it is critical to move toward strengthening programs, so that they don't disappear when their founders move on.

Often, CCD programs' roots in their institutions are fragile, with a single charismatic champion holding a program in place within an arts department that may be largely indifferent or hostile to CCD. Educators in this entrepreneurial position need to be aware of its vulnerabilities, nurturing allies institution-wide, and administrators need to support those efforts in the interests of long-term viability.

Practitioners have seen fledgling CCD programs swept aside when budgets are cut or a new department head arrives toting a new programmatic broom. For example, while this study was in preparation, ACT, the Artists, Community and Teaching Program begun in 2004 at Otis College of Art and Design, was dissolved with the arrival of a new department chair.

An overarching aim should be to infuse CCD values across institutions and programs, connecting CCD-focused programs with a matrix of related departments and programs.

This goal can be pursued in many ways. One is internal to institutions, building relationships with collaborating programs and departments sharing similar values. Another is multiplying relationships, so that community-based organizations aren't precariously attached to higher educational institutions through a single faculty member or administrator. Universities, through various departments and programs, can give community partners multiple opportunities to interact with their campus counterparts, from teaching to taking part in program-wide planning discussions. Community cultural development values and practices can be a tremendous asset to on-campus conversations about institutional identity and purpose. If administrators at every campus housing a CCD course or program were to invite practitioners to bring their skills to campus-wide dialogues along these lines, the result would be a far more vibrant conversation about the reinvention of the university, generating far more exciting action plans and far more student, faculty and staff engagement.

Higher educational institutions are also excellent venues for dialogues between CCD scholars and practitioners and those in allied fields. How is community cultural development thinking and practice enlivening community organizing these days? What is the untapped potential of CCD practice in other arenas such as healthcare and urban planning? Around the world, how are CCD practitioners partners in the movement to mediate the forces of globalization in aid of preserving cultural dynamism and self-determination? Some scholars are studying these questions already, but much more needs doing. Practitioners need help documenting examples and conveying them to wider audiences through meetings, media and publications; and academic departments seeking to renew their own fields and excite students will gain tremendously from practitioners' expansive thinking.

SEIZING OPPORTUNITY

Community cultural development practitioners and educators should collaborate in pursuing emergent opportunities that can benefit both higher education and community-based practitioners.

The drive to renew higher education is one of these opportunities, as mentioned earlier: CCD practitioners have enormous skill and energy to bring to that task. The approaching presidential election points to another potential opportunity in the larger political arena, with the possibility that a new president may call for increased funding for cultural development or job creation programs that could support community artists. It is also possible that a new administration would initiate new public-sector funding opportunities that could support education in this field or stimulate expanded CCD activity. It's vital that members and friends of the field remain aware of new developments in cultural policy that can affect its future, and be ready to respond when opportunity arises.

IN CONCLUSION

When we met to review our research and discuss our findings, members of the Curriculum Project team began by sharing immediate observations—whatever struck us most forcefully, whatever confirmed our prior views and whatever challenged them. We remarked on the field's fragmentation, the newness of so many initiatives in higher education and all the challenges that attach to that condition, the very real restrictions educators faced in translating a community-based practice into higher-education settings. We also noticed how eager and generous people were with their participation: educators are challenging themselves, they see what needs attention and they dearly want partners within higher education and among community-based practitioners to help satisfy their very real desire to make these new programs as powerful, whole and socially significant as they know community cultural development practice to be.

When we issued the "Call for Excellence" that inaugurated this project, we imagined it might result in a new program of initiatives needed to bring the field to ripening at this time of great activity and great opportunity. It is evident now that no single organization or project has the ability to implement the insights and recommendations derived from this research; rather, it is a large, multifaceted national project, with roles for everyone who cares about educating young people for community cultural development work. We hope to do our part, and we invite every reader of this report to seriously consider what steps he or she can take to ensure the harvest of U.S.-based CCD practitioners gains in quality, quantity and impact each year.

SECTION 6: BACK MATTER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Project team members are grateful for the support of the Nathan Cummings Foundation in carrying out our research and creating this report. We want especially to acknowledge the staff of Imagining America for providing such timely and expert support to the project.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH, INTERVIEWS AND SURVEYS

In preparing the study on which this report is based, the Lead Investigators conducted confidential telephone interviews with the 28 individuals listed below. In addition, 231 surveys were completed by educators, artists, activists and others involved in the field. Our deepest thanks to these individuals who gave so generously of their time and thoughtful observations. Team members also compiled course descriptions and syllabi for CCD-related courses and programs in higher education and community settings; the Community Arts Network <www.communityarts.net> was an especially useful source for that task. A summary sampling those descriptions appears as an appendix to this report.

Buzz Alexander, University of Michigan, Prison Creative Arts Project, Ann Arbor, MI
Arnold Aprill, Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE), Chicago, IL
Andrea Assaf, New WORLD Theater, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA
Caron Atlas, independent consultant, Arts & Democracy Project, Center for Civic Participation, Brooklyn, NY
Judy Baca, University of California at Los Angeles and Social and Public Art Resource Center (SPARC), Venice, CA
Ron Bechet, Xavier University, New Orleans, LA
Nancy Cantor, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY
Nicole Garneau, Columbia College Chicago, Arts in Youth and Community Development, Chicago, IL
Pam Heinz, Mary Ann Shaw Center for Public and Community Service, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY
Nick Jaffe, *Teaching Artist Journal*, Chicago, IL
Erica Kohl, Institute of the Study of Social Change, University of California, Berkeley, CA
Bob Leonard, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA
Liz Lerman, Liz Lerman Dance Exchange, Takoma Park, MD
Sonia BasSheva Mañjon, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT
Randy Martin, New York University, New York, NY
Susan Perlstein, National Center for Creative Aging, Washington, DC and Brooklyn, NY
Nick Rabkin, Center for Arts Policy, Columbia College Chicago, Chicago, IL
Bill Rauch, Oregon Shakespeare Festival, Ashland, OR
Michael Rohd, Sojourn Theatre, Portland, OR, and Northwestern University, Evanston, IL
Rosalba Rolón, Pregones Theater, Bronx, NY
Jim Shanley, Fort Peck Community College, Poplar, MT
Judith Tannenbaum, WritersCorps, El Cerrito, CA
Jack Tchen, New York University, New York, NY
Carlton Turner, Alternate ROOTS, M.U.G.A.B.E.E., Raymond, MS
Roberta Uno, Ford Foundation, New York, NY
Marta Moreno Vega, Franklin H. Williams Caribbean Cultural Center African Diaspora Institute, New York, NY
Chris Vine, Creative Arts Team, City University of New York, New York, NY
Billy Yalowitz, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Finally, we are grateful to the organizers of the March, 2008 Community Arts Convening and Research Project at Maryland Institute College of Art in Baltimore, who allowed members of The Curriculum Project team to conduct a pre-conference session of story circles and discussions with interested educators, students and practitioners.

APPENDIX: THE CURRICULUM PROJECT GLOSSARY

Every field has its own vocabulary. Often, terms overlap, with people calling the same practices by different names. This glossary is intended to help clarify some of the terms you will encounter in reading about The Curriculum Project.

Community describes a unit of social organization based on some distinguishing characteristic or affinity: proximity (“the Cambridge community”), belief (“the Jewish community”), ethnicity (“the Latino community”), profession (“the medical community”), or orientation (“the gay community”). The word’s meaning becomes more concrete closer to the ground: “the gay, Jewish, academic community of Cambridge” probably describes a group of people who have a passing chance of being acquainted, whereas many of the more general formulations are ideological assertions. As Raymond Williams put it in *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (Oxford University Press, 1976),

Community can be the warmly persuasive word to describe an existing set of relationships or the warmly persuasive word to describe an alternative set of relationships. What is most important, perhaps, is that unlike all other terms of social organization (state, nation, society, etc.) it seems never to be used unfavorably and never to be given any positive opposing or distinguishing term.

In the context of community cultural development, “community” describes a dynamic process or characteristic. There is general recognition that to be more than an ideological assertion, the bonds of community must be consciously, perpetually renewed. In contrast, a network is a much looser form of association.

Community Arts/Artist: This is the common term for community cultural development in Britain and most other Anglophone countries. A distinction is often made by adding the word “based.” While community-based arts emerge from a local group’s experience and imagination, the conventional idea of community theatre, for example, is the amateur remounting of established plays without an effort to express something specific about local people in this time and place. “Community arts” is also in use in the U.S., but in U.S. English, the term is also sometimes used to describe conventional arts activity based in a municipality, such as “the Anytown Arts Council, a community arts agency.” “Community artists” or “community-based artists” are the individuals engaged in this work.

Community Cultural Development describes a range of initiatives undertaken by artists in collaboration with other community members to express identity, concerns and aspirations through the arts and communications media, while building the capacity for social action and contributing to social change. Sometimes abbreviated CCD. The Curriculum Project uses this term because it seems to encompass all the key elements of the practice: community, culture and development (or as in the title of this report, culture and community development).

Community Engagement describes the internships, field placements and university-community projects that are part of many community cultural development education programs. In The Curriculum Project, the term is used to indicate a kind of reciprocal, mutually respectful working relationship between students, faculty and community partners.

Community Organizing describes the process of bringing people together to act on their common interests. In The Curriculum Project, this term is used to describe activities that seek social justice and cultural democracy. The goal of such community organizing is to create social movements, helping to build a base of common concerns and aspirations and to mobilize community members to act in concert.

Culture in its broadest, anthropological sense includes all that is fabricated, endowed, designed, articulated, conceived, or directed by human beings, as opposed to what is given in nature. Culture includes both material elements (buildings, artifacts, etc.) and immaterial ones (ideology, value systems, languages). Culture encompasses the distinctive spiritual, intellectual, emotional and material traditions and features of a people or society.

Development (with its many subsets such as “economic development,” “community development,” and “cultural development”) describes a process of analyzing the resources and needs of a particular community or social sector, then planning and implementing a program of interlocking initiatives to rectify deficiencies and build on strengths. The community cultural development field stresses participatory, self-directed development strategies, where members of a community define their own aims and determine their own paths to reach

them, rather than imposed development, which tends to view communities as problems to be solved by bringing circumstances in line with predetermined norms.

Popular theatre/Theatre for Development: These two terms have different origins, but over time, they have become more or less interchangeable. “Theatre for Development,” originating in Africa, Asia and Latin America, typically refers to the work of troupes touring indigenous communities and using enactments, stories and music in local languages to convey development-related knowledge, such as how to ensure a clean water supply, increase crop yields, or prevent the spread of HIV. Very often, the underlying aim is to make use of traditions deeply embedded in local culture that can help promote development, while encouraging a critical relationship to the cultural understandings that deter it. “Popular Theatre” (sometimes “People’s Theatre”) encompasses Theatre for Development and other drama-based practices focusing on social justice. One of the most widespread forms is Forum Theatre, pioneered by Augusto Boal.

Service-learning: Campus Compact, one of service-learning’s most active advocates, defines it as follows:

Service-learning incorporates community work into the curriculum, giving students real-world learning experiences that enhance their academic learning while providing a tangible benefit for the community.

Wherever service-learning is understood as conditioned on equal partnerships, it can be strongly compatible with community cultural development’s values. Where it is not, real community engagement can be watered down to little more than field experience or extra credit for students, without much regard for its larger impact.

Social justice is a social goal: a society in which justice is achieved in every sphere, including economic, political and cultural. Those who pursue social justice seek a fair distribution of social goods, such as equal access to opportunity, equal standing before the law, equal voice in determining society’s direction, and equal standing in social and cultural institutions, regardless of cultural heritage, race, gender, disability, education, or class. Inherent in the term is a critique of entrenched power and privilege. The term is used in The Curriculum Project to describe the commitments to pluralism, participation and equity that motivate much community cultural development work.

Scholarship is used in The Curriculum Project to describe those elements of education for community cultural development that focus on the field’s history and animating ideas, as well as the economic and policy environments for community arts work. In this pillar of community cultural development education, students learn about history, cultural policy, the development of art forms and practices, the ideas that drive the work, and the larger social and ethical issues that concern practitioners. This component of CCD education involves reading, writing and critical reflection about both theoretical and practical aspects of the work.

Teaching artist is a term for artists working in schools and other learning settings. They are not art teachers per se, but working artists who bring their skills and perspectives into classrooms, after-school programs, social service agencies, and sometimes other institutions such as hospitals and prisons. Some teaching artists think of themselves as community artists, applying community cultural development values and methods to their work, but this is not universal.

Training is used in The Curriculum Project to refer to practical learning, such as developing skills in group facilitation, community organizing methodologies and artistic practice.

APPENDIX: A SAMPLING OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS

What follows are brief descriptions of a selection of courses and educational programs related to community cultural development from across the U.S. The material is organized in four categories: Programs at Art Schools; Programs at Other Higher Educational Institutions; Individual Courses and Community-Based Programs. Wherever possible, descriptions are based on programs' own public information, much of it generously provided by participants in Curriculum Project research.

PROGRAMS AT ART SCHOOLS

B.F.A. in Community Arts, California College of the Arts, Oakland, CA

CCA's Community Arts Program, begun in 2004 Sonia BasSheva Mañjon, Ph.D., is an interdisciplinary, community-based approach to creative practice that draws on the resources of the Center for Art and Public Life. Students explore how artists interact, collaborate and intervene in a variety of social networks while committing themselves to build sustainable community relationships, engage cultural diversity and stimulate social transformation. An interdisciplinary program, the Community Arts BFA focuses on community-based arts practice and theory, with an emphasis on service-learning, civic engagement and issues in diversity. The curriculum combines coursework in the humanities and sciences with studios, courses in arts administration and cultural diversity and a required internship. Curriculum consists of 33 total units of studio requirements and 51 total units of humanities and sciences requirements plus 42 total units of community arts major requirements including: Introduction to Community Arts; Art & Society; Art Education; Technology Suite Studios; Mentorship Studio; Public Art & Community Collaboration; Studio Art Concentration; Senior Thesis; Community Arts Studio Electives.

B.A. in Performing Arts and Social Justice, Visual & Performing Arts Department, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

This program culminates in a year in the community working with community organizations and developing artistic responses to those experiences. The Upper Division Company of majors and faculty produces programs in "ongoing dialogue with the USF and Bay Area community," including production work with community groups such as ex-offenders, on and off-campus. Courses combine classical training and cutting-edge innovation. After completing foundations courses in performance, students are admitted as members of The Company, a student/faculty collaboration for majors only. The Company combines creative risk-taking with a serious engagement in community issues, culminating with the production of an original show. Students may choose an emphasis in either Dance or Theater.

Masters in Arts Management with a concentration in Arts in Youth & Community Development, Department of Liberal Education and Office of Community Arts Partnerships, Columbia College Chicago, Chicago, IL

This program was developed in 2003 by the Center for Community Arts Partnerships (CCAP) and the Department of Arts, Entertainment and Media Management to address the professional development needs of future leaders in the field of community-based youth arts. In the AYCD program, academic coursework is intrinsically linked to hands-on learning and leadership opportunities at community-based organizations and public institutions in the youth development sector, including a four-semester intensive practicum in which students work up to 20 hours a week in community-based youth arts organizations situated in neighborhoods throughout Chicago, serving low-income, under-represented and immigrant youth populations with multidisciplinary arts programs in writing, performance, music, visual art, public art, media and digital technology. The program focuses on three major areas of professional development: practical skills necessary for operating an organization, theoretical and philosophical aspects of youth development and understanding the role of the arts in the lives of young people and how they relate to society at large.

Master of Arts in Community Arts, Center for Art Education, Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore, MD

For visual artists who wish to pursue a career in art-based youth and community development. This is a 36-credit program, spanning two summers and one academic year, grounded in principles of social justice. The program includes classroom study of community arts theory and practice plus residency with community

organizations. Students learn to: conceive, implement and manage programs and events that engage children, youth and adults in meaningful art experiences; document and assess effectiveness of projects in meeting community interests; plan curriculum; develop proposals and fundraise.

Masters of Fine Arts in Graduate Studies: Public Practices, Otis College of Art & Design, Los Angeles, CA

This two-year, 60-credit program in Public Practice offers opportunities for close study with internationally known artists and theorists, field internships and teaching assistantships. Participants develop new artistic strategies and practices based on observation, research, social commentary and activism and visual and public performance art productions. The program, under the leadership of Suzanne Lacy, enriches an arts environment marked by a remarkable mix of art schools and a distinguished history of artistic innovation. Graduate students explore new artistic strategies and practices based on observation, research, social commentary and activism, and visual and performance arts productions in the public realm. Students work in individual studios on a single significant project in collaboration with each other, community members, interdisciplinary scholars and faculty. Students must be proficient in one form of visual art and one public practice such as teaching, community organizing or nonprofit program development. Program includes 39 studio credits, 21 credits in other studies and 14 credits in electives.

Master of Public Art Studies (MPAS), School of Fine Arts University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

A two-year program comprising evening classes, mentored field internships, thesis projects and the administration of campus-based public art projects. Students acquire professional skills as public arts administrators, public art consultants, cultural policymakers, grant writers, nonprofit directors and public artists. Students engage communities in public art projects, conduct research and question paradigms in established public art theory, develop new working models and put them into practice and explore the role of technology in the field.

PROGRAMS AT OTHER HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Arts and Community Practice Certificate Program, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL

This focused concentration on application of arts to community development is for undergraduates and graduate students in social work, dance and art education/therapy. The program integrates the theoretical and practical aspects of dance, art education/therapy and community-based generalist/clinical social work. Requirements include coursework in art education/therapy, dance and social work totaling at least 12 semester hours with at least three semester hours taken from each program in certificate-approved courses. Inclusive of groups and families, it addresses all stages of human development. Particular attention is given to prevention, enrichment and response to social concerns. Requirements include a major paper linking theory and applied experience.

Community Arts Management Minor, Department of Art, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, LA

The mission of this minor is “to help students develop analytical and strategic skills while expanding their understanding of artistic disciplines and their importance to community building and social enterprise.” Goals include incorporating and documenting the arts as an agent for social change and a tool to build community relationships. Students gain practical experience through intern and volunteer opportunities with community-based art organizations. Students must complete nine hours of art courses and nine hours of business courses for those students who are not art or business majors.

Community Arts Undergraduate Minor, Arts and Administration Program, School of the Arts and Applied Architecture, University of Oregon, Eugene OR

This 28-credit minor is designed for students interested in participating, leading and organizing arts in community settings. Students from Theatre, Dance, Music, Art, Education, Sociology and Family and Human Services take coursework in arts administration and programming, arts philosophy, arts education and community cultural development. Course requirements encourage students to be cognizant of the relationships between arts and culture, ethnicity, politics, economics, education, class, gender, age and occupation. Optional practicum: apprenticeship with local arts organization.

Cross-Disciplinary Arts in Community Program, Art and Art Education Department, Tyler School of Art, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

University courses, field internships, after-school arts workshops, intergenerational forums and interdisciplinary community-based performances/exhibitions feed into ongoing collaborations with local arts organizations based on an exchange of knowledge and images between partners, to create art based on the lives and stories of North Philadelphia. The program works in partnership with community organizations, schools and artists in North Philadelphia, collaborating on program development with Art Sanctuary, the Asian Arts Initiative, Temple University's New City Writing Program and local schools. Over the past three years we have created performances and installations that have garnered critical acclaim and enthusiastic local and city-wide audiences. Four courses are currently part of the program and a certificate program is in development.

Minor in Applied Theatre, Drama Department, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University, New York, NY

The Minor in Applied Theatre offers interested students, both theatre specialists and non-specialists, the opportunity to learn how performance has been and can be a vital adjunct to non-theatrical professions and cultural practices. The Minor consists of a minimum of four four-point courses, three of which must be from a list of designated Department of Drama courses, all of which address theatrical performance in non-theatrical contexts, such as Community-Based Theatre, History of Community-Based Performance, The Actor Teacher I & II, Theatre and Therapy I & II, Theories of Community and Performance, Boal & Beyond and Internship in Applied Theatre.

B.A. in Theatre in Education and Community, Department of Theatre, California Polytechnic, Pomona, CA

This program educates artists, teachers and advocates for theater in educational settings and communities, preparing them for employment in these fields and life-long commitment to civic engagement and socially responsible art. The program includes history, theories and methodologies of theater in education, community-based theater, theater for youth and using theater to teach across the curriculum. The program offers access to nationally recognized community-based theater companies such as Cornerstone Theater Company and Fringe Benefits Alliance. Includes community-based performance projects and service-learning opportunities with regional community partners.

B.A. in Visual and Public Art, Visual and Public Art Department, College of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences, California State University, Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA

This 120 total credit program prepares students to be arts practitioners with a set of skills and values that will make them active and responsible participants in society. VPA integrates individual production and collaborative processes, skills and projects, and the expressive and analytical. It addresses the complex issues of working in public space creating murals, sculptures, installations, book arts, painted and electronic billboards, light sculptures, large-scale digital and cyber art, time-based work, performance and environmental art and public ceremonial works. VPA provides a balance of studio and theory through a combination of core concept and skill courses, visiting artist experiences, independent learning opportunities and a community-based projects/service-learning component. Concentrations are offered in Large-Scale Painting and Murals, Large-Scale Sculpture and Installation, Integrated Media and Photography (digital art, electronic art) and Arts Education and Museum Studies.

M.A. in Applied Theatre, School of Professional Studies, City University of New York, New York, NY

The M.A. in Applied Theatre, the first of its kind in the United States, is a sequential, ensemble-based program for students interested in the use of theatre to address social and educational issues in a wide range of settings. This 36-credit ensemble-based program stresses the unity of theory and practice and is linked to the professional applied theatre work of the Creative Arts Team (CAT). Students are introduced to the history of the theatre movements and practices, exploring key theories in theatre, human development, learning theory and community development. They are taught the skills and strategies necessary for creating and implementing the work, and are asked to think critically about the goals of the work in relation to different audiences, needs and community contexts. One-semester apprenticeship opportunities are offered with CAT's professional outreach programs or appropriate programs elsewhere. All students culminate their studies with a Project Thesis in which they research, create, implement and document an original applied theatre model.

M.A. in Urban Studies: Arts in Transformation Track, Eastern University, Philadelphia

Twenty-four-month Christian-leadership degree program in short residency formats to accommodate working and out-of-state students. Provides skills, knowledge, practice and spiritual foundation for “artist practitioners committed to transforming cities through a broad range of artistic expression.” Special focus on arts-based interventions at individual, family, community, social-service and organizational-leadership levels through field-intensive community partnerships.

MFA Program in Directing and Public Dialogue, Virginia Tech, Department of Theater Arts, Blacksburg, VA

This program offers professional training in stage direction and artistic leadership within the evolving field of professional, community-based ensemble theater in the United States, providing training for directing plays, developing and maintaining an ensemble, working with actors and non-actors and non-actors in creative projects, creating and performing original work, forming and facilitating creative community partnerships, and animating community dialogue through theater—all within the context of the artist as an engaged citizen. The program is built on the relationship between projects and tutorials. Led by the primary advisor in consultation with the student’s graduate committee, the student develops a personalized plan of study tailored to specific background, needs and personal goals of the student.

MFA in Theatre: Theatre for Youth, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

This concentration offers comprehensive course work within a minimum 60-semester-hour professional program, providing the skills and experiences needed to prepare for work as drama specialists, for teaching in the field of Theatre for Youth, for professional careers in children’s theatre and for work in community theatres, recreational programs and social agencies. Admission requires 30 prior semester-hours in theatre. Thirty-six hours of required classes include: Research Methods, Theatre History, Studies in Dramatic Theory and Criticism, Methods of Teaching Drama, Community Based Drama, Advanced Studies in Theatre for Youth, Theatre for Youth Tour, Improvisation with Youth Seminar or Practicum. Each student undertakes a formal one-semester internship with a professional theatre, arts organization, or educational institution.

The Arts of Citizenship Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

This program helps undergraduates work in guided teams with community partners in Ann Arbor and Detroit to create community-based drama and dance, radio documentaries, history exhibits, Web sites and curricula as well as major projects in “cultural partnership” with community organizations, fostering public scholarship. Arts of Citizenship programs are designed to bring faculty, staff and students into collaboration on projects with educators, cultural and arts institutions, government and community partners; encourage teaching and pedagogical practices that link the study of culture and citizenship with experiential, practice-based learning; support scholarship, creative work and intellectual conversation that further the public roles of the arts, humanities and design; and build capacity of faculty, staff, students and community partners to engage in sustainable collaborative endeavors that enrich curriculum, research and creative work and expand the social capital of community collaborators.

Prison Creative Arts Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Founded in 1990 by Buzz Alexander, University of Michigan Professor of English, PCAP is committed to original work in the arts in Michigan correctional and juvenile facilities and has worked with prison actors, writers and performers to create two dance performances, more than 174 original plays in 18 Michigan prisons, 109 original plays in four juvenile facilities and 70 plays in Detroit high schools and one rural high school. Since 1998, the program has supported more than 40 creative writing workshops in Michigan prisons with 39 public readings and 26 anthologies. The program has also curated 10 exhibitions of Art by Michigan Prisoners and three exhibitions of art by incarcerated youth from four juvenile facilities. Alexander and partner Janie Paul train and mentor many students who facilitate PCAP workshops and continue connecting with the project after they graduate. Students become involved in PCAP through coursework with Alexander or Paul, such as courses in Community Writing and Public Culture, Discourse and Society and Topics in American Culture.

INDIVIDUAL COURSES

Much of the material in this section is based on course syllabi posted on the Community Arts Network at www.communityarts.net/canu/syllabi/index.php. Where dates appear after course names, they refer to the

semester or quarters for which a syllabus was provided. Some courses may have been offered in earlier iterations, subsequently repeated or modified and offered again, and others may be one-time offerings.

Art As Activism, Roosevelt University, Chicago, IL, Maggie Leininger (Spring 2008)

This course will investigate current theory as it relates to public, guerilla and political/social based art work. In addition, students will develop a collaborative public art work that will take place in North Lawndale community of Chicago with Umoja, a non-profit group that assists high school students at Manley High School to enter college. Students will be responsible for initiating, implementing and completing this collaborative process and will have direct interactions with members of Umoja and the North Lawndale community.

Art of the Public, Williams College, Williamstown, MA, Peggy Diggs (Spring 2005)

“New genre public art [is] visual art that uses both traditional and nontraditional media to communicate and interact with a broad and diversified audience about issues directly relevant to their lives [and] is based on engagement.” So writes Suzanne Lacy, a long-time practitioner of such work. Engagement with members of the public is the premise on which this public art tutorial is founded: the hands-on work of the class will consist in exploring issues directly relevant to the lives of targeted audience-participants. We will develop art designed for a life outside of the gallery, art that emphasizes a process of engagement with issues. We will investigate the places where we live, our environs, by listening, looking, reading, interviewing. Students will learn how to elicit thoughts of local citizens and, through workshops and collaborative processes, evolve projects that will air those concerns in public settings and in public formats.

Art, Activism, and Community: Social Change through the Visual Arts, Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University, Medford, MA, Mindy Nierenberg (Spring 2008)

How do artists address social issues? Can art transform lives? How can art serve as a force for creating public dialogue? Are there different aesthetics for art with a social or political message? In this course students will explore visual art created for positive social change. Through slide lectures and guest artists, students will learn and engage in dialogue about contemporary artists that are addressing issues of the environment, racial and cultural identity, human rights, healthcare and social justice. Innovative community-based art organizations will also be studied, with guest lecturers from local Boston organizations who have developed nationally recognized models. Students in this course will also have the opportunity to create an interdisciplinary public art installation with two visiting artists through the project “Harmony in the Age of Noise”.

Arts and Community Development, Saint Mary’s University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, Tom Borrup (Summer 2008)

This course explores vitality in geographic communities and the unique role played by culture. We’ll examine the dynamic relationships that exist between artists, cultural organizations and communities and ways that culture can be an active agent or catalyst for economic, social and civic development. Topics include a historical overview of the community development field, concepts of creative community building and how the civic and economic impact of the arts can be measured. Case studies of cooperative partnerships will also be explored. Specific areas of concentration include arts-based community building strategies and how indicators are used to measure outcomes.

Arts and Peacebuilding, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Craig Zelizer (Spring 2007)

Throughout the globe, there are numerous individuals, groups and organizations using arts-based processes to support peacebuilding efforts in severely conflicted societies. Arts processes, such as theater, music and film, can be an especially effective means to bring together identity groups who are in conflict, by sharing common cultural experiences and engaging in cooperative creative projects. The power of various arts processes to impact individuals emotionally, psychologically and spiritually via the creative process can help foster change within and between conflicted groups. However, the arts are not necessarily a magic panacea for addressing conflicts, it also vital to explore how they can legitimate cultures of violence in conflict regions. The course will cover a combination of theory and real-world cases, helping to contextualize many key concepts. In addition, students will receive practical exposure to several arts-based processes through exercises, guest speakers and research projects. Through taking this course, students will develop an understanding of how professionals and organizations are incorporating innovative arts-based peacebuilding processes in diverse settings that can help inform their future work.

Beyond Mexican Murals: Intermediate Muralism and Community Development, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Judy Baca (Winter 2008)

This is one class in a four-course sequence taken over two quarters: Beyond the Mexican Mural Beginning and Intermediate and Digital Mural Lab Beginning and Intermediate. The sequence of four courses is required to carry out the production of a mural for an actual community site. The winter course is a continuation of investigation of muralism as method of community education, development and empowerment. The class includes exploration of issues through development of a large-scale collaborative digitally created image and/or painting for placement in community. Students research, design and work with community participants, continuing the project through states of production to full scale and community approval.

Boal and Beyond Drama Department, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University, New York, NY, Jan Cohen-Cruz (Spring 2005)

An introduction to the practice and ideas of Augusto Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed, a body of theatrical techniques that physically activate spectators and empower them to rehearse alternatives to their collective and individual oppressions. Participants will begin each day playing some of Boal's games. We'll then focus on the major techniques—forum, in which spectators explore their own solutions to collective problems by intervening at the crisis point of a scenario; image, a techniques that privileges physical expression, providing an alternative form of communication not reliant on language; invisible theatre, staged in public spaces and masquerading as life; and rainbow of desire, a body of therapeutic techniques geared toward the individual. I'll describe his more recent work with legislative theatre and sambopera. We'll then move on to adaptations of this work beyond Boal, in response to the desires of the participants and perhaps, time allowing, will explore his "joker system," a totally beguiling and under-explored way Boal devised of working with dramatic material.

Citizen Artist, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, Kate Collins (Spring 2008)

Students enrolled in the Citizen Artist course will: explore the field of arts-based civic dialogue and develop an understanding of the ways in which art can and has enriched civic life in America; strengthen theatre techniques and skills necessary for devising collaborative original works; expand critical thinking skills as we pursue opportunities for civic dialogue and become familiar with different conceptualizations of citizenship; collaborate in crafting an interdisciplinary arts and dialogue-based curriculum with purposeful civic learning objectives; cultivate problem-solving skills as we see a community-based arts project through from start to finish; experience the ways in which the work of artists making intentional choices can serve as a valuable means to establish deeper connections within and between diverse communities; immerse themselves in a service-learning partnership and discover the many significant ways in which those who hold privilege in our society can become allies and agents of change.

Community Research Service-Learning, Visual and Public Art Department, California State University Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA, Stephanie A. Johnson (Spring 2005)

The Community Research Service-Learning Course is a learning experience designed to provide students with both theoretical and hands-on approaches to the concept of community empowerment and growth through the use of collaborative art activities. This semester students will develop the necessary skills for working in community settings: problem-solving, research, cross-cultural communication techniques, media analysis, ethical reflection techniques and methods of evaluating accountability as well as project planning, revision and presentation. Students can choose to spend the semester in placements with community partner organizations of the Reciprocal University of the Arts Project (RUAP) of The Visual and Public Art and The Music and Performing Arts Institutes or they find their own placements. The innovative approach to integrating community and university resources that is central to RUAP will provide a unique opportunity for students to develop and facilitate arts and recreational programs with local agencies. In addition to on-site placement work, class activities planned for this semester include community research exercises, research projects, presentations, guest lecturers and field trips to local organizations.

Community-Based Theatre: Art, Culture and Social Change, New York University, New York, NY, Caron Atlas (Fall 2003)

Our goal is to broaden our perspective and deepen our understanding of the intersection between art, culture and social change in creation, cultural organizing and cultural policy. Guest artists, organizers and policymakers will present interactive case studies to stimulate critical thinking and reflection about the practice

of this work. A discussion of values and principles will be a through-line for this course. We will begin by developing a series of questions to pose to our guests about how they do their work, how it ties into concepts and strategies for change, what systems support them, what methodologies and creative processes they engage, and what impact the work has. Guests will also be asked to talk about the questions they are asking of themselves and their colleagues.

Creating Meaning through Community Drama: Making Theatre Based on a Community's Own Stories, City University of New York School of Professional Studies, New York, NY

This course is designed to prepare students to devise and perform appropriate, theatre-based community interventions based on the community's own stories. They will gain a theoretical and practical grounding in the study of community theatre processes through which practitioners work in, with and for a specific community. They will intervene using theatre strategies, to interrogate particular interests, problems or issues that the community wishes to share.

Cultural, Ethnic and Gender Issues in Dramatic Literature (Topic: Community-based Theatre), Miami University, Oxford, OH, Ann Elizabeth Armstrong (Spring 2003)

In this class, we will focus on three specific methods for creating community-based performance: 1.) Augusto Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed, 2.) Story-telling, oral history and documentary drama, 3.) Street theatre. Each of these methods will be employed in relationship to the Over-the-Rhine neighborhood community in Cincinnati and the history of Freedom Summer 1964 at Western College, Oxford, OH. By studying community-based art-making, we will inevitably challenge many ideas that we hold about "community," "art," and "theatre." In many ways, we will think as interdisciplinary artists, embodying the perspectives of psychology, sociology, political science, education and cultural studies as well as those of visual artists, actors, playwrights and musicians. As we translate theories into our own practical projects, we will encounter several difficult questions such as: How do you define "community"? What is the relationship between art and ideology? How can theatre stimulate political and social change? What is the role of the artist in relationship to the community? How can marginalized groups use theatre to form a collective voice? How can performance serve to raise our consciousness? How can art empower communities and individuals, providing the tools of agency? Can theatre provide unique opportunities for expression in a world of mass media?

Do You See What I'm Saying? Beloit College, Beloit, WI, Amy Sarno and Darren Kelly (Fall 2007)

Right here, in Beloit, Wisconsin, is the site of the only known community housing built exclusively for African American workers in the state, comprising four apartment buildings in the process of being restored. Kelly, Sarno, class participants and community members will work together to preserve the spirit of this site. Initially, the course will focus on the historical and socio-cultural development of the Flats with special attention to industry and migration in the United States generally and Beloit specifically. During this time, the students will also participate in workshops on such topics as observation skills, listening/interview/recording techniques and facilitation skills. In the second half of the class, students will join community members in mapping exercises and story exchanges to develop a form of reminiscence theatre that will be used as the groundwork for a larger education and outreach program for the Fairbanks Flats Revitalization Group. The goals of this course are: 1) to familiarize students with the historical significance of Beloit; 2) to introduce students to basic community-based creative practices used for urban renewal; 3) to develop research and production skills necessary for community-based performance; 4) to explore issues of class and race as they pertain to both the individual and community; and 5) to develop collaborative learning skills.

Field Internship in Community Arts, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Billy Yalowitz, Pepón Osorio (Spring 2005)

An experiential introduction to Community Arts, focusing on artist/community collaborations. Community Arts projects bring artists together with people of a community of location, spirit, or tradition, to create art that is based in the life of that community. Projects with two communities will be undertaken this Spring. This course will lay the groundwork for the basic understanding of these two communities. We will use our experience and process to create parallels with other arts projects dealing with communities that have been created throughout the United States. Starting from the notion that Art already exists in communities and that every community has art objects and performance processes, we will develop unique projects that will introduce a different approach to the audience. Community Arts is a cyclical process, an exchange where we from Tyler/Temple will inform the communities with whom we work as much as we will be informed by them. This

approach to art has a set of demands that differ from traditional art-making. Community Arts is a powerful tool for developing an understanding of interacting with people and the visual world, and for furthering personal vision and an understanding of the responsibility of choice in the creative process. This course will expand the student's visual and performative capacities. We will explore an array of approaches from creating points of negotiation with our audience to creating work in a relatively unknown environment. From the self to the collective, we will investigate and experience various concepts essential in contemporary art-making. While collaborating in the creating of Art, students will be looking at their own ways of approaching the community as well as seeing past Community Arts works made by other artists. Attention will be given to the role of research in the creative process.

Interdisciplinary Seminar in Community-based Arts, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Billy Yalowitz (Fall 2004)

The goals of this course are for students to learn about the history and theory of Community-based Arts; to learn to think critically about the issues of race, class and aesthetics inherent in Community-based Arts practice; and to gain exposure to established Community-based Arts projects in Philadelphia through field trips and guest speakers. The course will prepare students to become involved in the growing number of field internships in Community Arts that are being offered through Temple's Community Arts & Literacy Network. We will study and visit key community-based arts programs in Philadelphia. Students will then choose from one of several ongoing community arts projects underway in North Philadelphia with partnering arts organizations, and will participate in workshops at these sites.

Introduction to Community Arts, California College of Arts, Oakland, CA, Sonia BasSheva Mañjon, Ph.D. (Spring 2006 and 2007)

This course explores how students can be active participants in society by defining and practicing the integration of art and social change. Community artists find creative solutions to political, social and economic issues in urban, rural and global communities. Community artists have been collaborating with and working for community organizations, service providers, cultural and educational institutions and government agencies as active agents for social engagement and change. This class will survey community arts movements in the 20th Century and present including the Arts and Crafts Movement, WPA Era, Harlem Renaissance, Chicano Art Movement, Community Cultural Centers, Artists in Correctional Facilities, Youth Development Organizations and Hip Hop Culture. Students will collaborate on a community-based project or a project that focuses on social change within community settings.

Making Art in Community II, MA in Community Arts (MACA), Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore, MD, Jann Rosen-Queralt and Fletcher Mackey (Winter/Spring 2006)

MACA students will develop artwork that is an outgrowth of their experience working with community, projects developed for Two Way Street and other influences of their choosing. These developments will become the basis for a thesis to be presented at the end of the summer session.

Performance and Social Change, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, Sonja Kuftinec (Spring 2005)

A practical and theoretical exploration of Boal's work in conversation with those who influenced and critiqued him, in a safe space for student risk-taking where amazing things can happen every week. Brazilian-born Augusto Boal has been working for five decades to transform individuals and societies through theater. Believing that everyone has the capacity to act—to take action and reflect on their conditions of being—Boal developed a "theater of the oppressed," embracing techniques including forum, image, invisible and legislative theater, all designed to raise consciousness and propel action towards individual and social change. Performance and Social Change investigates the possibilities and limitations of Boal's techniques through workshops, presentations and discussions. Critical and practical readings, impassioned debate and community-based research will dynamize our learning as we explore Boal's strategies, applying them to our own lives and surroundings. We will do so through a structure that gradually moves us from the safe space we create in the classroom to one you will co-create with communities, always reflecting on our practice as we do so.

Professionalism in Community Arts Practice & Community Arts Residency II, MA in Community Arts (MACA), Maryland Institute College of Art, Krafchek, McDonagh, & Hypki (Winter/Spring 2006)

MACA students continue to conceive, implement and manage projects and programs that engage community members in meaningful art experiences; document and assess the effectiveness of projects as compared to community needs and expectations; and gain hands-on experience in areas such as project and event planning, community organizing and program management. These real-world experiences are supported by intensive classroom study of community arts-related theory and practice.

Radical Street Performance: Global Perspectives, Drama Department, New York University, New York, NY, Jan Cohen-Cruz (Spring 2005)

Examination of performances worldwide that take place in public by-ways rather than theatre buildings and that are intended to question or re-envision dominant arrangements of power. We'll look at street theatrics that take place on large and small scale, support a range of agendas, take on single issues and broad visions and are performed by professional actors or by people driven by a tremendous incentive to change their own reality. The course is organized around five general categories of street performance: agit-prop, witness, integration, utopia, tradition. Each is accompanied by readings, a brief response paper, discussion, videos, as well as an opportunity to try it out at least in class, and in three cases, out in the world: Invisible or semi-Invisible Theater, Celebratory Performance and an Election Project using a form of your choice. Students will ally the third performance to a larger context, either by directly partnering their group with an activist group or with one of the national candidates' local organization. A five page research paper consists of assessing a street performance or demonstration taking place in New York City this semester vis-a-vis both efficacy and aesthetics. A final exam based on class readings concludes the semester's work.

Re/Building Community through the Arts, Ron Bechet, Xavier University, New Orleans, LA, John Barnes, Dillard University, New Orleans, LA, Jan Cohen Cruz, New York University, New York, NY, Amy Koritz, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA (Spring 2007)

This class focuses on the theory and practice of community-based arts, civic engagement in higher education and the relationship between art and community development. Students work in teams with local artists on *Home, New Orleans?*—a multi-disciplinary, art-and-community-development project grounded in selected New Orleans neighborhoods. The Project may take a number of forms, depending on the needs and goals of community partners. One approach begins with research, locating former residents of selected homes in devastated areas to reconstruct the life histories of the homes themselves. We imagine spring-boarding from the energy generated around house-history, or other community-based art works—in the form of theatrical performances, music, story-telling, oral histories, art installations and more—to practical steps that help move forward local neighborhood revitalization. The project seeks to celebrate and probe the joys and sorrows of community life pre-Katrina and participate in envisioning and providing creative tools to achieve a better future. The course is grounded in neighborhood arts workshops. These include workshop co-facilitation at a community center, planning for workshops, documenting, fund-raising or doing publicity and marketing for said workshops, and interviews/ story circles material about home. The number of community engagement hours expected of students varies based on home institution: Xavier students/6 hours per week, NYU/9 hours per week, Tulane/4 hours per week, Dillard/3 hours per week. (This course was taught by faculty from four different universities. All participants were in class together. Students were in mixed groups at their mini-internship sites, with assignments varying slightly depending on school.)

Research for Devising Community-Based Performance, Drama Department, New York University, New York, NY, Jan Cohen-Cruz with Urban Bush Women members & Rosemary Quinn (Fall 2005)

Students try out different research methods for making performances and writing essays grounded in local concerns, finding out what is on the minds and hearts of people in a particular place and exploring the broad context of these issues. We do primary research in neighborhoods within an easy walk of NYU. Students investigate how artists enter communities, develop relationships with local people, identify local concerns, deepen research, gather material for the creation of writing and performances, and develop a plan to impact policy. Urban Bush Woman Christal Brown guides performance-based exercises as Cohen-Cruz guides reading discussions and writing assignments. UBW artistic director Jawole Willa Jo Zollar and ETW's Rosemary Quinn lead master classes in translating research into performance. As the project develops, our

research becomes more focused and integrates secondary sources. We also look at models of devised, community-based plays.

COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS

Cornerstone Theater Company Summer Institutes, Los Angeles, CA

The Cornerstone Institute Summer Residency offers an intense, hands-on collaborative experience creating theater and exploring strategies for community engagement while living with and within a small, diverse community. Students learn both through classroom training and hands-on creation of a community-specific production. Classroom curriculum and production experience combine to provide a thorough understanding of the community collaboration process. The four-week program grows and changes each year responding to input from student participants as well as the unique circumstances of each community and location. The curriculum includes an overview of community-based theatre and Cornerstone's history; exploring community; theatre, vocal and movement explorations with community members. The text is *The Cornerstone Community Collaboration Handbook*.

Resources for Social Change, Alternate ROOTS, Atlanta, GA

This training program of Alternate ROOTS is devoted to teaching, sharing and exchanging ideas, methods and techniques for creating social change through the arts. RSC recognizes the need to institutionalize and pass on the best practices, growing knowledge and diverse skills gained as ROOTS members work in communities. Its core method of teaching is the development of partnerships between artists and communities and partnerships within communities leading to the empowerment of individuals and communities involved. RSC uses the arts as tools or search engines in collaborative projects that aim to provoke lasting change and turn community goals into long-term community solutions. Guided by principles of power, partnership, transformation, dialogue, aesthetics, RSC programs are tailored to each community, with flexible timeframes. No two workshops are alike: the learning exchange may be a one-day workshop or meeting, a residency or several working sessions and artist residencies over time.

Urban Bush Women Summer Institutes, Brooklyn, NY

The purpose of this 10-day Summer Institute is to connect concert professionals and community-based artists together in a learning experience to better maximize the possibilities of the arts as a vehicle for social activism and civic engagement. The Institute draws a cross-section of participants from across the country, the UK, Caribbean and Canada. The 2008 Summer Institute focuses on Collaboration, Leadership and Art-making, creating site-specific performances that engage in public dialogues regarding this year's theme, *Are We Democracy?* In addition to daily dance and conditioning classes, there are workshops on Asset Mapping; Creating Public Dialogues; Principles of Effective Community Organizing; Generating Choreography, Text and Music; and Undoing Racism, presented by the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond, New Orleans.

Liz Lerman Dance Exchange Summer Institutes, Takoma Park, MD

Week-long intensive dance workshops informed by an online toolbox designed for anyone seeking concrete techniques for choreography, community building and constructive human interaction, including artists, educators, students, social service professionals.

Appalachian Media Institute, Appalshop, Whitesburg, KY

Through AMI, young people in central Appalachia learn how to use video cameras and audio equipment to document the unique traditions and complex issues of their mountain communities. AMI offers a 10-week intensive summer institute and year-round media production training with youth, teachers and community groups in central Appalachia. AMI's goals are to develop the critical and creative skills of young people in central Appalachia and to involve them in their communities and the world by making and sharing media.

Sojourn Theatre One-Week Summer Institute, Portland, OR

The 2008 6-day Institute for adults working in theatre, education and community settings was on *Devising Civic Theatre: Performance, Social Practice & Dialogue*, offering participants an opportunity to explore the techniques and strategies Sojourn Theatre artistic director Michael Rohd uses in collaborative work with groups to devise performance material, build community, examine the potential of site-specific activity and explore social and political issues through collaborative conceptual, improvisational and physical investigations.

APPENDIX: CALL FOR EXCELLENCE

A Call for Excellence in Community Cultural Development Curriculum in Higher Education

from Dudley Cocke, *Roadside Theater/Appalshop*; Jan Cohen-Cruz, *Imagining America*; and Arlene Goldbard, *writer and community cultural development consultant*

A Singular Moment of Opportunity

We are three writers, practitioners, teachers, theorists and critics of community cultural development practice. “Community cultural development” (also called “community arts,” “community-based arts,” “community engagement through the arts,” “arts-based community development” and “art and social change”) describes a range of initiatives undertaken by artists in collaboration with other community members to express identity, concerns and aspirations through the arts and communications media, while building cultural capacity and contributing to social change. We’ve come together because we recognize a unique moment of opportunity in our field of practice. Four circumstances have converged to produce this opportunity:

- A critical mass of analytic writing and documentation has accrued, bringing new attention to cultural development theories and practices that have been gathering force over the last four decades;
- In the past ten years, universities across the U.S. have created dozens of individual courses, certificates and degree programs in community cultural development. (Communityarts.net lists 32 degree programs and 31 non-degree programs with relevance to community cultural development);
- Unprecedented numbers of students are matriculating in these programs, creating an unusual opportunity to affect the field by affecting their education; and
- More and more, social-justice activists are collaborating with artists and cultural workers to bring cultural awareness into their efforts, understanding that culture is an essential foundation for community development and social change. At the same time, artists are increasingly seeking intersectoral partnerships for their work.

Together, we three have aggregate experience of community arts amounting to nearly a century. We’ve chosen to work together on this project because we believe our complementary skills and experience uniquely prepare us to address community cultural development’s distinctive educational needs. Each of us has a depth of field experience, with a strong track record in community-based arts, community engagement and social change organizing. Dudley has long occupied a bridging role through his writing and speaking from an artist’s point of view, bringing the news of diverse American communities to policymakers and resource providers; Jan is also strongly grounded in academic culture and practice; and Arlene is recognized as an expert in both organizational development and cultural policy as they pertain to the field.

Common Concerns and Needs

Over the last year or so, each of us has been in even closer contact with the higher education aspect of the community cultural development field. Dudley and Jan have collaborated in community arts projects involving New York University, as well as Dillard, Xavier and Tulane universities, working intensively with students, faculty, artists and community organizers. Arlene has offered talks, classes and workshops at many colleges in support of her new book, *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*, using these opportunities to confer with many of those involved in newly developing programs.

What we’ve seen is a growing academic presence for community cultural development, but one with cross-cutting shortcomings and overarching needs:

Balancing disciplinary training and community work. Faculty members report great difficulty in balancing the need for students to have hands-on experience beyond the classroom with coursework that imparts training in arts techniques. Often, the departments that house these new programs are committed to a style of aesthetic training shaped for the student seeking a mainstream professional life in the arts; some resist acknowledging the equal need for training in community engagement methods and approaches. Even

for faculty members who have long and deep community engagement experience, trying to find room for this work in the curriculum can be like trying to pour new wine into old bottles that are already filled to the brim.

Curricular inadequacies. Many of the new programs take a piecemeal approach to community cultural development education, largely shaped by pre-existing departmental requirements and the particular strengths of the faculty members whose enthusiasm and commitment has brought these programs into being. Field experience may be emphasized in one place, coursework in another, but the two are seldom fully integrated. Many faculty members lack an appropriate depth of community engagement experience to guide students into a deep and effective practice in the service of social justice.

It appears that few of the existing programs provides adequate grounding in the larger cultural and social context for the work, such as required courses in cultural policy, social psychology, applied ethics, theory of social change or organizational behavior. Indeed, as focus differs from program to program, there is no consensus as to what constellation of courses would provide adequate grounding. Although the idea of moving across departmental lines to bring together diverse content and modes of learning is often appealing, even universities that have the needed range of courses typically find it difficult to break out of specialized “silos.”

A larger context of meaning. As presently constituted, university programs often elide questions of deeper meaning, overlooking their motivating power in students’ lives. Indeed, many students find their way to this work through their search for meaning. Sometimes that search is grounded in a formal spiritual tradition: Islam’s *zakah* and Judaism’s *tzedakah* both imply charity and restorative justice; a core concept of Judaism is *tikkun olam* (repairing the world); the tenets of Christian liberation theology entwine justice and mercy; and three elements of Buddhism’s eightfold path focus on right speech, action, and livelihood.

Others find meaning in a humanist context. For some, it may be environmental action grounded in reverence for the earth; for others, it may be working with elders or other groups out of the conviction that their marginalization diminishes everyone. Students are frequently delighted to discover that in community cultural development work, they can conjoin their passion for the arts with other powerful callings. In this spirit, community cultural development offers them experiences of deep listening, open-hearted collaboration, and action for social healing which are, in effect, non-specific forms of spiritual practice. As the Vietnamese Buddhist teacher Thich Nat Hanh has pointed out, “There are many groups of young people who are strongly motivated by the desire for social action, but because they don’t know how to take good care of themselves, they don’t know how to live and work with harmony among themselves, they give up the struggle after some time.”

Community-campus relationships. Based on our informal survey of the field, most existing university programs are challenged to some degree in finding truly equitable and effective ways of working with community partners, so that different types of knowledge are valued and both students and community group members feel their collaborations are useful and satisfying. While in recent years colleges have broadened their use of service-learning and other forms of campus-community collaboration, many have not fully incorporated community cultural development’s informing values of pluralism, participation and equity. As a result, community work is often superficial, and doesn’t offer students the opportunity to have a real social justice impact.

Parameters

These cross-cutting weaknesses in existing community cultural development higher education programs suggest some of the required elements of curricular excellence:

Integration of theory and practice. Excellence requires a balance of community engagement, training in both aesthetics and community organizing, and scholarship focusing on the field’s history and animating ideas, as well as the economic and policy environments for it. Inspired by Rev. James Lawson, a hero of the 1960s civil rights movement, our language reflects that justice must be governed by an emphasis on caring, or love. Or, as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., put it, “Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.” As depicted in the following diagram, an integrated curriculum will be most meaningful and effective if all three elements constantly interact, receiving equal emphasis in the service of this inspiring goal:



Recognition of multiple types of knowledge. Training for community arts work can't take place within the university as ivory tower. More than in many other fields of learning, community cultural development educators must seek and value non-academic learning to complement, enrich and complete coursework, collaborating with practicing community artists and community organizers in ways that acknowledge their essential equality with on-campus instructors.

Cultivation of social entrepreneurship skills. Excellent community cultural development practice requires several types of skill: the ability to effectively read complex social landscapes and situations, personal flexibility, and developed abilities to improvise, reflect, respond and self-correct. Cultivating such skills calls on faculty to transcend conventional educational approaches that treat the professor as an expert and the student as a client, rather than as co-participants in an iterative process of study, action and reflection. In essence, form follows function in community arts education, requiring training to employ the same methods as effective practice.

Useful Interventions

We believe that several types of strategic intervention would greatly benefit the developing field at this formative moment. University leaders in community cultural development need more knowledge of history, theory and practice, and more opportunities for dialogue, collaboration and higher-level training (*i.e.*, training the trainers). The particular interventions that will be most needed and welcomed will emerge from our dialogue with educators, students and practitioners; the ideas listed below are intended to suggest possible approaches.

Model Curriculum Project. Curricula will differ from institution to institution because many schools and departments are still discipline-specific, have access to varying levels of resources, or educate students for particular career aims, such as working in prison reform or child development. But to be effective, all must integrate training, scholarship and community engagement, as described above. Because the most effective training would combine doing and reflection, courses could not be seen as distinct modules, but rather as a sequence of interrelated activities propelling each student toward a degree.

The design of a model curriculum project would begin with a survey of existing programs here and abroad, underpinned by conversations with students, faculty, administration and leaders of collaborating community organizations. The resulting report and proposal would yield a set of standards to be circulated in draft throughout the field and discussed at the conference described in the next section. Ideally, resources would be secured to assist university programs in improving their own curricula in line with the project's guidance, for example, by underwriting expert consultation to guide them.

Community Cultural Development Conference. We see several ways this initiative could work: as a series of intensive conversations focused by topic, as regional gatherings and as a major national convening. In regional terms, some sections of the U.S. have clusters of developing programs. For instance, at Philadelphia's Temple University, a core curriculum is being developed for the Cross-Disciplinary Arts in Community Program at Tyler School of Art, eventually leading to a degree program; Moore College of Art, the University of the Arts and Drexel University have added one or two community arts courses with an eye toward building gradually. Bringing key faculty, administrators and students together with community-based practitioners and visiting experts could stimulate the learning dialogue needed to optimize these programs. Similarly, relevant programs are developing at Columbia College Chicago, the Chicago Art Institute and the University of Illinois at Chicago, and in other regional clusters. Similarly, educators and practitioners from

disparate regions may benefit from coming together for reflection and planning around specific topics, such as community cultural development and neighborhood revitalization.

Nationally, an opportunity exists similar to a 1988 initiative in museum practice, when the Rockefeller Foundation focused its considerable influence on intercultural relations and multicultural development. Its Arts and Humanities Division cosponsored two major conferences with the Smithsonian Institution on "The Poetics and Politics of Representation," highlighting museum practices in exhibiting non-European cultures. *Exhibiting Cultures*, the 1991 Smithsonian Institution Press volume that emerged from these gatherings, is still considered one of the most influential texts, widely used in museum-education and curatorial-training programs. It has increased the cultural sensitivity of museum practice and legitimated important voices that have influenced the field. A national conference that brought together community artists, faculty members, administrators, students and community activists could similarly generate a consensus on best practices in training, conceivably formalized in a similar volume of essays.

Community Cultural Development Institute. We also see at least two ways to instigate this intervention. To start with, a traveling institute might be best: equipping experienced practitioners and teachers with model curriculum materials, then bringing them to a series of colleges currently planning, initiating or piloting such programs. On each campus, institute trainers could work with local faculty, administrators, students, artists and collaborating community organizations to devise model action research projects, enabling deep learning through simultaneous study and action. Tailored to the needs of each institution, the model might be a single intensive period of hands-on work (e.g., a month's residency by institute trainers with provision for follow-up consultation), or a series of visits (e.g., shorter on-site periods at the beginning, middle and end of the school year, with provision for check-ins between visits).

In the longer term, an ongoing institute could provide teachers and practitioners with a place to take courses, engage in projects, conduct research and consider critical questions for the field in a timely manner. As both a think tank and a home for continuing professional education, such an institute would be a tremendous asset to a field poised to realize its full potential.

Next Steps

There is no shortage of ideas and enthusiasm in this evolving field. But as in all periods of rapid development, without the right kind of support, what could be a promising direction may wind up as a dead end, with creative and democratic impulses co-opted toward status quo ends.

We are prepared to invest a great deal of care and energy in strategic interventions like those sketched above. We are seeking a wise partner to house these efforts, helping to bring resources and attention to an opportunity ripe for the picking. As we envisage it, the ideal partner would be a center or institute, perhaps with academic affiliation, but willing and able to work equitably with many types of collaborators.

We are eager to talk. Please contact us: arlene@arlenegoldbard.com, jcohencr@syr.edu, roadside theater@verizon.net.

Spring, 2007