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How to Use This Playbook

ANY GOOD STRATEGY INVOLVES MANY MOVING PARTS.

THIS STORY IS NO DIFFERENT.

Depending on your community’s vision and current circumstance, any one of the strategies in this playbook could be beneficial. Thus, we organized the information we’re presenting as a history, so that you may view the tactics that contributed to success in the Cleveland, Ohio, area and decide whether they would make sense in the context of your work today. You’ll also see call-out material with some more concrete, universal lessons to help you apply those tactics. Here are some of the elements designed to help you navigate this playbook:

ICONS: These appear throughout the playbook, and you’ll find an index of each one in the supplementary materials:

- **Bios**: The skills people brought to the table are important. Whenever a new player is introduced, you’ll see this icon.

- **Core Values**: This work is difficult. It can be more so if the people involved aren’t operating from a set of shared values that guide practices and decision-making at every step of the way.

- **Pivitol Moments**: Sometimes, a single idea can change the game. Some are planned and some are unexpected, but all are critical to making change—and can be spotted only in hindsight.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS: Feel free to copy, scan, share and use this material in whatever way you find will help your own efforts. We simply ask that you respect the integrity of the work by using it in the context of arts and culture as a community partner. Also, please don’t repurpose these materials to generate revenue. This playbook and the materials in it are free and available to all.

TIMELINES: Timing is everything. CPAC takes a calculated set of steps to achieve a desired goal. In policy, these steps involve navigating the bureaucratic process. In partnerships, there are steps to building trust and establishing shared benefits and outcomes. These timelines visually represent how much time each of these processes can take and the critical acts that help advance these initiatives.
Light Up Cleveland Night: Cleveland's skyline was showcased during the nationally televised Browns-Bengals game on September 18, 1986. More than 130 downtown buildings cooperated by leaving their office lights on until midnight, producing a radiant cityscape. Image courtesy of Western Reserve Historical Society
INTRODUCTION

The Need for an Arts & Community Partnership

1997 AND BEFORE
Playhouse Square, view from Euclid Avenue in the late 1990s.
Photo courtesy of Playhouse Square
The Need

THE COMEBACK CITY. THAT WAS CLEVELAND IN 1997: THE HOME OF THE RECENTLY OPENED ROCK AND ROLL HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM, WHERE MAYOR MICHAEL R. WHITE HAD BEGUN TO UNDERTAKE HUGE CIVIC PROJECTS, INCLUDING BUILDING A SCIENCE CENTER AND A COMBINED STADIUM/ARENA COMPLEX CALLED GATEWAY, TO CHANGE CLEVELAND’S FACE AND LUCK.

After decades of economic disaster, of closed mills and crushed hopes that had sent the city’s middle class fleeing for the suburban developments along the interstate highways, Cleveland would no longer be the “mistake on the lake” whose polluted river had burned. It would become a magnet for music and sports fans, an attraction, a destination.

But beneath the hope and hard work, Cleveland’s iconic music and other performing-arts assets were in real trouble. The city’s opera houses; its ballet company; its nationally revered, groundbreaking black theater; even its prized and world-famous Cleveland Orchestra: All were caught in a constant cycle of financial crisis that threatened to close several of them permanently. Their corporate supporters—the many Fortune 500 companies that had reliably donated large portions of local nonprofit organizations’ budgets for decades—were pulling out of Cleveland. The performing-arts groups were perennially undercapitalized and understaffed. When the groups’ operating costs overwhelmed their resources, as regularly happened, the directors threw themselves on the mercy of emergency donors, big and small. Over and over again.

And those were the wealthier arts-and-culture groups. The smaller ones had far less to work with and little hope of more, competing—as they had to—with the larger organizations for whatever grants, donations and paying audiences their economically depressed hometown had left to offer. Cleveland had essentially no public-sector funding for arts and culture; local government arts support amounted to giving the orchestra a little money to present an Independence Day concert downtown every July.
In other metropolitan areas around the nation, from Providence to Seattle, leaders from different community sectors had recognized the power of artists to transform and revitalize neighborhoods and had pulled together to start wooing them with support, ranging from tax breaks and low-cost space to public-art commissions and grant-bestowing city and county arts councils. But Cleveland had almost nothing in the way of public cultural-development policies or infrastructure. Cross-sector conversations about growing the arts and culture were few.

One of those scarce discussions, and the most promising, had been about the effort to save Playhouse Square, Cleveland’s downtown theater district. By the 1970s, several formerly magnificent stage facilities had been abandoned and left to decay. As the threat of demolition grew, a visionary named Ray Shepardson collected a handful of actors and in 1973 put on the musical cabaret *Jacques Brel Is Alive and Well and Living in Paris* in the rundown lobby of the State Theatre. Shepardson’s bold action surpassed all expectation—the show, intended to run for three weeks, ran for two years—and won public attention for the architectural, historical, cultural and economic value of the deteriorating venues. Inspired by the strong community response, Cleveland’s foundations—the city’s primary supporters of arts and culture—began talking with government and business leaders about saving the theaters, remembered Steven Minter, president and executive director of the Cleveland Foundation from 1984 to 2003.

“A very important thing happened,” he said. When the city’s business community wanted to know whether renovating Playhouse Square were truly a viable project, McKinsey & Company consultants undertook a study of the costs and economic impact of rescuing the spaces, revealing that many jobs and visitor dollars would be generated by the revived theaters. Minter recalled, “The business leaders said, ‘Oh.’ And, ‘O.K.’”

They signed on to the project, and renovation began, culminating in the 1982 opening of the Ohio Theatre, the first of the theaters to be restored. By 1997, three of what would eventually be eight gloriously restored Playhouse Square performance venues were presenting top Broadway tours and Cleveland-produced performances to local and regional audiences.

Saving Playhouse Square proved what could be done when leaders regarded arts and culture as a means of community and economic development.

But in the greater context of 1990s-era Northeast Ohio, Playhouse Square remained both an anomaly and an island. Like large parts of downtown Cleveland, many city centers and neighborhoods across the
Cleveland sits in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, adjacent to Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina, Portage and Summit counties.
region were hollowed out and crumbling. Even in some first-ring suburbs, landmark historical structures, including churches, banks, movie theaters, warehouses, factories and stores, stood empty. Some sheltered a few artists who secretly squatted there, prevented by law from openly setting up house, creating studio or performance space, or making permanent improvements. Few if any local developers were renovating such structures for them. The small-business community had never considered individual artists as small-business owners and had no programs for them. Neither had the city and county governments, or the municipal financial institutions. The local tourism bureau lacked a comprehensive cultural-marketing effort. Arts-and-culture organizations saw one another as competitors; almost none of them collaborated, shared resources or even talked to each other much. Artists socialized, but with few networks and service organizations in place, they had no opportunity to meet en masse about common causes.

Across Greater Cleveland, many people who could have made a difference for arts and culture were not communicating or working with anyone else. As Plain Dealer art and architecture critic Steven Litt wrote in the late ’90s, “Is the example of Providence [the first U.S. city to transform a declining neighborhood by making it a tax-free zone for artists’ work/ performance space] applicable to Cleveland?…No such alliances have formed in Cleveland.”

Perhaps most important, no one across Northeast Ohio knew how many cultural organizations and artists there were in the region, let alone what kind of artists they were, what they needed to thrive or how they might benefit the area if they did. Someone was going to have to find out.

ROOTS OF CHANGE

During the early and mid-1990s, several years before Litt made his perceptive point, members of two major local foundations were detecting disturbing symptoms of a systemic operational crisis among Cleveland’s performing-arts organizations. Kathleen Cerveny, a local artist and arts journalist who had become the Cleveland Foundation’s program director for arts and culture in 1991, had started that job knowing Cleveland was one of several major U.S. cities without public-sector arts funding. Soon afterward, when a recession hit and the foundation began giving out “one rescue grant after another” to the city’s largest arts groups, Cerveny understood, she said, that those companies were failing—and worse, “that we alone could not save them.”

Her counterpart at the George Gund Foundation, Deena Epstein, shared her concerns: The foundation had recently done an arts-education study and the process had revealed that there was no real arts “community,”
Epstein said. People in arts and culture didn’t work together—and they needed to. And they needed funding. And they needed a plan.

David Bergholz, executive director of the Gund Foundation from 1989 to 2003, arrived at a similar epiphany in 1995. “Cleveland went through a rather steep decline in corporate and personal wealth,” he noted of that time, “so I think there was a clear recognition that there was pressure on [the performing arts] organizations.”

With input from Cerveny and Epstein, Bergholz and the Cleveland Foundation’s Minter became persuaded that a thorough examination of the city’s major performing arts organizations, including their funding challenges and operations, would help the foundations determine why the groups seemed to be lurching from crisis to crisis, financially. Action followed quickly: In March 1995, the Cleveland Foundation created a special Civic Study Commission on the Performing Arts. Made up of community leaders, the commission’s purpose was to look into the cases of 11 performance organizations and seek answers to critical questions, including how to stabilize the groups financially and improve their operations; whether or not Greater Cleveland had enough money to help the organizations grow; and what role arts and culture should play in the community’s future development.

The facts the commission discovered over the ensuing year revealed a Cleveland arts-and-culture sector affected by nationwide trends and local idiosyncrasies. The former included the high fixed costs, inadequate capitalization and increased competition suffered by performing groups across the U.S., while the latter encompassed the falling population, employment levels and numbers of arts-education opportunities that made Cleveland a uniquely risky home

Before any investment in a service organization or project existed, funders sought answers to critical questions.
for its performing companies. But the single most telling conclusion derived by the commission was, its report explained, that in an era of eroding support for the arts nationwide, “engendering [a] new climate would require strengthening the relationship between the performing arts and the whole community.”

The answer for Cleveland’s 11 top performing and presenting organizations was not an airdrop of cash. It was the building of a Northeast Ohio value system in which arts and culture would not only be recognized and respected as integral to the region’s present and future, but also sought after and supported as engines of community benefit, just like business, education, science, technology, health and the other major industries that together shaped the area’s economy and quality of life.

“As a result,” the report continued, “the question before the Commission changed from, ‘How can the survival of individual institutions be guaranteed?’ to ‘How do the performing arts serve the Greater Cleveland community, and how can the community create conditions to sustain them?’”

The commission recommended 13 goals—some for arts and culture organizations, some for funders and some for Greater Cleveland as a whole—that its members thought would turn Northeast Ohio into that arts-valuing and -supporting community. Goal 9 urged Cleveland to “Create a comprehensive cultural planning process through which the arts participate in Greater Cleveland’s renewal and growth agenda.” Goal 13 advised it to “Create a mechanism to generate public support for the arts and create a local civic arts agency to oversee, manage and distribute the funds.”

These two key aims and their 11 fellow directives became the instigation for and raison d’être of the Community Partnership for Arts and Culture (CPAC, a.k.a. “see-pak”).
The Cleveland Foundation Civic Study Commission on the Performing Arts

13 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Adopt best practices for management and governance
2. Pursue partnerships and collaborations

NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

3. Support partnerships, collaborations and consolidation efforts
4. Require best practices performance
5. Recognize the need for operating support

NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDERS

6. Ensure strong board leadership
7. Forge educational partnerships with area school systems, especially Cleveland Public Schools

NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUSINESS, THE ARTS, THE SCHOOLS AND FUNDERS

8. Commit to a community-wide cultural planning process
9. Create a broad-based steering committee
10. Create a shared vision for the role of the arts in Greater Cleveland
11. Create new opportunities for broader and more diverse participation in the cultural life of greater Cleveland
12. Structure a system to provide better risk management and enhanced sustainability for the arts
13. Create a mechanism to generate public support for the arts and create a local civic arts agency to oversee, manage and distribute the funds

MID- AND LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GREATER CLEVELAND COMMUNITY
INTRODUCTION: THE NEED FOR AN ARTS & COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

Severance Hall interior. Photo © Roger Mastroianni, courtesy of The Cleveland Orchestra
The Partnership

The Civic Study Commission had examined why many of the city’s most significant arts organizations were caught in a downward financial spiral. It concluded, in 1996, that systemic change was needed in Greater Cleveland’s understanding about arts and culture and their role in the community’s quality of life.

It also deduced that a change of that kind depended on finding out two kinds of information: the impressions that residents of Northeast Ohio held about arts and culture, and the hard facts about arts and culture as an industry and as part of the regional economy.

This research would be essential to creating a valid arts-and-culture plan for the area, a plan that would help people see what benefits arts and culture were already providing to their region and which resources artists and organizations required in order to improve, grow and provide even more.

The two foundations’ leaders, who were driving this effort to help arts and culture groups, saw that a research job of that size needed a special organization to carry it out, one that could devote its full attention to what promised to be a long task. CPAC’s 1997 creation was for the purpose of carrying out that inquiry, which was to be CPAC’s first and most essential task. But before any research could be done, the foundation leaders had to pick a person to lead the organization.

“We wanted to find someone who had experience in building partnerships, in working with the public sector,” someone “skilled politically, comfortable with data,” said Steven Minter, who was president and executive director of the Cleveland Foundation at that time.

Hiring Tom Schorgl, he added, “was a no-brainer for us.”

Choosing the Right Point Person

Schorgl had come to the attention of Kathleen Cerveny and Deena Epstein, the arts-program officers for the Cleveland and Gund foundations,
respectively, in their travels around Ohio for arts-related meetings and conferences. As then-president of Culture Works, a Dayton organization he had helped build from the merger of a united-arts-funding organization and a local arts council, Schorgl had been a speaker at an event Cerveny and Epstein both attended. Though they didn’t know him, Cerveny recalled, “We looked at each other said, ...this is the kind of person we need.”

David Bergholz, executive director of the Gund Foundation at the time, agreed. It was, “I think, his style,” Bergholz said of Schorgl. In the politics of the nonprofit world, you have to work with the public and the for-profit sector, too, he explained—and “set goals, be tough-minded, make all sides happy in the process. I saw [Tom] as this potentially very competent broker.”

After Schorgl was hired in June 1997 to head CPAC, he worked out of the Gund Foundation offices for a short time, giving Epstein a chance to observe his methods and strengths. He projected confidence, she said. He was well spoken. He wasn’t “artsy”—civic leaders couldn’t dismiss him for that, she noted. He had a broad base of knowledge. “He listened. He was solid. And he presented sort of a neutral face. I call him a Switzerland,” Epstein explained with humor. “He could mediate and people trusted him,” because, she added, he always lived up to his word.

Along with a reliable, an experienced and an effective intermediary, CPAC also got in Schorgl a president and CEO who valued hard data and knew their benefits. The opportunity to gather comprehensive data on an arts-and-culture community, and then custom-craft a plan for that community based on its proven assets and issues, was enormously appealing to him.

In fact, it’s one of the main reasons he was interested in the job. After interviewing with the foundation leaders, Schorgl recalled, he discovered that they didn’t want some widely used, pre-fab, cookie-cutter plan, but rather, something emerging from the uniqueness of the local community. That impressed him, because he knew that it wasn’t just the arts-and-culture sector of Greater Cleveland he needed to engage: It was every sector. He knew that unless a broad and diverse cross section of the community became invested in the future of arts and culture and in helping to create a plan for it, little that the plan recommended was likely to happen.

“I really liked their perspective on how to do this,” he said of the foundation leaders. “I felt as though, based on the interviews that I had, they wanted this to be a very thorough and inclusive process.”

And that was the process they got.

10 Leadership Qualities Needed in an Arts Services Organization

An organization’s leader should be:

1 / POLITICALLY SAVVY: Work with public and for-profit sectors while managing the politics of the nonprofit sector and making all sides happy in the process

2 / TOUGH-MINDED: Set practical goals, and be a very competent broker

3 / TENACIOUS: Learn from the community, through experiences and through failures—persuade people to see the value of arts and culture, and enlist their support

4 / CONFIDENT: Behave in a manner that can’t be dismissed, by civic leaders or others, as being stereotypically “artsy”

5 / EXPERIENCED: Have a broad base of knowledge

6 / AN EFFECTIVE INTERMEDIARY: Listen. Be solid and reliable. Present a neutral face

7 / RELIABLE: Be trustworthy—always live up to your word

8 / DATA-MINDED: Value hard data and know their benefits

9 / RESPECTFUL: Understand the uniqueness and the importance of getting to know the local community

10 / INCLUSIVE: Understand that unless a broad and diverse cross section of the community becomes invested in the future of arts and culture and in helping to create a plan for it, little that a plan recommends is likely to happen
In the politics of the nonprofit world, you have to work with the public and the for-profit sector,... and “set goals, be tough-minded, make all sides happy in the process.”

TRANSFORMATIVE POWER

The result of all this, more than 20 years later, is that Northeast Ohio has changed the way it regards and treats arts and culture. Just as importantly, arts and culture have profoundly changed Northeast Ohio, especially Greater Cleveland.³ As a result of CPAC’s work

- **Tax money has been dedicated for arts and culture**
  These funds provide Cuyahoga County organizations with an annual $12 million in operating and project support. Approximately $3 million in five-figure Creative Workforce Fellowships was awarded to individual artists between 2009 and 2016. Artist entrepreneurship and investment have turned Gordon Square, Tremont, St. Clair-Superior, Detroit-Shoreway, North Collinwood, Ohio City and other hard-luck Cleveland neighborhoods into centers of creative energy where arts and cultural venues draw crowds, the crowds support new businesses, and the business and recreational activity promotes infrastructural improvements such as streetscapes and renovated buildings while discouraging crime.⁴ In turn, financial institutions and real-estate and community developers have worked together to create housing and work space priced and customized for artists. Neighborhood centers, libraries and schools bustle with arts-education activities for all ages. Bridges and sidewalks, plazas and parks, rail stations and bus exteriors pop with commissioned artworks.

- **Facilities have been built or renovated**
  These include the spectacularly expanded Cleveland Museum of Art; the striking new Museum of Contemporary Art–Cleveland; the lovingly and brilliantly restored Severance Hall, home of the Cleveland Orchestra; the completely redone Cleveland School of

³ / Northeast Ohio has changed the way it regards and treats arts and culture.
⁴ / Artist entrepreneurship and investment have turned hard-luck Cleveland neighborhoods into centers of creative energy.
Examples of Cultural Policy

ZONING / Ordinances that allow artists to create home and studio spaces for themselves in abandoned or underused industrial buildings (i.e., a Live/Work Overlay District)

ZONING / Developing arts or historic districts

LAND USE / Vacant land/lot reuse for arts projects/performances

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / Require every public construction project to allot 1 percent of budget for public art

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / Set aside money for arts-related economic-development grants

TAX CREDITS / For renovators of historical buildings, for film companies that shoot their projects in Ohio

TAX RELIEF OR TIERED COMPLIANCE / Scaled admissions tax based on structural capacity

BUDGETING / Shifting funds from graffiti abatement to public art commissions that deter graffiti

EMPLOYMENT SERVICES / Recognize creative fields as legitimate vocations for training and placement

the Arts; the reimagined Allen and Hanna theaters at Playhouse Square; a new home for the community stage company, Near West Theatre, in the Detroit-Shoreway area; and the handsome spaces specially created for artists in the reclaimed Tower Press, Hyacinth Lofts and 78th Street Studio buildings, to name just a few.

• **Governments have become involved**
  The city, county and state have encouraged artists to do even more community-development pioneering by approving ordinances that, for instance, allow artists to create home and studio spaces for themselves in abandoned or underused industrial buildings; require every public construction project to allot 1 percent of budget for public art; set aside money for arts-related economic-development grants; create arts districts; and give tax breaks to renovators of historical buildings, to film companies that shoot their projects in Ohio and to small music venues helping to revitalize their neighborhoods.

• **Creative businesses have merged or collaborated**
  Significant collaborations have sprung up among related creative organizations. Cleveland’s public radio and television stations, WCPN/90.3 FM and WVIZ/PBS, joined forces in 2001, creating the nonprofit public-media organization ideastream and building a state-of-the-art studio facility whose current home is Playhouse Square. Cleveland’s ParkWorks, an environmental and landscape-improvement organization, merged in 2011 with Cleveland Public Art to create LAND studio, a nonprofit organization focused on enhancing public spaces. Cleveland State University’s theater and dance programs now work and share facilities at Playhouse Square with the Cleveland Play House, American’s oldest regional professional theater. This collaboration enables CSU students to learn directly from professional technical and artistic personnel, including those of Cleveland State University’s resident professional dance company, GroundWorks DanceTheater.

• **Innovative cross-sector partnerships have emerged**
  Leaders in the community development, health and safety sectors now see arts-and-culture assets as critically important to neighborhood and organizational growth. For instance,

  o Community development corporations (CDCs) have built strong relationships with their arts-and-culture counterparts. Slavic Village Development, a nonprofit CDC, has been revitalizing a Polish neighborhood in the heart of Cleveland in part by focusing on culture and the arts. The village literally integrates housing and art during its annual *Rooms to Let* event, in which
How did such profound changes come about? What was it that CPAC did and said to persuade Northeast Ohioans to embrace arts and culture, expand their community roles and support their growth? How did it help Northeast Ohio become a more creative place?

dozens of artists create works in vacant lots and in homes slated for demolition. Broadway School of Music and the Arts is a significant anchor for the neighborhood—and partner with Slavic Village Development, offering visual art classes, music lessons, guest artist concerts and year-round student and faculty recitals.

- Healthcare institutions have more aggressively considered arts in the healthcare experience. The MetroHealth System (Cuyahoga County’s hospital system) arts-in-medicine department has expanded expressive arts therapy programming; brought performances and art into facilities new and old; and is working on population health issues, such as the opioid crisis, mental health, HIV/AIDS and infant mortality.

- Safety institutions have connected with arts education organizations. The Cuyahoga County Juvenile Justice Center works with the Center for Arts-Inspired Learning to engage the youth in its detention housing with self-discipline and skill-mastery projects such as percussion drumming, visual arts, journaling and theater games.

CPAC has been instrumental in these efforts as inspirator, advocate, adviser, think tank, policy strategist, data source, convener, collaborator and/or manager.

How did such profound changes come about? What was it that CPAC did and said to persuade Northeast Ohioans to embrace arts and culture, expand their community roles and support their growth? How did it help Northeast Ohio become a more creative place?
IntroductIon

Left: Inter|Urban installation by Ellen Rutt. Photo by Bob Perkoski, courtesy of LAND studio
Top right: Love Lunes Over Buckeye. Photo by Lisa DeJong, courtesy of LAND studio
Bottom right: MetroHealth System’s Arts in Medicine Institute. Photo by Linda Jackson
INTRODUCTION: THE NEED FOR AN ARTS & COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

BACK TO THE BEGINNING

This playbook examines CPAC’s development of the skills that enabled it to help build a strong arts-and-culture sector and its evolution into an arts-and-culture service organization able to put those skills to effective use in creative placemaking. Through CPAC’s process, organizations and communities anywhere can see what worked in Northeast Ohio and what didn’t, in examples they can apply to their own creative placemaking. But more important, they may recognize that they have nothing to fear, and much to gain, from inviting everyone in their communities to join the effort.

We start at CPAC’s beginning, with its extraordinary original mandate to do wide-ranging, in-depth, regional research, and then to apply that wealth of data to a viable arts-and-culture plan for the region.

CREATIVE PLACEMAKING is “an approach to community development and urban planning that integrates arts, culture and community-engaged design strategies” (Kresge Foundation) that involves “partners from public, private, nonprofit and community sectors strategically [shaping] the physical and social character of a neighborhood [or] city...around arts and cultural activities” (Ann Markusen and Anne Gadwa, Creative Placemaking).

In other words, creative placemaking brings together residents, artists, planners and developers, and draws on all stakeholders’ viewpoints and skills to transform decaying neighborhoods and cities into vibrant, thriving and diverse communities. It replaces the myth that the arts are for only the wealthy and educated with the reality that art is for, and has unique power to benefit, everyone.
ACQUIRING SKILLS

Building a Strong Arts & Culture Sector

1997–2007
A researcher examines a human skull from the Hamann-Todd Human Osteological Collection at the Cleveland Museum of Natural History. Photo by CPAC
Researching: Getting the Facts

You can’t plan or act effectively until you have the facts. And the best way to get the facts is by systematically looking for them. The Community Partnership for Arts and Culture was founded on this conviction: it was created expressly to research and devise a regional plan for northeast Ohio’s arts-and-culture sector.

Consulting with everyone

Tom Schorgl, newly minted president of CPAC, dove right in. From his June 1997 hiring through April 1999, he and his initial staff of two worked to collect information for what would become *Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan*. It was a daunting undertaking: Citizens and leaders of seven northeast Ohio counties would need to be consulted, their responses organized, the numbers tallied and graphed, conclusions drawn and, based on those conclusions, a comprehensive regional strategy devised.

First, CPAC assembled an executive steering committee of 22 leaders from a wide range of northeast Ohio sectors, including commissioners from Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina and Portage counties. Next, the organization planned and implemented its research strategy, which consisted of two arms: quantitative and qualitative.

To obtain quantitative data, CPAC engaged three professional consulting firms to help canvass northeast Ohioans about arts-and-culture issues, employment, attendance and finances. On CPAC’s behalf, the firms sent out separate surveys to art makers, presenters and consumers, hearing back from 600 artists of all disciplines, 52 art and cultural organizations,
and 6,000 audience members from 59 arts or cultural events throughout the region. These respondents addressed topics ranging from artists’ needs and obstacles to programming, spending and customer satisfaction.

The CPAC staff gathered qualitative data by holding a total of 42 public discussions with 890 area residents, including 21 community dialogues, 12 subsequent focus sessions and 9 action discussions. (These public forums will be discussed in chapter 2.)

By questioning and listening to so many Northeast Ohioans of different backgrounds and professions, including artists and arts-organization workers, CPAC was able to reveal significant trends in local thinking about arts and culture, as well as hard facts about their value, cost and accessibility. Just as important, by enlisting the public in the effort to study local arts and culture and participate in strategic thinking about them, CPAC encouraged a large and diverse group of citizens to claim an even more direct stake in the future of the arts-and-culture sector.

Similarly, CPAC’s recruiting of elected officials and other civic leaders to the plan-research steering committee meant that key people—people with the power to set policy and allocate money—were directly involved in the process, invested in its success and

### Consulting with Everyone

1 / Assemble a steering committee or task force from a wide range of sectors

2 / Obtain quantitative data about the arts and culture sector: employment, finances, participation/attendance, infrastructure

3 / Survey art makers, presenters and consumers separately, about
   a. Needs of and obstacles faced by artists, arts businesses and nonprofits
   b. Programming
   c. Spending
   d. Customer satisfaction

4 / Hold public discussions with residents
   a. Community dialogues
   b. Focus groups
   c. Action discussions

5 / Reveal trends: pair local thinking with hard facts about value, cost and accessibility

6 / Enlist all segments of the public to study local arts and culture and participate in strategic thinking about them

7 / Recruit elected officials and other civic leaders with the power to set policy and allocate money to be directly involved in the process

### STAFFING

All organizations were asked to provide some information on the numbers of current staff. The following table summarizes the information generated based on the response to these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE XIII: Number of FTE staff*</th>
<th># full-time staff</th>
<th># part-time FTE</th>
<th>Total staff in FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $250k</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>315.1</td>
<td>560.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250k-$499.9k</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>226.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500k-$999.9k</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>182.2</td>
<td>316.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000k-$2,499.9k</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>197.7</td>
<td>492.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $2.5 million</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>614.8</td>
<td>2,106.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>1,402.7</td>
<td>3,701.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that for purposes of this survey, full-time equivalents (FTE) were defined as 40 hours per week, 50 weeks per year.

Source: Community Partnership for Arts and Culture (2000). Northeast Ohio’s Arts and Culture Plan. Cleveland, Ohio
inclined to champion the plan when it was unveiled. Together, these philosophically committed leaders and citizens became a persuasive influence on public opinion: Though it took time for some of the plan’s central recommendations, such as public-sector arts funding, to be realized, these informed, unofficial advocates helped to increase regional awareness of and conversation about arts and culture, eventually changing general public perception in favor of supporting them with dedicated tax dollars.

“The real magic here was [using] data to make the case,” said Cleveland attorney John Paul Lucci, who had just finished a graduate program in political science at Case Western Reserve University when he joined CPAC in 1998, becoming its vice president of research operations for the next 18 months.

The data were the tools that CPAC and its allies needed to give that conversation weight. When CPAC released its economic-impact findings in June 1999, in advance of the full regional arts-and-culture plan, Greater Clevelanders were as startled by the scientifically derived figures about arts-related spending and employment as if Kleig lights had suddenly flashed on in a dark theater. Few of them could have guessed that regional arts and culture annually stimulated more than $1.3 billion in economic activity. Or that the regional nonprofit

---

**SUMMARY**

The total economic activity generated by the nonprofit cultural sector in the seven-county Cleveland region is thus almost $1.4 billion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE XII: Total Economic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Ancillary Spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE FROM NORTHEAST OHIO ARE MORE LIKELY TO APPROVE A TAX INCREASE TO SUPPORT THE ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Increases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
arts-and-culture sector employed about 3,700 full-time-equivalent workers. Or that Northeast Ohio’s nearly 50,000 arts-and-culture volunteers donated more than $40 million worth of services every year.

Across Northeast Ohio, many people read “$1.3 billion” and suddenly realized that arts and culture mattered to their communities, not just in a feel-good way, but in actual jobs and dollars.

“I think that the work of...CPAC was critical in connecting the dots for all of us,” said Peter Lawson Jones, a Cleveland attorney, actor and playwright, and a former Cuyahoga County commissioner. “Once [they] shared that data—the economic impact of millions and millions of dollars—that’s what made me say there might be an opportunity” for the county to work with arts and culture organizations on community economic growth.

THE CORE OF SUCCESS: BUILD TRUST

And any such opportunity would require building relationships and, ultimately, trust, between the new organization and Northeast Ohioans. Or, as Schorgl succinctly stated it, CPAC’s work “absolutely depends on trust.”

A good example is when he approached Greater Cleveland arts and culture organizations about sharing their subscriber lists with CPAC. The marketing research firms hired by CPAC required those lists to survey the organizations’ consumers for habits, likes, dislikes and other useful marketing information. But, Schorgl said, he detected some suspicion about the information request, especially among the larger companies. Not only did they regard each other as competitors for these jealously guarded subscribers whose names and addresses CPAC was requesting, but they were also concerned about the foundations’ intentions in creating CPAC, and whether or not whatever was being planned would threaten their autonomy, even their existence.

After the foundations reassured the arts groups that CPAC would erase the subscriber data when the research was complete, they cooperated. They were pleasantly startled to see that the resulting research did exactly what they had been told it would do: It showed them audience demographics and preferences they could use to refine their marketing strategies; it revealed where their subscribers were located, geographically; and, most helpfully, it identified by zip code areas where new subscribers could be cultivated. Moreover, the major organizations discovered that their subscriber bases overlapped with those of other organizations, large and small. This was a revelation: The organizations could see that they didn’t own their audience members, they shared them.
The data had proved to them that CPAC’s research, and CPAC itself, could be trusted. “They were kind of surprised,” Schorgl noted. “That particular research was a turning point.”

It set the tone for CPAC’s relationships across the local arts-and-culture spectrum, establishing that CPAC was a service organization created to serve the arts organizations first and foremost, he added. Significantly, that research also marked the first time that organizations on that spectrum put aside their wariness to work together and were rewarded with benefits all could share.

But the reliability and depth of the data generated by the research firms—the carefully constructed surveys; the scientific methodologies; the experienced interpretation of figures; the crisp design and presentation of reports—reassured not only the arts organizations that CPAC knew what it was doing: It also proved to officials, the public and the press that CPAC’s results were accurate, and that they and it could be trusted.

The data and the trust they inspired led Northeast Ohio cities and counties to pass laws, create grants and boost tourism. They helped organizations craft more effective programs, learn to collaborate with each other and better market their work. Ultimately, the data convinced the voters of Cuyahoga County to pass one of the largest arts-funding taxes in the nation.

---

Credibility Is Key

Present information professionally: It should be cleanly formatted and proofread, and background information on methodology should be provided. If data aren’t developed with proven research methods, they can be easily discredited and dismissed.
In several ways, then, the rigorous information-gathering that went into crafting *Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan* set a precedent and a standard for the Northeast Ohio arts-and-culture community and for CPAC itself. It made clear that hiring professional research firms was worth the expense, even after CPAC secured its 501(c)(3) nonprofit status and began raising its own operating funds. It showed that the value of arts and culture was measurable in certain ways—ways that counted with public officials, businesspeople, practical-minded citizens and the media. It proved to artists and cultural organizations that reliable data could positively affect public perception and opinion about their sector. It also gave them important insights into their own industry and operations. And it began shaping CPAC’s reputation as an organization dedicated to its mission of championing arts and culture for the good of the whole community through principled, enterprising, thorough and trustworthy operations.

Research for the plan also marked the beginning of what would become a core component of CPAC’s mission: Conducting research on an ever-widening array of useful arts-and-culture-related topics, from surveys of arts-and-culture consumers in the Greater Cleveland and Greater Akron areas, respectively, to an occupational analysis of arts-and-culture organizations to the economic impact of individual artistic disciplines such as music and visual art to the role of arts and culture in health and medicine. Everything CPAC did from then on would be based on rigorous factual examination. As a result, the organization’s research skills have deepened.

**Everything CPAC did from then on would be based on rigorous factual examination.**

**GOOD HABITS, BEST PRACTICES**

Megan Van Voorhis always starts with an environmental scan. As one of CPAC’s early research directors, its longtime chief operating officer and now its president and CEO, Van Voorhis has found that investigating what other people already know about an issue—and how they learned it—better educates her and CPAC on what she calls “the big landscape.” It also allows the organization to ask better questions of the region’s residents. And finding out what Northeast Ohioans think is perhaps CPAC’s greatest ability.
“The skill is about *listening,*” Van Voorhis explained. “Our answer, when we’re trying to solve a problem, is to bring people together and listen to them.”

Getting that input has made a difference in every piece of research—formal or informal, no matter how extensive or on what topic—that CPAC has undertaken. When Schorgl began the organization in 1997, he personally interviewed most of the people CPAC was seeking information from, meeting with hundreds of leaders and citizens to acquaint them with CPAC and its mission, to learn about Greater Clevelanders and to find out what was on their minds.

“He made a point of visiting every suburb, every neighborhood in the Cleveland—almost the whole county,” recalled Cerveny, the Cleveland Foundation’s former arts officer. Schorgl reached out to people, she continued. He got them to come together, asked them what concerns they had about their neighborhoods and talked with them about how the arts could address those problems.

Then he got back to those people to acknowledge that CPAC had truly heard what they had to say. This additional personal contact with community members demonstrated that their opinions mattered. “And I think that’s another part of the magic sauce,” Cerveny said.

Epstein, formerly of the Gund Foundation, thinks so, too: all those meetings “were critical,” she stressed. “You got a buy-in from people,” a buy-in reinforced when the completed research showed the impact of arts and culture on so many different community sectors. “So now,” she added, “all those people are friends of the arts.”
Andy Curlowe, Razed Dream House, acrylic, pencil and collage on canvas, 60” x 60”, 2012
Planning: Drafting an Arts & Culture Blueprint

In a way, doing research has been an end in itself for CPAC: the results of its research for the arts-and-culture plan convinced a lot of people who had probably never thought much about it that arts and culture matter deeply to the success of their communities. That revolutionized Northeast Ohio’s thinking.

But dramatically raising awareness is only half the job that properly designed research can do. The other half can help communities materially by inspiring fact-based plans for needed changes in the look and function of a place, in how its citizens learn and work and take care of each other. In other words, data-based planning leads to concrete changes in neighborhoods and towns that positively affect quality of life, making existence more enjoyable for residents and persuading people from elsewhere to visit or move there.¹⁰

As noted in the introduction, Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan, which was launched in January 2000, has transformed the region.

How did CPAC craft a plan that was capable of effecting such productive change? By doing what it excelled at: talking with everyone and building trust.

And Tom Schorgl understood that this had to begin with the organization itself.

Selecting the Steering Committee

He knew that achieving CPAC’s two central goals—creating a regional cultural plan and securing public-sector funding for the arts—depended on his inviting the Northeast Ohio community into the process so CPAC
could learn from it, persuade it to see the value of arts and culture, and enlist its support.

CPAC’s steering committee thus had to represent both the community’s key sectors and its broad diversity. Leaders of all demographics, and from business, government, education, law, organized labor, religion and other fields, soon joined artists and arts-organization administrators on the committee, giving it what Schorgl thought would be a “different, but authentic point of view.” The committee members’ dissimilarities had other strategic significance for CPAC: Most importantly, it meant that the members could connect CPAC to a wide range of people throughout the region. They could also communicate CPAC’s case for arts and culture directly to the people in their own professional and personal spheres.

RESEARCHING THE PLAN DESIGN—ENGAGING THE PUBLIC
The overarching goals of the plan itself were to stabilize and sustain the arts-and-culture sector and connect it with other sectors, while increasing the region’s access to, and economic strength through, arts and culture.

Researching and writing any in-depth plan, whether it’s a comprehensive, regional arts-and-culture blueprint or a road map for a single project, is a lengthy operation. During the two-year–long course of gathering data for and composing Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan, CPAC periodically informed the community and key individuals about interim findings through several means, including:

1. Using press releases and meetings to keep the public, the news media and other important stakeholders updated about important discoveries during the plan-researching and -building process
2. Sending the completed plan to key stakeholders first
3. Providing written summaries of all 21 community dialogues to participants and posting the summaries on CPAC’s site
The primary objective of the plan-design process was to create a plan based on abundant input from, and fully reflecting the needs and concerns of, Northeast Ohio’s communities—in other words, to fashion a plan “with the region’s people, not for them” (Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan).

The CPAC staff and steering committee adhered to this tenet by “exerting the effort to engage as many people as possible,” explained Schorgl. “We made sure our planning process wasn’t going to be cloistered…but as organic as possible within the community. You need to be transparent, but you also need to develop a relationship with constituents and the community in which they live, so they know the process and the product aren’t rigged. It had to include the public at every level.”

And it did.

The steering committee carefully crafted a series of 42 public forums with the overt intention of gaining wide-ranging, diversified public participation. The events were grouped into three sequential types, with gradually narrowing focus: 21 community dialogues fed into 12 focus sessions that led to 9 action discussions. All three types were open to the public, and they included residents of, and were deliberately located across, the seven-county region the arts-and-culture plan would affect. They...
involved a broad swath of Northeast Ohio’s population, including the Native American Indian, Latino, Asian American and African American communities, as well as denizens of areas from Lake County in the east to Lorain County in the west, and from Cuyahoga County in the north to Summit and Medina counties in the south.

CPAC got the word out to people in the region about the community dialogues through direct mailings, announcements in and coverage by local newspapers and radio stations, bilingual marketing and presentations to numerous civic and arts-and-culture groups. In response, a total of 700 people from all over Northeast Ohio showed up to the 21 dialogues, including homemakers, healthcare professionals, students, dancers, truck drivers, architects, senior citizens, painters, merchants, community activists, attorneys, postal workers, clergy, social workers, teachers, engineers, neighborhood developers, college professors, musicians—and more.

The 60- to 90-minute meetings combined presentational and conversational formats, and were designed to stay on track, but also to allow for open-ended discussion. Schorgl opened each event by giving a brief presentation about CPAC and about the purpose and rules of the gathering. Then, “we started with a framework of questions,” he explained. Participants were asked six questions, grouped into three categories, which had been composed by the steering committee to elicit key information from Northeast Ohioans about what arts and culture meant to them and their communities:

1. **Arts and culture**
   - Why are arts and culture important to you?
   - If arts and culture aren’t currently important to you, how could they become important to you and the community in the future?

2. **Community**
   - What community issues are of most concern to you?
   - How do you see artists, arts organizations and cultural organizations helping to address these concerns?

3. **A cultural plan**
   - What three goals would you like to see evolve from this process?
   - What are the strengths this community has to offer in developing a regional arts-and-culture plan?

At that point, the occasion opened up into a brainstorming dialogue during which Schorgl “facilitated conversation—and listened very
carefully” to the information being shared. The input from community dialogue participants was striking and expansive; the region’s residents were concerned about everything from educational access to the quality of community life, from activism in the arts to the arts’ role in reflecting our civilization, and from funding to discrimination to audience development. The CPAC staff and steering committee were “surprised by the level at which people engaged in the conversation,” Schorgl said. “There was robust discussion...around the value of the arts, economic impact, community.... People were really ready to talk about these issues.”

This wealth of data was taken back to the steering committee and its community dialogue subcommittee, which culled from it five preliminary goal divisions: education, resources, communication and awareness, capacity building, and community development.

The 12 focus sessions followed. They began, as did the community dialogues, with a brief introductory presentation by Schorgl, followed by a question-and-answer segment. Then, Schorgl stated each of the goals, and the ensuing discussion of a given goal defined specific objectives for meeting it.

Like the product of the community dialogues, the ideas and suggestions provided by the focus session participants were thoughtful and eclectic, but on point. They ran the gamut, from identifying sources of support for artists and arts organizations to researching and promoting the arts-and-culture sector’s impact on the regional economy, and from educating local news media about the area’s arts-and-culture offerings to using arts-and-culture events as a means of bridging Northeast Ohio’s various communities.

Last, the nine action discussions were the most narrowly focused of the three forum types, with the purpose of determining strategies for achieving the objectives defined during the focus sessions.

Taken together, the public forums were a concentrated, intentional effort to obtain as much, and as varied, community input as possible to build the arts-and-culture plan. What makes the process at least unusual, and possibly unique, is “that we kept coming back to the community,” Schorgl emphasized. “At each step in the [design] process, we went to the community and said, ‘Here’s how we’re defining “goal” (or “objective” or “strategy”),’ and actually having input at every level. But that was critical if it was going to be a community cultural plan, versus us getting [initial] input, then going into a cave for two years” and then foisting a finished plan on the public.
This qualitative arm of the research process “was intense,” Schorgl remembered, “and it didn’t happen overnight.” (It spanned 14 months.) “But the value…was that it provided a deep and broad understanding of what needed to be done—of what was working in arts and culture and what needed improvement.”

And that hard-earned understanding, combined with the profusion of quantitative data being amassed by the research firms, helped CPAC create a step-by-step plan to realistically address the many issues faced by the region’s arts-and-culture sector and its communities.

DRAFTING THE BLUEPRINT—MINDING THE GAPS

From its inception, with the mandate and support of the Cleveland and Gund foundations, CPAC has looked for “gaps,” unfulfilled needs, in the arts-and-culture sector and the larger community. Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan was the blueprint that did, and continues to, address those needs. And it worked (and continues to work) because “[e]xtensive community input and exhaustive quantitative research back up every one of the plan’s goals, objectives and strategies” (Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan, introduction).

For instance, an area of need identified by numerous respondents to CPAC’s research, whether during community dialogues or a telephone survey, was access to the arts and to culture. One tantalizing finding was that “More than 90 percent of people who answered the Public Survey agreed that Northeast Ohio’s arts and cultural resources are a source of great pride. But more than 60 percent said they did not attend arts and cultural programs because they were not aware of them” (Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan, p. 7; source: Public Telephone Survey, AMS Planning & Research, 1998–99). As also noted in the plan, “Access is the bridge that can bring more people to the arts, and deliver the arts to their doorstep” (p. 4).

“Access” (during the working phase, initially the concept of “communication and awareness”), therefore, became one of the four final goals of the
completed plan (along with “learning” [education], “partnership” [community development] and “resources” [capacity building]). By combining quantitative and qualitative research, and guided by the input from the public forums, CPAC’s steering committee gradually shaped what started as a “gap” into a honed solution for filling it:

1. A research-identified gap/need: Improve access to arts and culture
2. A goal to address that need: “Effectively connect the region’s people to arts and culture”
3. An objective to meet the stated goal: “Build comprehensive public information programs”
4. The strategy to achieve the objective: “Develop print and electronic materials that will:
   • “Promote the value and diversity of arts and culture,
   • “Highlight the region’s varied arts and cultural opportunities,
   • “Provide a calendar of events, [and]
   • “Serve employers as recruitment tools.”

This example is just one of the plan’s 4 goals, 12 objectives and 41 strategies. These covered the cultural landscape from expanding access to arts and cultural opportunities to integrating arts and culture into core K-12 curricula; developing collaborations among the cultural, public and private sectors; and strengthening the arts-and-culture sector’s business practices and benefits. The final objective was squarely aligned with CPAC’s original mandate: to continue qualitative and quantitative research on the cultural sector.

WE HAVE A PLAN

It was done: After more than two years of detailed, multifaceted, comprehensive research; hundreds of conversations with individuals and groups; dozens of written reports, website posts and media stories; and a fully public-informed design process, Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan launched in January 2000 (and was formally published in May of that year).

This marked both the accomplishment of CPAC’s first preeminent goal and the organization’s eventual shift to its second one: stabilizing artists and arts-and-culture groups in the region by securing public-sector funding for them.

The route from achieving the first goal to completing the second wasn’t short or without challenges—or disappointments. But CPAC traversed that road by continuing its work to engage the public in an ever-expanding awareness of the value of arts and culture to them, individually; to their neighborhoods and communities; and to the region as a whole.
Arts-and-culture professionals share ideas as they wait for the Arts and Culture Roundtable to begin. BOP STOP at The Music Settlement is Cleveland’s premier listening room. Photo by CPAC
CHAPTER 3

Convening: Bringing People Together

CPAC had successfully commenced the implementation of the arts-and-culture plan for Northeast Ohio. The organization’s process of research and inclusion had two primary and transmutative effects: it shifted area residents’ thinking about the merit of local arts and cultural groups and artists. And it made it clear to Northeast Ohioans both within and outside of the arts-and-culture sector that they would have a direct and continuing role in CPAC’s work.

Key to the success of the plan was the overt, up-front and ongoing work by CPAC’s staff to engage as many of the region’s people as possible, reflected in the methods and content of the quantitative and qualitative research. Inviting the community into the plan process not only made people feel included, it also showed them that CPAC’s work was open to their scrutiny and comment.

Central to CPAC’s engagement effort was the seemingly simple act of convening people to explore similarities and differences, and to mutually discover common ground. Bringing people together, Schorgl said, “for us, is a principle.”

True to that creed, CPAC has been convoking groups of Northeast Ohioans since its inception. Several types of convening followed that done during the researching and drafting of the arts-and-culture blueprint. One was open to the arts-and-culture sector and the public; the others were forums for artists and representatives of the area’s arts and cultural organizations.
POWER TO THE PEOPLE

In March 2002, several Cleveland City Council members, led by Councilmember Joe Cimperman, introduced to the assembly Resolution No. 491-02, which called for the council to hold an “Artists’ Summit and Exhibit” at City Hall. The objective of what came to be called the Arts and Cultural Summit was to create a cultural report for City Council that would “serve as a blueprint for progressive public policy that will realize the potential of the arts and cultural industry for Cleveland and the region (Cleveland City Council Arts and Cultural Summit Report, October 2002, p. 5).”

The resolution passed unanimously, and formally endorsed initiatives that many civic leaders encouraged and that were codified in the new arts-and-culture plan: more arts and cultural festivals in neighborhoods, more arts education in schools, more partnership between the arts-and-culture community and the public and private sectors, more capacity building for arts-and-culture organizations and individual artists, and the establishment of local public-sector support for arts and culture. Most importantly, the resolution acknowledged that Cleveland’s arts-and-culture community was a critical economic force in a region searching for economic health.

For Cleveland, this was arts convening on a nuclear scale.

The summit, held in May 2002, was an unprecedented gathering. Free and open to the public, it attracted 600 artists and arts-and-culture workers, businesspeople, members of organized labor, educators and elected officials, as well as representatives of the news media. The city’s then-mayor, Jane Campbell, attended and spoke, providing a nearly dizzying level of validation for local artists. That level rose when Campbell noted that her priorities for Cleveland were jobs, schools and safety, and that “The arts have a role in all three of those things,” as the Plain Dealer reported.

Participants spent the afternoon session discussing common experiences in, successes and defeats with, and obstacles to strengthening Cleveland’s arts-and-culture industry. Specific topics focused on five areas of overarching concern—areas that, unsurprisingly, reflected the Northeast Ohio’s Arts and Culture Plan’s research and its four goals of access, learning, partnership and resources:
CHAPTER 3: CONVENING

1. **Access**—What can we do to connect more of Cleveland's citizens to arts and culture?
2. **Awareness**—How can we better promote Cleveland's arts and cultural assets?
3. **Resources**—How can public investment expand the cultural sector’s economic benefit to the region?
4. **Education**—How can we best provide life-long arts education to our citizens?
5. **Partnership**—How can arts and cultural organizations and artists best collaborate and form partnerships with businesses, government and other community organizations?

All five topics were discussed during both of two, hour-long breakout sessions, in different breakout rooms. Two CPAC staff members were present in each room: one facilitated the conversation and one transcribed it. Summit participants were free to select which discussion to attend during each session, as well as to leave a dialogue at any time and enter another. The goal was to involve everyone in constructive conversation on a focused topic in a manner that generated effective solutions.

At the end of each session, the facilitators distilled their notes into brief public policy recommendations for each topic. Those strategies became the written report that was presented to City Council and the Mayor’s office in October 2002.

The summit proved so publicly visible and galvanizing for the arts-and-culture sector that it accomplished in a single day what years of individual efforts never had. For arts people, it

- showed them what a large group they were,
- created a sense of solidarity among them,
- brought them in contact with elected officials and experts who could help them,
- allowed them to network easily with each other,
- gave them useful information through a variety of panels and talks, and
- created an electrifying sense of event that raised awareness about arts and culture.

For Cleveland, this was arts convening on a nuclear scale: “The early 2000s at City Hall were really important for artists,” Van Voorhis emphasized.

---

**Convening People**

1. Be clear on the purpose
2. Open meetings up to invite all arts-and-culture professionals
3. Align discussion topics with research findings
4. Break into smaller groups when necessary to encourage dialogue among subgroups (e.g., organizational budget size, discipline, topic area)
5. To avoid bias among participants, make sure staff is facilitating and taking notes in every discussion
6. Let people choose in which discussion they want to participate
7. Distill notes into brief public policy recommendations
8. Make sure the decision makers (e.g., executive directors) are in the room

---
The summit had brought the power of assembly, which had emerged during the design of the arts-and-culture plan, into high relief for CPAC. So the staff continued focusing on another type of convening, one that it had launched a few months prior to the summits: The Cuyahoga County Arts and Cultural Roundtables.

**STRONGER TOGETHER**

The roundtables grew out of a series of 14 cultural dialogue meetings for the region’s arts-and-culture leaders (i.e., artists, executive directors, managing directors, artistic directors and development directors). The meetings had taken place during October and November of 2001, and had included 47 of the sector’s leaders. Several objectives resulted from those dialogues, including building a public relations campaign for Northeast Ohio that clearly communicated the value of the region’s arts and culture, developing cultural tourism and having CPAC become an intermediary to help form collaborative relationships among the various arts-and-culture groups.

Unsurprisingly—and in full alignment with the second of the initial two reasons for CPAC’s existence—the priority goal to come out of the dialogues was to create a campaign establishing local public-sector funding for arts and culture in Greater Cleveland.

Another desire expressed by sector leaders, and one that CPAC rapidly implemented, was to have regular, informal opportunities to interact with each other and find common cause among the area’s arts-and-culture organizations. Thus, the Arts and Cultural Roundtables were born.

Eventually, these latter two goals would coalesce.

But in the meantime, the roundtables—casual, open, 90-minute forums that took place in various arts venues around the city—began in January 2002. The meetings convened on a roughly quarterly basis for several years thereafter, and their purpose was two-fold: First, they were open to all nonprofit arts-and-culture organizations and would provide an opportunity for administrators and staff members to meet on an informal basis to share information. Second, they would be a vehicle for developing specific actions within the sector to address common-cause issues. It was understood that each organization, regardless of size, would endeavor to have its chief executive (president or executive director) present, regardless of whether other staff members attended, because if the groups’ chief executives weren’t actively involved in the meetings, the groups’ decision-makers couldn’t reach consensus on issues and related strategies.¹⁴

The attendees of the lively, productive inaugural roundtable codified the conclusions of the cultural dialogues of the previous fall, determining that the following three issues were critically important to the assembled group:
1. Advocacy—Actively addressing the chronic lack of local public-sector cultural support.

2. Public awareness—Creating a public awareness campaign about the value of arts and culture in relation to improvements it makes to education, the economy and quality of life.


Suggested solutions for addressing these issues were numerous, wide-ranging and specific. They included

- **(advocacy:)** establishing advocacy as a permanent goal of the quarterly roundtable meetings, encouraging board chairs and executive directors to meet with public officials to show agreement and unity regarding public-sector support, and cultivating public- and private-sector leaders and supporters (“champions”) for an arts-and-culture public-policy campaign;

- **(public awareness:)** organizing arts-and-culture groups to develop a media campaign promoting culture in the region, holding public cultural events to generate familiarity with and enthusiasm for the cultural sector, and marketing Northeast Ohio as one of the finest arts-and-culture resources in the U.S.; and

- **(collaboration:)** forming task forces to identify action steps for specific art forms or cultural disciplines, networking with non-arts-related organizations (including community development organizations, neighborhood organizations and social service agencies), and developing a mechanism for sharing vital information (e.g., best practices, funding, databases, programs and services).

By 2003, the most compelling common-cause issue was still the original one: addressing the lack of local public-sector cultural support. And beginning that year, until late 2006—when Issue 18, a tax to generate

“The roundtables were...the primary vehicle for bringing artists and arts leaders together to build an agenda around public funding.”
public-sector funding for arts and culture, appeared on the ballot—the roundtables’ driving force was to generate support for such funding. “The roundtables were really the first wave of common-cause convening” in the arts-and-culture sector, explained Van Voorhis. “They were the primary vehicle for bringing artists and arts leaders together to build an agenda around public funding.”

Schorgl elaborated, noting that between 2003 and 2006, the roundtables “provided training around the advocacy of public policy.” They were also an instrument of organization and information: The events’ status reports, for instance, kept the arts-and-culture sector and the larger community informed about what had been achieved and what still needed to be achieved.

After Issue 18 was passed in November 2006, the electrifying energy behind the roundtables dissipated somewhat. “Without such a compelling cause,” said Van Voorhis, “it was harder to get people together.”

The gatherings continue, however, albeit on an as-needed basis, explained Schorgl. They occur about once a year or, if needed, more often; they continue to be popular; and they still focus on common-cause topics of general interest to the sector, such as community/neighborhood development and arts education. (Two roundtables held in April 2017 focused on training in public-policy advocacy. The second one centered on an existential issue for the sector: The Trump administration’s threats to eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum and Library Services.) Basically, said Schorgl, “If we see a sector-wide need, we put together a roundtable” about it.15

While the CPAC-hosted roundtables continued post-Issue 18, the culture of convening originated by CPAC bore offspring—artists self-convening
in smaller groups around needs specific to that group. Northeast Ohio’s Collective Arts Network (CAN) is a good example of this, said Schorgl: “It was an effort of smaller visual arts organizations and artists who got together to get information out about their work,” galleries and shows. A response to insufficient coverage by area news media, the group established a quarterly publication, the CAN Journal, providing the region with information missing from local papers. CPAC provided some technical assistance, Schorgl explained, “but they did it on their own.”

For CPAC, convening—connecting people and facilitating their communication and problem solving—is a core competency. It’s one that allows the cultural sector and the larger community to work better, together and to more lasting effect. It also enables CPAC to continually learn what the arts-and-culture sector is, does, thinks, wants and needs. If you’re an organization like CPAC, Van Voorhis said, these outcomes “are your investment.”

**FOR EXAMPLE**

**TAXES:** Music clubs successfully advocated for a tiered admissions tax based on venue size

**MEDIA:** Small visual arts organizations developed the CAN Journal to address gaps in media coverage

**EDUCATION:** The Cleveland Arts Education Consortium continues to advocate for arts education in Cleveland public schools
“Love Lunes Over Buckeye” is a literary art project unique to Cleveland’s Buckeye neighborhood. The project pairs neighborhood spoken word poet Damien Ware with the visual art firm Little Jacket and sign-painting artist Alan Giberson to create a series of hand-painted “Lune” poems along the Buckeye Road commercial district. Photo by Lisa DeJong, courtesy of LAND studio
AFFECTING PUBLIC OPINION:

Involving & Informing Everyone

Note: This chapter and the following one separately examine two undertakings that occurred in tandem, roughly between 2001 and 2006: First, this chapter explores CPAC’s continued active engagement of average citizens and the arts-and-culture, business and government sectors to inform everyone about the need for public policy that supported arts and culture. Then, the next chapter looks at CPAC’s various efforts to get policy measures passed.

THE ARTS AND CULTURAL ROUNDTABLES HAD “CREATED A CULTURE OF CONVENING,” NOTED VAN VOORHIS, AND HAD GALVANIZED ARTS-AND-CULTURE-SECTOR SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC FUNDING FOR THE ARTS. BUT THIS SECTOR INSPIRATION ALONE DIDN’T GET CPAC AND NORTHEAST OHIO TO THE PUBLIC-FUNDING FINISH LINE. THAT REQUIRED CPAC TO FORGE AN EVEN STRONGER RAPPORT WITH THE COMMUNITY THAN IT ALREADY HAD AND TO INVOLVE ITSELF IN A NUMBER OF POLICY ATTEMPTS, SOME OF WHICH WERE MORE SUCCESSFUL THAN OTHERS.

A FOUNDATION OF TRUST

From the first, CPAC wanted the public to better understand arts and culture and realize that they had practical and personal value. Thus, from its earliest days, CPAC has worked to influence public opinion in plain view of the community and the press.

While the surveying and public forums for the arts-and-culture plan took place, CPAC’s team simultaneously crunched data and released it to the public, fueling Northeast Ohioans’ interest in, and knowledge about, their
arts-and-culture community with the very facts and ideas that the citizens themselves had supplied to the researchers.

CPAC’s openness in sharing the research helped convey to the public the multiple values of a strong arts-and-culture sector. Even during the organization’s initial years, that message made sense to the populace, because the way CPAC talked about it resonated with them. Influencing public opinion begins with “knowing what people care about, where people are at, what they understand and what they don’t,” noted Van Voorhis—and knowing how arts and culture fit into that.

For instance, when early CPAC surveys revealed that Clevelanders tended to feel inferior and pessimistic about their city, Schorgl realized that talking to residents about the renowned Cleveland Orchestra, Cleveland Museum of Art, and Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum could lift their civic pride. It might also help them see, he said, that, “‘Well, the river might be on fire, but we have some national and international champions when it come to the arts.’”

Definitive data—scientifically gathered and proven to be reliable—were another means of crafting messaging that made sense to Greater Cleveland. The numbers unearthed by CPAC’s research were essential to the 2004 and 2006 arts-and-culture–levy campaigns (Issues 31 and 18, respectively), which were spearheaded by CPAC. Political strategist Jeff Rusnak helped CPAC and a levy coalition muster the information that research had indicated would be the best-selling points about public-sector arts-and-culture funding: that it would preserve and create jobs, attract visitors to the county, and strengthen the economy. Economic value became the focus of ads and yard signs; the impact of arts and culture on education and local quality of life also served as useful ad content and talking points. The appeal of these public benefits—based on years of groundwork and community discussion about the value of arts and culture that had been sparked by CPAC’s research and outreach—helped the first tax come close to passing and persuaded a majority to vote yes on Issue 18.

CPAC found that clear, hard evidence worked best in persuading listeners to consider the points being made. “If you’re communicating the values that are produced by an asset,” Schorgl said, “all of a sudden, people realize, ‘Hey—this is an asset!’”

---

**Persuading People Takes Patience and Persistence**

- Ask decision makers what they need or what they’re held accountable for to get a sense of where arts and culture aligns with those needs
- Measure everything: Information must be reliable, scientifically gathered and if possible, vetted and endorsed by a neutral third party
- Know which messages resonate
- Talk to everyone, and share those messages consistently
- Follow through on promised materials and actions
- Clear, hard evidence works best
- Remind people of both the practical and personal values of arts and culture
WINDOWS ON THE PROCESS

This facts-first approach, combined with relationship building, reassured Northeast Ohio residents—including the press. When Schorgl began leading CPAC, he systematically introduced himself to members of the news media, shared research with them, directed them to other sources of information, met with editorial boards and reporters when CPAC had major news to impart, and routinely stayed in touch with beat reporters about incremental developments in CPAC’s projects. And reporters always found themselves welcomed into CPAC meetings and events.16

“It’s important to know who’s covering your particular industry,” to read their writing and learn their perspectives, Schorgl said. The best way to inform the press, he added, is, “you always give them the facts, but you don’t try to go beyond what they’re asking you” because that can be confusing. That doesn’t mean you withhold important details or try to pretty up the points you’re making, he continued: The job of the media is not to help you, but to inform the public, and the point of media relations is to help people understand your organization and work.

// /

MEDIA RELATIONS

The media’s job is not to help you, but to inform the public. Media relations help journalists understand your organization and share accurate information about it.

• Invite and welcome members of the press to public conversations and for interviews about research
• Know who is covering your industry
• Learn their perspectives
• Give facts, but don’t try to go beyond what they’re asking
• Provide accurate information in forms best suited to the particular medium (e.g., something they can copy and paste, sound bites, images, video clips)
• Meet with editorial boards about taking a position
• Connect with reporters. Journalists and bloggers are not one in the same, and each has a different level of influence and credibility
“It’s news, and sometimes news is about things that aren’t pleasant. Be straightforward,” he advised. “The media are not players—they’re the referees. If they make a call that you don’t think is accurate, suck it up and get back in the game.”

For CPAC, that meant continuing to provide accurate information in forms best suited to the particular medium. For instance, print media can make use of more substantive quotes and details, while radio and TV reporters are frequently looking for sound bites. But for every outlet, CPAC team members tried to pack information into their comments. And even though the news industry has changed considerably over the last decade, making the process of broadly disseminating information more difficult, CPAC still meets with editorial boards and connects with reporters.

The organization’s constructive relationships with the media have crucially affected its ability to influence public opinion by helping journalists create stories that give the public insight into the organization, what it was doing and why it was doing it. During the 2004 and 2006 tax-levy campaigns, for instance, Rusnak was initially worried about providing the press with so much access to the arts community’s campaign deliberations. But, he said, he realized that CPAC’s open approach was helping the media to understand the context of campaign strategies and decisions, and to write stories that better informed the public.

SPREADING THE WORD

CPAC’s staff and board also use their many other community contacts to publicize information, sharing research with funders and professional associations; networking with colleagues, collaborators and program participants; and meeting regularly with businesspeople and elected officials. Taking part in panels, colloquia and other events in Northeast Ohio and around the nation additionally helps CPAC bolster its reputation and promote its work, too. CPAC communicates online through e-blasts and its cultureforward.org website, which hosts the organization’s research and artist-resource databases, as well as arts-and-culture–related news, blogs and videos.

All these tactics involve “a lot of reminding and continuing to circle back and push the message,” said Van Voorhis.

But they were and continue to be worth the effort: “I think we have a great deal of trust now,” added Van Voorhis. “We said what we were going to do and we did it. People have seen how the research impacts them. On the public-policy front, I think people absolutely trust CPAC.”
Cimperman agreed. “Tom changed the [game]” by always being sincere and logical, he explained. “What CPAC was talking about intuitively made sense. They weren’t trying to sell me on something alien.”

This sentiment was widely held, and it was crucial to CPAC’s efforts to eventually pass public-sector funding for arts and culture.

**FRIENDLY PERSUASION**

But perhaps one of the best ways to understand CPAC’s profound effect on Cuyahoga County’s attitude toward arts and culture is to look at how it aided a couple of smaller policy wins before it led the drive to resolve Cuyahoga County’s public-sector-funding issues. The former include a live-work ordinance and percent-for-art legislation, while the latter are Issues 31 and 18 (all of which will be discussed in the following chapter).

Except for the arts-and-culture–funding issues, for which CPAC took the lead, every law that the organization has helped bring into being was instigated by someone who came to CPAC looking for information or advice. In other words, CPAC became a valued resource for other people’s legislative efforts. This earned them trust and buy-in before they initiated the drive for voter-approved arts-and-culture funding.17

For instance, Cimperman had approached CPAC in 2001 in hopes of finding some research about live-work policies. At his request, said Van Voorhis, the organization examined the subject. The data they found proved useful to Cimperman. But perhaps just as important was the way CPAC helped him think. A newcomer to the idea that arts and culture could make education, neighborhood development, healthcare and other key community benefits more effective, the council member began to see those issues “more critically, more strategically” once he began engaging with CPAC, he said. A close working relationship developed between them.

Because CPAC has always offered sincere interest and free research and counsel, the arts-and-culture sector has come to rely on the team for effective help, said LAND studio CEO Gregory Peckham, who also serves on CPAC’s board. In the early 2000s, Peckham’s own organization came to CPAC for ideas on how to get city percent-for-art legislation passed. His group had been working on the effort for some time, and CPAC helped them develop a better strategy and navigate the political process, getting the city government to work with them, Peckham recounted.

Connections such as these may be CPAC’s most potent resource in the organization’s work to strengthen arts and culture for the community’s
benefit, suggested CPAC board member Julian Rogers, who became familiar with the organization as the field director for the 2006 Issue 18 campaign and later worked briefly as a part-time CPAC staffer.

“I don’t see how Issue 18 could have passed without CPAC,” Rogers said. Their greatest skill and tool is “a legitimate, real relationship with the arts community that was kind of the glue to the whole thing.” Rogers added that the organization also recognizes the necessity of building the same kinds of genuine relationships with elected officials. (This practice continues through CPAC’s Public Officials Breakfasts. These gatherings offer members of the arts-and-culture sector and local elected leaders the chance to talk with each other and build connections based on mutual understanding and the discovery of common ground.)

In fact, CPAC has made such a point of staying closely connected with its arts-and-culture constituents through office meetings, visits to studios and performance venues, informational gatherings, and political-organizing events, said Cimperman, that “for a long time, I didn’t know where their offices were. I always met them out in the community.”

CPAC’s relationships have encouraged political unity in the sector, as well. But even though that unity may weaken a bit from time to time, Peckham said, organizations look to CPAC to interpret what’s happening...
CPAC learned from its setbacks, kept drawing attention to the value of arts and culture, and eventually changed the public’s mindset, Lawson said. “That’s good policy making.”

in the community, and it does a great job of making the complex clear and actionable.

All of this takes time, of course. As we’ll see, it took CPAC three tries over six years, from 2001 until 2006, to fulfill the goal of getting public arts-and-culture funding instituted in Cuyahoga County.

“You don’t pick up your marbles and go home,” said former Ohio Arts Council director Wayne Lawson about the multiple attempts to pass a funding levy. “You have patience. You have positive patience.”

CPAC learned from its setbacks, kept drawing attention to the value of arts and culture, and eventually changed the public’s mindset, Lawson said. “That’s good policy making.”
Lifetime arts advocate Barbara S. Robinson delivers a speech at MOCA Cleveland as the audience awaits election results in November 2015. The ballot issue to renew a tax on cigarettes in Cuyahoga County to fund arts and culture passed by an incredible 75.2-point margin. Photo by Mike Thomas
Advocating: Advancing Public Policy

Note: The previous chapter discussed the public opinion aspect of CPAC’s work to pass public-sector policy measures; this chapter looks at the group’s efforts to enact actual policy.

THE CPAC TEAM AND ITS ALLIES HAD PERSUADED NORTHEAST OHIOANS NOT ONLY TO PAY ATTENTION TO ARTS AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ARTISTS, BUT ALSO TO THINK ABOUT THEM DIFFERENTLY. THAT WAS JUST THE FIRST STEP, HOWEVER. THE ORGANIZATION’S NEXT STEP WAS TO CONVINCE VOTERS TO PROVE THEIR CONVERSION BY PUTTING MONEY DOWN ON A TAX INCREASE TO SUPPORT THE ARTS AND CULTURE.

These voters weren’t inhabitants of a thriving city with a long history of public arts-and-culture support, either. These voters were in economically depressed Greater Cleveland, one of the relatively few remaining American metropolitan areas with essentially no dedicated public arts-and-culture funding. Cue the Mission: Impossible theme song.

And yet, CPAC did it. It took time—more time than CPAC had expected—and a great deal of effort, in part because at the organization’s outset, local perceptions about who was responsible for the financial health of arts-and-culture groups were ingrained—and not in the arts’ favor.

MISSION POSSIBLE

In 1997, arts-and-culture policy was such a new concept for Greater Cleveland that even local politicians had rarely thought about it. As in so many other American cities, cultural organizations had emerged there because civic-minded wealthy people or poor-but-intrepid artistic people had galvanized influential members of the private sector into giving their money and volunteering their leadership. Across Northeast
Ohio, serious arts-and-culture support had come to be viewed as the obligation of foundations, elite patrons and subscribers, not of governments or ordinary citizens.

Joe Cimperman, then a Cleveland City Council member, said he hadn’t considered the impact of arts-and-culture policy on development, education, health and other issues until the turn of the 21st century. Playwright, actor and attorney Peter Lawson Jones, also a former county commissioner, said he had certainly been aware of the intrinsic value of the arts, but not their effects on the local economy.

Once CPAC was launched, however, with public-sector funding as its second preeminent goal, that began to change, quickly and dramatically.

Tom Schorgl had begun building the framework for public funding as soon as he came on board by reaching out to all sectors, demographic

"The Racial Dot Map" is a visualization of the geographic distribution, population density and racial diversity of the American people as they were counted during the 2010 Census. This portion of the map shows Cuyahoga County and environs. Image Copyright, 2013, Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (Dustin A. Cable, creator)

Not only was the team ultimately successful in their endeavors to secure public funding for the arts, that success further improved public understanding of arts-and-culture benefits. You can see this in the improvement of voter support from the initial ballot issue to secure public funding and the ballot issue to renew it, regardless of the racial demographic of those communities.
groups and geographic areas of the region, talking and listening to people, and overseeing data collection on the local impact of arts and culture for use in Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan.

This outreach had included meeting with elected officials, such as Cimperman and Jones, at all levels of government. By talking with them, learning what they needed to help the public, and figuring out how arts and culture might assist in those efforts, CPAC aimed to serve as a good partner for the region’s public leaders. Its objective was to help them achieve community goals by demonstrating the benefits of a strong arts-and-culture sector.

“Your first instinct is, ’I gotta get to know these guys. And I’ve gotta get to know them on their terms, not mine,’” Schorgl recalled. “We knew it was important for us to be a go-to information source for city and county government.”

And they were. By connecting with so many people and conveying so much intelligence, Schorgl and the CPAC staff became the most visible sources of information on the subject, and they naturally began to take on the roles of advocates, community organizers and authoritative spokespeople for the regional arts-and-culture sector. And community leaders and public officials began to pay closer attention, especially to the arts-and-economic-development data.

All of which was critical to CPAC’s efforts, between 2001 and 2006, to obtain public-sector funding for arts and culture in Greater Cleveland.

**STARTING SMALL**

In the first few years after the cultural plan was released, CPAC, the arts-and-culture community and some local politicians worked toward and began to score some policy victories. As previously mentioned, in 2001, Cimperman sought help from CPAC on research about live-work ordinances, which allow artists to turn disused industrial buildings into safe home and studio space, and won City Council approval of such a measure. In 2003, fellow council member Matt Zone led an effort that established a percent-for-art ordinance, requiring Cleveland public-building projects to allot 1.5 percent of their construction budgets for public artwork in, on and around the structures. Also in that year, with counseling from CPAC, Lake County, Cuyahoga County’s neighbor to the east, raised its existing hotel-bed tax to help fund arts-and-culture activities there.

And, influenced by CPAC economic data, the Cuyahoga County government began shaping what would be launched in 2004 as the Arts and Culture as Economic Development (ACE) grants. ACE was what...
Jones called a “precursor” to a ballot issue: A small program funded through the county’s economic-development department to assist cultural projects likely to create jobs or financial impact. Jones called it a “natural outgrowth of that [CPAC-inspired] thinking and something we could do immediately.”

A kind of demonstration model for local-government arts-and-culture funding, the ACE grants proved successful within the year, generating significant and measurable increases in jobs and new dollars that reinforced CPAC’s case for broader public arts support.

**POLITICAL PROS NEEDED**

In the midst of these electoral efforts, however, and despite the passage of Cleveland’s live-work ordinance in 2001, Schorgl had begun to realize that, despite all of CPAC’s contacts, conversations and convenings to that point, greater progress was required. Local artists and cultural organizations still desperately needed a solid public-revenue source, yet a ballot issue creating public-sector funding to support the general operations and artistic work of Cuyahoga County’s arts and cultural sector hadn’t materialized.

In part, this was because everyone involved—the money people, the politicians, the average citizens—had agendas, tangled relationships and histories affecting the calculus of what got done in Cuyahoga County. And Schorgl, who’d moved to Northeast Ohio to head CPAC, hadn’t lived in the area long enough to know all the nuances.

“We had a challenge and we were only seeing part of the challenge,” he said of CPAC’s situation then. “We had lots of questions. We needed advice and counsel” from someone who could tell CPAC who to go to in government, how to make a case and get an issue on the ballot, how to build a campaign. “Once we made that connection,” Schorgl said, “we were much better positioned to make the case” for arts and culture.

So in 2002, Jeff Rusnak, a professional political strategist, began helping CPAC navigate the political landscape. Rusnak assisted with research, including arts-and-culture roundtables, and worked with the staff to build both a case and a coalition of community leaders and activists to back an arts-and-culture funding issue. “You’ve got to have someone who understands politics” on all levels, Rusnak noted. “You’ve got to have a strong team of people.”

As CPAC and Rusnak intensified their efforts to meet with key political figures, rally the arts-and-culture sector and keep the media in the loop, leaders began to respond. Jones worked with CPAC to form the Cuyahoga County Cultural Leadership Task Force, including
people from the arts-and-culture sector, to study how the proceeds of arts-and-culture taxes might be distributed in the forms of different grant programs. The fact that Greater Cleveland, unlike many American cities of comparable size, provided essentially no public dollars to its renowned cultural institutions began to needle local pride; that and the arts’ impressive economic-activity numbers brought major stakeholders, including Cleveland’s mayor and executives from its chamber of commerce, into the discussion. They began to openly consider that the arts-and-culture sector might deserve some portion of a tax levy, and a process began to take shape.

But the effort fell apart almost as suddenly as it had come together. A proposed tax that was supposed to help fund the arts-and-culture sector was mostly centered on paying for a new convention center desired by the business community, with only a very modest percentage of the revenue going to arts and culture. The proposal crumbled before ever getting on the ballot. Many factors were to blame, from polls showing a lack of public support for a convention center to an unexpected political maneuver that would have allowed revenue to go only to capital projects, thus blocking arts organizations from getting their hoped-for general operating support. The complexity of those factors emphasized further for CPAC and its allies how byzantine and incremental the political process was going to be. They felt additional pressure because Cuyahoga County held only two elections per year; losing this first opportunity for an issue meant it might be a year or more before they could try again.

The fact that Greater Cleveland, unlike many American cities of comparable size, provided essentially no public dollars to its renowned cultural institutions began to needle local pride.
The arts-and-culture-funding coalition, CPAC and Rusnak set about preparing carefully in the meantime. Rusnak knew that to craft a ballot issue with any chance of success CPAC and the arts-funding coalition would have to balance competing interests in the general community and the arts-and-culture sector. CPAC reached out to the citizenry once again and conducted focus groups and polls that showed the coalition needed two things: an open, transparent process that invited the community to voice its opinions and be heard, and a fair method of dividing tax revenue among qualifying arts-and-culture groups so that the biggest and most famous ones couldn’t win all of it. The first element would give citizens a personal stake in the issue’s outcome. The second would reassure them that their money was going to support a competitive grant program open to county arts and cultural groups of all sizes and disciplines, as well as artists of all disciplines.

The process was pivotal, Rusnak pointed out, because in any community, openness and transparency make people feel included, reduce their suspicion of change and change makers, and allow them to see the context of the issue—to grasp why it’s important.

Organizers needed to be thorough and creative in preparing and carrying out a campaign, and willing to consider any viable approach, no matter how unexpected or untraditional. You “don’t close the door on anything,” he said.

CPAC was already expert at handling crystal-clear community research, and it had been taking surveys and talking with citizens all along. But coming up with a fair grant-distribution system demanded some thought. The team eventually chose a funding mechanism that would award money in a special ratio of dollars to budget, giving small organizations amounts representing greater percentages of their overall budgets than larger organizations would get. This would offset the fact that larger organizations would still necessarily get bigger grants than smaller groups did.

**A LITTLE HELP FROM YOUR FRIENDS**

At the same time that CPAC was working with Rusnak to build a foundation for a public-sector funding levy, it took what would prove to be a highly strategic step, one with long-lasting consequences for the organization and its mission: It rallied the arts-and-culture community to the cause of a health-and-human-services tax renewal, Issue 15, on the county’s May 2003 ballot. The issue had nothing directly to do with arts and culture, and leaders of the health-and-human-services sector initially viewed the offer of help with suspicion. But the arts-and-culture people asked nothing in return. They distributed yard signs and literature, and spoke to their audiences from performance stages, urging them to vote yes on the issue. When it won by a small percentage, health-sector and
county leaders realized something big: Not only did the arts-and-culture sector truly have the whole community’s welfare at heart, it also had the political force to turn what might have been a defeat into a win. “When that levy passed by a small margin,” said Cerveny, everyone “saw how important the arts coalition’s involvement had been.”

By making common cause with another sector, the arts-and-culture community proved that it could be a political force and won a lot of new friends. The greater respect it commanded after the passage of Issue 15 added momentum to the sector’s continuing work with county leaders on an arts-and-culture tax issue. This momentum was timely, because the next step in the process required a difficult decision: What kind of a tax to levy and what, if anything, to bundle it with? No interest group or industry wanted its products, licenses or sales taxed, and nearly all vehemently resisted county attempts to do so. Only “sin” taxes on harmful products seemed likely to draw enough public support to overcome industry objections, and so, though CPAC and the cultural community would have preferred another tactic, the county commissioners chose an excise-tax increase on cigarettes to generate public-sector funding for arts and culture.22

PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE

But before the “sin”-tax plan could be implemented, a surprise opportunity to get on the ballot appeared: Very early in 2004, the county commissioners unexpectedly decided that they were willing to put a property-tax
increase on the March ballot; the money would be earmarked for general economic development, with the intent of allotting some of it for arts-and-culture support.

But the circumstances were far from ideal—there were three drawbacks for CPAC and the coalition: County voters disliked property-tax increases; the election date gave arts-and-culture activists very little time to carry out an effective campaign; and perhaps worst, arts and culture could not be mentioned in the ballot language. Even in campaigning, the only way the coalition could phrase the intent of the issue was to call it a tax supporting economic development “including arts and culture,” an awkward pitch at best and too long for yard signs.

The arts-and-culture-funding coalition had to decide whether to take what Schorgl called “a leap of faith” and take advantage of this chance at funding. The group’s members knew this would likely be a long shot. Yet, imperfect though the issue was, they decided that trying to establish public-sector funding for arts and culture—even if the revenues were modest—would be better than giving up the chance to get on the ballot for the foreseeable future.

The property-tax levy, called Issue 31, appeared on the March 2004 ballot. It failed. But it did better than anyone had expected, with 46 percent of voters in favor of it, even though support had polled at only 28 percent prior to the vote. This made Issue 31, as the Gund Foundation’s Deena
Epstein put it, a plan that backfired for county government, which, she said, had allowed the issue to go forward to appease the arts-and-culture community, only to find that that community had muscle.

The public-sector-funding effort “really gave artists a political power that was there, but had never been harnessed in that way before,” Cimperman said. In addition, CPAC’s data got the attention of the county’s most influential people and helped persuade voters “because it wasn’t something fuzzy,” he explained: The hard numbers made clear that there’s a cost to the community for supporting arts-and-culture activity, but there’s also “a huge benefit.”

Issue 31 also proved that the arts-and-culture sector could mobilize, Schorgl noted, and it served as a valuable practice run for the 2006 push to the polls. Through the processes of planning and campaigning, CPAC and the coalition had discovered how to cope with existing conditions as well as fluid ones, learning to identify barriers early on and take advantage of opportunities quickly. With the knowledge gained from this instructive defeat, CPAC intended to get the arts-and-culture community ready for the next political opportunity.

**EYES ON THE PRIZE**

Regarded with new seriousness by county leaders and fired up over their good showing at the polls in 2004, coalition members spent the next year carefully and successfully laying the groundwork for a tax issue.
that could do for arts and culture what the sector needed to have done. Because Ohio’s state legislature has an unusual amount of control over what Ohio counties put on their ballots, CPAC—through a political-action committee that did the actual lobbying—first had to persuade state legislators to let Cuyahoga County legally make itself an arts-and-culture taxing district.

Initially, legislation was revised to permit Cuyahoga County to form an independent, countywide regional arts-and-culture district (a political subdivision of government). Then, enabling legislation was amended to allow Cuyahoga County commissioners to place before the voters an excise tax on cigarettes to generate public-sector funding for arts and culture. If the voters adopted the county excise tax, the regional arts-and-culture district could legally receive and distribute the proceeds from it in the form of grants to nonprofit arts-and-culture organizations or projects located in the county.

Once that was accomplished, state law required that a plan be created for a new branch of local government that would receive the tax revenue and disburse it as grants. CPAC worked closely with the county to research and recommend fair, impartial granting processes for this new entity, mapping out thorough application requirements and disinterested peer-review adjudications. They determined funding levels for the general operating support that would aid arts and cultural organizations and for the project support that would help underwrite individual artists and specific cultural endeavors by any type of county-based organization.

With all that in place, and no opposition to speak of from the tobacco lobby, a new levy, Issue 18, was placed on the November 2006 ballot.

After six years of trial, error, learning and strategizing, the arts-and-culture community of Cuyahoga County, and everyone who believed in and supported it, had their well-deserved day: More than 100,000 pairs of voters’ hands helped Issue 18 pass by a 10-percent margin, creating what would be $158 million for arts and culture over the 10-year life of the levy. A decade later, hundreds of thousands more reached back into their pockets: The levy was renewed for another 10 years, approved by an astonishingly high 75.2 percent of voters.

CPAC’s methods and work produced clear results, said former Cuyahoga County Commissioner Jones. “Clevelanders have a much greater appreciation for arts and cultural institutions and events than they did,” he noted. “We’re better off because we have a greater economic impact from the arts community in terms of jobs and money. Many artists and arts-and-culture workers have been able to remain here and grow.”
APPLYING SKILLS

Connecting Sectors, Strengthening Community

2008–2017
Untitled, installation in a foreclosed house, Rooms to Let 2017, by Rachel Yurkovich. Living plants were installed underneath pried-up floorboards and given soil and water. Rooms to Let is an annual arts event in Cleveland’s Slavic Village neighborhood, a district deemed by some national publications as ground zero for the foreclosure crisis. The event transforms vacant houses scheduled for demolition into innovative art installations. Photo courtesy of the artist.
Coping with Change: The Success of Issue 18 Yields to the Foreclosure Crisis

CPAC accomplished its primary goals during its first 10 years: between 1997 and 2007, it drafted and implemented a regional cultural plan and established public-sector funding for arts and culture, as well as many other resources for artists, arts-and-culture organizations and northeast Ohioans generally.

Yet as CPAC’s second decade began, life and the economy immediately presented the organization and Greater Cleveland with new and enormous challenges: The Great Recession that struck the world’s economies in September 2008 was prefigured by devastated Northeast Ohio neighborhoods that left streets in some parts of the region lined with deserted homes and businesses, and killed off many arts and cultural organizations. Deciding how to try to help both the arts-and-culture sector and the metropolitan area in general tested CPAC’s ingenuity and resolve.

BEFORE THE CRASH

Many months prior to the recession, in January 2007, Greater Cleveland had gone from having no broad-spectrum, public-sector, arts-and-culture funding to having one of the nation’s largest sums of public dollars dedicated to that purpose: Issue 18’s cigarette-tax increase. Talk of creativity and entrepreneurship filled local forums, from town-council chambers and university research centers to boardrooms and broadcast studios. Design was suddenly a hot topic in both business and urban renewal, and the arts had become the “A” that turned STEM schools into STEAM schools. Clevelanders were getting excited about growing the
biotech industry, about incubating startups of all kinds with money and facilities, about the crossovers between science and art that had generated local efforts in medical illustration, about computer-game design and about curriculum enrichment that married dance to math and music to social studies. Deserted city warehouses had begun lighting up with artist studios, galleries and event spaces. Northeast Ohio seemed, at last, to be on the rise.

Then, disaster. Exactly 12 months later, foreshadowing the larger crash to come, block after block of Cleveland houses stood abandoned, rotting, as empty as if a plague had struck—10,000 of them foreclosed on and vacant across the city, 1,500 in the arts-revitalized Slavic Village neighborhood alone, as Thomas Ott reported in his cleveland.com story of January 24, 2008, “The Foreclosure Crisis: What It Means for Northeast Ohio.” Families had lost their homes and the real-estate market had crashed under the weight of bad mortgages; the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, one of the foreclosing institutions, was offering 120 Cleveland houses for sale at $1 apiece. The city government was spending $7.5 million on demolitions, using money that could have
Cleveland...had become ground zero for an international financial crisis that would lead to bank failures, battered global economies and the deepest, longest crash since the Great Depression of the 1930s. The city, long haunted by unemployment, low levels of education, poverty and homelessness, saw the pale light of recent hopes for improvement blotted out by a newly dark and frightening reality.

CPAC, like nearly all the rest of America, hadn’t seen this crisis coming. Yet a hint—provided by a local banker—had already started the organization looking at ways to match artists with vacant property in hopes of revitalizing neighborhoods.

FORCES GATHERING
Several years earlier, Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC), a national, 10-year artists-support effort, had selected Cleveland as one of the nine American cities it would support in assessing artists’ needs and developing resources for artists. In 2005, LINC had awarded CPAC a grant to address local artists’ needs for business training and resources,
including low-interest business loans. While working steadily to obtain public-sector funding for arts and culture in Cuyahoga County, CPAC had used the grant to collaborate with Cleveland’s small-business association, the Council of Smaller Enterprises (COSE), to create artist business-training programs and health-insurance options. CPAC was also pursuing the idea of a low-interest loan program for artists, and continued that work after voters had approved the arts-funding tax in November 2006.

CPAC’s leaders wanted to see whether banks and the county government could partner with them on special programs that would give individual artists access to money for space, equipment and other professional necessities. Precedent existed in a linked-deposit program the State of Ohio had set up in the 1940s to help farmers: Counties had deposited money with the banks, the banks had agreed in return to lend the money to farmers, and the counties had used its share of the interest to reduce the loan rates for the farmers.

Toward the end of 2006, CPAC contacted some of Cleveland’s major financial institutions about joining forces in a low-interest loan program. The bankers agreed to a meeting. But after it was over, nothing happened, despite CPAC’s repeated attempts to follow up. Those big banks may have been the wrong partners, Van Voorhis noted in retrospect; perhaps small, local institutions such as credit unions would have been more accommodating. “I was frustrated about it,” she said.

Yet the reason for the big banks’ silence eventually emerged: One of the officials who had met with CPAC revealed that the bankruptcy laws were about to change, and soon it would be hard for lenders to collect what was owed them by bankrupt loan recipients. Consequently, banks didn’t want to take on any more risk.

The banks’ risk aversion may have been the first local tremor of the catastrophe to come. But with the foreclosure tsunami still just a distant
ripple in early 2007, CPAC went looking for another source of capital for artists that would steady them financially even if grant or earned income faltered. The team needed information, a model.

The CPAC staff quickly concluded that homeownership might be the solution their team was searching for.

It was the Gund Foundation’s Deena Epstein who told Schorgl and his team about Paducah, Ky. A small town suffering its own version of economic malaise, Paducah had decided to try to spark a recovery by offering artists around the nation incentives to move there; buy empty, dilapidated houses in its Lowertown neighborhood for very little money; and then fix them up. Paducah’s Artist Relocation Program, an early and prime example of creative placemaking, proved an enormous success, generating restored period homes, arts businesses, street activity, a performing-arts center and national recognition. The CPAC staff quickly concluded that homeownership might be the solution their team was searching for.

First, owning a house was a traditional aspiration and investment for Americans, often the most significant and reliable investment that families could make. Second, owning a home would have material and psychological benefits for artists, including the financial appreciation of the structure over time, a sense of permanence and personal safety, and rootedness in a community they could belong to and draw support from. Third, the community itself was likely to benefit from artist-home-owners as they repaired houses and landscaped them, practiced and taught their creative skills, spurred commerce, and maybe even provided public artworks and performances to their neighborhoods.

“I saw there was intense interest in Paducah on the part of [elected] officials,” Schorgl recalled. That, and knowing that CPAC could likely
find ways to both help local community development corporations (CDCs) and bring them in as partners in creative-placemaking efforts, made the model viable for CPAC. It would appeal to the public and open the door to important new policy work.

HELP FOR A SLOW-GROWTH REGION

As it always did before deciding whether to embark on a project, CPAC began its research. The staff knew they couldn’t assume that artists would want to buy houses at all, let alone in a neighborhood or city new to them, so it made sense to survey them to find out what living arrangements they liked best, and where they liked them. CPAC’s 2007 Survey of Artists Regarding Their Work/Living Space Needs, carried out by the Cypress Research Group of Beachwood, Ohio, found that, of the 471 professional artists questioned, most wanted

- combined or connected live-work space rather than separate spaces for living and working, preferably with high ceilings and lots of natural light.
- to own their own homes/spaces.
- to live in safe neighborhoods.
- to live among or near other artists.

///

DESIRED AMENITIES: MOST ATTRACTIVE AMENITIES FOR WORK SPACE

Artists were asked to identify the most desired amenities for their art work building space. Space to sell work was, by far, the most preferred amenity. We should emphasize, however, that the space alone would not be desirable if the building location were not also attractive, for whatever reason, to potential customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Amenities</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space to Sell Work</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Work Area</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodworking Facility</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking Facility</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Space</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkroom</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/Film Studio</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Room</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space to Rent to Other Individuals</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Studio</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundry</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassblowing Facility</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results prompted even deeper thinking among CPAC’s staff. It had found that most reports about the relationship between artists and community development came from East or West Coast sources, where growth and change tended to be rapid. There was a good chance, staffers thought, that struggling Rust Belt cities such as Cleveland needed different approaches because their growth was slow.

In Northeast Ohio, Van Voorhis said, CPAC had noticed that vacant properties existed, but artists couldn’t get access to them because of financing difficulties. The artists needed advocacy and assistance, two things CPAC could provide.

No one in the field was talking about creative placemaking at that point. Such work was called “artist-based community development,” noted CPAC Director of Research and Advancement Kristin Puch, and it was part of CPAC’s continual search for ways in which the arts-and-culture sector could help the entire Northeast Ohio community improve while helping artists and organizations grow stronger, more connected and more effective. Since the CPAC team had become aware of Paducah’s program, artist homeownership had looked more and more to its members like a good means of serving the organization’s mission.

### Studio Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Light</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for Storage</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ceilings</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Speed Data Lines</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundproofing</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ventilation</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversized Doors</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Electrical Wiring</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Drains</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Disposal</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Load-Bearing Floors</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for Larger Machinery</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Plumbing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair Accessibility</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprung Floors</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No one in the field was talking about creative placemaking at that point. Such work was called “artist-based community development.”

When the foreclosure crisis suddenly hit the region in early 2008, it made CPAC’s work even more urgent.

Fortunately, by then, many aspects of this “artist-based community development” were beginning to come together for CPAC as a result of both well-planned steps and rapid adaptation to changing circumstances. Thanks to its LINC funding, CPAC had already identified low-cost business loans and affordable space as two elements necessary to Greater Cleveland artists’ stability and success. When nationwide financial changes made the business loans unworkable, CPAC—by keeping a close eye on arts-industry developments and on what was happening in general across the community and region—was able to identify a new capacity-building frontier, one that would also build community. And because it had built diverse networks for itself of knowledgeable people in appropriate fields, CPAC was able to enlist experts and key players to help it explore that frontier.

Cuyahoga County Treasurer James Rokakis, for instance, had initially provided Schorgl with advice on the low-interest-loan idea; Rokakis soon founded the county’s first land bank, to manage the area’s increasing numbers of abandoned houses, and continued to provide CPAC and local CDCs with useful information about properties and procedures.

CPAC’s efforts to secure funding had also proved timely. Its second LINC grant in part supported the organization’s Survey of Artists, but was
When nationwide financial changes made the business loans unworkable, CPAC...was able to identify a new capacity-building frontier, one that would also build community.

CPAC thought that sharing its research would help regional practitioners in arts, commerce and community development to understand that collaborating might produce beneficial results.

So to learn what creative placemakers in other Rust Belt cities were trying, and to build a geographic community whose members could take heart.
So to learn what creative placemakers in other Rust Belt cities were trying, and to build a geographic community whose members could take heart and advice from each other, the organization decided to bring these practitioners together with research experts for a conference...
and advice from each other, the organization decided to bring these practitioners together with research experts for a conference in downtown Cleveland. In May 2008, more than 140 creative placemakers from 11 heartland states converged on a Cleveland college campus to share their ideas and experiences, discuss community issues and solutions, and network. From the bonds of common concerns and goals created here, the participants would form a cohort, carrying the transformative work of arts, culture and creativity forward through subsequent conferences and papers.

CPAC named the whole project “From Rust Belt to Artist Belt.”

Vacant properties in Cleveland’s Collinwood neighborhood.

Left: Photo by Megan Coffman
Right: Photo by CPAC
Cleveland’s Gordon Square Arts District streetscape renovation during the From Rust Belt to Artist Belt II conference. Photo by CPAC
CHAPTER 7
Theory Becomes Strategy: The Foreclosure Crisis Leads to From Rust Belt to Artist Belt

IN ITS SEARCH FOR MODELS AND TACTICS WITH WHICH TO ADDRESS GREATER CLEVELAND’S RECESSION- AND FORECLOSURE-RELATED DIFFICULTIES, CPAC WAS INSPIRED TO HOLD TWO FROM RUST BELT TO ARTIST BELT CONFERENCES (WHICH LED TO TWO MORE) AND PRODUCE RESEARCH ON THE TOPIC, INCLUDING CASE STUDIES BEFORE, AND A WHITE PAPER AFTER, THE FIRST CONFERENCE. EVENTUALLY, ALL THE INFORMATION GLEANED ENCOURAGED CPAC TO PLAN ITS NEXT STEP: IMPLEMENTATION OF ITS OWN CREATIVE-PLACEMAKING IDEAS. BUT FIRST, THE TEAM HAD A LOT OF WORK TO DO.

THINKING REGIONALLY

CPAC had been considering the financial and development situation in the Midwest for several years before the first From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conference. In 2004, Schorgl and Van Voorhis took part in multicity research and discussions about artist resources sponsored by LINC and the Urban Institute (a Washington, D.C.-based think tank that conducts economic and social policy research). During this project, they’d realized that, possibly because most existing arts funders and resources were located on the coasts, “flyover country was not getting looked at,” Van Voorhis said. Consequently, CPAC recognized that Midwestern communities were going to have to develop their own solutions and support each other.

In fact, when the team chose to pursue the From Rust Belt to Artist Belt project in 2008, it saw approaching and working with other heartland
cities as an opportunity, one that funders would like because such partnerships would increase the impact of their grants. An alliance of cities would also strengthen the case for arts and creative placemaking by showing widespread similarities in urban issues across the Midwest and art and culture’s positive effect on them. Not only was the idea of “scalability”—broadening the effects of dollars, policy and programs—in the air, but embracing a wider geographic area also felt like a natural next step for CPAC, which had been launched with a focus on Northeast Ohio rather than on Cleveland alone.

With funding from LINC and the Ford and Kresge foundations, two of its primary supporters, CPAC set about creating what Schorgl called “a showcase of information” about arts-based community-development issues and solutions that would allow professionals from other Rust Belt cities to learn from each other and develop working relationships. The idea, Van Voorhis said, was to ask all of them what CPAC had been asking itself: “How can arts and culture help these kinds of cities?”

LIKE MINDS

Before May 2008, CPAC’s concepts about creatively changing a community’s physical infrastructure were literally only on paper, in the form of research and case studies. But the theoretic became tangible when a host of people from states as far flung as Missouri and New York convened at Cleveland State University’s Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs for the first From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conference.

The all-day event was a summit of people in pertinent fields from around the region. They included such experts as Reinvestment Fund CEO Jeremy Nowak; Mark Barone, founder of the Paducah Artist Relocation Program and head of engagement initiatives for the University of Syracuse;
Robert Brown, director of Cleveland’s city-planning commission; Amy Green Deines, board president of the Contemporary Art Institute of Detroit; Ann Markusen, director of the University of Minnesota’s Project on Regional and Industrial Economics; and Americans for the Arts’ community-development manager, Mary Margaret Schoenfeld.

Attendance was high. Local leaders came, too, including CDC staff, who heard the symposium information with more receptive ears than before. The case studies and the presentations “spoke their language,” Schorgl noted. It helped that, by then, CPAC had gained credibility in the community-development sector, first, for its success in getting public-sector arts funding established, and second, because that funding was money the CDCs could apply for in support of their own arts-related community projects.

CPAC followed the conference with a 78-page white paper written by Kristin Puch (then surnamed Tarajack), who, at the time, was the team’s new research fellow. Titled “From Rust Belt to Artist Belt: Challenges and Opportunities in Rust Belt Cities,” it examined how artists, planners and activists had begun improving postindustrial neighborhoods in the middle of America. The paper

- offered both perspective and context on the growing value of creativity to communities and their sectors;
- established verbal and geographic definitions of the Rust Belt;
- provided background on the region’s past and current economic status;
- listed the region’s challenges and assets;
- broke down what artists and Rust Belt cities could offer each other; and
- recommended policy and action.

...it examined how artists, planners and activists had begun improving postindustrial neighborhoods in the middle of America.
The theories and ideas laid out in the paper posited that artists, in the role of urban pioneers, offered postindustrial communities a desirable means of transforming areas full of disused manufacturing and residential buildings, crumbling infrastructure, and brownfields into attractive, productive neighborhoods with the economic and social benefits a healthy community requires.
The theories and ideas laid out in the paper posited that artists, in the role of urban pioneers, offered postindustrial communities a desirable means of transforming areas full of disused manufacturing and residential buildings, crumbling infrastructure, and brownfields into attractive, productive neighborhoods with the economic and social benefits a healthy community requires.

But that was hardly the end of the project. The first From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conference proved such a success that CPAC decided to host another, in the fall of 2009. For From Rust Belt to Artist Belt 2, as it was known, the team planned a two-day event that was less a symposium than a kind of extended practicum of panels, tours and workshop discussions aimed at helping Rust Belt creative placemakers identify and solve the concrete problems they faced. Sessions included such real-world topics as how to recognize and harness the power of a community’s arts-and-culture assets; how to zone cities for artist space and creative activity; and how to assess whether buildings were usable. Participants could get coaching in innovative financing strategies, find out how to control gentrification and, at the end of the conference, receive feedback from experts on the feasibility of their project ideas.

CPAC had started to move out of the reference room and into the laboratory.

**HANDS-ON LEADERSHIP**

From Rust Belt to Artist Belt 2 represented a turning point for CPAC in several ways. The team had succeeded in creating a community of Rust Belt placemakers from disparate arts and development professionals across the upper Midwest. Further, they gave From Rust Belt to Artist Belt, in all of its forms, a life of its own by motivating other participants to host later conferences in their home cities: Detroit organized From Rust Belt to Artist Belt 3 in 2011; St. Louis put on From Rust Belt to Artist Belt 4 in 2012. This proved that CPAC could be a catalyst for creative placemaking on a wider scale and gave the organization a regional cohort in which to learn, share and experiment.
The conferences also led to some Cleveland CDCs embracing creative placemaking more fully. For example, a number of them brought their own literature and research to the events to share with others; CPAC used that information, together with its own Artist as an Entrepreneur Institute business-course listings, as the root stock of Creative Compass, the comprehensive online artist-resource database that CPAC would eventually build with the second half of its LINC grant. Brian Friedman, former executive director of Northeast Shores Development Corporation in Cleveland’s Collinwood neighborhood, saw From Rust Belt to Artist Belt’s points about the potential value of arts and culture to community development so vividly that he volunteered his staff members to CPAC to help with the first conference. “He got it immediately,” said Schorgl.
From Rust Belt to Artist Belt as a whole produced intangible benefits, as well, such as the enthusiasm of Cleveland artists who attended the conferences, artists who were already involved in changing their city for the better and were eager to do more. CPAC saw their zeal as proof that the arts-and-culture community represented success in a city that had felt like a failure since the 1970s. The conferences’ achievements also proved to the team that CPAC had done its job, demonstrating yet another way—on top of economic value—in which the arts-and-culture community contributed to, and reflected well on, Cleveland. As a result, Van Voorhis said, CPAC could from then on be part of a civic conversation in a different way than when the organization first started. Respect for, and interest in, CPAC had risen. “I think what it did was increase attention for CPAC’s work,” she said of the project. “That was, for the staff, very exciting.”

The From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conferences also made clear to CPAC, however, how hard it was going to be to get Rust Belters to commit to the processes needed for effective collaboration and lasting change. Building problem-solving coalitions across borders required a lot of time and effort. The groundwork of researching what would work locally had to be carried out, and then partnerships and programs constructed. Instead, many leaders wanted a quick fix—one for which they could take all the credit.

“They wanted to know what the magic formula was,” Schorgl noted.

Some conference attendees just wanted CPAC to give them information and then leave them alone. CPAC’s board wanted the opposite: They wanted the staff to turn the From Rust Belt to Artist Belt material into revenue-generating licensed material and ongoing programs. Trying to balance the real-time work of community-building with board and funder desires for CPAC to grow its earned income created challenges.

But the biggest lesson of all was realizing that the reason From Rust Belt to Artist Belt worked was not because other cities were receptive to its ideas, Van Voorhis said. It was because national funders were able to influence those cities’ thoughts and actions with strategic money.26 It showed her, she added, that if you don’t have resources going in, you can’t have this kind of outcome.

CPAC did have resources, fortunately, and put them to use providing placemakers with networking opportunities, workable ideas and strategies. The experience prepared the ground for the team’s next big step in creative placemaking: Doing it themselves in a real Cleveland neighborhood.
Waterloo Arts Fest 2017. Photo courtesy of Waterloo Arts
CHAPTER 8

Placemaking in Practice: From Rust Belt to Artist Belt 2 Leads to Artists in Residence

FROM RUST BELT TO ARTIST BELT 1 AND 2 LED CPAC TO CONCLUDE THAT ARTIST HOMEOWNERSHIP COULD BE A SIGNIFICANT MEANS OF REVITALIZING CLEVELAND NEIGHBORHOODS PHYSICALLY, ECONOMICALLY AND CULTURALLY: IT LOOKED LIKE A SOLUTION BOTH FOR ARTISTS, WHO NEEDED SPACE AND STABILITY, AND DECLINING NEIGHBORHOODS, WHICH NEEDED PERMANENT AND CONSTRUCTIVE RESIDENTS.

Now, some creative placemaker needed to set up a demonstration model to test the theory—and with no other Cleveland organization more appropriate or better able to lead such an experiment, CPAC decided to take on the project itself, to step into the lab—the Greater Cleveland community—and see whether it could work.

CPAC already had an outline for this complex undertaking: the eponymous post-From Rust Belt to Artist Belt 1 white paper, the self-stated purpose of which was “to inform local lenders, community developers, real-estate companies, commercial and residential developers, elected and appointed officials and civic leaders about best practices that could integrate artists into a Rust Belt community’s development goals.” CPAC aimed to create circles of inter-reliance: to help Rust Belters help artists to help cities.27

Seth Beattie, who was then CPAC’s community-development specialist and would become the director of the Artists in Residence project, thought this approach could work well in Northeast Ohio and other postindustrial centers. He noted that studying development in light of artists’ space

27 / Creative placemaking requires an inter-reliance between communities that help artists and artists who, in turn, help communities.

Seth Beattie
CPAC Staff (2005–2013)
needs made CPAC realize that cities such as Cleveland were very different from fast-growth urban areas, because, with their slow economic growth and equally slow infrastructural change, development there could be planned to address a wide range of opportunities over the long term. Beattie also saw fewer barriers to creativity: Because cities such as Cleveland had so little to lose, more imagination could be used in the problem solving. As Van Voorhis pointed out, the vacant-property problem in Cleveland had reached such extremes that CDCs clearly could no longer control it. The city needed new and effective tactics and—in the belief that arts and culture could provide them—CPAC wanted to get the process started.

But how to do it?

Learning that, said Van Voorhis, became the next natural thing for CPAC to tackle. As always, the team turned to research and planning to prepare itself, but they knew they still had to make a leap to get from idea to action.

“We did lay out terms of engagement,” Schorgl noted. “All that looks good on paper. But paper and reality are two different things.”

CPAC had created and operated other multifaceted programs, including the Artist as an Entrepreneur Institute business-training course and the Creative Workforce Fellowship grant awards for individual artists. With a community-development demonstration project, however, the level of complexity rose much higher, because it required finding viable ways for real artists to buy real houses in a real—and willing—neighborhood.

“The big idea was the urban laboratory,” a concept of Beattie’s that would let CPAC experiment, remembered Puch. Van Voorhis agreed. She and the others knew the project might not lend itself to replication—
The Artist as an Entrepreneur Institute is a four-part, artist-focused course designed to give artists the business tools they need to complement their artistic talents. The classes, established in 2003, cover all aspects of developing a creative business, from marketing to bookkeeping and accounting, and from identifying and developing a personal brand to understanding the market, raising capital and legally protecting one’s work.

Artist as an Entrepreneur Institute includes a comprehensive resource book with worksheets, presentations, readings and resources. Session formats feature a mix of lectures, panels, group discussions and practical exercises. The program is now presented locally by Summit ArtSpace (formerly Akron Area Arts Alliance) and nationally by the Broward County Cultural Division. There also is an online version, which curates content from various online sources.

CPAC’s Creative Workforce Fellowships were awarded between 2009 and 2016. Made possible through a grant from Cuyahoga Arts & Culture, the grants invested directly in the future of Cuyahoga County artists. The Fellowship was designed to strengthen the voices of 20 outstanding artists each year. CPAC awarded more than 160 Fellowship grants over the course of the program.
for one thing, the LINC program was ending and its specific kind of funding wouldn’t be available anymore. The CPAC team might have to be satisfied with learning lessons and being able to teach others how to apply them to the circumstances in their own neighborhoods. So “that represented a departure for us,” she admitted.

But she also wanted to proceed. “The only way to take it from theory to practice is to do a demonstration model,” Van Voorhis explained: “Study, test and study.”

THE RIGHT MOMENT

Daunting though a demo seemed, by the end of 2009 CPAC was readier to try one than it had ever been. After 12 years, it had the right team in place, with the right skills and backgrounds. But just as important, its work—especially the public-sector–funding campaign and the From Rust Belt to Artist Belt program—had persuaded area residents and CDCs that artists mattered deeply to the local economy, to education, to quality of life. CPAC had seen a rise in regional demand for artist services in public projects and educational outreach. And with an additional tool, 2009’s *A Guide to Mapping Neighborhood Arts and Cultural Assets*, CPAC had facilitated a broadened public understanding of all that arts and culture encompass. The organization compiled the guide to help communities develop a simple interviewing protocol for creating an inventory of their arts-and-culture assets and then use that inventory to gain a basic grasp of their local arts-and-culture context. The resource encouraged people to go into their own communities to ask residents...
about the arts happening in their neighborhoods. Through that process, many Clevelanders discovered that “culture” meant more than official museums and concert halls—they saw that it could include home crafts, church singing, garden design and many other activities they’d never considered to be “art.” Residents realized that neighborhoods they’d assumed were devoid of culture were actually rich in it.

With growing numbers of the public seeing themselves and their lives intertwined with local arts assets, CPAC now had a city prepared to welcome more artists into its economically suffering communities. Only the necessary money was missing.

In this way, the organization gave and got a clearer picture of Cleveland’s cultural wealth, explained Puch. Such research served CPAC’s asset-based approach to development, one that looked at arts and culture as an ingrained part of everyday life—art as hobby, art as fun. By discussing the general nature of creative activities and their benefits with residents over time, CPAC had helped arts and culture feel a lot more inclusive to Clevelanders, and more familiar: Residents found they already enjoyed it and valued it. They became more open to having art in their neighborhoods and more aware of the good it could do. The asset-mapping guide in particular offered community leaders a how-to for acquiring the accurate information they needed to plan effective arts-and-culture-related development strategies and programs.
With growing numbers of the public seeing themselves and their lives intertwined with local arts assets, CPAC now had a city prepared to welcome more artists into its economically suffering communities. Only the necessary money was missing.

Then Schorgl and his colleagues heard that LINC, approaching its 10-year expiration date, would offer a final round of artist-needs funding. CPAC applied, receiving $250,000 from the Kresge Foundation through LINC in 2011 to create its proposed Artists in Residence homeownership program.

CPAC began looking for dollars to match the last round of LINC money and took its first steps toward finding the right partner and neighborhood for Artists in Residence. That included sending out a call for proposals from CDCs around the city and finding out where Cleveland artists were already concentrated. In 2010, the same year the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) released Creative Placemaking, its study of the process, CPAC undertook one of its own: Released in 2011, and titled Putting Artists on the Map, CPAC’s work showed exactly where in the Cleveland area artists preferred to live and which types of buildings and neighborhoods they chose.

**PUTTING ARTISTS ON THE MAP: SUMMARY REPORT**

Map 1, Artists and Artist Neighborhoods
THE POWER OF NUMBERS

This research proved extremely useful when CPAC simultaneously presented it and the guidelines for its proposed Artists in Residence program to Cleveland CDCs. Already wooed and won over to the idea of artist-based community development by From Rust Belt to Artist Belt, CDC leaders immediately saw from the maps how many artists were already at work in their communities and understood the potential benefits of adding to those numbers, increasing the artists’ civic involvement and presenting their neighborhoods to the world as desirable cultural and residential centers. The mapping showed that artists preferred about 25 of Greater Cleveland’s neighborhoods, some within the city limits, others in first-ring suburbs.

The high number of attractive neighborhoods meant that CPAC had many CDCs vying to partner with it on Artists in Residence. The organization had wanted the process to be competitive, Schorgl said, and it could be competitive because the LINC funding was from outside the local region—no CDC could claim that local money was being used to favor one neighborhood over another.29

Valerie Schumacher
CPAC Staff (2008–present)

Deciding to make the partner-selection process a contest posed risks, however, and the staff discussed them thoroughly, said Valerie Schumacher, who was CPAC’s program coordinator at the time. In particular, trying to unify the CDCs behind the cause of creative placemaking while they were competing with each other to get into the Artists in Residence program could have presented problems for CPAC, she explained, so it became clear that those organizations not selected would still need to benefit from Artists in Residence in some way. And it would be difficult to get selected: The chosen CDC needed to be familiar with the issues
and procedures of homeownership, and needed to have some arts-related development in process, but not too much. On top of that, Van Voorhis noted, when CPAC got some resistance from certain CDCs, the staff realized that they would need to choose one they could work with well and effectively.

Of the 13 CDCs that applied, only 5 finalists emerged. A second, conceptual step produced the winner, Schorgl said: northeast Shores Development Corporation. Led by Brian Friedman and representing an old working-class neighborhood called Collinwood near Lake Erie on Cleveland’s eastern border, Northeast Shores got the nod because its area would benefit visibly from the project. Unlike in Cleveland’s art-filled Detroit-Shoreway and Tremont neighborhoods, for instance, in Collinwood the effects of Artists in Residence could be seen and separated from other ongoing development. Arts and culture were not yet a big industry there.

But based on what was already happening in Northeast Shores’ neighborhoods, which featured small, homey bungalows and stores, Friedman had begun to realize that not all artists wanted to live in inner-city lofts—that many had kids and pets and wanted to live in a good-quality neighborhood with shopping nearby, he said. Friedman had attended parts of From Rust Belt to Artist Belt and was familiar with the ideas and goals that arts-related development embraced. He also knew that CPAC had tracked which Cleveland neighborhoods had the greatest concentrations of artists for its *Putting Artists on the Map* research. “We were very interested in...[seeing whether] we had attracted enough artists [to North Collinwood] to make it relevant” to development efforts, he said. It turned out that they had.
Schorgl and his staff were looking for a neighborhood that understood the value artists can bring to a community and had begun to attract and help them, but did not yet have a large artistic population or many related programs in place. “If you looked at the population of homeowners in North Collinwood, you’d find some artists were on the map,” Schorgl observed. “But not many organizations.”

It helped that Northeast Shores had worked with CPAC on the From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conferences—the acquaintance forged during those events facilitated the later alliance. Also, Schorgl’s team thought they could work with Friedman’s, and vice versa: “There was a lot of conversation before a collaboration ever developed,” remembered Beattie, who, in addition to managing the Artists in Residence project, became an employee shared by the two organizations. In Northeast Shores, Schorgl added, “We saw a partner. We also saw an opportunity, as a partner with them, to begin to integrate more fully into the neighborhoods the value of arts and culture. Brian valued what we valued.”

But the other CDCs would get something, too: Research. Every one of them would be able to learn from Artists in Residence’s results, because CPAC would share its processes and evaluations.31

TESTING A SOLUTION

Before embarking on Artists in Residence, CPAC had supported some local efforts to create rental housing for artists in Cleveland’s Detroit-Shoreway and Slavic Village neighborhoods. CPAC had even moved its own offices, in 2005, to the Tower Press Building, a landmark industrial building in the St. Clair-Superior neighborhood that had just been independently remodeled as a live-work residential and office center for artists and arts organizations.

Now, with CPAC and Northeast Shores partnered for Artists in Residence, it was North Collinwood’s turn to be poised for change. The neighborhood already had an alternative music venue, an art gallery and a coffee shop that were drawing attention and clientele. Northeast Shores wanted the district to grow, but lacked the resources to make it happen. That was just the combination CPAC was looking for.

“I think it was really important to them that they selected a neighborhood that was still beta-testing,” Friedman noted. North Collinwood suited CPAC, he said, because it offered a case where real change might not happen otherwise, a situation where the Artists in Residence collaboration would be meaningful and significant.

For Northeast Shores, working with CPAC meant being able to support a countrywide artist search that could bring North Collinwood national...
The neighborhood already had an alternative music venue, an art gallery and a coffee shop that were drawing attention and clientele... North Collinwood suited CPAC...because it offered a case where real change might not happen otherwise, a situation where the Artists in Residence collaboration would be meaningful and significant.
attention and potential new residents whose artwork might generate businesses and other community benefits. Friedman and Beattie went on a research tour to Paducah, Pittsburgh and other cities that were putting the arts to use in community development, to see what worked and what didn’t. But that was just the first step in the two organizations’ research. The second was their deep and project-long effort to listen to North Collinwood residents and leaders, both to determine their inclinations and gauge their reactions to Artists in Residence’s potential effects. The collaborators wanted to make sure that community members got chances to weigh in, not just on what got done in North Collinwood, but also how it got done, Beattie recalled.

The collaboration that emerged from CPAC’s and Northeast Shores’ planning eventually included two not-for-profit financial institutions—Village Capital Corporation, a real-estate-financing subsidiary of Cleveland Neighborhood Progress, and NoteWorthy Federal Credit Union, which serves the Greater Cleveland arts community—to assist home buyers with mortgages and home/studio-improvement loans. CPAC and Northeast Shores also made a small pool of money available for the community projects that artist-residents would be encouraged to undertake, and they built processes for marketing the housing stock and easing new residents’ transition into the neighborhood.

EVERYBODY WON

The result of all this work helped reverse local population decline, rebuild a central commercial corridor around arts businesses and restore a positive identity to the neighborhood. Artists in Residence met its stakeholders’—neighborhood residents’, artists’, CPAC’s and Northeast Shores’—definitions of success.

When the program ended in 2013, Collinwood’s denizens had new artist-homeowners, lasting community programs and arts-related businesses raising the neighborhood’s cultural awareness, spirits and fortunes in creative ways. Artists in Residence reduced the number of vacant houses, promoted property improvements and encouraged community art projects of all kinds, whether educational, entrepreneurial or simply aesthetic. Perhaps most significantly, Beattie added, Artists in Residence created “a platform…for a much broader constellation of players” that led to changes such as North Collinwood’s improved access to healthy food.

Artists gained opportunities to buy good, affordable homes; build financial equity; have proper live-work space; become part of a creative community; and stabilize their lives.
For Northeast Shores, Artists in Residence proved important as an artist-housing project, but it also had collateral impact—the subprograms in marketing, transition services and community art projects that were established by the CDC during its collaboration with CPAC continue today, Friedman said. Northeast Shores also won a $500,000 grant from ArtPlace America, a collaboration among numerous foundations, federal agencies and financial institutions that focuses on creative placemaking, giving the CDC the wherewithal to build effectively on what had already been accomplished in North Collinwood. “What I was looking for, and finally got,” Friedman noted, “was outright growth hormone.”

For CPAC, Artists in Residence had shown that such a program could work and that a community could truly benefit from embracing and assisting artist-homeowners. In spite of some expectable difficulties stemming from different organizational needs and styles of operation, both partners found the experiment worthwhile and effective: Collinwood had visibly, measurably changed. And other CDCs could learn from Northeast Shores’ experience and CPAC’s studies.

“We’d never done anything like that before,“ said Schorgl in looking back. “There were some tense times.” But because of Artists in Residence, he added, a stronger alliance had been formed between Cleveland-area CDCs and the arts-and-culture sector.

On top of that, CPAC had shown once again that culture could be valuable to communities in a way many people had never considered. A program such as Artists in Residence “places the value of arts and culture in the context of value to the community,” Van Voorhis said. “This work allowed us to position arts and culture in different ways.”

Since successfully proving that arts and culture could help strengthen the local economy and raise neighborhoods into a state of greater vitality, CPAC has found other Cleveland sectors looking to the creative community for that same kind of lift. For instance, noted Van Voorhis,
in 2016, when former Cleveland City Council member Joe Cimperman became president of Global Cleveland, an organization working to attract international newcomers to the city, “he said, ‘What can we do to make your next intersection be with immigration?’”

For CPAC, which added the word “connects” to its mission statement in 2012, Artists in Residence gave traction to its role as intermediary between arts and culture and other community realms, Schorgl said. Clevelanders could see more clearly that the arts have many practical uses as well as intangible, personal ones.

“The value of art is balancing the intrinsic vs. the utilitarian,” explained Van Voorhis. “We tried to keep that message front and center.” The message changed how the community viewed both culture and CPAC.

Beattie added that Artists in Residence, like many CPAC undertakings, functioned in part as an ongoing dialogue among people from sectors that traditionally have little contact with one another, at least in Cleveland. The benefits of those discussions, he said, include34 “increasing the visibility of arts and culture well outside of CPAC, as a collaborative force.”

Artists in Residence proved that arts and culture could play an effective leading role in civic problem solving and that CPAC could be a player in Greater Cleveland’s urban planning, economic health and future. It also demonstrated that CPAC’s sphere of influence was expanding onto the shores of other social concerns—and could continue to. The program taught important lessons about collaborative, functional placemaking to all involved, and left the CPAC team with experience in building functional cross-sector operations, a workable model, earned influence and a strategic plan that made helping other sectors a goal.

They were prepared when the health sector presented itself as arts and culture’s next potential ally.
While in residence at Cleveland Print Room, a Cleveland Foundation Creative Fusion artist, Adolfo Bimer, visited Cleveland Metropolitan School District’s Case Elementary School, where he helped students create self-portraits using instant photography. These portraits were shown in a public art installation, Snaps n’ Words, in collaboration with Neighborhood Connections and Cuyahoga Arts & Culture, in the St. Clair-Superior neighborhood. Photo by CPAC
CHAPTER 9

Arts and... Everything: Artists in Residence Leads to Creative Minds in Medicine; Creative Minds in Medicine Gives Rise to Creative Intersections

FROM RUST BELT TO ARTIST BELT AND ARTISTS IN RESIDENCE, WHOSE ACTIVITIES OVERLAPPED BETWEEN 2008 AND 2013, SHOWED CPAC THAT CREATIVITY COULD SERVE A CITY AND A REGION WELL AS THE FULCRUM AT WHICH THE LEVER OF CHANGE TIPPED.

The team’s organically widening perspective on placemaking was bolstered by the 2010 NEA paper, which provided an overview of the subject that was broader than neighborhood development alone: Placemaking meant more than just the built environment. A healthy community is shaped from other components, too.

That’s how Kristin Puch summed up what has become CPAC’s philosophy on helping creativity change community. Especially since the NEA paper was published, Puch explained, she and her colleagues had embraced an asset-based approach to community improvement that can, did and does include many other sectors. 35

The From Rust Belt to Artist Belt project reinforced that choice. Once CPAC began working with the community-development sector, Schorgl said, many subjects relating to other fields started emerging. CDC leaders would bring up other issues in the course of From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conversations about infrastructure problems, he added; talk of abandoned homes raised questions about the health concerns of lead-based paint, for instance, or the safety challenges resulting from vacant lots and deserted or unlighted streets.
Once CPAC began working with the community-development sector...many subjects relating to other fields started emerging.

Simultaneously, from around 2007 to 2010, regional and national current events were keeping health on Clevelanders’ minds. The city was in the planning stages of bringing a medical mart—a healthcare version of Chicago’s signature Merchandise Mart—to its downtown. Obamacare, or the national Affordable Care Act, as it’s properly known, was in the works.

In fact, for a Cleveland organization looking to build on existing community strengths, no local sector offered better ones than the medical industry. The Cleveland Clinic possessed a world-renowned reputation and an enormous network of campuses. There were also the University Hospitals and MetroHealth systems; medical schools; a growing biotechnology industry; huge numbers of support industries, such as hospices and therapy centers; and scads of practitioners.

To CPAC, the Cleveland medical industry was an obvious asset, a sector already intermixed with arts and culture through expressive arts-based therapies, medical illustration, and facility and product design. But the staff also saw that much more could be accomplished—increased benefits to public health and the economy, a wider range of opportunities for artists, growing numbers of collaborations between sectors—if everyone involved had more information and closer connections. Strengthening and expanding the alliance created several years earlier, when CPAC and the arts-and-culture sector helped get the health-and-human-services tax renewal passed, seemed a logical next step in CPAC’s placemaking process.

The existing arts-related medical programs and businesses had a low profile that CPAC’s 2014 Creative Minds in Medicine project was intended to raise, Schorgl said. With every creative intersection the organization tries to implement or reinforce, he explained, it aims to legitimize the
The existing arts-related medical programs and businesses had a low profile that CPAC’s 2014 Creative Minds in Medicine project was intended to raise. With every creative intersection the organization tries to implement or reinforce, it aims to legitimize the different applications of arts and culture to community life.
different applications of arts and culture to community life. Though CPAC didn’t have enough money to carry out an arts-and-medicine demonstration model along the lines of Artists in Residence, the team knew that solid research, effectively written and disseminated, could focus greater attention on the arts-health connection and validate it. Creating that legitimacy was especially important in this case because the arts-health intersection lacked the urgency that had driven CPAC’s efforts to get artists into recession-slammed neighborhoods and their acres of foreclosed homes.

**MAKING THE CASE**

The arts-health project lacked the acute need of Artists in Residence, but its momentum slowly snowballed, nonetheless, Van Voorhis recalled. Its impetus was fueled by the research that simultaneously prepared the ground locally for further action and allowed CPAC to establish ties with the people and institutions already involved in health-related arts work. With support from the Kresge and Surdna foundations, CPAC carried

---

*Over the course of two October days in 2014, attendees learned from panels and talks led by a vibrant spectrum of speakers.*

Left: Jimmy Woody asks conference attendees to use theater in a medical context. Photo by CPAC

Right: Dancing Wheels Company & School performs at Creative Minds in Medicine. Photo by CPAC
out a large number of one-on-one interviews with Northeast Ohio arts-health leaders for a white paper offering rationale, evidence and case studies in support of the idea that arts and culture have valuable roles to play in community health and human services. The research process and the finished paper raised awareness, increasing media interest and the attendance at the follow-up conference, said Puch, who led the research. The Creative Minds in Medicine event brought together community stakeholders for discussions with leaders from local and national health and arts organizations, as well as representatives from government agencies and departments.

Over the course of two October days in 2014, attendees learned from panels and talks led by a vibrant spectrum of speakers ranging from Akram Boutros, head of the Cuyahoga County MetroHealth system, and Maria Jukic, executive director of the Cleveland Clinic’s Arts & Medicine Institute, to Cleveland Institute of Art architecture professor Sai Sinbondit, City of Cleveland Planning Director Freddy Collier, disabilities expert Erin Hoppe of VSA Ohio, and Sunil Iyengar, the director of research and analysis for the National Endowment of the Arts. Doctors, poets, therapists, musicians, administrators and theater artists considered the arts-and-health economy and policy, as well as such holistic topics as “Dementia Arts: Celebrating Creativity in Elder Care,” “The Expanding Role for Arts and Culture in Healthcare,” “The Healing Power of Music” and “Vital Signs: Cleveland Museum of Art Programs for Healthcare Professionals.”

As a result, said Van Voorhis, Cleveland’s stature as an arts-health center rose. Stanford University shared the Creative Minds in Medicine information, as did other institutions. But perhaps the most dramatic results were local: MetroHealth’s Boutros, who gave the conference cachet just by participating, took the arts-health intersection a giant step forward by announcing during his speech that MetroHealth would develop its own arts-and-culture–related programs.

“The audience gasped when Boutros said, ‘I’m putting it in the budget,’” Puch remembered. Expressive arts therapies had been a part of MetroHealth’s culture for a long time, but Boutros’ declaration placed the arts-health connection center stage. His decision to put real money into that connection had immense impact, not only because of the example he set, but also because he had, with one sentence, made it possible for arts and culture to be integrated into the entire MetroHealth universe. It’s easier to develop a program systemically than to have individual doctors going after individual grants, Puch noted.38

Using CPAC’s white paper as a guide, MetroHealth subsequently built its own comprehensive arts-health program plan, including everything
from doctor training to infrastructure design. Now, “art is everywhere” at MetroHealth, Van Voorhis said: therapy extends to additional areas, such as the burn unit; therapy fellowships are available; performances take place throughout system facilities; and art-health services are available to residents of the surrounding neighborhood through local health centers and school-based health programs. The whole organization has also become sensitive to population-health issues and is exploring the broader implications of arts, culture, health and well-being—spreading and adapting ideas that CPAC introduced.

HEALTHY ALSO MEANS SAFE

Creative Minds in Medicine’s greatest long-term effect on both CPAC and the entire Cleveland community may turn out to be the hospital industry’s own evolving strategies concerning arts and broad issues of community health. As these institutions continue trying to figure out how best to apply arts and culture to health concerns—how to simultaneously expand and refine programs, collaborate with different sectors and one another, and move forward creatively as well as scientifically—they may undergo a change in mission. Like CPAC, whose view of its work has been growing from a tight focus on arts and culture to a wider one that studies Northeast Ohio’s interconnected problems and how arts and culture can help, area hospitals may increasingly recognize the links between health and other human interests and needs, including arts. They may come to focus, not just on one part of community welfare, but on all parts of it.

Van Voorhis said she sees a health-industry shift toward whole-person care that could bring needed changes in approach to social ills as well as human ones, including new challenges such as opioid addiction. MetroHealth has looked at certain community-health issues, such as gunshot violence, she noted, working with Cleveland Public Theatre and Robin Pease of the local arts-education group Kulture Kids to produce a performance piece called The Storm. This one-woman show, based on interviews with MetroHealth caregivers about their experiences with gun-violence victims, was presented at the hospital to allow medical personnel to share in, and learn from, the human stories related to the violence and its effects.

Between MetroHealth’s initiatives and Cleveland CDCs’ years-long concerns about the effects of a decaying environment on neighborhood security, it was perhaps natural that CPAC’s next creative-placemaking project became arts and safety. But circumstances played a role: In August 2014, just two months before the Creative Minds in Medicine conference was to take place, Americans’ attention was suddenly riveted by the fatal police shooting of Michael Brown, an unarmed black man in
Ferguson, Mo., and the rioting that followed. The event sparked nationwide outrage over systemic racial prejudice within U.S. police forces, as a series of such shootings and subsequent disturbances followed in cities around the country over the next year. One of those cities was Cleveland.

The country’s atmosphere grew uglier: The volume of violent incidents, court cases and peaceful protests increased, as did the degree of widespread national soul-searching. Amid this cultural maelstrom, the CPAC team became convinced that arts and culture could offer Clevelanders a way to talk with each other, reduce tensions and devise fresh approaches to the underlying problems.

It wasn’t the first time that CPAC had considered safety as a frontier for arts-and-culture involvement: The idea had first arisen in 2013, as the team was planning its next series of cultural roundtable events. Van Voorhis’ attention had been caught then by a reference to a Philadelphia arts-and-criminal-justice conference. But the time wasn’t right for CPAC to pursue that angle. “Some things have their moment,” she said: When circumstances, including money, current events and opportunity, dovetail with ideas, then an organization can act. Even the

Between MetroHealth’s initiatives and Cleveland CDCs’ years-long concerns about the effects of a decaying environment on neighborhood security, it was perhaps natural that CPAC’s next creative-placemaking project became arts and safety.
horrors of the 2014 shootings of Brown and of Tamir Rice in Cleveland couldn’t bring all of the necessary elements into alignment.

In 2015, however, new circumstances converged and the moment arrived. CPAC had money that year from a Kresge operating-support grant that would allow the staff to address the safety issue as part of its creative-placemaking efforts. The Creative Minds in Medicine project had been completed, and though the CPAC team continued to work on many fronts, it had enough time to take on a new endeavor. And safety—from prejudice, violence and fear—was on everyone’s mind, locally and nationally.

CPAC decided to tackle the matter. But how?

The team decided to undertake a fact-finding and idea-sharing process, for themselves and for Cleveland.

CHOOSING THE MEANS
The situation created certain constraints on CPAC’s choices. Public safety was essentially a new subject for the organization, so it had no backlog of research to tap. “What we weren’t sure about was, was there enough happening in Cleveland to justify a white paper?” Van Voorhis recollected. A large project or research paper would take a lot of time. But a full-scale program or demonstration project would cost more than the funds CPAC had available.

The team decided to undertake a fact-finding and idea-sharing process, for themselves and for Cleveland. To carry it out, they chose their best, most basic and most effective means of community engagement: public meetings. Called the CPAC Creative Intersections Speaker Series 2016, this series of five, 3-hour mini-summits brought together artist-activists, law-enforcement experts, educators, journalists and the public to talk
with—and listen to—each other about safety.39 Every other month, from March through November of that year, speakers selected from the community and around the country met with Clevelanders at Bohemian National Hall to share perspectives and discuss solutions to deep-rooted community-safety issues. About 60 people attended each session, including some members of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police Department.

Inviting both experts and community stakeholders to the discussions allowed CPAC to learn more about the topic and gave participants the opportunity to make contacts and share information and ideas about roles that arts and culture can play in community safety. What the Creative Intersections series provided the community, Schorgl explained, was “a way to begin to fashion [their] own approach” to the problems.

This tactic allowed CPAC to use its greatest strengths in pursuing a key part of its mission. That mission, said Puch, is not to tell the community what to do, but to offer research, ideas and advice, and to help connect people to the resources they need to do their own thinking and find their
Building Trust

1 / Identify the best leader/representative who will listen and has the right skills
2 / Be a resource for other people’s efforts before driving your own
3 / Get to know people, and get to know them on their terms, not yours
4 / Follow through on every promise, or follow up on what the obstacles were
5 / Get data
   a. Talk with and listen to everyone you can, whether it’s in-person, through a survey, or following news and updates from those in the field
   b. Ask two key questions: “What is the most important issue facing you, your business or your community?” And, “How can arts and culture help you solve it?”
   c. Hire professional researchers
6 / Present information professionally
7 / Listen to the responses to the data from a wide range of people
8 / Follow up with what you heard to make sure you got it right
9 / Stay transparent: Include and inform people at every step when you start to build and implement strategies

own answers. This ensures that important ideas, skills and practices will become ingrained in the community itself, not just in CPAC activities, and thus last much longer. But like any good intermediary, CPAC also stays active and involved in the local effort to improve the process. “It’s keeping CPAC at the center of the community instead of sitting on the edge and observing,” Schorgl said.

In cases such as Creative Minds in Medicine and the speaker series, noted Schumacher, CPAC didn’t create services, but added new ideas to existing ones to help the community creatively build its own capacities. With its base of knowledge, CPAC can see opportunities and weaknesses that others in the community might miss and, when circumstances allow, encourage and assist change.

“We’re like the giraffe that can see the overview,” added Puch. With public safety, however, “we’re learning as we’re going,” she said, “because we didn’t do a whole paper.”

STARTING A CONVERSATION

The community has been learning with them. Topics in the speaker series included “Building Safe Places,” “Empowering Youth,” “Bridging Divides,” “Activating Change” and “Moving Forward,” all intentionally broad and discussed within the context of what arts and culture can do to promote understanding and communication, teach useful skills, provide opportunities for self-expression and meaningful work, and create safe spaces.

Addressing public safety without a white paper or an information kit presented challenges to CPAC, which likes to provide communities or gatherings with basic knowledge about a situation before working toward solutions for it. “We have a system for how to do this,” said Schorgl. But like all creative placemaking, that system depends on money. Funding or the lack of it can change an organization’s direction, preventing an idea from becoming action. So can insufficient time and staff hours. CPAC tries to effect as much change as its resources permit, but it has to be clear-eyed about what’s doable. So even though safety has become a critical issue in Cleveland and CPAC has already gotten some worthwhile results from its effort to connect people in the safety and arts-and-culture communities with each other, the organization must carefully balance the attention and money it expends on its range of efforts, Schorgl said.

That balance is especially important because not every subject that interests CPAC will interest funders, said Van Voorhis. Perhaps even more important, she added, it takes time for CPAC to develop
significant relationships with other sectors, and the team can’t just abandon its work with longtime allies in order to focus attention on a new topic, even an urgent one.

Despite CPAC’s recognition that everything is subject to timing and funding, however, the team plans to pursue the safety issue for the foreseeable future. And not only because its challenges are far from solved, but also because CPAC needs to earn the trust of the safety sector before it can create an effective alliance with it. Trust is already a problematic dynamic in safety, Van Voorhis explained. As it did with other stakeholders in other sectors, she said, CPAC needs to prove its dependability to the public-safety sector and allay the sector’s skepticism about the pertinence of arts and culture to personal security, law enforcement and justice.

To do that, CPAC began by laying out the facts for everyone involved. But instead of writing another white paper, the team chose to present its research in a more 21st-century form: a video that Van Voorhis described as a position statement on the subject of youth violence, one that validates and defines that subject as an arts-and-culture concern. For CPAC, she added, it’s an experiment in changing public opinion in the digital age.

That mission isn’t to tell the community what to do, but to offer research, ideas and advice, and to help connect people to the resources they need to do their own thinking and find their own answers.
THREE CREATIVE INTERSECTIONS | THREE DIFFERENT APPROACHES

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1. **Convening:** From Rust Belt to Artist Belt brought community developers together to explore how artists can be vital partners

2. **Research:** A white paper articulated the theory behind why this intersection is important

3. **Convening:** CPAC held a second From Rust Belt to Artist Belt convening to discuss practical aspects of implementing creative placemaking. CPAC licensed the conference material to Detroit, Mich., and St. Louis, Mo.

4. **Demonstration:** Artists in Residence offered two years of investment in artist/community partnerships in Cleveland’s Waterloo district

**PROS**
- Early buy-in from attendees at the initial conference
- Variety in programming and research maintained interest over time
- Conference spurred national interest
- Local demonstration model tested theory and measured impact of a small, focused investment

**CONS**
- Early conversations lacked hard-copy research and evidence of creative placemaking benefits
- As creative placemaking was just emerging, we had to evolve programming
- The demonstration model took a significant amount of human capital, financial resources and time

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

1. **Research:** CPAC completed a white paper on the intersection of arts, culture, and health and human services at the start. It included an extensive literature search, national outreach, local site visits and interview processes

2. **Convening:** Creative Minds in Medicine was a two-day conference based on the local definitions and themes of arts and health

3. **Maintain relationships:** CPAC maintains relationships with stakeholders and provides counsel to arts-and-health initiatives using the findings

**PROS**
- Building a definition of arts-and-health initiatives created a shared understanding among stakeholders and brought disparate groups under one banner
- Site visits built connections and buy-in
- The white paper was an invaluable tool for promoting the conference and making the case
- Conference planning was better informed

**CONS**
- It took more than a year to complete the research
- Maintaining local interest was difficult during the year between the site visit and the release of the research
- The conference was developed after the white paper was released rather than in conjunction with its release
1. **Build relationships:** CPAC had conversations with stakeholders about the intersection of arts and safety. Those conversations suggested that the community could benefit from hearing what was happening locally and nationally.

2. **Convening:** A speaker series was created; it featured professionals from national and local sources speaking on a broad range of topics related to arts and safety. Events were held on a Thursday afternoon every other month.

3. **Documentary short:** Using footage from the series and additional interviews, a 10-12 minute documentary, created in collaboration with a local filmmaker, showcased how arts and culture influence public safety in Cleveland.

**PROS**
- The time from conceptualizing the speaker series to implementing it was less than CPAC’s past conference development.
- The events attracted people who were previously unconnected to CPAC.
- The time commitment for attendees was much less than the time required by conferences.
- The extended format allowed CPAC to adapt and respond to local feedback and current events.
- The documentary illustrates and grounds the concept in reality.

**CONS**
- No research was developed to make the case or ground the topic with data.
- The shorter event time limited the depth to which topics could be explored.
- Documentary making was a new discipline for the organization and required us to focus on only one aspect of arts and safety, youth empowerment.
- Filming and production took longer than originally anticipated.
The video, which is scheduled for release in 2018, will present creative placemaking as a path connecting community development to health to safety, areas of concern that all Greater Cleveland CDCs want to see addressed in their neighborhoods. Identifying the route is part of CPAC’s job as a community intermediary, said Schorgl. “We take the path that seems to be logical with arts and culture. That path has led us to a lot of interesting [initiatives] that might never have been uncovered otherwise.”

…it takes time for CPAC to develop significant relationships with other sectors, and the team can’t just abandon its work with longtime allies in order to focus attention on a new topic, even an urgent one.
HONING SKILLS

Lessons Learned

2018 and Beyond
PART III: LESSONS LEARNED
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Learning from the Past

It’s hoped that this history of CPAC can provide arts service organizations in other cities with insight into how they might successfully use creative placemaking to strengthen their own arts-and-culture sectors and, thus, their whole communities.

One of the chief takeaways that CPAC staffers, current and former, hope readers will absorb from CPAC’s collective experience is that “there’s no right or wrong way to make a playbook” for creative placemaking, noted Valerie Schumacher, CPAC’s director of artist services, “because no formula exists.”

As CPAC built itself from the ground up, shaping its internal structure and outreaching actions as it went, its decisions and processes “weren’t recipes,” added Schorgl. Rather, “they were [guided by] principles.”

Thus, when Schorgl, Van Voorhis and the team defined an initiative they wanted to act on, they thought it through, planning and predicting to the best of their ability; dove in; and then looked back and learned as much as possible from it once on the other side. There have been several misses and a lot of hits over the years in CPAC’s various arenas of endeavor, from planning to effective communication to team building to funding to implementing demonstration models. But one of its most fruitful areas of both achievement and (sometimes hard-earned) erudition has been, and continues to be, collaborating with other groups to accomplish more than they could by themselves. What Van Voorhis calls “the push-pull of working cross-sector” has been an irreplaceable source of knowledge, both positive and painful. “There’s lot to be gained and learned from partnerships,” she noted.

Collaborating

When considering a working alliance with another organization, CPAC’s big-picture goal is always to strengthen artists, arts and cultural organizations and the larger community. But the first step is gauging
whether or not collaboration is really called for. Perhaps the specific goal CPAC wants to achieve could be accomplished better and more easily by hiring a firm to handle the work, instead, or by encouraging an organization that specializes in that area to develop its own related program or service. Is collaborating the best way to accomplish the objective, taking efficiency, cost and the range of outcomes into consideration? In several cases, the answer has been yes: CPAC couldn’t have accomplished those particular goals alone. As Van Voorhis pointed out, the organization can expertly handle research and information-sharing on its own, but showing that something works in practice requires partners.

If collaboration is the best means of achieving a goal, the next step is determining the degree to which each group should be involved: Is each going to contribute funds? staff? administrative support? hands-on project work? Or will CPAC act more simply as a provider of resources, whether guidance, data or something else?

These considerations lead to the all-important third step—weighing whether the potential collaborators are a proper fit. Key elements to this aspect of the process are the organizations’

- respective skill sets and the consequent division of labor,
- individual organization size and staffing levels,
- pre-existing relationship (or lack of same), and
- ability to effectively communicate with each other.

“Complementary skill sets matter,” Van Voorhis emphasized.

For example, it made sense for CPAC to partner with the Council of Smaller Enterprises (COSE) to provide artists with business training and services such as affordable health insurance and networking opportunities. COSE already had such programs and service infrastructures in place, but was unfamiliar with the arts-and-culture sector; CPAC knew that sector and artists’ needs inside and out, and could provide ongoing counsel in that regard, but couldn’t efficiently create and run a range of business-support programs. In addition, CPAC could supply financial support (through LINC funding) and promotional assistance. Each organization had abilities to offer the other that were necessary to reaching the shared goal of helping artists become better businesspeople.

“We used our own strengths, but stayed in close touch with each other,” said COSE’s Steve Millard. “We helped a lot of people.”

Similarly, CPAC’s early work with the Cuyahoga County government worked well and as hoped for from both partners’ points of view, in part, because each party was assigned specific tasks that played to its
strengths. In 2004, the county’s department of economic development asked CPAC to help it create and run a grants program called Arts and Culture as Economic Development (nicknamed ACE). CPAC’s job reflected its expertise: It researched program models, including types of grant classifications, award amounts, adjudication processes and potential review-panel members, and it supplied data about and insight into the arts community. The county government, meanwhile, provided financial resources, and its staff used their savvy to work on the program’s legal aspects, said Tracey Nichols, then the county’s assistant director of economic development. (Nichols is currently director of financial services for Project Management Consultants, a subsidiary of Cleveland-based law firm Thompson Hine LLP.) The staff managed the contracting and reporting processes, as well as the grant application intake.

“We were working elbow to elbow with CPAC because they had more expertise in that area [arts] than we did,” Nichols explained.

...the division of work was clear and...important questions, ideas and obstacles were discussed early and throughout what became a close working relationship.

Because the division of work was clear and because important questions, ideas and obstacles were discussed early and throughout what became a close working relationship, Nichols added, the program ran successfully for several years. And the relationship with CPAC has lasted, she said. “Even now, whenever I have a question about the arts...I can call them and they give [me] everything I need to be effective in what I do.”

Size matters in collaborations, too, although not always in terms of parity—discrepancies can complement each other. At the time of the COSE
partnership, for instance, CPAC was (and still is) a small organization, while COSE was big, with 15,000 members and a much larger staff.

Staffing counts on a couple of levels. The obvious issues are that there have to be enough bodies, and bodies with the right skills, to ensure the work can get done. Van Voorhis warned that when considering collaboration, each organization has to look closely at “what [a project] really takes from a staffing perspective.” Seth Beattie, CPAC’s former community-partnership specialist and strategic-initiative director, added that collaborations are likelier to work when the groups involved connect at all staff levels, not just through senior management. The deeper blending promotes camaraderie, he noted, and thus, better working relationships. This approach also preserves institutional learning, which is a significant benefit, because if one or two key people leave during the course of a collaboration, Beattie explained, “it completely changes things.” This can be especially problematic when any of the cooperating organizations is small. You have to figure out “how you afford a deeper bench of staff to begin meaningful relationships that can outlive the transition of one or more leaders,” he added.

Pre-existing relationships also help shape a solid partnership, Van Voorhis said.

Take, for instance, the Artists in Residence collaboration between CPAC and Northeast Shores Development Corporation to create homeownership opportunities for artists in Cleveland’s North Collinwood neighborhood. Prior to this joint project, the two organizations’ executives had gotten to know each other during the From Rust Belt to Artist Belt conference. The acquaintance forged during that event eased the later alliance.

“There was a lot of conversation before a collaboration ever developed,” remembered Beattie, who managed the North Collinwood project as an employee shared by the two organizations.

Another element vital to success is candid conversation.

Talk It Through, then Figure Out a Plan

The complexities of bringing together separate organizations to realize an ambitious, multifaceted goal can’t be fathomed or resolved quickly or facilely. Once two groups choose to collaborate—and before the collaboration begins—the players must discuss ideas, specify desired outcomes, voice assumptions and think through potential problems and their possible solutions.

Schorgl stressed that even when collaboration is the right choice and the participating groups are a good fit, the organizations have to determine whether they have a truly shared goal, and one that represents a win
for all involved. Yet budding colleagues also have to acknowledge up fronts that one or more of them may lose, instead. What would that look like? How would they prepare for it? Also, does the prospective partner genuinely share the goal or is a more self-serving agenda at work? All outcome scenarios must be taken into consideration, Schorgl said. In any collaborative project, he added, “It’s important to understand the extent [to which] each organization will share its desired outcomes and challenges.”

But clear, direct communication doesn’t stop at the start of the process. In the course of the CPAC-Northeast Shores collaboration, Beattie learned three important tactics, he said: Make it a priority to set aside time for collaborators to talk regularly; create time to get into the community and learn from it; and ensure that many voices take part in the decision making.

The initial, in-depth discussions should lead to a detailed road map. Planning is critical to successful collaboration, but every collaborative project has its own trajectory and outcome, planned or not.
Constructive Challenges

Sometimes, despite combining the best of intentions with clear communication, plans and process, that trajectory goes off course.

CPAC’s ultimate goal in its cooperative efforts, as with everything it does, is to actively help people and organizations see arts and culture as resources, and also as a sector useful to others, “not just something that’s in it for itself,” noted Van Voorhis. Successful collaborations can help prove that value by increasing trust, strengthening relationships and producing good results for both the participants and their community. But “You have tension in collaborations all the time,” she said. “You need to have conversations, you need to have someone managing the relationship” (which, she noted, is not the same thing as managing the job the collaborators are carrying out).

Artists in Residence offers an illustrative case of hurdles faced and overcome—or not. In some ways, explained Van Voorhis, this is the best case to examine to understand the potential downsides of partnering: Though ultimately successful, it was one of CPAC’s most complex collaborations and “the closest one we had, because we shared a staff member and we came up with program models together.”

Even if organizations know each other fairly well, when they try to mesh styles and aims, “project management can be awkward,” Schorgl said. Beattie added that combined efforts can take on a life of their own and “you have to monitor that.” But two tactics allowed Northeast Shores and CPAC to work together productively: having Beattie serve as a shared staff member and liaison (in what Schorgl called “a very challenging job”) and perpetual communication.

Northeast Shores Executive Director Brian Friedman also acknowledged hurdles in the partnership. “There were challenges. I’m not going to lie, we’ve been in better collaborations,” he admitted, noting that points of friction arose over differing expectations and needs.

Fostering mutual understanding between the two groups was one of Beattie’s biggest tasks. The process was one that “took a while for all of us to get in the groove of,” he said, but added that “things went pretty smoothly for the amount of ground we were trying to cover and the infrastructure we were trying to build.”

Because the process grew out of continual discussion—not only between the two organizations, but also with artists and many other stakeholders in the North Collinwood neighborhood—everyone involved developed a sense of involvement and buy-in from having a voice in decisions. Differences did appear between the two organizations,
Despite their shared aim: Their subgoals weren’t the same, they moved at unequal speeds, and their staff experiences diverged because what was daily business for Northeast Shores was a special project for CPAC. But by augmenting conversation with diplomacy, Beattie was able to manage the two teams’ concerns and juggle priorities well enough to keep the project moving forward.

Everyone involved agreed that the two organizations needed more, and more regular, face time with each other to build their relationship. “It was a little awkward that we only met when we had to meet,” Friedman recalled. He also recognized that CPAC and Northeast Shores had different views on how the collaboration would wind up: CPAC was looking for a definitive ending to the project, so it could see and measure results based on clear before-and-after scenarios, Friedman said, while Northeast Shores was focused on making sure project accomplishments continued after CPAC was no longer a partner. Further muddying the measurables was an ArtPlace America grant that Northeast Shores was awarded, which kicked in before CPAC exited.

If he were to do it again, Friedman added, he would insist that CPAC and Northeast Shores define their desired outcomes with brighter lines and do a better job of imagining how to continue and manage the work once the collaboration was over. Even with the problems, however, he felt that the North Collinwood venture was worth doing: “It was fantastic,” he said, “and frankly life-changing for the community.”

In Spite of One’s Best Efforts. But regardless of how well organizations try to prepare for a joint program, it may not work out, for various and wide-ranging reasons, whether internal, external or both.

Being an organization run by humans for humans, CPAC has erred, experienced setbacks and made decisions that disappointed people, including its own backers. Some of this reaction was probably inevitable as CPAC, like the offspring of two involved parents, began growing up, asserting itself and turning into an entity separate from the foundations that birthed it. Former Cleveland Foundation program officer Kathleen Cerveny had hoped, for instance, that the Arts Summit CPAC helped initiate in 2002 would become an annual event featuring a local state-of-the-arts assessment of sector development. “That just isn’t happening,” she said.

Other projects—CPAC’s first and unsatisfactory website, culture4me.org, and its failed early tries to get public-sector arts funding passed, for instance—didn’t take either because the timing wasn’t right or because CPAC found that it wasn’t sufficiently prepared to carry them out.
Schorgl and the staff were determined to learn from these results and rigorously evaluated anything that went wrong, researched other models and tactics, and often tried again.

Some plans misfired because of a fundamental error. In 2006, for instance, when Schorgl, Beattie and Van Voorhis met with a group of CDC leaders to present CPAC’s research on neighborhood arts assets. The trio had tried to persuade Cleveland’s CDCs, pre-From Rust Belt to Artist Belt, that arts and culture could be useful to them. “And they were so skeptical of us”—suspicious, she believed, that CPAC was invading their turf. The three leaders realized that they had broken their own proven rule about first getting to know community members, then asking those people what problems they were facing and how arts and culture might help. Instead, they had essentially cold-called the CDCs and told them what CPAC thought they should do.

“We changed our approach to them,” Van Voorhis recalled. “We went back and did our homework” and, eventually, the CDCs came to see the arts-asset research as beneficial.

Even some of CPAC’s successes came with drawbacks. Former Cuyahoga County Commissioner and onetime CPAC board member Peter Lawson Jones noted one: “I would have liked another funding mechanism than a cigarette tax” for public arts revenue, he said. It’s a resource that diminishes as more and more people quit smoking and fewer young people start, but with limited options at the time, he added, “that was a lesson in not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good.”

And, said Van Voorhis, projects can be affected by external circumstances beyond CPAC’s control: “Collaborations can end due to no fault of the arts service organization,” she noted, whether the cause stems from societal shifts or the changing dynamics within other organizations.

This can result in programs never being fully implemented. ArtistAdvance, for instance, a strategy CPAC had hoped to create that would have enlisted banks to provide financial training and low-interest business loans for artists, dead-ended after a 2005 change in bankruptcy laws prevented banks from getting involved. Similarly, CultureADD, CPAC’s online diagnostic tool for gauging an arts organization’s health, proved infeasible because it relied heavily on financial data that weren’t easily available to the target audience of users.

In other situations, joint efforts were planned, designed, successfully executed and helped a lot of people—and then were abruptly no longer
needed. The ACE grants, for example, ended in 2006 when county voters passed the arts-and-culture funding issue that made it unnecessary. And the project with COSE to provide artists with health insurance became moot in 2010 with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act.

PLANNING

CPAC embraces the balance of science and art that good plans require: science, because data analysis must lead to logical conclusions and fact-supported aims; art, because once the aims have been determined, the plan to achieve them must be imagined and plotted like a musical score or an architectural blueprint.

A blueprint isn’t a building, as a map isn’t the territory. But a blueprint is imperative to the successful conjuring of a building, as a map is essential to the effective navigation of a landscape: It provides a step-by-step path that will take the organization or community from idealized goal to realized goal.

In the service of crafting detailed blueprints, CPAC has an official planning philosophy—a plan to plan. That philosophy stresses a conducive culture, including

- consensus (not absolute, but at least an overwhelming majority agreement),
- inclusiveness, featuring a board fully invested in CPAC’s purpose and goals, and close working relations between board and staff,
- planning as an ongoing function, not a finite task, with chosen steps determined by the situation and goals (form following function),
- discussion and decisions based on staff research that involves surveys of the board, stakeholders, focus groups and others to assess points of view, values and concerns, and
- assessment and selection of steps through a logical, rigorous process leading to a complete plan of research-based values (what/why), goals (where/when) and implementation strategies (how).

Within the larger context of that culture, one of CPAC’s first steps in any planning process, as noted in chapter 2, is to look for a “gap”: a community need that’s going unfilled, said Van Voorhis. Often, timeliness is a factor; what people in the community are talking about right then has urgency.
Whether such a gap has been revealed by number-crunching or by the anecdotal evidence of interviewing stakeholders and others, she explained, once it’s been identified, CPAC examines it closely: Can it best be addressed by one of CPAC’s core competencies or is it something that others in the community could handle better? Would CPAC add something new to any existing efforts to solve the issue or would it be duplicating what’s already in place?

The staff and board then eliminate strategies that call for skills or experience CPAC doesn’t have or that don’t match CPAC’s mission and resources. But, Van Voorhis added, the real question is: Is there a set of coordinated, comprehensive efforts that could move CPAC closer to several goals—not just one—and so maximize impact and efficiency by, say, building capacity, fostering collaborations, changing public opinion and creating political action in a concerted effort? Several of CPAC’s signature projects, such as From Rust Belt to Artist Belt and Creative Minds in Medicine, have accomplished such multiple aims.

CPAC is always looking for that sweet spot, Van Voorhis said: “As we’ve gotten better, it’s not about one activity, but about thematically linked activities. For a small organization like ours, that matters.”

The success of the planning process also depends heavily on quality input. “Who’s in the room with you really matters,” said Van Voorhis, noting that it was because the head of Cleveland’s Council of Smaller Enterprises (COSE) was present during discussions on how to get artists access to affordable health insurance that CPAC and COSE discovered they could work together to create a whole program of business resources for artists. And did.

Last, inherent in a successful planning process—and thus a successful plan—is the realization and ready acknowledgement that plans aren’t carved in stone. And when the results aren’t what you’d hoped, you analyze why, learn and try again. “When we had a setback, we’d sit down and ask why it didn’t go right,” said Schorgl. “And then go out and talk to people” to figure out how to make what went wrong work.

“A plan has got to be a growing thing,” he observed “something malleable. All plans are subject to timing, interruptions and the resources at hand.” He recalled, for example, that it took CPAC and the Cuyahoga County community three tries—much longer than they’d hoped—to get public-sector arts funding passed by voters. But each time, Schorgl said, CPAC and the campaigners learned more and adjusted their approach accordingly.
For instance, they soon realized that voters and public leaders needed to know how the money would be spent before they could feel comfortable approving a tax to raise it. So even though CPAC hadn’t originally intended to do this, they held public information sessions to explain who would receive funding and to present different disbursement models that would allow the money to be fairly awarded. CPAC also used the sessions to spell out the fiduciary and community-value standards that nonprofit arts-and-culture organizations and arts-and-culture–related projects would have to meet to qualify and compete for grants. Reassured, Cuyahoga County voters eventually approved the countywide cigarette excise tax that created $158 million for arts and culture over 10 years—and later, overwhelmingly approved a renewal of that tax for an additional decade.

COMMUNICATING EFFECTIVELY

When Tom Schorgl started leading CPAC, he said, “One thing that I thought was absolutely essential: I needed to meet and talk with as many people as possible.” This deep belief in the intrinsic value of communication has been CPAC’s guiding tenet from the beginning.

From the outset, he knew he had to have substantive discussions with a wide range of Northeast Ohioans if he were going to learn their thoughts and introduce them to key ideas about arts and culture. But in most places, it’s difficult to get people—especially officials—to open their doors and sacrifice their time for someone they barely know. Schorgl’s initial efforts to connect with Cleveland leaders succeeded, he said, in part because CPAC was created and backed by the Cleveland and Gund foundations, organizations those leaders respected.

Having the support of an important institution or two is key to getting people to listen to you, he said. It doesn’t have to be a foundation; any leaders and/or the civic, business, arts or political entities they represent can be effective if they’re well regarded by the community, believe in your project goals and will provide the funding needed to reach them.

Going Face to Face

With the foundations’ support, Schorgl started setting up meetings with Northeast Ohio’s leaders in such sectors as arts and culture, education, government and business. But getting in the door was just the first step: He then had to persuade his listeners that he had a message worth
hearing. Schorgl’s deep, urgent belief in the value of a healthy arts-and-culture sector to Greater Cleveland’s economy and quality of life got their attention.

“I had a purpose,” Schorgl explained, “and I could speak to that purpose in simple terms, which was sustaining and maintaining an asset in the community, which was arts and culture. That’s how I approached everyone I met.”

Balancing Schorgl’s drive to convey CPAC’s purposeful message to as many people as possible was his desire to elicit information from as many people as possible. “The most important thing to say is, ‘I genuinely want you to tell me,’” and to let them know that you truly want to hear and understand their perspective and can respect them for telling it, Schorgl stressed. And he completed his dispatch by asking his listeners two questions: What is the most important issue facing you, your business or your community? And, how can arts and culture help you solve it?

In part, this need for intelligence was fed by a pragmatic reality—Schorgl wasn’t from Northeast Ohio. He didn’t know the area’s history or ways, but he also didn’t have any preconceived ideas. “That was important, because I needed to learn firsthand what was going to work and what wasn’t going to work,” he explained. “I had a lack of Cleveland knowledge and an abundance of enthusiasm.” Even those Greater Clevelanders who dismissed or opposed CPAC’s mission were worth talking to, Schorgl added, because listening to them provided clues about what they did value. That helped CPAC figure out how to convincingly relate those values to the importance of arts and culture.48

Having the support of an important institution or two is key to getting people to listen to you.
CPAC found they needed to ask questions not only to garner information from both allies and opponents, but also to help separate what people believed or assumed about something from the facts about that thing: How did they know something, what experiences had they gone through? This process of close querying allowed CPAC to learn a lot about Northeast Ohioans.

It’s about Them

Whether CPAC communicated via speaking, querying, writing or creating a website, a governing dynamic underlay it all—true interest in the people with whom they’re conversing.

“My approach to communications is about them, not me,” noted Van Voorhis, about keeping other people’s interests front and center. “I think you can tell genuine interest. I think people can sense it. Sincerity is so important.”

Valerie Schumacher, whose position as director of artist services requires continual communication with creative Northeast Ohioans and ongoing assessment of their needs, agreed with the need to be genuine. “The fewer assumptions we make about [people] and the more we listen, the better,” she said. She’s found that working one-on-one with constituents...
...working one-on-one with constituents gets easier over time, especially when other CPAC staff members know the same people and a relationship begins to develop between those artists and the whole CPAC organization.

Over the years, the substance and manner of CPAC’s communications—listening, caring, helping—slowly but steadily bred trust. With talented professionals and solid research to draw on, the organization applied its assets to CPAC’s working relationships, Schorgl said. In other words, CPAC spoke through actions, and what that meant in practice was delivering. CPAC fostered a company culture of keeping promises, and whatever it said it would do—fulfill its mission or simply send someone an e-mail—the team worked hard to get it done.

Most people will take a first meeting, Van Voorhis said, but you must follow up with actions you said you’d take for them: “If we don’t do that and circle back for them, that’s it—trust is gone.” Because CPAC assiduously followed up, people and organizations across Northeast Ohio began to trust CPAC to consistently follow through. Those people included journalists, neighborhood residents, arts professionals—and elected officials.
“Tom was effective with the politicians, which was critical,” said the Cleveland Foundation’s Cerveny. “He had all the facts down cold. He just knew his stuff…and people respected that.”

They also respected what former Cuyahoga County Commissioner Jones called Schorgl’s “quiet and persistent determination” and his “common sense on steroids.” Business leaders who had seldom considered the relevance of arts and culture to their sector found themselves persuaded by CPAC’s work. COSE’s Steve Millard became a prominent example: He pointed out that Schorgl’s first presentation to the group had been less than captivating, but in spite of that, Schorgl had opened Millard’s eyes to the idea that artists were businesspeople and that serving them as such “could be good for us and good for [CPAC] and good for the artists.” As a result, Millard served as a CPAC board member, fostering a significant collaboration between CPAC and COSE that provided business training and health-insurance services to artists.

CPAC was equally effective with the news media, whose members were intentionally included from the beginning in the regional discussion about arts and culture. As with other key players in the life and value system of the region, Schorgl systematically contacted and introduced himself to editorial boards, editors, producers and reporters around Northeast Ohio. At the same time, he acquainted them with CPAC’s mission and the issues it was created to address, including providing
them with materials about CPAC. For every subsequent occasion, be it new research to explain, events to announce or a campaign to help launch, CPAC sent releases and sought in-person meetings with media representatives.

In the lengthy course of researching and writing the arts-and-culture plan, for instance, the organization periodically informed the community and key individuals about important findings and data through media releases. Schorgl and his staff also met with members of the press to explain their planning processes and present what had been accomplished to that point. This served the dual purpose of getting useful feedback that could help CPAC refine the plan more effectively before its formal publication, and keeping Northeast Ohioans interested in the planning process and its aims.

But the news media were always invited in, not just during the creation of the arts-and-culture plan: By making nearly every kind of sector meeting and process that CPAC led open and transparent to the media, the staff helped news organizations get interesting stories and CPAC get attention for its cause. Just as important, the warm welcome and good access that CPAC offered reporters led to them understanding the nuances of the arts-and-culture debate through firsthand experiences that encouraged regular, accurate news coverage.

“From the beginning, I found Tom to be completely open about his intentions regarding CPAC’s mission,” said Donald Rosenberg, who, as the Cleveland Plain Dealer’s classical-music critic and arts reporter, covered CPAC’s launch and initial steps. “Tom was always available for comment and CPAC provided all requested information.”
Similarly, CPAC’s communication with the arts community about what they needed and wanted conveyed the organization’s view of them as a boon to Greater Cleveland. Members of the arts-and-culture sector, who had felt ignored by public officials and other leaders, particularly appreciated being invited to share their opinions. As a result, CPAC gained invaluable information about those individuals and the sector. And in turn, artists and arts workers began coming to CPAC with their thoughts and concerns and soon discovered that the staff would advise them and refer them to local experts and useful resources. (And, thanks to foundation support, at no cost.) CPAC became what Schorgl described as a “primary-care physician” for artists and arts and cultural organizations.

These communication tactics—talking with everyone through as many methods as possible, making a convincing and factual case, being sincerely interested in what everyone has to say, working constructively with others—became ingrained in CPAC’s organizational culture and accomplished something critical: They helped people recognize CPAC as an open, accessible organization that welcomed their opinions.

In turn, this enabled CPAC to gather data from a wealth of sources, impartially noting other people’s priorities, concerns and sensitivities. In time, CPAC discovered which aspects of arts and culture appealed most to which Northeast Ohio communities and began to formulate a plan to create resources, healthy growth and community significance for arts and culture. And the organization began winning attention and, frequently, support by offering appropriate, appealing and viable arts-and-culture ideas for addressing the particular problems people needed to solve.

CPAC’s approach to communication also got a core message about creativity and its benefits across to the larger community in ways that created a ripple effect of benefits, starting with individual artists on the grassroots level, and gradually spreading to their families, neighborhoods, people in their professional spheres and community leaders. It illustrated what Cerveny thinks is the real key to strengthening arts and culture through the community, and the community through arts and culture: Through organizations such as CPAC, she said, the people of an industry or city or region have to be able to see that the arts-and-culture sector not only heard them and their concerns, but also gave them what they asked for: “Everybody’s got to win.”

It doesn’t hurt to make people feel special, either. John Paul Lucci, CPAC’s vice president of research operations in the late 1990s, recalled that, when the completed cultural plan was about to be rolled out, the
professional communications firm helping CPAC with the process provided a list of the most influential people in Cleveland. And “we made sure every one of those people had a copy of the plan before it came out,” he said, “so they were in the know before the big story” went public.

**If You Changed One Thing...**

The CPAC team members have used various means of communication to reach all sorts of people in all sorts of places. They’ve succeeded at it, building strong relationships with every sector of the community. But the task was made more difficult, and the group’s efforts sometimes made piecemeal, Van Voorhis admitted, because CPAC has never had a communications or marketing director. Thus, the organization’s most comprehensive impact on public opinion usually came from its various campaigns.

CPAC members know that this is an organizational challenge they’ll have to address before long, because their continued success depends on being able to reach and inform the arts-and-culture sector, influential leaders and the public. Personal interaction matters, Van Voorhis noted, because “people don’t connect to bureaucracies. They mistrust them.”

What CPAC needs to do is continue the kinds of one-on-one contacts with members of the community, from the grassroots to the top leaders, that have been the core of its approach to creative placemaking, she added. “We have to maintain those relationships we’ve already built, and build new ones.”

---

**BUILDING THE TEAM**

If CPAC were involved in sports instead of arts and culture, it would probably be the starting lineup of a basketball team: an intentionally small but select group of players managed as a circle of peers, each of whom is valued for special skills as well as for versatility and is recognized as vitally important to the group’s success. The team’s work requires focus, endurance and flexibility—the capacity to run up and down the court while nimbly adapting to changing circumstances and needs, and never losing sight of the goal. Strong sports teams succeed not only because they possess talent and ability, but also because they have tenacity and heart. Much like a seasoned team, CPAC has won some of
its key placemaking victories through sheer preparedness and a refusal to give up.

As in all its functions, the organization’s size, culture and goals result from a plan. CPAC has never been intended to have legions of staffers, Schorgl said, just a few people well trained in three core areas. From the beginning, the staff has stuck determinedly to those areas—research, public policy and capacity building—despite CPAC’s growing reach and influence within Northeast Ohio’s complex society.

“Their sharp focus—I think that kept them from going too far afield,” noted former Gund Foundation officer Deena Epstein. “If you’re everything to everybody, you’re nothing to no one.”

The generic term CAPACITY BUILDING originally described a process of increasing staff and facilities to handle a growing volume of business. It has evolved to encompass everything from training and equipment to convening and opportunities.

If creative placemaking transforms communities into workshops where imaginative accomplishment can be crafted, then it’s logical to look at capacity building as the systematic increasing of knowledge and tools used in those workshops. But “tools” means more than equipment, and for artists and other creative people, tools include intangible factors as well as concrete, visible items: the right atmosphere as well as the right awl; clear permitting processes as well as a proper dance floor. And perhaps above all, funds and fair access to them.

CPAC regards Cuyahoga County public-sector funding for arts and culture as its most successful capacity-building project. But, said previous CEO and president Tom Schorgl, the organization also views its most-requested service—to act as an intermediary—as a capacity-building function. This is because that work fits into CPAC’s mission to help the arts-and-culture community grow stronger in creative achievement, community respect and financial stability, thus benefiting society in general.
That focus has applied to more than just areas of operation. Board selection and activity, staff hires and tasks, strategic planning, project and organization partner choices, community interaction, messages sought and imparted—all have been, and continue to be, carefully weighed and examined by CPAC to make sure they truly fit with the organization’s mission and goals before the organization commits to them. Yet that rigorous process would have affected Northeast Ohio very little without people on all levels of the CPAC structure who could turn ideas and tactics into productive relationships with each other and the community. It’s because of those people—individuals of ability and humanity—that CPAC has succeeded as an organization.

It benefits from “a strong executive leadership, an absolutely dedicated staff, and a very diverse and influential board. That made it a powerhouse,” said Jones.

On top of that, “Tom established a culture, and CPAC a reputation, for collaboration…so everybody felt welcome, a part of the organization,” said Dennis Lafferty, one of CPAC’s former board chairs.

It’s also helped that those who know the organization well perceive CPAC staff members not only as “really the best,” as COSE’s Millard put it, but as something more: a group with “great credibility and great relationships,” he said. People trusted them. And, he added, “They’re just fun to work with.”

Before it could become skilled, welcoming, trustworthy and fun, however, CPAC had to grow from a concept into a functioning company of professionals. As CEO, president and—for a few months—CPAC’s only employee, Schorgl’s first task was to form a steering committee that could help him to start carrying out his organization’s complicated mission.

As noted in chapter 2, CPAC’s steering committee simultaneously reflected Northeast Ohio’s key sectors and its broad diversity. Its members’ dissimilarities allowed them to put CPAC in touch with a wide variety of people. The members also conveyed CPAC’s bone-deep belief in the importance of arts and culture directly to people in their own arenas.

Eventually, with the help of CPAC staff, steering-committee members mastered the data and the effective arguments for arts and culture as community assets. As the steering committee evolved into a full board, “they were as well-informed as the staff,” Schorgl
noted. Successive board chairs, including high-profile Cleveland finance, law, technology, music and other types of executives, took on rightful nonprofit leadership responsibilities, such as helping to set the tone for the whole board, creating committees and appointing leaders, heading the executive committee and overseeing fiduciary matters.

The board members “were the ones who said, ‘This is what CPAC needs to do as an organization,’” Van Voorhis explained. But also, she said, “what I’ve seen in critical moments is that the board, because of its diverse composition, [provides] a critically important external view for the staff,” giving them the outside perspectives they need to understand and serve the community.

But why were leaders of their rank moved to join CPAC—this tiny, new enterprise in an industry traditionally lacking money, power and status—in the first place? For two dominant reasons: First, because foundations are arguably Greater Cleveland’s most influential organizations, the fact that they had seen a need to launch CPAC and support it with funding and counsel practically guaranteed the cooperation of community leaders with CPAC’s efforts, at least initially. The second reason is simpler: Data.

Lafferty, then executive assistant to the Cleveland-based managing partners of Jones Day, one of the world’s largest law firms, had seen some of that data. It was part of the information that CPAC had begun releasing bit by bit as it researched the arts-and-culture sector’s economic impact for the regional plan it was developing.
When Lafferty read, as many other Northeast Ohioans were reading, that arts and culture represented a $1.3 billion industry in the seven counties around Cleveland and Akron, he realized that there was a “compelling case to be made for public-sector arts funding,” he recalled. “I was convinced we had a need and an opportunity.”

He was also impressed with Schorgl, whom he found knowledgeable, inclusive, transparent and collaborative, as well as with the thoroughness of the research, he said. Lafferty later joined the board, became chair and found his instincts about CPAC and its leader validated.

CPAC’s “was always a hands-on, active board [with] vigorous communication and very, very high attendance,” he recalled. As chair, Lafferty continued, he would meet frequently with Schorgl to talk about issues facing the organization. Schorgl would provide background information, and the two would examine options, sketch out a potential direction and then take it to the board as a whole for discussion. Once an action had been agreed on, CPAC staff would carry it out. The board had so much confidence in the staff, he added, that “there was no micromanaging.”

Board members from inside the arts-and-culture community had similar reactions to CPAC’s internal culture and process. “I came to the table thinking, ‘Wow, this is a really impressive group of people!’” said longtime board member and treasurer Stephanie Morrison Hrbek, who is also the founder and former executive director of Cleveland’s community stage company, Near West Theatre. She joined the board because she was aware that CPAC aimed to get long-needed public-sector funding established for the arts-and-culture sector. “I knew that this was the make-or-break action step for us to join forces with. It was an absolute privilege” to be asked to serve on the board, she explained. She “didn’t even think about it” before agreeing.

Hrbek soon came to admire the way CPAC business was conducted. Schorgl built a team by sharing power and giving the staff room to grow. As the steering committee became an official board focused on policy rather than on daily operational tasks, most of the members’ work took place in board committees composed of “really strong people. It was a well-oiled machine,” Hrbek said, with board meetings serving as the opportunity for hard-working committees to report their progress to the entire board.

The members focused on strategic planning as well as on specific issues. Aided by Schorgl’s knowledge and experience in arts-and-
culture policy and organizational matters, CPAC provided its board with the information and structure needed to get planning work done. “That was a very inclusive and deep process for us,” Hrbek recalled, one that generated energy and breakout groups that brought ideas forth for discussion by the board, staff and stakeholders who were invited to participate. “Tom made sure there was a continuum of people in the room, diverse people. Everybody was heard. There was always leadership.”

There was also trust, something Lafferty said the organization built from within the same way it was building it across regional sectors: by listening, discussing, providing reliable information and always following through. “Just hard work, slogging day by day,” he added.

For the board, that work was made more effective as all of CPAC’s actual operations became staff-driven, including jobs such as collecting relevant informational materials and typing up meeting agendas that supported board activities. “I had everything put in front of me,” Hrbek observed. “The staff was handling the minutiae and it makes the job of the board that much easier.”

She said CPAC set a standard of meticulous business conduct that included assigning a finance-committee member to review CPAC’s books every quarter. “We’d never done that” at Near West Theatre, she admitted.

Choosing Believers

To carry out a complex mission in such rigorous fashion, CPAC needed staff members of unusual commitment. Schorgl knew that, with the small team CPAC could afford, his hires were going to have to be multitalented and capable of learning new areas of operation quickly. He wasn’t necessarily looking for people trained solely in the arts, he said. As a result, CPAC has been staffed, over time, by employees with skills—in business management, public policy, technology or other fields—on top of their experience and/or abiding interest in arts and culture. Whatever their backgrounds, the passion CPAC staff members have demonstrated most clearly is for positive community change and the process of creating it. Van Voorhis describes it as a calling.

Certainly, a CPAC job requires caring about people, whether individually, as a society or both, and about facts, two areas that mark the opposite ends of a very wide interest spectrum. Indeed. Valerie Schumacher, CPAC’s director of artist services and its website manager, experiences the demands of those two extremes every day. “I love what I do, I love connecting people to resources that can help them,” she said. “What I’ve noticed about working here is that we always deliver.”
The specific artist resources she delivers require a range of skills to create, from listening to artists and attending their events to making sure the CPAC websites she helped design function properly and contain fresh, useful information. Accuracy, flexibility and real concern apply to everything she does. With artists, “the more genuine we are, the better,” Schumacher said. “We just all have to ask questions. What we do is help people understand what they do.”

**Building Consensus**

Having a staff whose members come from different backgrounds but who are all passionate about what they do occasionally results in deep divisions of opinion.

During early internal discussions about the Artists in Residence project, for example, Beattie, CPAC’s community-development specialist at the time, was all for it. Van Voorhis, with her background in financial matters and her commitment to finding capital for artists, had reservations. She worried that CPAC might lose sight of arts and culture in the complex work of salvaging property and lifting up whole neighborhoods. Their opinions didn’t jibe. But CPAC operates on the principle of consensus. Something had to give.

So the staff did what they always do: “You hash it out,” looking at the risks and opportunities and playing devil’s advocate, Schorgl explained. “You go through that [process] and you come to an ‘Aha!’ moment” where everyone thinks things might work. Staff agreement is crucial to board support, he added.

“We negotiate with one another,” Van Voorhis said. But after vigorous debate on a decision, eventually someone yields. “And then we all get behind it. Period.”

In this case, it was Van Voorhis who reached the turning point. As a staff member, she observed, you have to choose your battles and know when to let go. “I remember making a choice to set aside the skepticism and see where this would go. It was a transition moment for me personally.”

---

**ATTRACTING FUNDING**

CPAC began its organizational life with an advantage: The two foundations that launched it, alongside the two that quickly followed, the John P.
Murphy Foundation and the Kulas Foundation, have also provided CPAC with general operating funds since its inception in 1997. Though the money has not been guaranteed (CPAC has had to demonstrate progress toward its goals as well as propose a funding renewal every year, and amounts have varied over the organization’s two decades), the funding’s relative reliability has given CPAC validity in the eyes of other funders. It has also allowed CPAC to work more adventurously and effectively. As a result, CPAC’s projects have become attractive to more specific kinds of funding from other grantors.

Hard to find as that kind of operating support might seem, pursuing it is essential to any organization that hopes to create significant community change, because change of that nature takes relentless effort over time.⁵⁶

“Those things don’t happen without focus,” and the foundations’ front-end investment in CPAC allowed it to maintain that focus, noted Van Voorhis.

Schorgl views that investment as critical to mission success. In fact, he thinks the first move of every service organization should be to find dependable operating support, in much the same way that smart entrepreneurs secure start-up funds before launching an enterprise. In communities lacking foundations, he said, other powerful organizations and leaders—whether in government, business or other civic-minded sectors—may be persuaded to provide the needed funding.

The Art of Attraction

From its founding backers and from the cultural plan’s well-researched delineation of the arts-and-culture sector’s value and needs, CPAC gained not only validation, but also community trust. Those advantages led to others: One of the most significant was when CPAC received key funding from a national source, Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC), established in 2003 to address artists’ needs and to create opportunities for artists over a 10-year period. As discussed in previous chapters, with LINC’s support, CPAC was able to carry out aspects of its regional plan by creating collaborative business-training programs for artists and by researching and sharing information about artist-based community development. Those initiatives, in turn, helped CPAC merit funding from the Kresge Foundation, the Surdna Foundation and the Educational Foundation of America among others, to develop more research and models for creative placemaking, such as the Artists in Residence program in Cleveland’s North Collinwood neighborhood.

Funders’ satisfaction with CPAC stems directly from the same sorts of best practices and exacting processes that CPAC follows in all areas of
its work and recommends to the organizations it counsels. Its approach to development includes:

- Rigorously researching foundations.
- Using that research to engage truly appropriate grant-makers for the projects CPAC believes it should create.
- Meeting with foundation program directors before applying, to connect with—and learn from—them in the same kinds of face-to-face conversations that characterize all of CPAC’s research and outreach efforts.
- Delivering on application promises once you’ve been funded.

CPAC doesn’t just chase dollars, explained Kristin Puch, the organization’s director of research and advancement: It looks for compelling reasons, derived from data, to start new endeavors and match those ventures with funding sources that potentially align with them.

That makes a difference, she added. CPAC isn’t guessing about the community it serves or the funders it hopes to attract—it does research. And solid research, such as that done for the regional plan or during CPAC’s artist-needs assessments, not only steers the choice of project to something the community provably needs or wants, but also helps funders understand the impact of CPAC’s work, allowing CPAC to make a convincing case for the need for funding. In addition, further research into the results and effects of a funded project clearly shows funders their return on investment.

**Positioning and Flexibility**

Puch thinks that CPAC’s success with funders has been due in part to the organization’s ability to create a unique niche for itself. “Our focus on the cross-sector work is something that really sets us apart,” she said. So has CPAC’s geographic concentration on the Greater Cleveland area. “Being so responsive to the community…I think that has helped us to attract national attention for that funding.”

CPAC has been fortunate so far in its sources of support. But like all not-for-profit organizations, it needs to think continually about augmenting its resources in new ways. Over the years, the CPAC team has considered steps such as making CPAC a membership organization to create income from dues, Van Voorhis noted. The organization decided against that particular change but, in future, may have to try to expand its support in some other way.
Always, the issue of funding requires self-evaluation. “We have to ask, ‘What does the community want from us?’” said Van Voorhis. “And, ‘Where should we go for support?’”

EXECTURING DEMONSTRATION MODELS

CPAC has proved over and over that successful creative placemaking depends on research of all kinds. Yet, as in certain college courses, some ideas and experiences can’t truly be understood simply by doing the reading. In those cases, the organization has to go into the lab and try them out to see how they work.

That lab is the Greater Cleveland community. There, CPAC has experimented with many aspects of creative placemaking, from arts-business services and public arts-and-economic-impact grants to tax relief and community-development opportunities for arts and culture organizations and individual artists.

The core strategy behind...all of CPAC’s collaborative demonstration models...was to approach these experiments as opportunities to show how arts and culture can contribute to other sectors’ work and goals.
Arts as Partner and Problem Solver

The core strategy behind this and all of CPAC’s collaborative demonstration models, said Beattie, was to approach these experiments as opportunities to show how arts and culture can contribute to other sectors’ work and goals, rather than chances to demand favors for artists and cultural workers. “The idea is about arts and culture being additive to the work at hand and key to community impact,” he explained.

Though each of these models resulted in something concrete, such as research or action steps, all of them have functioned primarily as ongoing dialogues among people from sectors that traditionally have little contact with one another, at least in Cleveland. The benefits of those discussions, said Beattie, include “increasing the visibility of arts and culture well outside of CPAC, as a collaborative force.”

Artists in Residence proved important as an artist-housing project, he noted, but it also had collateral impact, such as increasing the amount of...
Northeast Shores’ arts-and-culture programming and getting its marketing and transition-services operations established. Artists in Residence also sparked substantive arts projects and businesses, and helped Northeast Shores qualify for its ArtPlace America grant.

The results prove the validity of what Beattie described as the project’s intentional “reseeding approach,” which allows good work, skills and knowledge to survive and evolve after the collaboration itself has ended.

Linda Warren of Cleveland Neighborhood Progress and Village Capital seconded that. Though projects like Artists in Residence often can’t be replicated because the funding used to create them ceases to exist, low-cost components or byproducts of such projects frequently can, she said. For example, Warren noted, two long-term gains that Artists in Residence delivered include an artist project that makes tiny galleries of repurposed phone booths and bus stops, and Artists in Residence

61 / Approach your experiments as opportunities.
62 / Though some projects can’t be replicated, low-cost components or byproducts of such projects frequently can.
collaborators having learned how to work with the Cuyahoga Land Bank to get homes for artists.

“Those small things are completely transferable,” she said.

So are relationships: As a result of CPAC’s 2014 Creative Minds in Medicine research, Northeast Shores developed its Collinwood 2015 program providing money to neighborhood artists for arts-and-health projects. It also takes full advantage of CPAC’s placemaking research, with staff avidly combing through any newly released data to see if it can be applied to Northeast Shores’ work, said Northeast director Friedman.

// //

During its first 20 years, CPAC has learned an immeasurable amount from its various ventures, regardless of where a given project has fallen on the continuum of success: The organization’s frank misfires, partial wins and unmitigated accomplishments have all helped it gain insight, wisdom and know-how. There may not be a recipe or a codified formula for creative placemaking, but CPAC continues to appraise and apply all lessons learned, and it’s getting smarter as it gets older.
Though projects such as Artists in Residence often can’t be replicated because the funding used to create them ceases to exist, low-cost components or byproducts of such projects frequently can.
Brandon Juhasz, Rear View, c-print mounted on sintra, 2011
Looking to the Future

CPAC’s 20-Year Anniversary Has Provided the Organization with an Unusual Opportunity to Evaluate Itself, Its Missteps and Its Accomplishments; Learn from the Wealth of Information It Had Accrued, Factual, Political and Spiritual; and Shape the Resulting Awareness into a Re-Invigorated Future for Itself and for the Artistic and General Communities It Serves.

This self-assessment isn’t itself atypical—CPAC has been examining its own practices, methods and decisions from the start. What makes this occasion singular for the staff is the coincident and consequential transition that occurred at the end of 2017: After two exceptionally successful decades as the organization’s founding president and CEO, Tom Schorgl retired. Megan Van Voorhis, a 15-year CPAC veteran and the group’s longtime COO, has taken the helm of this well-established, unprecedentedly innovative arts service organization.

The self-check that accompanied this transition was an opportunity “to look realistically at where we are now,” explained Van Voorhis, “and constructively move forward.” This analysis has proved fruitful in some expected ways, such as showing the team just how far they and Cuyahoga County’s arts and citizens have come since 1997. Looking back over CPAC’s first two decades has allowed the staff to identify and take satisfaction in their considerable big-picture accomplishments. Other discoveries were more surprising.

A PERCEPTUAL SEA CHANGE

Cuyahoga County’s public-sector funding and the methods by which it was secured represent what most people believe to be CPAC’s single most significant, widely noted and far-reaching contribution on behalf of the arts-and-culture sector.

CPAC moved the needle on Cuyahoga County’s public arts support from zero to 60 in less than a decade. The difference that has made for
artists and area arts organizations has almost literally been the difference between life and death, especially during the grim years of the Great Recession and its aftermath.

“No other organization has made such a major financial contribution” to the arts-and-culture sector in such a short time, said Greg Peckham, the managing director of LAND studio who is also a CPAC board member. For organizations such as his, he added, “That has been a fundamental, game-changing” factor affecting bottom lines.

But one of the most compelling differences between life pre- and post-CPAC may be less obvious at first look: the fundamental shift in the Northeast Ohio community's perception of arts and culture.

As important as the money has been and continues to be to Greater Cleveland's artists and its cultural groups of all sizes, the tools and methodical approaches CPAC used to make that money possible, combined with the potent collaborations and political alliances it built, have created an even rarer and more meaningful change in Northeast Ohio: a change in public understanding about the value of arts and culture and the need to support them for the good of all residents.
Now, said Van Voorhis, local “officials have a much higher appreciation for, and better understanding of, the arts-and-culture sector” than they did before CPAC began its work. And the general “attitude toward us, toward arts and culture, is quite sincere and it’s favorable.”

CPAC’s data-driven, inclusive approach enabled it to attain one of its main goals, “creating an environment that looks at arts and culture as a partner,” Van Voorhis noted. “We’ve seen a dramatic change in the ways arts and culture have been infused in Cleveland society.” That partnership between the arts and the citizens of Northeast Ohio grew stronger as the public-sector arts funding saved arts organizations and produced what former Cleveland Foundation leader Steven Minter called a “wealth of outreach programs” enriching the lives of children and adults across Cuyahoga County.

Schorgl sees the funding and other civic gains for the arts as the results of CPAC bridging gaps and ending the arts’ exclusion from the general life and functions of the community. “CPAC’s success [is creating] connections within the arts-and-culture sector and outside the arts-and-culture sector,” he said. “Because of that, in different ways, the arts-and-culture sector has reached out to work with the community” and reinforce its own value.

That evolution of perspective—primarily among voters, but also within other sectors, including media, government, business, community-development, health and safety—amounts to a quiet revolution. “Clearly, what Cleveland is today,” said Minter, “is an enormous tribute to CPAC,” which helped organize the community and served as a data source and strong advocate for the arts-and-culture sector’s inclusion in economic turnaround.

By changing the minds of Northeast Ohio’s residents and leaders, CPAC not only stabilized many of Greater Cleveland’s arts-and-culture organizations, but also “brought to the forefront the political power an arts community could have if it worked together,” noted Wayne Lawson, former head of the Ohio Arts Council.

CPAC’s process of persuasion has fundamentally altered the public’s outlook on more than the arts. They also see themselves and the place where they live differently now. From CPAC’s research came “Education—waking people up to the world that is, not the world that could be,” said former Cleveland City Council member Joe Cimperman.

In other words, the public learned what arts and culture were already doing for Northeast Ohio because CPAC gathered and disseminated that information, helping artists and the larger community see and talk about the reality of Cleveland’s cultural, economic and other challenges. Over
Some potential benefits of arts and culture go undiscovered

Innovative solutions, cultural and community progress

Scarcity Mindset among arts-and-culture orgs and artists as they compete with other sectors and each other for finite resources

Arts and culture’s ability to produce sustained benefit is at risk

Service organizations must maintain a critical balance between evaluating and supporting the arts-and-culture sector and maintaining relationships with peer sectors. In order for partners to effectively tap into the full potential of arts and culture, the arts-and-culture sector must be resourced. If either player is concerned only with its own survival, a partnership isn’t possible.
time, it offered the area’s residents a wide variety of arts-related solutions to those challenges, from better capitalization and training to new cross-sector roles for artists, creating a kind of civic momentum fueled by the recognition of artists’ worth to the city and region. By the time CPAC began mobilizing arts workers and supporters on behalf of Issue 18 in 2006, Cuyahoga County voters were ready to acknowledge that arts, culture and creativity had a vital role to play in the area’s improvement—a role the arts sector backed with newfound political muscle that surprised everyone, including themselves.

“The artists themselves pointed out the power in the community,” Cimperman said.

ABLE PARTNERS

Having achieved so much with area artists and denizens, CPAC now finds itself not only in the midst of a big transition, but also in a rather surprising yet strangely familiar situation. Twenty years on from the organization’s beginnings, staff members feel as if they’ve spiraled back to their foundations: CPAC’s self-appraisal has revealed that the elemental needs experienced by artists, the arts and the region’s residents in 1997 both have been effectively addressed and yet persist.

Fundamental among these is the perennial necessity for money. The arts-and-culture sector can be a uniquely capable partner in communities’ work toward vitality. But being such an able ally “requires stable funding,” stated Van Voorhis. “The sector can’t be a partner if [artists and organizations are] worried about where their next check is coming from.” Conversely, Schorgl added, once the sector has that security, communities quickly see its positive ramifications.

Van Voorhis enlarged the point by referring to the concept of “scarcity mindset,” a theory proposed by Sendhil Mullainathan, an economics professor at Harvard, and Eldar Shafir, a psychology professor at Princeton. “Basically,” Van Voorhis summarized, “when you don’t have enough of something, you can think only about that thing, about that scarcity. And then you make decisions related only to your immediate scarcity, not to your longer-term needs.” This mindset precludes one’s ability to think about the future, she added—and “this is very related to the situation artists find themselves in.”

All of this has activated a purposeful realization for Van Voorhis—that “a weak arts-and-culture sector does not a good partner make. A weak sector doesn’t recognize the value that others bring to the conversation, and doesn’t allow for knitting people together around a common vision. CPAC is the community partnership for arts and culture,” she emphasized,
“and the arts can be a great force for good, but that’s a ‘both and’ proposition,” it isn’t binary. Constructing a fully healthy society, she added, doesn’t mean pitting “community development versus arts development—both are necessary. Having a strong community requires a strong arts-and-culture sector.”

“CPAC is still a catalyst...that’s one of the main things we do. But we must be a product of what’s needed now. And we’re doing that.”

CELEBRATING THE COMMON CAUSE

CPAC, beginning with Schorgl, has always understood that the place of arts and culture in a vibrant civilization isn’t peripheral or as an afterthought—it’s central, essential. And Van Voorhis’ insight roots her more deeply in this stance. “CPAC’s job,” she stated, “is to ensure that conditions for a vigorous arts-and-culture sector exist” in Northeast Ohio.

In 1997 the sector’s acute and chronic shortages convinced the Cleveland and Gund foundations that an entity such as CPAC was needed. Twenty years later, some of those issues are ongoing. So is CPAC’s ability to address them. In fact, meeting the sector’s needs is what CPAC excels at.

And the CPAC team will do it by continuing to apply its core competencies: executing and sharing in-depth research, serving as an intermediary both within the arts-and-culture sector and between it and the larger community, and providing arts-related solutions to the region’s challenges. “CPAC has a good track record of helping the arts-and-culture sector stay healthy and strong,” said Schorgl.

What the group focuses on as it goes about meeting the needs of the area’s artists, arts-and-culture groups and the public may shift somewhat in the coming years. What won’t change is another of CPAC’s core competencies: planning. Appropriate to its recent self-audit, and harking back to its origins, CPAC has been researching and composing a new strategic plan.
Beginning in the fall of 2016, the organization began to gather data for the plan, which is moving them through the passage from Schorgl’s legacy to Van Voorhis’ tenure. As always when CPAC engages in planning, this meant talking to a lot of people: The process included three focus groups, numerous key-person interviews with principal stakeholders and an online survey that produced 610 responses. CPAC took all the information generated by this investigation and shared it with the group’s board of trustees during a retreat. Last, in February of 2018, it shared the new strategic plan with the public, via community dialogues.

The current plan’s mission, “To advance the arts and culture sector in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County,” reinvigorates CPAC’s original calling, “To strengthen, unify and connect greater Cleveland’s arts and culture sector.” The plan’s four areas of strategic focus, similar to some of the group’s early goals, are to

- secure additional sustainable revenue for the arts-and-culture sector,
- strengthen the arts-and-culture learning landscape,
- develop cultural policies with local governments, and
- increase public participation in arts and culture.

“CPAC is still a catalyst,” stated Van Voorhis. “That’s one of the main things we do. But we must be a product of what’s needed now. And we’re doing that.”

One of the ideas the team has been kicking around is the creation of a new community cultural plan—a blueprint for its next two decades. A contemporary cultural plan, if one arises, “would establish a new shared vision and agenda for the future of arts and culture in our region, for where all need to go together,” Van Voorhis said. If a new cultural plan does even a fraction of the good that the first one did, Northeast Ohio’s future looks bright.

Over its 20-year history, CPAC has unified and engaged multiple local sectors, scores of organizations and thousands of individuals around numerous causes, large, small and in between. Its fundamental belief that arts and culture are imperative to the educational, social, psychological and economic well-being of humans, and to the building and sustaining of vital communities, has had a profound effect on the society it serves, helping its residents benefit—measurably and immeasurably—from the multifaceted, multi-sector assets generated by creative placemaking. CPAC’s conviction has transformed areas of Greater Cleveland and Northeast Ohio, physically, sociologically, financially and spiritually.

Cleveland, once a poster child for postindustrial urban decline, now is a thriving example of creative placemaking.
Lynnea Holland Weiss, part of the Zoetic Walls mural project by Waterloo Arts. Photo by CPAC.
This book is devoted to the tale of the astonishing impact that the Community Partnership for Arts and Culture has had on Greater Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. It details the vision and the faith in the power of the arts evinced first by the Cleveland and Gund foundations, then by what became the CPAC team and then by myriad additional supporters. All of the players in this narrative have labored or still labor to make a positive difference, on multiple fronts, in the quality of the daily lives of the region’s citizens, artist and nonartist alike.

But what this story doesn’t mention is the unseen, bedrock philosophy on which CPAC’s creation and existence securely rest. This wisdom may be invisible even to CPAC members and their compatriots, but every program, every practice, every meeting, every service that the group’s staffers and supporters engage in reveals it.

It’s the assumption of universal, inherent value vs. the assumption of hierarchical, assigned value.

The dual, intersecting acts of strengthening arts and culture and of creative placemaking organically and inexorably pierce the architecture of traits through which value is normally determined in our world: one’s gender, race, class, sexual orientation, etc. Creating, enjoying and experiencing art, in any form, via any method and in any place, can reveal all of us to each other as kindred souls. The connections created by the metamorphic infusion of art into everyday lives make it possible to glimpse how the world might look if each person in it was understood, by all of us, to be as important as every other person in it.

Especially for the world as it exists now, such transmutation is a lofty ambition and, when it occurs, a fleeting achievement. But the continual, hammering attempt to increase the opportunities to realize this aspiration, despite its ephemerality, is at the heart of what CPAC does. Intrinsic to creative placemaking and to CPAC’s approach to its work is the bone-deep conviction that everyone involved—from an individual artist to a CEO to the manager of small arts company to an elderly homeowner to a student to the small business owner down the block—gets to have a say in the shaping of our society.

CPAC is by no means the only organization endeavoring to transform a city and its citizenry through a core belief in the affirming influence of the arts. Nor have its efforts been unerring or always successful. But despite the inevitable frustrations and occasional failures encountered over the previous two decades, the group has been and will continue to be a potent example of creative placemaking and its ability to make human society a better place to be.

In the end, this may be its most significant service to its community, to its partners.

—Kay Mallett
RESOURCES

Supplemental Materials
Timelines
LINC includes Cleveland in survey
Foundation Center launches Funding for Arts Month
CPAC releases “Advancing Support Systems for Artists in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area”
CPAC hosts Expert Hour as an ancillary program of AEI
Broward County, FL, licenses AEI
CPAC surveys artists re: their work/living space needs
Charlotte, NC, licenses AEI
CPAC launches From Rust Belt to Artist Belt (“Artist Belt”) conference

2002–2008
CPAC hosts Engaging the Future efforts with Cleveland Foundation.

Akron licenses AEI.

Welcome to Cleveland Weekend.

CPAC hosts an arts and health tour for public officials.

CPAC releases Creative Minds in Medicine white paper.

CPAC hosts Creative Intersections Speaker Series on arts and safety.

CPAC launches AEI online.

Artist Belt white paper is released.

CPAC hosts second Artist Belt conference.


Artist Belt II report is released.

Artist Belt II report is released.

Creative Intersections Timeline continued

BUSINESS / COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT / EDUCATION / HEALTH / SAFETY

July 2013

CPAC supports Engaging the Future efforts with Cleveland Foundation.

August 2013

Welcome to Cleveland Weekend.

October 2009


July 2010

Artist Belt II report is released.

September 2016

CPAC hosts Creative Intersections Speaker Series on arts and safety.

March 2016

CPAC launches AEI online.

September 2016

CPAC releases Creative Minds in Medicine white paper.
### Timelines

#### 2008–2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CPAC includes arts learning as a strategic imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Creative Compass website launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>North Shore Collinwood neighborhood is selected for pilot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Detroit hosts 3rd Artist Belt conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Artists in Residence is announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Putting Artists on the Map shows where artists are in CLE and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The City Club hosts a panel on Creative Minds in Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CPAC hosts Creative Minds in Medicine conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CPAC submits testimony in support of music therapy licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>CPAC releases documentary on arts and urban youth safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>St. Louis hosts 4th Artist Belt conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Detroit hosts 3rd Artist Belt conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Artists in Residence is announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Putting Artists on the Map shows where artists are in CLE and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>CPAC submits testimony in support of music therapy licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Creative Compass website launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>North Shore Collinwood neighborhood is selected for pilot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Detroit hosts 3rd Artist Belt conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Artists in Residence is announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Putting Artists on the Map shows where artists are in CLE and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>CPAC includes arts learning as a strategic imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Creative Compass website launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>North Shore Collinwood neighborhood is selected for pilot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Detroit hosts 3rd Artist Belt conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Artists in Residence is announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Putting Artists on the Map shows where artists are in CLE and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>CPAC submits testimony in support of music therapy licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Creative Compass website launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>North Shore Collinwood neighborhood is selected for pilot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Detroit hosts 3rd Artist Belt conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Artists in Residence is announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Putting Artists on the Map shows where artists are in CLE and why</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOCAL PUBLIC-SECTOR FUNDING / OTHER POLICY ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2000</td>
<td>CPAC forms Cuyahoga County Public Policy Task Force; begins meeting with County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2000</td>
<td>Lake County forms Lake County Arts and Culture Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2001</td>
<td>Produce framework and resolution for Cultural and Economic Public Policy for SCACD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland City Council enacts Live-Work Overlay District Zoning Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Lake County Bed Tax approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2003</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County Cultural Leadership Taskforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2004</td>
<td>Issue 31 on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2004</td>
<td>Issue 31 defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>Arts-and-culture sector backs Health and Human Services Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Formation of Regional Arts and Cultural District (RACD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
<td>RACD Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2006</td>
<td>Amendment to ORC3381—Tobacco Tax Permissive Authority (passed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>Issue 18 on ballot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St. Clair-Superior becomes first legally zoned Live-Work Overlay District
Arts and Cultural Summit I
Arts and Cultural Summit II
Cuyahoga County Cultural Roundtable
CPAC counsels launch of CAC General Operating Support Grants
Economic analysis of CAC ACE Grants
CPAC counsels launch of CAC Project Support Grants
Issue 18 approved
Amendment to ORC3381—Population Requirements
Lake County Visitors Bureau Arts and Culture Fund
Cuyahoga County Arts and Culture as Economic (ACE) Development Grants
House Bill 66—Tobacco Tax Permissive Authority
Amendment to ORC3381—CAC Board #’s
CPAC counsels launch of CAC General Operating Support Grants
Economic analysis of CAC ACE Grants
CPAC counsels launch of CAC Project Support Grants

2002
MAY 2002
OCT 2002
FEB 2003
JULY 2004
SEPT 2004
APRIL 2005
NOV 2006
JUNE 2007
NOV 2007
PUBLIC POLICY TIMELINE

continued

LOCAL PUBLIC-SECTOR FUNDING / OTHER POLICY ISSUES

- Investing in Artists report
  - DEC 2007

- Creative Workforce Fellowship program launch
  - JAN 2009

- Arts & Culture Advocacy Taskforce
  - JAN 2012

- CAC environmental scan
  - MARCH 2012

- Admissions Tax Exemption—Small Live Music Clubs testimony
  - JULY 2012

- Advocacy Training Series
  - MARCH 2014

- Arts and Culture Action Committee
  - SEPT 2014

- Ambassador Group Model vetted
  - FEB 2015

- Issue 8 focus groups
  - MAY 2015
Part IV: Supplemental Materials

Research List

1999
- Artists, Organizations & Audience Survey Results
- Cultural Budget and Economic Activity Analysis for Northeast Ohio
- Target Markets

2000
- Northeast Ohio’s Arts and Culture Plan

March 2002
- Benefits and Barriers: A Survey of Arts and Culture Consumers in NEO

2002
- Cleveland City Council Arts and Culture Summit Report

March 2003
- Benefits and Barriers: A Survey of Arts and Culture Consumers in the Greater Akron Area

July 2003
- Presentation of Workforce, Programs and Services Loss Study

January 2004
- Economic Impact of Non-Local Arts and Culture Consumers
- Arts & Culture Organizations: A Study of Their Occupations

February 2004
- Cuyahoga County Public Sector Arts and Culture Investment Models

June 2004
- Arts and Cultural Industry Workforce Parameter

December 2004
- Arts and Cultural Festival Competitive Analysis

February 2005
- Advancing Support Systems for Artists in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area

July 2005
- Northeast Ohio Cultural Consumer Insight

September 2005
- Increasing the Strength of the Undercapitalized in the Arts and Culture Sector

April 2006
- Festival Funding Analyses

August 2006
- Educational Outcomes—Cleveland School of the Arts

October 2006
- Cuyahoga County Arts & Culture Nonprofit Groups: Initial Assessment of The Sector’s Financial Status—A Five-Year Analysis of Organizations’ 990 Reports

October 2006
- Arts, Culture & Allied Employment

2007
- Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan Assessment
- Investing in Artists

September 2007
- Collaborative Marketing Database Launches

January 2008
- Ohio Cultural Data Project (DataArts) Launches
MAY-08  Strengthening Arts and Culture: Familiarity, Use and Favorability of Sector-Enhancing Activities
DECEMBER-08  From Rust Belt to Artist Belt White Paper
OCTOBER-09  Cuyahoga County Arts and Culture Organizations and Economic Recession
OCTOBER-09  Arts & Cultural Asset Mapping Guide
FEBRUARY-10  CMD Marketing & Audience Development Project
JULY-10  From Rust Belt to Artist Belt II Report
OCTOBER-11  Remix Cleveland
APRIL-12  Putting Artists on the Map
MAY-12  Statewide Snapshot of Arts & Culture Nonprofits
APRIL-13  Culture Pulse
JULY-13  Engaging the Future
JANUARY-14  Capital Campaigns Research
MARCH-14  Creative Workforce Fellowship Evaluation
APRIL-14  Creative Minds in Medicine White Paper
MAY-14  City Club Program—Creative Minds in Healthcare
JULY-14  When Artists Break Ground
OCT-14  Culture Pulse
NOVEMBER-14  Forming Cleveland
OCT-15  Dance Focus Group—Economic Cluster Analysis
NOV-15  Literature Focus Group—Economic Cluster Analysis
DEC-15  Culture Pulse
JAN-16  Theatre Focus Groups—Economic Cluster Analysis
APRIL 17  Culture Pulse: 5-year Trend Analysis
JUNE 17  Staging Cleveland
### Capacity-Building Programs and Services

As a means of strengthening arts and culture while building relationships, CPAC engaged in a number of services that were not discussed in-depth in this book. Below is a list of those activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Launch Year</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Year Ended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Technical assistance, counsel and research support</td>
<td>remains active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture4Me online calendar</td>
<td>transitioned 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture ADD</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Artist as an Entrepreneur Institute (AEI)</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AEI is translated in partnership with CIPUSA</td>
<td>single offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>COSE Arts Network</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CPAC licenses AEI curriculum nationally and locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Broward County, FL</td>
<td>remains active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>State of South Carolina</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>COSE Arts Network</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Summit ArtSpace (formerly Akron Area Arts Alliance)</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Creative Workforce Fellowship Program</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Audience Matters: Marketing and Innovation</td>
<td>single offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Creative Compass</td>
<td>remains active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Booked!</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Speak Up 2-day workshop</td>
<td>single offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Artist as an Entrepreneur Institute goes online</td>
<td>remains active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Core Values

INTRODUCTION

1. (page 7) Research lays the foundation before any investment, to define what service organization or project is needed.

2. (page 8) Credible research results challenge or confirm your own assumptions rather than reinforce existing beliefs.

3. (page 13) As a result of leadership breaking down silos between sectors and the sectors working as a unified force, Northeast Ohio has changed the way it regards and treats arts and culture. Just as importantly, arts and culture have profoundly changed Northeast Ohio, especially Greater Cleveland.

4. (pages 13–14) Artist entrepreneurship and investment have turned neighborhoods into centers of creative energy.

PART I

5. (page 24) Success is dependent on trust.

6. (page 26) The value of arts and culture is measurable in certain ways.

7. (page 26) Reputation is built by the actions you take and repeat.

8. (page 26) Every program, service and planning process should be a result of rigorous factual examination.

9. (page 27) When you’re trying to solve a problem, bring people together and listen to them. Then follow up and tell them what you heard.
10. (page 29) Data-based planning leads to concrete changes in neighborhoods and
towns that positively affect quality of life, making existence more enjoyable for
residents and persuading people from elsewhere to visit or move there.

11. (page 30) Diversity means many things, including different sectors, leaders of all
demographics and varying philosophies.

12. (page 31) An inclusive and transparent process by which decisions and plans are
made is sometimes equally as important as the result.
• Every additional effort is worth the authentic relationships and perspectives
  that result
• Transparency and building relationships require including the public at every
  stage and level of the process

13. (page 37) Bringing people together to explore similarities and differences and
to mutually discover common ground is a critical step in building trust and buy-in.

14. (page 40) When trying to achieve a specific and common goal, it's critical to
convene regularly.

15. (page 42) If you see a need, bring people together and talk about it.

16. (page 47) Welcome and invite members of the press to planning conversations.

17. (page 49) Become a resource for other people’s legislative efforts—earning trust
and buy-in—before initiating your own.

18. (page 56) Know your strengths. Work with pros in other fields whenever needed.
Regarding public funding, you’ve got to have someone, or a team, who understands
politics on all levels.

19. (page 57) Task forces can be used to study and demonstrate different ways in
which proceeds of arts-and-culture taxes (or another new funding mechanism) might
be distributed.

20. (page 58) To craft a ballot issue with any chance of success, one must balance
competing interests of the broader community and the arts-and-culture sector.

21. (page 58) In any community, openness and transparency make people feel included,
reduce their suspicion of change and change makers, and allow them to see the
context of the issue—to grasp why it's important.

22. (page 59) When developing grant programs, organizational capacity and access to
capital are important considerations for distributing funding.

23. (page 60) Understand the local players and culture before setting a public policy
agenda. No interest group or industry wants its products, licenses or sales taxed. In
Cleveland, “sin” taxes on harmful products seemed the only option likely to draw
enough public support to overcome industry objections.
PART II

24. (page 69) A good idea needs the right timing; keep your ears to the ground.
   • One failed initiative can make way to new ones better suited for the environment
   • Unique solutions can be found in surprising places
   • Creating a culture of sharing and openness to failure allows others to embrace, adapt and improve on your ideas

25. (page 71) Midwest industrial cities face a different set of issues than do cities on the East and West coasts, which calls for different approaches.

26. (page 83) Building problem-solving coalitions across sector borders requires a lot of time and effort, so if you don’t have resources going in, you don’t have strong outcomes.

27. (page 85) Creative placemaking requires an inter-reliance between communities that help artists and artists who, in turn, help communities.

28. (page 88) To get this work off the ground, area residents and CDCs must internalize and trust the idea that artists matter deeply to the local economy, to education, to quality of life.

29. (page 91) With national funding for the demonstration model in a neighborhood of Cleveland, no CDC could claim that local money was being used to favor one neighborhood over another.

30. (page 92) Artists are people. Not all artists want to live in inner-city lofts—many have kids and pets and want to live in a good-quality neighborhood with shopping nearby.

31. (page 93) Research was embedded into the Artists in Residence program design from the start. From establishing a baseline measurement through surveys to mapping when arts businesses or nonprofits opened or closed shop, the process was entirely about measuring the impact of concentrated dollars in a defined geographic area.

32. (page 96) Artists in Residence and the subsequent publications were proof that a community benefits from embracing and assisting artist-homeowners.

33. (page 96) Show people what’s “outside the box.” Arts and culture can be valuable to communities in ways many people have never considered. It’s a lot easier to convince people to think outside the box when they can see what’s out there.

34. (page 97) Sometimes a spark is all that’s needed. Enable others to grow new initiatives and alliances outside your scope of work.

35. (page 99) Embracing an asset-based approach to community improvement through arts and culture can, did and does, include many other sectors. Once CPAC began working with the community-development sector, many other fields started emerging as potential arts-and-culture collaborators.

36. (page 100) Build on the community’s existing strengths.

37. (page 100) Legitimize the different applications of arts and culture to community life, whether it’s neighborhoods, health, public safety, talent retention, or creating and experiencing the art itself.
38. (page 103) It’s more efficient to develop a program systemically, by building it into the budget and planning ahead, than to have individual players going after individual grants reactively or duplicatively.

39. (page 107) Explore new issues by fact-finding and idea-sharing before jumping into a space where people have already been working for a long time. A series of mini-summits on arts and safety, for example, brought together artist-activists, law-enforcement experts, educators, journalists and the public to talk with—and listen to—each other about safety, a sector in which tensions can be high and that mistrust has permeated over a long stretch of time.

40. (page 108) The purpose of creative intersections isn’t to tell other sectors what to do. It’s to offer research, ideas and advice, and to help connect people to the resources they need to do their own thinking. This ensures that important ideas, skills and practices will become ingrained in the community itself, not just in your own activities, and thus last much longer.

41. (page 108) It’s critical to balance the expenditure of resources across a range of efforts and sectors. A team shouldn’t unnecessarily abandon its work with longtime allies in order to focus attention on a new topic, even an urgent one.

42. (page 109) Don’t get stuck in the past. Instead, build on it to be a product of what’s needed now.

PART III

43. (page 119)
   1. Make it a priority to set aside time for collaborators to talk regularly
   2. Create time to get into the community and learn from it
   3. Ensure that many voices take part in the decision making

44. (page 119) You don’t need to invent everything. Drawing attention to what’s already there may be the most powerful tool you have.

45. (page 122) Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

46. (page 123) A blueprint isn’t a building, but it’s critical to successfully engineering a building. A map isn’t a landscape, but is essential to effectively navigating one. Cultural plans provide a step-by-step path that can take an organization or community from idealized goal to realized goal.

47. (page 124) One of the first steps in any planning process is to look for a “gap”: a community need that’s going unfilled. Then begin to understand what the urgency is to fill it.

48. (page 127) Even people who dismiss or oppose your mission are worth talking to because they can provide clues about what they do value. Then you can work to convincingly relate those values to the importance of arts and culture.

49. (page 133) Stay laser-focused. If you’re everything to everyone, you’re nothing to anyone.
50. (page 136) A team is built by sharing power and giving people room to grow in ability and responsibility.

51. (page 137) Trust is built within an organization the same way it’s built across regional sectors: by listening, discussing, providing reliable information and always following through.

52. (page 137) To carry out a complex mission in rigorous fashion, you need staff members of unusual commitment.

53. (page 137) This work requires caring about people, whether individually, as a society or both, and about facts and measurement, two areas that mark seemingly opposite ends of a very wide interest spectrum.

54. (page 138) Expand artists’ day-to-day thinking by helping them understand what they do more broadly for their community.

55. (page 138) Negotiate, and after vigorous debate, make a decision—and everyone gets behind it. Staff agreement is crucial to board support.

56. (page 139) Change of this nature takes relentless effort and focus over time.

57. (page 139) The first move of every service organization should be to find dependable operating support, in much the same way that smart entrepreneurs secure start-up investment before launching an enterprise.

58. (page 140) Don’t chase dollars. Look for compelling reasons, derived from data, to start new endeavors and match those ventures to funding sources that potentially align with them.

59. (page 140) Solid research not only steers the choice of project to something the community provably needs or wants; it also helps funders understand the impact of the work.

60. (page 140) Fill a gap, create a niche. CPAC’s success with funders has been due in part to the organization’s ability to create a unique niche for itself, as well as its geographic concentration on the Greater Cleveland area, allowing it to be responsive to community needs.

61. (page 142) Approach your experiments as opportunities. Show how arts and culture can contribute to existing work, rather than asking for resources or overreaching into areas where people have been working for a long time.

62. (page 143) Though some projects can’t be replicated, low-cost components or byproducts of such projects frequently can.

63. (page 149) The public learned what arts and culture were already doing for Northeast Ohio because CPAC gathered and disseminated information, helping artists and the larger community see and talk about the reality of Cleveland’s cultural, economic and other challenges.
Pivotal Moments

INTRODUCTION

a. (page 8) Building value means more than generating money: The initial research that the founders did to assess the performing arts organizations concluded that a solution for their survival was not an airdrop of cash. It was the building of a Northeast Ohio value system in which arts and culture are supported and viewed as engines of community benefit and better quality of life.

b. (page 24) Cultural consumers tend to participate across organizations and disciplines: As a best practice, organizations may rightfully be hesitant to share the private information of subscriber bases. To reduce fear that those households would be solicited without their permission, researchers agreed to erase all personal identifying information once it was analyzed. Once everyone agreed and the data were evaluated, it turned out that the organizations already shared and were soliciting the same audiences anyway.

c. (page 58) Focus groups uncovered just how skeptical residents were of government. It showed leaders that the campaign for funding not only needed to be transparent and open; it also needed to publicly ensure that any funding would be widely and fairly distributed, and not go only to the largest institutions.

d. (page 60) Author Ralph Waldo Emerson said, “the only way to have a friend is to be one.” By supporting a health ballot issue and asking nothing in return, the arts-and-culture sector was recognized by leaders in partnering sectors as a significant political force with the community’s well-being at heart.

e. (page 61) Though the first issue to support arts and culture failed, it offered some key insights. The effort gave artists a political power that was there, but had never been harnessed in that way before. In addition, CPAC’s data got the attention of the county’s most influential people. The campaign, and the fact that the issue failed by only a small margin, proved that the arts-and-culture sector could mobilize, and that there was some public interest behind it.

f. (page 62) Because Ohio’s state legislature has an unusual amount of control over what Ohio counties put on their ballots, CPAC—through a political-action committee that did the actual lobbying—first had to persuade state legislators to let Cuyahoga County legally make itself an arts-and-culture taxing district.

g. (page 62) After six years of trial, error, learning and strategizing, Cuyahoga County voters passed the ballot issue to tax cigarettes solely for funding arts-and-culture organizations, projects and creators.
PART I

h. (page 69) After a failed attempt at partnering with banks on a low-interest artist loan program, Deena Epstein, one of CPAC's founding funders, caught wind of a program in Paducah, Ky. A small town suffering its own version of economic malaise, Paducah was offering artists around the nation incentives to move there; buy empty, dilapidated houses in its Lowertown neighborhood for very little money; and then fix them up. The CPAC staff quickly concluded that homeownership might be the solution their team was searching for.

i. (page 78) An alliance of cities strengthened the case for arts and creative place-making by showing widespread similarities in urban issues that were unique to the Midwest and art and culture's positive effect on them.

j. (page 88) Using a questionnaire about the existing assets in the area, staff helped neighborhoods discover that “culture” could be more inclusive, and residents realize that what they once thought was devoid of culture was actually rich in it.

k. (page 104) Creative Minds in Medicine’s greatest long-term effect may turn out to be the hospital industry’s own evolving strategies concerning arts and broad issues of community health.

l. (page 104) Through arts and culture and otherwise, the health industry is seeing a shift toward whole-person care that could bring needed changes in approach to addressing social ills as well as human ones.

PART II

m. (page 131) In time, CPAC discovered which aspects of arts and culture appealed most to which Northeast Ohio communities. From these insights, the plan to create resources, healthy growth and community significance for arts and culture was built. The organization began winning attention and, frequently, support by offering appropriate, appealing and viable arts-and-culture ideas for addressing the particular problems people needed to solve.

n. (page 137) With the small team it could afford, CPAC had to hire staff who were multitalented and capable of quickly learning new areas of operation. Thus, the organizational culture inherently attracted thoughtful, highly competent staff members with a wide range of interests and passion for arts and culture.
Biographies Index

MARK BARONE
CREATOR AND IMPLEMENTER, PADUCAH ARTIST RELOCATION PROGRAM (2000); P. 78
Artist Mark Barone is a national, award-winning consultant to cities across America, showing them how to use the arts to revitalize blighted neighborhoods. He is widely respected for his successful creation and implementation of the “Paducah Artist Relocation Program,” in Paducah, KY. The Artist Relocation Program began in March 2000 and has become a national model for using the arts for economic development. At a time when funding for the arts was being cut, Paducah fostered an environment where artists and the arts could flourish. The goal of the program was to use the arts to revitalize one of Paducah’s most historic neighborhoods. The combination of properties offered by the city at little cost (often as low as $1) and the lure of becoming a part of a true art enclave proved irresistible to artists.

SETH BEATTIE
CPAC STAFF (2005–2013); PP. 85, 86, 93, 95, 97, 118–122, 138, 142
Seth Beattie is a program officer with the Kresge Foundation’s Arts & Culture Program. He helps advance the program’s goal of using creative placemaking to integrate arts, culture and community-engaged design into development and urban planning. He joined Kresge in the spring of 2017, after 13 years working at the intersection of arts and community development. He is founder of Spire + Base, a consulting firm advising nonprofits in the development of creative-placemaking strategies, and has worked extensively with community development corporations, arts organizations and funders.

DAVID BERGHOlz
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE GEORGE GUND FOUNDATION (1989–2003); PP. 7, 12, 180, 184
Dave Bergholz was the executive director of the George Gund Foundation in Cleveland from 1989 to 2003. He served as a founding board member of Cuyahoga Arts & Culture. He had a more than 40-year career in the nonprofit sector in Pittsburgh and Cleveland before his retirement in 2003. He worked in the areas of community and economic development, education, the arts, health care, city planning and government improvement. He is a photographer and an artist who has exhibited his images and conceptual work throughout the Cleveland and Pittsburgh areas.

ROBERT N. BROWN
ASSISTANT PLANNING DIRECTOR, CITY OF CLEVELAND (1989–2005); P. 79
Robert Brown is a city planner and consultant. Brown has 39 years of experience as a city planner, including 10 years as Director of City Planning for the City of Cleveland. Brown prepared Cleveland’s Civic Vision 2000 Citywide Plan and led the city’s work in the Reimagining a More Sustainable Cleveland project, both of which were recipients of American Planning Association awards. Brown has written and administered innovative zoning and development regulations on a wide range of topics, from signs to design districts and from urban agriculture to townhouses.
JANE LOUISE CAMPBELL
MAYOR, CITY OF CLEVELAND (2002–2006); P. 38
Jane Campbell was the first female mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, serving as its 56th mayor, from January 1, 2002, to January 1, 2006. Campbell, a Democrat, was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives for six terms, from 1985 to 1996. She served as a Cuyahoga County commissioner from 1997 to 2001, and as chief of staff to Senator Mary Landrieu of Louisiana from 2009 to 2013. Campbell now directs the Washington, D.C., office of the National Development Council, advocating for small business, community development and job creation in her hometown and across the country.

KATHLEEN CERVENY
DIRECTOR OF ARTS GRANTMAKING AND INITIATIVES, THE CLEVELAND FOUNDATION (1991–2015); PP. 6, 7, 11, 12, 27, 59, 121, 129, 131, 184
Kathleen Cerveny was the Cleveland Foundation’s director of arts grantmaking and initiatives (1991–2015) and was critical to the formation of CPAC. During her tenure, she served on the national board of Grantmakers in the Arts and designed and managed three multi-year professional development and capacity-building initiatives for Cleveland area arts organizations. She is an artist, a poet and a lifelong arts advocate. Prior to her role at the Foundation, Cerveny maintained a ceramic studio and exhibited her work locally and nationally. She was a founding member of the Hessler and Coventry Road street fairs, and served on the board of the New Organization for the Visual Arts (NOVA) and as president of Ohio Designer Craftsmen.

JOE CIMPERMAN
COUNCIL MEMBER, WARD 13, CITY OF CLEVELAND (1997–2016); PP. 38, 49, 50, 54, 55, 61, 97, 149, 151
Joe Cimperman served seven terms on Cleveland City Council, from 1997 to 2016. He represented the 13th Ward, which included the St. Clair–Superior, Midtown, Downtown, Tremont, Ohio City/Near West, Duck Island and Forest City Park neighborhoods of Cleveland. Joe, a German Marshall Fellow, assumed the leadership of Global Cleveland in April 2016.

AMY GREEN DEINES
FOUNDING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DETROIT CENTER FOR DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY (2012–2015); P. 79
Amy Green Deines is a professional designer with experience in both the public and private sectors, specializing in architecture, graphic design and urban design. Her small design practice, which she co-founded in 2007, is an award-winning, multidisciplinary design and technology studio. Deines was appointed Dean of Cranbrook Academy of Art in July 2016. Prior to that, she was a Professor and Interim Dean of the College of Architecture and Design at Lawrence Technological University (LTU), where she also acted as Executive Director of LTU’s Detroit Center for Design and Technology (DCDT).
DEENA EPSTEIN  
PROGRAM OFFICER, THE GEORGE GUND FOUNDATION (1990–2015);  
PP. 6, 7, 11, 12, 27, 61, 69, 133, 177, 184  
Deena served the George Gund Foundation for 25 years (1990–2015) as its first-ever senior program officer for the arts. She was critical to the formation of CPAC. Prior to her work at the Foundation, she was a journalist for the Plain Dealer, covering a variety of topics including higher education and consumer affairs. She crafted editorials and wrote her own column until she was approached by the Foundation’s then-president, David Bergholz.

BRIAN FRIEDMAN  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NORTHEAST SHORES (2003–2017); PP. 82, 83, 92, 93, 95, 96, 120, 121, 144  
Brian Friedman served as the Executive Director of Northeast Shores Development Corporation from 2003 to 2017. He developed and implemented programs to increase commercial and residential investment in the mixed-income, mixed-race Collinwood neighborhood of Cleveland, Ohio. Friedman led the redevelopment of the Waterloo Business District from a 40% vacant urban commercial corridor into a regional arts and entertainment district with a 6% vacancy rate. Friedman raised more than $9 million in public and philanthropic support to move this initiative forward.

PETER LAWSON JONES  
COMMISSIONER, CUYAHOGA COUNTY (2002–2010), CPAC BOARD MEMBER (2002–2011);  
PP. 24, 54–56, 62, 122, 129, 134, 135  
Peter Lawson Jones served as a member of the Board of Cuyahoga County Commissioners from 2002 to 2010, and for three of those years as its president. Jones previously served two-and-a-half terms in the Ohio House of Representatives, where he was the ranking member of the House Finance and Appropriations Committee and second vice president of the Ohio Legislative Black Caucus. Lawson Jones served on CPAC’s Board of Trustees for nine years. He is an attorney, a business consultant, a professional actor, a voice-over artist and a public speaker.

DENNIS LAFFERTY  
CPAC BOARD MEMBER (2003–2012); PP. 134–137  
Dennis Lafferty (B.S.B.A. Youngstown State University) joined Bernie Moreno Companies as Vice President, Strategic Operations & Community Relations after a 23-year career at the international law firm of Jones Day. Lafferty began his career serving as VP of Government Relations for the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, where he was the co-founder of Leadership Cleveland, now in its 39th year. During his career, Dennis has played leadership roles in developing the nation’s only tobacco tax dedicated to arts and culture, the site selection and land acquisition for Progressive Field and Quicken Loans Arena, the expansion of Cleveland Hopkins International Airport and the creation of the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame. He has served on the Cleveland–Cuyahoga County Convention Facilities Authority and the Cleveland Cuyahoga County Port Authority.

WAYNE P. LAWSON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OHIO ARTS COUNCIL (1978–2006); PP. 51, 149  
Wayne Lawson has been a pivotal figure in arts leadership across the state of Ohio. For nearly 30 years, Lawson served as the fourth executive director of the Ohio Arts Council. Following his retirement in 2006, he continued his fervent support for the arts by serving as a professor of public policy and arts administration at the Ohio State University, advising the Greater Columbus Arts Council on strategic initiatives and volunteering on a number of arts and cultural boards.
**STEPHEN LITT**  
**THE PLAIN DEALER, ART AND ARCHITECTURE CRITIC (1981–PRESENT); P. 6**  
Steven Litt is the art and architecture critic for the Plain Dealer, Ohio’s largest newspaper. He writes the newspaper’s architecture and urban landscape blog and its art blog.

**JOHN PAUL LUCCI**  
**CPAC STAFF (1998–2000); PP. 23, 132**  
John Paul Lucci is a partner in Hahn Loeser’s Business Practice Area and co-chair of the firm’s Corporate Transactions Group. John Paul has a primary focus on mergers and acquisitions, private equity and general corporate law. He has represented clients in leveraged buyout transactions and venture capital financings, and has represented private-equity funds in the acquisition and disposition of portfolio companies. He was CPAC’s Vice President of Research and Operations from 1998 to 2000.

**ANN MARKUSEN**  
**CO-AUTHOR, “DEFINING CREATIVE PLACEMAKING” (PUBLISHED 2010); PP. 18, 79**  
Ann Markusen’s work in research and consulting on artists, arts organizations and creative placemaking was critical to informing and grounding CPAC’s work in creative intersections in data. She is Director of the Arts Economy Initiative and the Project on Regional and Industrial Economics at the University of Minnesota’s Humphrey School of Public Affairs, and Principal of Markusen Economic Research. She is a researcher, frequent public speaker and adviser to public agencies, policymakers, businesses, economic developers and nonprofit organizations across the U.S. and in Europe, Japan, Korea, Australia and Brazil. Her expertise is in economic development at the state and local level, where she brings analytical skills to bear on the ways that industries and occupations shape possibilities for creating good work. Markusen is currently serving as a research and writing consultant for the Minnesota House of Representatives’ Select Committee on Living Wage Jobs.

**STEVE MILLARD**  
**CPAC BOARD MEMBER (2004–2013); PP. 116, 129, 134**  
Steve Millard is president and executive director of the Council of Smaller Enterprises (COSE). For the last 15 years, he has guided COSE’s pioneering health insurance group-purchasing program and served as a nonpartisan advocate for the health insurance needs of small business on the state and national levels. Prior to COSE, Steve served in strategic roles at Andersen Consulting and GE Healthcare.

**STEVEN A. MINTER**  
**PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE CLEVELAND FOUNDATION (1984–2003); PP. 4, 7, 11, 149, 184**  
Steve was the president and executive director of the Cleveland Foundation when CPAC was formed and later served as one of the founding board members of Cuyahoga Arts & Culture. He held prior positions as a program officer and associate director of the Foundation (1975–1984). His more than 15 years in governmental positions include serving as Under Secretary for the United States Department of Education during President Carter’s administration, and as Commissioner of Public Welfare for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (1970–1975), as well as rising through the ranks from caseworker to Director of the Cuyahoga County Welfare (1960–1970).
STEPHANIE MORRISON HRBEK
CPAC BOARD MEMBER (1997–2006); PP. 136, 137
Stephanie Morrison Hrbek founded Near West Theatre in 1978 on the principle of providing access to experience of the theater arts to everyone who was interested, regardless of their economic status. She was a charter member of CPAC’s steering committee and subsequently a charter member of its first Board of Trustees. She served on the Board from 1997 to 2006, facilitating CPAC’s implementation of Northeast Ohio’s Arts & Culture Plan, while providing strong financial leadership and offering counsel from the perspective of an artist and a manager of a small arts-and-culture organization.

TRACEY NICHOLS
DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, THE CITY OF CLEVELAND (2008–2017); P. 117
Tracey Nichols recently joined Project Management Consultants after serving nearly nine years as director of economic development for Mayor Frank G. Jackson of the City of Cleveland. During her tenure, Nichols led her team to complete almost 900 projects, representing nearly $3 billion in investment in the city and creating and retaining more than 27,000 jobs. Nichols’ team also secured nearly $100 million in grants and pass-through funding. Nichols is known for creating innovative programs such as the Vacant Property Initiative, which has resulted in the development of nearly 4 million square feet in vacant buildings and more than 100 acres of vacant land, creating and retaining more than 7,500 jobs.

DR. JEREMY NOWAK
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND PRESIDENT, THE REINVESTMENT FUND (1985–2011); P. 78
Jeremy Nowak is a Distinguished Visiting Fellow at Drexel University’s Lindy Institute for Urban Innovation. He created the Reinvestment Fund, one of the largest community investment institutions in the United States, and chaired the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. He is also the chair of the investment committee for Spring Point Partners, on the board of directors of the University City Science Center in Philadelphia, on the Advisory Board of the Institute for Urban Research at the University of Pennsylvania, and a Senior Fellow at the Center for Impact Investment at the University of New Hampshire’s Carsey School of Public Policy. A widely published author and columnist, he is the co-author with Bruce Katz of The New Localism: How Cities Thrive in the Age of Populism.

GREG PECKHAM
CPAC BOARD MEMBER (2009–2018); PP. 49, 50, 148
As the Executive Director of LAND studio, Greg Peckham leads organizational direction and sets programmatic focus and priorities, identifying and selecting projects and opportunities that support LAND studio’s vision and mission. LAND studio was formed in 2011 out of a merger between two other nonprofits, Cleveland Public Art and ParkWorks. Peckham was the executive director of Cleveland Public Art from 2004 to 2011, and Managing Director of LAND studio from 2011 to 2017.

KRISTIN PUCH
Kristin Puch is the Director of Research and Advancement at CPAC. During her tenure, Puch has authored two white papers that shed light on the intersection between arts and culture and other community sectors. “From Rust Belt to Artist Belt” explored the many ways artists and
Community developers are collaborating to spur renewed growth in neighborhoods in formerly industrial cities such as Cleveland. “Creative Minds in Medicine” explores how Cleveland’s arts and healthcare assets are affecting health and well-being outcomes for individuals and communities alike. Puch also oversaw the development of Cleveland-based conferences on these topics. In addition, she oversaw the development of CPAC’s discipline-specific economic impact studies and leveraged data from the Cultural Data Project to develop CPAC’s Culture Pulse series.

**JULIAN ROGERS**
**CPAC STAFF (2007–2008), CPAC BOARD MEMBER (2011–PRESENT); P. 50**

Julian Rogers serves as the Director of Community Partnerships with Cleveland State University and oversees the Office of Civic Engagement. There he provides support to faculty and students that allow them to develop mutually beneficial relationships with the community. Prior to joining CSU, Rogers was a member of the inaugural Cuyahoga County Council, where he represented a diverse district of about 118,000 people. Before serving on the council, he was Executive Director of Education Voters of Ohio, an advocacy organization dedicated to improving public education. His career has been spent in community engagement and education. He served for seven years as Senior Assistant to the CEO and Liaison to the Office of the Mayor for the Cleveland Metropolitan School District. At CPAC, Rogers served as Program Associate for Public Policy and Research.

**JAMES ROKAKIS**
**CUYAHOGA COUNTY TREASURER (1997–2011); P. 72**

James Rokakis, the Western Reserve Land Conservancy vice president and Thriving Communities Institute (now, Thriving Communities) director, is one of the nation’s leading experts on the foreclosure crisis and urban revitalization. Rokakis has testified before Congress, and his tireless work to help neighborhoods with vacant, abandoned and dangerous homes has been featured on 60 Minutes and in the Washington Post and the New York Times. After serving on Cleveland City Council for 19 years—the last seven as chair of the finance committee—Rokakis took office as Cuyahoga County Treasurer in 1997. Faced with Cuyahoga County’s mortgage foreclosure crisis, Rokakis helped to write and pass Ohio House Bill 294, which streamlined the foreclosure process for abandoned properties. Additionally, Rokakis was the driving force behind a bill that allowed for the creation of the Cuyahoga County Land Reutilization Corporation, also known as the Cuyahoga County Land Bank. It was the first county land bank in Ohio.

**DONALD ROSENBERG**
**THE PLAIN DEALER, CLASSICAL MUSIC CRITIC/ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT REPORTER, (1992–2013); P. 130**

Donald Rosenberg is an experienced journalist and musician who is devoted to people in the field and to subjects that make a difference. As a longtime music critic, he has written about major artists, ensembles and organizations for a variety of print and online publications. As editor of EMAG, The Magazine of Early Music America, he enjoys sharing ideas with musicians, scholars, writers and enthusiasts who bring the world of early music to life.

**JEFF RUSNAK**
**PRESIDENT AND CEO OF R STRATEGY GROUP; P. 46–48, 56, 58**

Jeff launched R Strategy Group in 2010. The firm is the culmination of a 30-year career dedicated to providing the best strategic direction to organizations, businesses, candidates and causes that
improve our communities and Ohio. Jeff has developed, directed, and managed diverse projects for local and national clients in support of education, the environment, arts and culture, economic development, health care, human services, professional sports facilities and other critical public interest issues. He directed the successful campaigns to renew the tax to fund Cuyahoga’s robust arts and culture sector and Cleveland’s public owned sports facilities and he provided the strategic vision for the highly regarded 2006 countywide ballot initiative that established Cuyahoga Arts & Culture—one of the top local funders of arts and culture in the US.

MARY MARGARET SCHOENFELD
COMMUNITY-DEVELOPMENT MANAGER, AMERICANS FOR THE ARTS (2007–2009); P. 79
Mary Margaret Schoenfeld is an independent arts management consultant with a particular focus on funding and arts service organizations. Her 25-year career as a practitioner in cultural development included providing training and technical assistance to artists and arts administrators, providing strategic planning services, conducting research and providing analysis about arts in the community, developing and supporting peer learning networks, and managing funding programs and other resources to ensure that arts and cultural opportunities were available to the widest possible audience.

THOMAS B. SCHORGL
Tom Schorgl was the founding President and CEO of CPAC in 1997 and served in that position for 20 years. He was recruited by Bergholz, Cerveny, Epstein and Minter when he was the president of Culture Works in Dayton (1994–1997). Prior to his work there, Schorgl led the Indiana Arts Commission (IAC) as Executive Director, serving in this capacity for a decade beginning in August 1983. During his tenure at IAC, the National Endowment for the Arts recognized the commission for its innovative support and arts development in rural and minority communities. Schorgl began his professional arts administration career as curator and then executive director of South Bend Regional Art Museum.

VALERIE SCHUMACHER
Valerie Schumacher has served in a range of roles over her tenure at CPAC including supporting program operations and managing the nonprofit’s online presence. When she joined CPAC in 2008, Schumacher implemented CPAC’s award-winning Artists as an Entrepreneur Institute (AEI) and began developing the e-mail newsletters. Schumacher’s passion for connecting arts and culture professionals with resources they need fueled her work as she managed planning, content creation and implementation of Creative Compass, a clearinghouse of information for artists in greater Cleveland and the Northeast Ohio region. Valerie supported the implementation of the Creative Workforce Fellowship during its full run from its beginnings in 2008, and she directed the program from late 2014 until it ended in early 2017.
RAY SHEPARDSON
FOUNDER, PLAYHOUSE SQUARE (1973), P. 4
Ray Shepardson was a theater restoration specialist and theater operator credited by many with beginning the trend toward restoring old unused movie theaters to become economic engines for their communities. He is the founder of the Playhouse Square association in Cleveland and is recognized as the visionary who helped motivate the creation of one of the nation’s largest performing arts districts. He was involved in 40 restorations throughout his career and operated several theaters after their restoration.

MEGAN VAN VOORHIS
In 2003, Megan Van Voorhis joined the staff as Assistant Director of Programs and Services, and gradually worked her way through the ranks to her current position as President and CEO, which she assumed on January 1, 2018. In Van Voorhis’ 15-year history with the organization she has engaged with every aspect of its work. This has included activities ranging from business development for artists to launching a Collaborative Marketing Database, as well as conducting research on the impact of arts and culture, securing local public-sector funding for arts and culture in Cuyahoga County, developing and managing arts and cultural grantmaking processes, and successfully advocating for policies that support arts and culture.

MICHAEL R. WHITE
MAYOR, CITY OF CLEVELAND (1990–2001); P. 3
Michael White served three 4-year terms as Mayor of Cleveland, from 1990 to 2001, when he retired from public service. He was Cleveland’s longest-serving mayor, its second African American mayor and its second-youngest mayor. White is now the program director for the Neighborhood Leadership Development Program, which is part of the Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation. In 2017, he was awarded a Cleveland Heritage Medal for his significant contributions through leadership, collaboration and service.

MATT ZONE
COUNCIL MEMBER, WARD 15, CITY OF CLEVELAND (2001–PRESENT); P. 55
Matt Zone was first elected to the Cleveland City Council in 2001, representing Ward 15, which includes the Detroit-Shoreway neighborhood where he and generations of his family grew up. Ward 15 also contains the Edgewater area and parts of the Ohio City, Cudell and Stockyards neighborhoods. Zone is a strong advocate for the arts, green building and alternative energy, and he has been a major force behind ongoing capital projects that are generating bursts of vibrancy in his West Side ward, including the development of the Gordon Square Arts District, which is comprised of new housing and businesses, retail development and the construction and renovation of three theaters.
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Written testimony of the Community Partnership for Arts and Culture
IN SUPPORT OF HB 269, OhioSounds Testimony
Before the Ohio House of Representatives, Ways and Means Committee
February 15, 2016

The Community Partnership for Arts and Culture (CPAC) is pleased to submit written testimony in support of HB 269 related to the Ohio Sound Recording Investor Tax Credit (OhioSounds).

Over the past decade, CPAC has conducted several studies that highlight the economic and social impact of the entire arts and culture sector focused on its service area of greater Cleveland. More recently, the organization developed a methodology for demonstrating impact on a discipline level; for the first time, our community has an understanding of the specific benefit that discrete disciplines of the arts and culture sector have for the residents of our region. In 2011, CPAC, in collaboration with Cleveland State University (CSU’s) Center for Economic Development, released the first report in this series focused on Cleveland’s music industry study called Remix Cleveland, which quantifies the viability of music as an economic driver for a number of key reasons.¹

¹ Remix Cleveland can be accessed at: http://cultureforward.org/Reference-Desk/Research-Library/Economy/Remix-Cleveland (Note: In 2014, CPAC and CSU released the second study in this series focused on the visual arts, craft and design study called Forming Cleveland.)
First, the music industry means good-paying jobs for our communities. *Remix Cleveland’s* industry analysis revealed that total employment in Cleveland’s music industry was 2,718 and remained stable despite the two economic recessions between 2000-09. The music industry’s total payroll increased by $29.3 million over this period to a total of $114.8 million. Average wages for the sector also increased by $10,224 over the same period, totaling $42,228. For recording & publishing jobs in particular, the average wage was $50,941. This stability illustrates the success and vitality of music as an economic engine.

Second, the OhioSounds tax credit would encourage business growth in our communities. *Remix Cleveland* details the business linkages that exist within the music industry’s ecosystem:

The OhioSounds tax credit would not only benefit sound recording businesses – it would have positive implications for the entire music industry’s ecosystem. An increase in the number of sound recording studios would develop a stronger pipeline for retaining our robust population of musicians and encouraging more
musical production here. For example, for every 1,000 people in greater Cleveland, five are musicians, which outpaces the numbers in cities like Pittsburgh and Indianapolis. However, the study revealed a low share of sound recording studios by location quotient in Cuyahoga County, which suggests these services must be accessed from businesses outside of our area. Moreover, the same trend holds true for the state of Ohio based on location quotient data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for sound recording studios.²

Third, the music industry generates far-reaching economic and tax impacts for the entire local economy. According to Remix Cleveland’s economic impact numbers, Cleveland’s music industry accounted for 6,210 total jobs³ created in Cuyahoga County. When adjusted to 2015 numbers, these jobs generated $289 million in labor income; $885 million in total output; and $97 million in tax revenue.⁴

Fourth, enacting a tax credit supportive of the music industry sends a strong signal of our state’s commitment to protecting, and growing, our music industry. This is a prudent investment because it leverages our historic music legacy while positioning it to be a source of innovative job growth in the future. For example, Cleveland is known the world over for its history of being the birthplace of rock and roll, a renowned stop on the blues and jazz circuit, a hub for classical music, the “Polka Capital of the World”, and a pioneer in gospel music. Our wide ranging history has given us a music sector that is far-reaching and comprised of many different genres, not just one signature style of music. We have a competitive advantage that cannot be understated – we are defined by our diversity and our ability to appeal to a wider set of musical tourists and creators alike. However,

² Ohio’s 2014 location quotient for NAICS code 512240 “Sound Recording Studios” is 0.50 when benchmarked against the United States according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Location Quotient Calculator. The location quotient is a ratio of the percentage of local employment in an industry to the percentage of national employment in that same industry. A location quotient less than 1 indicates that the local economy’s employment in an industry is smaller than the national share; a location quotient greater than 1 indicates that the local economy’s share of employment in an industry is larger than the national average.
³ Total of direct, indirect and induced jobs.
⁴ These figures are generated from Remix Cleveland’s economic impact numbers being adjusted to 2015 dollars using the Consumer Price Index. These adjusted figures provide an estimate of the music sector’s impact in today’s dollars based on business data available at the time of the Remix Cleveland study. Additional business churning for the sector will have taken place in the intervening years.
similar to other business sectors, the future of our music industry rests on how well the policy environment
nurture the assets that exist here today.

In closing, we urge you to support HB 269. OhioSounds represents a crucial investment in a viable and
longstanding economic driver in our state. This legislation will also enhance our music industry's ability to
compete nationally, while attracting additional investments to our state from related music businesses.
OhioSounds comes at a critical juncture as other states such as New York and Louisiana have taken steps to
enact similar tax credit legislation which could pose challenges for the future of Ohio’s music industry.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas B. Schorgl
President and CEO
CPAC
Cleveland, OH

Kristin L. Puch
Director of Research and Advancement
CPAC
Cleveland, OH

In 1997, Community Partnership for Arts and Culture (CPAC) was instituted as the coordinating body for Cleveland's arts
and culture sector. Over its history, CPAC has worked to ensure our arts and culture sector is operationally strong, well-
resourced and publically positioned so it can serve as a vital partner in our community's resurgence. As a service
organization for the arts and culture sector, CPAC is valued for its ability to institute programs to strengthen the sector's
operational capacity, lead advocacy efforts regarding cultural policy in Cuyahoga County such as local public sector
funding, and forge new opportunities for arts and culture to partner with other sectors such as education,
economic/community development and health and human services. CPAC is notable for serving arts and culture
organizations and individual artists throughout its history.
Live Work Overlay District
Chapter 346
Live-Work Overlay (LWO) District

Section 346.01 Purpose

The Live-Work Overlay (LWO) District is established to permit and promote shared occupancy by residential uses in combination with work activities in suitable locations. By facilitating establishment of such “live-work” space, the district is intended to meet an identified need for buildings that combine living space with work space. In addition, the district is intended to assist in revitalizing areas impacted by the presence of under-utilized and deteriorated buildings suitable for re-use as live-work space.

Section 346.02 Definitions

(a) “Live-Work Unit” means a room or rooms used by a single household both as a dwelling unit and as a “Work Space,” as defined herein, where the work is conducted by one or more members of the household and where such Work Space occupies at least fifty percent (50%) of the unit’s total floor area. The living space of a Live-Work unit shall contain a kitchen area and sanitary facilities.

(b) “Work Space” means an area within a Live-Work Unit that is designed or equipped exclusively or principally for the conduct of work activities and is to be regularly used for such work activities by one or more occupants of the unit.

Section 346.03 Mapping and Applicability

The LWO District shall be mapped as an overlay district, and shall be mapped only in locations where the underlying zoning district is a Business District, a Residence-Industry District, a Semi-Industry District or a General Industry District. The regulations of the underlying district shall govern except where in conflict with the regulations of the LWO District. The LWO District shall be mapped in an area where the underlying zoning prohibits residential occupancy only if it has been determined that current and anticipated future uses in the immediate vicinity will be compatible with live-work occupancy.

Section 346.04 Certificate of Occupancy

No Live-Work Unit shall be occupied nor shall the use of a Live-Work Unit be changed without issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the Commissioner of Building and Housing. Such Certificate shall be issued only if the Commissioner determines that the proposed work activities and living space meet all applicable regulations of these Codified Ordinances.

Section 346.05 Permitted Uses

All uses permitted in the underlying zoning district shall be permitted in a LWO District except as provided in this section.

(a) Conditionally Permitted Uses. Notwithstanding otherwise applicable restrictions on residential occupancy in Semi-Industry and General Industry Districts, such residential occupancy shall be permitted in a LWO District as part of a Live-Work Unit if approved by the City Planning Commission in accordance with the conditional use criteria of Section 346.06.

(b) Prohibited Uses. The following uses and activities are prohibited within a Live-Work Unit:

1. amusement and recreation uses, as listed in Section 343.11;
2. adult entertainment uses, as listed in Section 347.07;
3. pet stores, kennels, animal hospitals;
4. gun and firearms sales;
5. automotive service stations, and motor vehicle repair garages; and
6. liquor sales.
Section 346.06 Conditional Use Determination

(a) Approval Criteria. The City Planning Commission shall approve establishment of Live-Work space as a Conditional Use in a General Industry District or in that portion of a Semi-Industry District where residential uses are otherwise prohibited if the Commission determines that the following conditions have been met.

(1) The subject building was constructed prior to the initial effective date of this chapter.

(2) Individuals residing in Live-Work Units will not be subject to excessive levels of noise, vibration, fire hazards, explosion hazards, smoke, or other potentially harmful environmental conditions by existing or likely future industrial uses in the immediate vicinity.

(3) By virtue of the nature and location of current and likely future uses, existing industrial or commercial activities in the immediate vicinity will not be impeded by the presence of the proposed Live-Work Units.

(b) Notice Requirements. Prior to taking action on any application for establishment of a Live-Work Unit, the City Planning Commission shall notify the Division of Fire of such application and shall seek its comment on applicable safety issues. Subsequent to approving establishment of a Live-Work Unit, the Commission shall notify the Division of Fire of such approval, including the address of the subject property.

Section 346.07 Dividing Walls, Access, Identification and Fire Code Regulations

A wall dividing the living space from the Work Space is not required in any Live-Work Unit, but each Live-Work Unit shall be separated from all other uses in the building and shall have separate access either from the building exterior or from an interior corridor that is separate from such other uses. The bathroom in any Live-Work Unit shall be enclosed and shall comply with requirements of the Building and Housing Code. All Live-Work Units shall comply with applicable Fire Code regulations, including applicable fire resistance requirements and emergency egress requirements of the Codified Ordinances. Each exterior door providing access to Live-Work Units shall be identified by a plaque marked in lettering at least two (2) inches in height with the words “Live-Work Units” or similar language.

Section 346.08 Parking, Sign and Yard Regulations

(a) Parking. Within a LWO District, no additional parking shall be required for establishment of a Live-Work Unit in a building which was constructed prior to the initial effective date of this section. For a Live-Work Unit proposed in a building first occupied after the initial effective date of this section, parking shall be provided to meet the requirements of the underlying zoning district. Such parking requirements shall be applied in a manner that considers each Live-Work Unit as a single dwelling unit and that measures the floor area of Work Space exclusive of the area devoted to living space.

(b) Signs. Signs shall be permitted in accordance with the regulations applicable to the underlying zoning district.

(c) Yards. Within a LWO District, requirements for residential interior side yards and rear yards shall not apply to a Live-Work Unit established in a building which was constructed prior to the initial effective date of this chapter.

Section 346.09 Acknowledgment of Industrial Use

In a General Industry District and in any portion of a Semi-Industry District where residential occupancy is otherwise prohibited, the Certificate of Occupancy establishing a Live-Work Unit or changing the use of a Live-Work Unit shall include a statement, signed by the applicant, stating the following: “The applicant acknowledges that the Live-Work Unit is located in an area zoned for industrial uses that may be incompatible with a typical residential environment. The applicant further acknowledges that these and future industrial uses in this district have the right to operate without any restrictions other than those applicable to uses in the underlying industrial zoning district.” Such language shall be included in any lease or deed pertaining to the Live-Work space.

Section 346.10 Submission Requirements

In addition to otherwise required plans and information, any application to establish a Live-Work Unit or to change the use of a Live-Work Unit shall identify the nature of the work activities to be performed in the Live-Work Unit and shall be accompanied by a floor plan that identifies those areas to be used as living space and those areas to be used as Work Space. Such plan shall also identify the nature and location of equipment, furnishings or other improvements that cause the Work Space to meet the definition in division (c) of Section 346.02.
UNCOVERING ARTS AND CULTURE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

The most effective community development efforts build upon a neighborhood’s particular niche and take into consideration the needs, goals, and aspirations of the neighborhood in which they are taking place. The arts and cultural asset map complements this concept, as it would provide community developers with a clear idea of the character and brand their particular neighborhood should take by showing what assets exist organically. The following are some questions for an informational interview with residents, business owners, volunteers or frequent visitors in your area. The full Arts and Culture Asset Mapping Guide as well as source material is available online.

1. Who are the most creative individuals in your neighborhood?

2. What organizations are the most creative?

3. Who are the most active people and organizations in your neighborhood?

4. Does your neighborhood have many cultural groups?

5. Are there any natural features (i.e. parks, lakes, etc.) in your neighborhood?

6. Where are your neighborhood’s gathering places?

7. What historic sites and buildings are in your neighborhood?

8. Are there any annual events or festivals that take place in your neighborhood?

9. What traditions does your neighborhood have? How are they passed down?
10. What places hold special significance for your neighborhood? Why?

11. What products (i.e. art, food, furniture, or anything else that is made locally) are unique to your neighborhood? Who are the artists, craftspersons, or businesses that make them?

12. Who or what organizations in your neighborhood have influenced you the most? How have they influenced you?

13. Are there any other names for your neighborhood? How did your neighborhood get these names?

14. What are the major cultural groups in your neighborhood?

15. Who are your neighborhood’s artists? Where can you find art in your neighborhood?

16. Who else should I talk to?
UNCOVERING ARTS AND CULTURE
IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD
For informal, “on the street” interviews

1. What words come to mind when you think about your neighborhood?

2. How would you describe the people of your neighborhood?

3. What are common sights and sounds around your neighborhood?

4. What makes your neighborhood unique?

5. What makes your neighborhood beautiful?

6. What aspects of your neighborhood do you take great pride in?

7. What neighborhood affiliations do you have? (i.e. religious affiliations, political affiliations, teams, clubs, families, volunteer groups, cultural groups, and occupational groups)
UNCOVERING ARTS AND CULTURE

NEXT STEPS

CPAC has compiled this guide in an attempt to encourage community leaders to take a deeper look into the wealth of arts and cultural assets that exist right in their own backyards. The research included is not exhaustive but is meant to give neighborhood leaders an introduction and starting point for carrying out an arts and cultural asset-mapping project. The full guide and information is available online.

1. After carrying out a broader analysis of who’s who and what’s what in the neighborhood using the above interview questions, or through your own institutional knowledge, the findings can be used to identify a list of “experts” (who may not see themselves as such) who can provide more detailed information on arts and cultural practices in the neighborhood such as:

   - Neighborhood and family histories
   - Legends or folklore about the neighborhood and its people
   - Testimonies and artifacts
   - Informal get-togethers
   - The art itself: Music; instrument making; dancing; theater; crafts; wood carving; pottery; fishing; cooking; gardening; and many others…

2. Develop a listing of the neighborhood’s major categories of arts and cultural assets.

3. Once these categories are identified list specific assets that operate or exist in the neighborhood. You can use a combination of research methods to extract this more concrete information such as:

   - Focus groups of stakeholders
   - Individual interviews with stakeholders
   - Surveys
   - An ocular/environmental scan
   - Online research
   - Review of articles and other media stories

4. Overlay each of these sites onto a map of the neighborhood.

The map and related data can be used to inform all residents of the arts and cultural assets in their neighborhood, as well as engage those assets more fully in planning.
1. What I Think About Collinwood

Thank you for taking this survey about your experiences in North Collinwood. Your responses will help us to make the neighborhood an even better place to live, work and visit.

We’d like to know what you think about the North Collinwood neighborhood, but first, please check any of the following that apply.

- [ ] I live in North Collinwood.
- [ ] I work part-time (30 hours or fewer) in North Collinwood.
- [ ] I work full-time (31 hours or more) in North Collinwood.
- [ ] I do not live or work in North Collinwood, but I visit the neighborhood frequently.
- [ ] I am not very familiar with North Collinwood.

If you live in North Collinwood, tell us how much you agree with the following statements. If you don’t live here, you can skip this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree / Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am very satisfied with my current housing situation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s very likely that I’ll still be living in the neighborhood 5 years from now.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know my neighbors really well.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We’d like you to tell us what you think about the neighborhood’s personality and character. For each of the following statements, please tell us whether you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree / Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is authentic.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is unique.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is creative and artistic.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is culturally diverse.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s a strong sense of community spirit in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of the neighborhood.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We’d like you to tell us what you think life is like in the neighborhood. For each of the following statements, please tell us whether you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree / Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is safe.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is a good place to raise kids.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is a healthy place to live.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is generally clean.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood has good access to recreation and parks.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking around in the neighborhood is easy.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We’d like you to tell us what you think about other characteristics of the neighborhood. For each of the following statements, please tell us whether you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree / Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are a lot of activities going on in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood has a lot of places for entertainment and shopping.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood is affordable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood has a lot of good housing options.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. More Thoughts About Collinwood

In general, how would you describe the quality of life in North Collinwood?

- Very Bad
- Bad
- Decent
- Good
- Very Good

In general, do you think North Collinwood is changing for the better, changing for the worse or not changing all that much?

- Changing for the better
- Changing for the worse
- Not changing all that much

What 3 words come to mind when you think about North Collinwood?

First word
Second word
Third word

What do you think are the 3 best things about the North Collinwood neighborhood?

First thing
Second thing
Third thing

What do you think are the three most pressing issues the neighborhood needs to address in the next few years?

First pressing issue
Second pressing issue
Third pressing issue

What are 3 types of businesses not currently in North Collinwood that you would like to see here?

First business
Second business
Third business

How would you describe the people in the North Collinwood neighborhood?
3. Getting Involved

We’d like to know a little bit more about how involved people feel in making our neighborhood a better place. Please let us know if you’ve participated in any of the following in the past year in the North Collinwood neighborhood (you can check multiple boxes).

- A neighborhood clean-up or beautification program
- A neighborhood gathering, festival or block party
- A program for neighborhood children
- A neighborhood watch or block club meeting

Other ways you are involved in the North Collinwood neighborhood (please describe)

In general, how involved do you feel in the North Collinwood neighborhood?

- Not very involved
- Somewhat involved
- Very involved

The following nonprofit organizations and programs are working to make the neighborhood an even better place. How familiar would you say you are with each of them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Program</th>
<th>Not at all familiar</th>
<th>Not very familiar</th>
<th>Somewhat familiar</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Shores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnership for Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists in Residence Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alive on East 185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Collinwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Pop-up Galleries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk All Over Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Art in Collinwood

As you may know, a lot of musicians, writers and other artists have been moving into the neighborhood over the past three decades, and especially in the past few years. In general, would you say artists are making North Collinwood a better neighborhood, a worse neighborhood, or do they not have much effect on the neighborhood?

- Make it a better neighborhood
- Make it a worse neighborhood
- Don’t have much effect

In general, do you think there are already too many artists in the neighborhood, about the right amount or that we should recruit more artists here?

- Too many artists already
- About the right amount of artists
- Recruit more artists to the neighborhood

How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know / Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having artists in a neighborhood helps the local economy.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists help bring different groups of people in a neighborhood together.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists improve the educational success of a neighborhood’s children.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists make it easier for people to see life in a different light.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the best of your memory, how many arts events do you think you’ve attended in North Collinwood in the past year?

- I have not attended an arts event in the past year.
- 1 - 2 events
- 3 - 5 events
- 6 - 10 events
- More than 10 events
To the best of your memory, how many arts events do you think you’ve attended in the past year, either in North Collinwood or elsewhere?

- I have not attended an arts event in the past year.
- 1 - 2 events
- 3 - 5 events
- 6 - 10 events
- More than 10 events

Please share a few examples of arts events you’ve attended in the past year.

One example

A second example

A third example
5. My Background

At Northeast Shores, we are committed to making the North Collinwood neighborhood an even better place to live, work and visit. To do this, it’s helpful to have some basic information about the background of the people we’re serving. At the same time, we fully respect your privacy. We will not share your individual information outside of Northeast Shores and the Community Partnership for Arts and Culture. If you would prefer not to answer any of the following questions, please feel free to skip them.

What’s the zip code at the address where you live?

What intersection do you live nearest (example, East 152nd and Waterloo)?

Are you an artist (by artist, we mean anyone who creates work in craft, dance, design, literary, media, music, theatre or visual art, regardless of how much time you spend on this work)?
- Yes
- No

What’s your gender?
- Female
- Male
- I would prefer not to say.

What is your ethnic background (you can select multiple choices)?
- African American / African Origin
- Asian American / Asian Origin
- Caucasian
- Hispanic American / Latino / Latina / Latin Origin
- Middle Eastern American / Middle Eastern Origin
- Native American or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- I would prefer not to say

Other (please describe)
What is your current age?

- 17 and younger
- 18-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41-45
- 46-50
- 51-60
- 61-70
- 71 and Older
- I would prefer not to say.

Do you identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender?

- Yes
- No
- I would prefer not to say.

Are you currently living with a disability?

- Yes
- No
- I would prefer not to say.
6. Thank You!

Thank you for completing this survey. If you would like to be entered in our drawing for a gift certificate, please provide us your name and e-mail address (or telephone number if you don't have e-mail).

**What's your first name?**

[Input field]

**What's your last name?**

[Input field]

**What is your e-mail address or telephone number?**

[Input field]
ADVOCATE THROUGH CREATIVE MINDS IN MEDICINE

Simple strategies for infusing *Creative Minds in Medicine* into your advocacy work.

**Tweet** and thank a decision maker within your community for their active role in supporting arts and health assets. Connect them back to the research.

**Tell your story** through a guest blog on CPAC’s website. Highlight your experiences and share it with others through social media connections.

**Connect** with others in the field by hosting an informal lunch forum and discussing the work of each person at the table. Use a case study within the research to initiate the conversation.

**Create an experience for decision makers** to engage in the work you and others are doing. Create an experienced-based ‘tour’ and invite them to take part.

---

**Examples**

“We are fortunate to have @joeccimpeaman support the work we do in our community. Thanks for helping us change lives!”

#cmmCLE

@cultureforward #arts&health

“Studying anatomy was never something that I took seriously or practiced much in art school, which is strange, considering my new fascination.”

guest blog by Arabella Proffer

Invite four organizations within and outside the arts and culture sector to take part. Rotate who hosts the lunch every quarter. Share pictures and stories with one another.

Invite three artists or organizations doing work similar in nature to provide a 30 minute active experience. Host them all at one site or build in time to visit multiple sites. Visit cultureforward.org website and search ‘Site Visit’ for more tips!”
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