

THE ART OF HIGHER LEARNING:
THE CREATIVE CAMPUS AND THE
EVOLVING PHENOMENON OF UNIVERSITY ARTS ENGAGEMENT

by

Eric Jason Oberstein

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of the Master of Arts
in the Faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University

2009

For my parents, for their unwavering support and love

For Aaron Greenwald, my mentor at Duke Performances, who inspired me and taught me about the importance of creating a vibrant arts presence in a university community

For Professor Joan Jeffri, Professor Steven Dubin, and Professor Martin Vinik, who offered invaluable guidance and feedback in the development of my topic and writing

Abstract

In the wake of the 104th American Assembly conference of 2004 that focused on the intersection of the arts and higher education, energized activity around the notion of the Creative Campus has spread throughout colleges and universities across the United States. The arts have played a significant role on college campuses for many years, but it was not until recently that a community of performing arts administrators and campus-based presenters initiated a rejuvenated national conversation on the topic. This activity has been facilitated by shifts in higher education following the turn of the millennium, the emergence of funding entities interested in embedding the arts into the life of the academy, the evolution of the performing arts presenter into active producer and campus leader, and the development of university-based strategic planning initiatives around the arts. University performing arts presenters are working to strengthen the relationship of the arts with the campus and sustain such efforts into the future.

Key Words of Subject

arts education, Creative Campus, performing arts presenting, university arts engagement

Table of Contents

Preface.....	viii
History of University Arts Engagement.....	8
Why Now?.....	11
<i>Initiating a national conversation: The 104th American Assembly conference</i>	11
<i>Shifts in higher education</i>	18
<i>Funders get on board</i>	20
<i>The evolving presenter and strategic planning initiatives</i>	22
Models of the Creative Campus.....	28
<i>Hostos Center for the Arts and Culture, Hostos Community College</i>	30
<i>Lied Center of Kansas, University of Kansas</i>	32
<i>Lied Center for the Performing Arts, University of Nebraska-Lincoln</i>	35
<i>Stanford Lively Arts, Stanford University</i>	37
<i>The Hopkins Center, Dartmouth College</i>	40
<i>Hancher Auditorium, The University of Iowa</i>	42
<i>Carolina Performing Arts, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</i>	43
<i>Center for the Arts, Wesleyan University</i>	46
Analyzing the Creative Campus and Moving Forward.....	49
<i>Ownership</i>	49
<i>Adaptiveness, collaboration, and learning</i>	50
<i>Partnerships with faculty and artists</i>	51
<i>Recommendations</i>	52
<i>Continuing challenges</i>	53

References.....	56
Appendix A: List of Interviewees.....	61
Appendix B: Interview Questions for APAP Grantees.....	63

Preface

While an undergraduate at Duke University, I worked at Duke Performances, Duke University's performing arts presenting body. I had the opportunity to help produce a variety of festivals and performance series, allowing me to see firsthand the manner in which a university presenter engages a variety of communities on a college campus, including students, faculty, administrators, staff, and members of the local community. I believe that this work has the tremendous capacity to facilitate dialogue among these constituencies and to teach us a great deal about our world. I would love to return to the university setting one day to work at the intersection of the arts and higher education. I believe that this opportunity to study the Creative Campus has given me a broad perspective on the many ways in which the arts and culture can be used as a means to bring us together and redefine the manner in which we approach education in this new century.

-Eric Oberstein, January 2009

In the spring of 2004 the American Assembly¹ sponsored a conference at which university administrators, campus-based presenters, faculty, and arts leaders came together to discuss the “Creative Campus,” the evolving notion of a university as a major center for interdisciplinary engagement with the arts. This gathering not only produced a report focused on the training, sustaining, and presenting of the performing arts in American higher education, but it also led to a wave of activity—articles, speeches, meetings, and strategic planning initiatives. University administrators and presenters from across the country recognized that they were part of a community of individuals invested in effecting change on their campuses through the performing arts. This community was faced with the following question: How can we develop new ways of using the arts as a means to reach out to the diverse constituencies of our institutions?

I assert that this gathering of stakeholders in the arts and higher education communities acted as a catalyst for new Creative Campus activity. This gathering was one ingredient that contributed to a renewed interest and focused dialogue on the relationship of the arts and higher education, and the potential of such a marriage in the twenty-first century. In addition to this energized national conversation, there were a variety of other currents happening simultaneously that synergistically fueled discourse around the Creative Campus. These currents include recent shifts in higher education, including a more expansive focus on interdisciplinary education, investigation of global issues, and universities’ desire to attract top students through the creation of vibrant

¹ The American Assembly is a “national, non-partisan public affairs forum illuminating issues of public policy by commissioning research and publications, sponsoring meetings, and issuing reports, books, and other literature. Its initiatives facilitate communication and action among decision makers, lawmakers, and other leading authorities representing a broad spectrum of views and interests from all sectors. Its reports and other publications are used by government and community, by civic leaders and public officials. Founded by Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1950, The American Assembly is affiliated with Columbia University.” (from <http://www.americanassembly.org>)

campus cultures. In addition, various foundations and funding entities emerged that were interested in supporting projects that dealt with new modes of student engagement, especially through the arts. Furthermore, campuses across the country aimed to build on arts-focused work they had been doing at their respective institutions for many years. Numerous long-standing, active presenting programs across the country form the foundation for such forward-thinking work today. Campus-based presenters, in particular, aimed to embrace a more holistic approach to university arts engagement, in which they used the professional artists they were bringing to campus as a means of reaching out to diverse parts of their communities and finding commonalities among individuals in different disciplines. These presenters see themselves as active producers, and they have helped to mobilize and collaborate on strategic planning initiatives around the arts at their respective institutions. Ultimately, in this essay I aim to investigate two primary research questions. First, in what ways are university performing arts presenters and administrators re-conceptualizing the role of the arts in a university setting? And second, why now? What was the impetus for the planning of the Creative Campus conference at the time that it happened, and what spurred the other simultaneous currents?

My research explores the various models by which these university entities are engaging their communities, including students, faculty, staff, and local community members, through the performing arts in unique ways. When discussing creativity and the arts, it is important to establish a set of definitions to frame the conversation, as creativity and the arts are certainly not synonymous terms. In this essay, the arts refer to modes of expression commonly thought of as artistic disciplines, including music, visual

arts, dance, drama, film, creative writing, and others. In the context of the Creative Campus, creativity refers to a process by which institutions of higher learning aim to develop fresh approaches to interdisciplinary collaboration and learning. Because the Creative Campus discussions were built around understanding the intersection of the arts and higher education, the stakeholders discussed here are primarily invested in focusing on the arts as an essential ingredient in the development of a Creative Campus. In *Art, Mind, and Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity*, psychologist and pioneer of the theory of multiple intelligences, Howard Gardner (1984) sees artistic thinking as an important part of the creative process. Philosopher Maxine Greene asserts, “Creativity is putting things together in novel ways, having your own stamp and your own voice, finding your own voice” (NewMusicBox, 1999). In this context, the arts help individuals on college campuses find that voice, either manifested in new expression or new modes of collaboration and experimentation. Whether nurturing the arts for arts’ sake or using the arts to facilitate cross-campus collaboration, both are necessary elements in developing the Creative Campus.

To fully understand the significance of the Creative Campus, I outline the trajectory of university arts presenting, mapping the growth of the field from the days of the Association of College, University, and Community Arts Administrators (ACUCAA) in the 1970s to the organization’s evolution into the Association of Performing Arts Presenters (APAP) in 1988. I also examine consortia of university presenters, including Major University Presenters (MUPs).

Following an exploration of the historical evolution of university arts presenting as well as the various currents contributing to renewed interest in the Creative Campus, I

focus specifically on the APAP Creative Campus Innovation grant program, funded by the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, as a lens to look at the work being done by eight university presenters from across the country, including: Hostos Center for the Arts and Culture, Hostos Community College, CUNY (Bronx, NY); Lied Center of Kansas, University of Kansas (Lawrence, KS); Lied Center for the Performing Arts, University of Nebraska-Lincoln (Lincoln, NE); Stanford Lively Arts, Stanford University (Stanford, CA); The Hopkins Center, Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH); Hancher Auditorium, The University of Iowa (Iowa City, IA); Carolina Performing Arts, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Chapel Hill, NC); and Center for the Arts, Wesleyan University (Middletown, CT). This pool of eight universities encompasses all of the grantees from the program and provides models for what the Creative Campus can be.

Each university, varying in size and geographic region, developed an original project using the arts as a medium to explore topics relevant to its community during the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years. Each institution is not a traditional performing arts conservatory, but rather focuses on research and a broad liberal arts education. This sample allowed me to explore the application of the arts as a means of learning and engagement in non-arts disciplines and settings. Some of the questions that I investigate include: How are these presenters facilitating dialogue and collaborations among individuals from all academic disciplines, and how are university presenters rethinking the “artist/institution paradigm” in the sphere of higher learning? This essay concludes with a discussion and synthesis of my findings, including various strategies employed by the universities, the challenges and opportunities that these schools face in

integrating the arts into campus life, as well as implications and lessons for continuing such work into the future.

My general method for pursuing my research and developing the accompanying analysis involved the collection of articles inspired by the Creative Campus conference and its impact at universities across the country, especially as manifested through the following: a) new strategic planning initiatives around the arts, b) the establishment of university arts offices, and c) the cultivation of university arts endowments. I investigated the Creative Campus Innovation grant program and the recipients' projects in depth, gathering materials from each university presenter and conducting interviews with the directors of each organization (or individuals that oversaw the Creative Campus project planned at each school). I focused on the eight grantees, in particular, as there is a diverse set of schools represented, including a community college as well as both small and large private and public universities. In addition, I supplemented these interviews with conversations with other leaders involved in the Creative Campus discussions, including university administrators, faculty, funders, researchers, and assorted university presenters. I believe that these discussions with leading thinkers and practitioners in the field reveal a great deal about the appeal of a rejuvenated national interest in the arts in a university setting.

This topic is of relevance to the field because universities are important arenas for nurturing and developing the arts and arts audiences, and they have enormous potential as centers for arts education, especially when a university's performing arts center is the only "game" in [a college] town. There is an abundance of notable university arts-related activity occurring across the country. For example, the largest single gift ever made to

Princeton—\$101 million—was donated to build a performing arts curriculum and to support an artist-in-residence program. In addition, a search of the relevant literature on the subject yielded some interesting findings. Sociologist Jennifer Lena conducted a pilot study to “map” the Creative Campus at Vanderbilt and Ball State Universities; she used network analysis to graphically depict how creative work on a campus comes into being, highlighting the major players and points of collaboration. Uncovering both the impetus for and products of the Creative Campus is particularly exciting, as it illuminates some of the deeper forces at work in higher education and the arts.

Other research is being conducted around the Creative Campus in addition to Professor Lena’s work. A great deal is being written both on a local and national level on the subject, largely due to the potential impact that the arts can have on university communities. Steven Tepper of the Curb Center for Art, Enterprise, and Public Policy at Vanderbilt is a leading Creative Campus thinker, and he is particularly interested in modes of arts engagement as well as the motivations of universities when realigning their priorities around the arts. Alan Brown and Jennifer Novak of the consulting firm WolfBrown conducted an impact study, commissioned by several university presenters, on the intrinsic impact of live performance—essentially, how live performances transform audiences. The book *Gifts of the Muse*, written by researchers at the RAND Corporation, also explores the impact that the arts can have in a university setting.

The Creative Campus has tremendous implications. I believe that real learning lies in identifying the challenges and opportunities related to campus arts engagement. Are there specific models that have emerged that are effective in reaching out to a broader campus community? I am interested in gauging how different university

presenters evaluate the success of their work and decide how to move forward. My hope is that my interviews will shed light upon different strategies for campus arts engagement. I hypothesize that the connection between the arts and higher education is being strengthened, as many universities are working hard to embed the performing arts into the everyday life of their campus communities.

History of University Arts Engagement

Before investigating the current state of university arts presenting, it is important to consider the roots of the field and how exactly the performing arts came to stake a claim on college campuses across the country. For more than a century, colleges and universities in the United States have played an increasingly important role in presenting the performing arts. Universities both produced and disseminated the performing arts, but it was not until the period following World War II that universities began to construct major performing arts centers, recognizing the importance of their work to audiences and artists. These performing arts centers contribute immensely to the culture of their communities, and they each have a variety of roles in these communities. They are “*incubators* of new work, offering much-needed residencies and providing context for their audiences; they are *educators* of young artists and future audiences; they are *presenters* of live performance; and they are *catalysts* for cultural awareness in their communities” (Association of Performing Arts Presenters, 2002, p. 7). These entities were seen as having a significant public and civic purpose, exposing audiences to diverse cultures, art forms, and subject matters.

With the growth of performing arts presenting on college campuses in the 1950s there was an increase in the number of concert managers who had a specific interest in the educational role of the arts and the unique issues that came with presenting professional performing artists at universities and colleges. A group of these presenters left the National Association of Concert Managers in 1957 and formed the Association of College and University Concert Managers (ACUCM). ACUCM was officially incorporated and granted non-profit, tax-exempt status in 1969. In the late sixties and

early seventies the presenting field began to expand beyond the university setting, which led ACUCM to change its name in 1973 to the Association of College, University and Community Arts Administrators (ACUCAA).

The presenting field continued to grow and with this growth came rich dialogue about the challenges and opportunities related to presenting, both on the campus and off. In 1988 the ACUCAA changed its name to the Association of Performing Arts Presenters (APAP), composed of members primarily based in the United States and Canada. The current membership (over 1,900) includes “presenting organizations; regional, state, and local arts agencies; service organizations; producing companies; artist managements; booking agencies, and individual artists, among other performing arts professionals” (Association of Performing Arts Presenters, n.d.2). While the membership has expanded beyond colleges and universities, issues relevant to these constituents are still a major focus and university arts administrators are able to learn from and exchange ideas with their peers from outside the campus community. Every January APAP holds an annual conference in New York City at which thousands of presenters, artists, artist managers, and other entities in the performing arts come together to discuss issues including marketing, audience development, advocacy, education, community engagement, and presenting of international artists, among other topics relevant to the field. At the 2008 and 2009 conferences, APAP held plenary sessions devoted specifically to the discussion of the Creative Campus and the experiences of different university presenters engaging their respective communities through the arts.

In an effort to further advance a sense of community among university presenters, a consortium known as the Major University Presenters (MUPs), was established as a

means for campus-based presenters at research universities to network and connect with one another. “The consortium was established to connect the nation’s most distinctive and prominent university performing arts presenters, to enable the sharing of practices and information, and to develop other areas, such as networking and leadership development” (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill News Services, 2008). Universities must be invited into MUP by the current membership, which includes eighteen schools. The group is facilitated by Jerry Yoshitomi, and in 2005, a consortium of fourteen of its member institutions commissioned a value and impact study, conducted by WolfBrown consultants, investigating the intrinsic value of the performing arts on college campuses, as well as the different ways of assessing such an impact on participants and audiences (WolfBrown Consultants, 2008). From APAP to the MUPs to other smaller, more informal networks of university presenters, there is a strong desire for such entities to learn from one another and to help achieve national progress in the field of campus-based arts presenting.

Why Now?

One of the primary questions about the recent activity around the arts at American colleges and universities is: Why now? Why are universities investing heavily in the arts and realigning their strategic planning processes around the arts? Some schools have opened new performing arts centers and arts offices, and they are recruiting new arts faculty and administrators to help integrate the arts more deeply into the everyday culture on their campuses. I assert that a variety of simultaneous currents have contributed to these Creative Campus efforts, including the sustained national conversation initiated by the 104th American Assembly conference, a variety of fairly recent shifts in higher education, substantial financial investment from universities and foundations, the evolution of the role of the presenter, and the development of strategic plans focused on the arts. These currents have generated incredible energy around projects across the country focused on the application of the arts in the university setting.

Initiating a national conversation: The 104th American Assembly conference

In March 2004 the 104th National American Assembly met to discuss the topic, “The Creative Campus: The Training, Sustaining, and Presenting of the Performing Arts in American Higher Education.” Alberta Arthurs, former Director of Arts and Humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation and Principal, Arthurs.US; and Sandra Gibson, President and CEO of APAP, co-chaired this gathering. A diverse group of individuals attended this conference, including university administrators and professors; performing arts presenters and artists; and representatives from nonprofit, business, and government organizations. These individuals focused on the role that the performing arts play in

higher education. This event reinforced the significant symbiotic relationship between universities and the arts.

Discussion at the American Assembly highlighted a broader effort to raise a consciousness of the Creative Campus among stakeholders at universities. Attendees recognized that universities mostly have a three-pronged mission of research, education, and service, and the arts can be actively incorporated into each of these elements as a means of achieving broader university objectives. They agreed that in order for the arts to survive and be appreciated, a new generation of arts appreciators, consumers, and artists must be cultivated. For this reason, attendees emphasized the importance of providing platforms for engaging students, faculty, staff, and community members through the arts. This includes not just those individuals studying or working in the arts, but all members of the university community. Programming and participation opportunities for all individuals would help foster broad appreciation for the arts across the campus.

Arts education is part of the expansive education that universities aim to provide for their students. The Assembly suggests, “Arts presenters can provide educational opportunities to the general student body by exposing them to artists and artistic enterprises on campus and by providing contexts for understanding the work. Presenters should collaborate with faculty members to achieve this” and organize performances that tie into classes on campus (The American Assembly, 2004, p. 12). This complements what students are studying in the classroom, and it allows them to incorporate a specific performance or residency into the learning process. These performances encourage students to think in new ways about specific subjects and ask important questions related

to their field of study. Such thought and inquiry advances the arts, and it helps create cross-disciplinary links on campus that improve campus relations in general.

Students are important presenters on college campuses, and it is in the best interest of the professional arts presenters to collaborate with these individuals. Students and student organizations are constantly involved in presenting a wide assortment of arts performances, including music, theater, and dance, as well as film screenings and other arts events. “Student presenters often enhance the scope of material available to campus communities in ways that complement more formal presenting activities and advance aesthetic and cultural diversity. Professional presenters can benefit from the work of such informal presenters” (The American Assembly, 2004, p. 13). Professional arts presenters at universities can gain greater visibility among the student population by collaborating with these student presenters. Such collaboration will enhance the events presented by both groups. Students often attend performances or events in which their friends are involved, so by assisting with student presenting, professional presenters on campuses will have more opportunities to interact and engage with students. This partnership may also help create a general awareness about events presented by the university performing arts series. If students have positive experiences at either the student or professionally programmed events, and they discern a connection between the two, they may be more willing to look into attending events put on by the other entity.

Arts presenters have the capacity to create collaborative relationships with all members of the university community in an effort to consciously build a culture around the arts, one in which interactivity and creative leadership are stressed. The Assembly asserted the need to involve campus leaders in emphasizing to students the importance

and significance of arts participation on campus. Administrators, faculty, board members, and other individuals can attend performances and encourage student attendance and participation. “College and university leaders can convey the importance of the arts in society as well as in the academy, the importance of creativity in all aspects of human endeavor, and the importance of the arts in maintaining international flows of expression and understanding” (The American Assembly, 2004, p. 17). University arts presenters should not attempt to engage students and other constituents alone; rather, they can take advantage of the various resources they have on campus and work with different entities to achieve these goals. This creates a broad network of supporters for the arts on and off campus.

A variety of opportunities were evident following the American Assembly convening on the Creative Campus. University arts presenters are in a unique position to help generate a *consciousness* around the Creative Campus at their own institutions. A thriving arts and cultural scene on a college campus has the potential to attract, retain, and teach students how to succeed in a world that requires creativity. “Students are no longer content to experience education and culture in a top-down, passive way. Instead, growing up with a ‘do-it-yourself’ ethos, students want to create their own culture, whether through blogs, writing and recording songs, amateur films... and other forms of art” (Tepper, 2006b). Ultimately, university administrators and faculty can help facilitate this, providing students and other community members with a more interactive cultural experience.

Steven Tepper acknowledges that students should be the primary concern of university leaders and arts presenters. He argues that “as long as teaching and learning

remain a central goal, students have to be the primary constituent for Creative Campus work. Other goals are important... but if students are not front-and-center, future Creative Campus initiatives will remain on the margins” (Tepper, 2006b). Tepper lays out a series of questions that may be helpful in evaluating whether students are being properly immersed in the arts during their college years. “Are [students] engaged in creative pursuits? Do students leave campus having had a meaningful and important artistic experience? And, perhaps, most importantly, do they develop a heightened curiosity about the world during their years as undergraduates?” (Tepper, 2006a, p. 5). These questions are significant, as they may help ensure that students and education remain at the center of a university’s work around the arts.

The college years are formative years that influence the development of a new generation of change agents. Thus, there is tremendous opportunity for universities to provide the resources for students to develop an appreciation for the arts and subsequently grow as innovators. As Syracuse University chancellor Nancy Cantor stated in 2005 in an address at Cornell University, “If we in higher education care about making our students both creative and resilient, the arts should be at the core of our educational mission, the medium as well as the object of exchange” (Cantor, 2005, p. 2). The American Assembly concluded that the time is ripe for colleges and universities to build the Creative Campus, and students and all of the many other stakeholders in university communities can be included in that process.

Tepper asserts that three primary conclusions can be drawn from the American Assembly conference. First, American universities and colleges are likely the biggest single arts patrons in America. Second, artistic assets are underutilized on college

campuses. Third, there is a need for new research on how the arts operate on a college campus. Given this assessment, he argues that university leaders need to recognize their defining role in the arts ecology and take responsibility for that role more deliberately and assertively. In addition, stronger bridges need to be built between campus presenters, faculty, and student affairs so that the performing arts become an integral part of campus life. Furthermore, research must be conducted to better understand the impact of the arts on a campus. Tepper is specifically interested in quantities of programs and events, as well as participation levels. He also stresses the need for qualitative research on the impact of a healthy arts scene in achieving broader university objectives (Tepper, 2004, p. B6).

The American Assembly meeting inspired many articles, essays, and speeches on the Creative Campus in which various stakeholders discussed the importance of moving forward with the work and findings of the conference. Numerous entities are also working to address the lack of national research and scholarship on the intersection of the arts and higher education. Sociologist Jennifer Lena developed a pilot study to map creativity and the Creative Campus at Vanderbilt and Ball State universities. Professor Lena distributed surveys to students, asking them to list creative “hot spots” on campus, as well as creative organizations, people, and programs. She will use network analysis to graphically depict how creative work on a campus comes into being, highlighting the major players and points of collaboration (Tepper, 2006b). This work will help illuminate how campus-wide cultures are formed around the arts and creativity.

The consulting firm, WolfBrown, has conducted research on the Creative Campus, which was commissioned by fourteen member institutions of the Major

University Presenters consortium. Released in January 2007, the report, entitled “Assessing the Intrinsic Impacts of a Live Performance,” aimed to define and measure how audiences are transformed by a live performance. Six presenters surveyed audiences at a total of 19 music, dance, and theater performances. The study’s research design included a pair of questionnaires, the first which dealt with the audiences’ mental and emotional preparedness for the performance, and the second which looked at a range of reactions to the performance, including captivation, intellectual stimulation, emotional resonance, spiritual value, aesthetic growth, and social bonding. This report is unique, in that it addressed the hypotheses that the intrinsic impacts that come from attending a live performance can be measured, that different sets of impacts can be derived from different types of performances, and that the impacts received are affected by an audience member’s “readiness to receive” the art. The measurement tool that the study developed allows performing arts presenters to engage more deeply with their audiences and develop programming that has specific benefits for those audiences (Brown & Novak, 2007, p. 2).

Another entity invested in research on the intersection of the arts and higher education is the newly established Mike Curb Creative Campus at Vanderbilt University—the first national research program on creativity, the arts, and higher education. The program is administered by the Curb Center for Art, Enterprise, and Public Policy at Vanderbilt. In addition to pursuing its research objectives related to development and measurement of the Creative Campus, the program also aims to affect every student on the Vanderbilt campus through new courses, faculty, guest speakers, and internships. Furthermore, a select group of students will be chosen as Undergraduate

Curb Leadership Scholars, and the program is also launching a fifth-year Master's degree in creative enterprise and public leadership (Mike Curb Creative Campus Program at Vanderbilt University, 2008). Mike Curb, an executive from the music recording industry and philanthropist interested in the arts and education, provided funding for the program.

Shifts in higher education

In addition to the momentum created by the American Assembly conference, various shifts in higher education, especially since the millennium, have fostered and facilitated the wide range of activity associated with the Creative Campus. Colleges and universities, in particular, are looking to develop a broader focus on interdisciplinary education, develop students that can engage with global issues, and attract top students through the creation of vibrant campus cultures. The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) developed a project entitled Liberal Education and America's Progress (LEAP), which stresses the importance of a liberal arts education in the 21st century. LEAP outlined its essential aims and outcomes as developing students with knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, intellectual and practical skills, and personal and social responsibility. AACU emphasized the importance of integrative learning in this project, as such experiences help students to develop intercultural skills, work in teams, and think critically. The arts are seen as helping to develop each of these priorities, and thus universities and funders see the arts as a means to achieve objectives for a 21st century education. In addition, The LEAP project identified an assortment of high-impact educational practices, including first-year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities,

collaborative projects, community-based learning, internships, and capstone projects and courses, among others (Association of American Colleges and Universities, n.d.). All of these practices are a natural part of the Creative Campus, thus bolstering the case for strengthening the arts and culture on a college campus.

In addition to the LEAP-focused rationale, the Creative Campus helps to provide fast visibility to campuses in an era of increasing competitiveness, and the arts also help to incorporate a diversity of thoughts, perspectives, and cultures into the broad academic environment. “Because of the kind of work they produce, artists today often know, and need to know, a good deal about the full spectrum of the academic work done at universities, fields from physics and chemistry to history, philosophy, and literary theory” (Garber, 2008). This helps to create shared understanding among scholars and students of varied backgrounds. Steven Tepper asserts that the new cultural policy of the United States “must be focused on unleashing the creative and expressive potential of all citizens” (Tepper, 2008, 379). Recently, researchers have given attention to the impact of arts engagement. A study entitled *Gifts of the Muse*, which was carried out by the RAND Corporation and commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, looked at the benefits of the arts, particularly intrinsic benefits, which “refer to effects inherent in the arts experience that add value to people’s lives.” These benefits are structured in a continuum and include captivation, pleasure, expanded capacity for empathy, cognitive growth, creation of social bonds, and expression of communal meaning (McCarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras, Brooks, 2004, p. 37-44). They are aligned with universities’ priorities for education. Ultimately, the arts are seen as helping to prepare students to thrive in a world that demands awareness, creativity, and innovation.

Funders get on board

Funding from a variety of entities has helped to facilitate and advance Creative Campus work. The reality is that deeper engagement through the arts on college campuses requires financial investment, in addition to support from administrators, faculty, students, and community members. Such commitment has helped a variety of initiatives and projects at schools across the country, and it reflects a belief by various foundations, philanthropists, and university administrators in the work being undertaken at various institutions around the arts. Especially given the aforementioned shifts in higher education, as well as the dialogue that followed the American Assembly conference, this influx of funding is certainly a by-product of the various currents fueling the Creative Campus.

The Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (DDCF) has been a leading funder of Creative Campus work, collaborating with APAP on the Creative Campus Innovation grants, which distributed large-scale grants to eight schools across the country to carry out interdisciplinary, campus-wide projects in which the performing arts presenting body at each institution was charged with the task of working to integrate its work more deeply into the academic life of the university. DDCF also made three large grants to three different campus-based presenters as part of its Leading College and University Presenters program for artistic programming and endowment purposes—Krannert Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Clarice Smith Center for the Performing Arts, University of Maryland; and University Musical Society, University of Michigan (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign News Bureau, 2006). Ben Cameron, Director of the Arts at DDCF, stated that following an internal strategic planning process

at the foundation, technology, the erosion of audiences, and leadership transition were identified as some of the most pressing issues facing the arts, and it was felt that universities were equipped to help address these issues, resulting in the various grant initiatives (interview, January 11, 2009).

Other schools have worked to establish arts endowments, understanding the importance of building a foundation for long-range fiscal health for university performing arts centers and arts programs. Carolina Performing Arts at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill launched a campaign to match dollar for dollar a \$5 million challenge gift made by the William R. Kenan, Jr. Charitable Trust by December 31, 2007 (Carolina Performing Arts, n.d.). In addition, the Major University Presenters consortium engaged campus leadership, primarily provosts, to provide a pool of funds to help facilitate cross-campus programming and commissions (Tepper, 2006b).

An influx of funding has the incredible potential to support a broad array of arts initiatives and programming on campuses. Numerous schools across the country provide subsidized tickets for students, often below \$10. These affordable tickets help to get young patrons in the door at performances that under normal circumstances they may not be able to afford to attend. Increased funding also creates opportunities for universities to distribute grants to students to create their own arts-based projects or to create work-study opportunities for students interested in careers in the arts. The philanthropic support that Mike Curb has provided to Vanderbilt University to build an entire program devoted to the study of the intersection of the arts and higher education illustrates the importance of cultivating donors to support intensive arts-based work at universities. In 2005, Princeton University received its largest single gift ever—\$101 million—to build a

performing arts curriculum and to support an artist-in-residence program (Pogrebin, 2006). The Curb Center at Vanderbilt also held national research meetings in 2006 and 2008, supported by the Ford Foundation and the Mellon Foundation, to help set a research agenda to explore the relationship between art, creativity, and campus life. In the fall of 2005, the Ford Foundation supported a similar meeting at the University of Texas at Austin. At these meetings, “scholars have begun to offer potential research strategies for understanding how the arts add value to our campuses” (Tepper, 2006b).

The evolving presenter and strategic planning initiatives

Acknowledging the momentum following the American Assembly conference, as well as the various shifts in higher education and the development of new funding sources for Creative Campus work, universities across the country began to build upon the arts-based work being done at their schools and re-conceptualize what was possible artistically at their institutions. Presenters, in particular, who had brought professional artists to their communities, further redefined their roles, developing an even more holistic approach to university arts engagement. Interdisciplinary collaboration and engagement became more of a mandate, and the term “presenter” no longer seemed to encapsulate the many responsibilities of a campus-based arts administrator in the twenty-first century.

The university performing arts presenter has evolved into much more of a producer, an entity that collaborates with and fosters new work by artists, using these experiences to reach out to constituencies on a deeper, more meaningful level. “Historically, the role of the presenter has been that of facilitator: selecting the artists,...

advertising the performance, selling the tickets, and then moving on to the next project. Today, most presenters understand this as the most rudimentary definition of presenting” (Foster, 2006, p. 45). The presenter is now actively looking for commonalities across campus, thinking of ways to use artists as a bridge to spark discourse and discussion. In their study on the intrinsic impact of a live performance, Alan Brown and Jennifer Novak assert that their findings suggest a “shift in the traditional role of arts presenters from one of simply marketing and presenting to one of drawing audiences into the experience (i.e., an engagement approach) through a combination of education, outreach, marketing and interactions with artists” (Brown & Novak, 2007, p. 21). In this regard, presenters would establish new criteria for selecting artists, as they would aim to work with artists that are open to the collaborative and educational experience, rather than simply performing one night and leaving town the following morning. Such a presenter is more invested in Brown & Novak’s notion of “benefits-based programming,” in which presenters first decide what impacts they hope to create for their constituents and then choose artists, works of art, and strategies that most effectively engage community members and deliver those types of impacts.

Presenters at an increasing number of universities are collaborating with upper-level administrators and faculty in an effort to define the types of desired impacts they want for their students and their communities, both through professional performances and through curriculum-based learning. Numerous universities have developed strategic, long-range plans focused solely on the arts, and others have defined the arts as one major area of focus among others in broader campus plans. Strategic planning initiatives identify various arts-based goals, including the recruitment of more arts faculty, the

generation of more campus-wide collaborative arts engagement projects, the development of capital campaigns for new arts buildings, the growth of the role of campus-based presenters and performing arts centers, and the active incorporation of the arts into cross-curricular learning as a means of achieving more expansive educational goals. Universities including Stanford, Princeton, and Columbia, in addition to other schools, have released strategic plans focused on the arts over the past few years. Such a commitment by top-tier universities reflects a belief in the impact of the arts on education and the enrichment of campus cultures.

Stanford University launched the Stanford Arts Initiative as a means of bringing the arts into the curriculum and integrating them with other fields of study, from the humanities, sciences, and social sciences to law, business, medicine, and engineering. Established in 2006, the Stanford Institute for Creativity and the Arts (SICA) became the administrative and strategic base for the Arts Initiative, “leading the creation of new undergraduate programs, hosting artists in residence, awarding grants for research and teaching, incubating performances and exhibitions, and developing new degree programs.” The Institute’s co-directors, Jonathan Berger and Bryan Wolf, acknowledge that their goal in the Arts Initiative is “to create a culture of creativity across the entire university” by focusing on four primary areas—enriching student life, strengthening core arts departments, creating new programs and expanding partnerships, and building world-class arts facilities. The Stanford Challenge is aiming to raise funds specifically for the Arts Initiative’s numerous goals (Berger & Wolf, n.d.).

Princeton University is undergoing an equally ambitious transformation. In January 2006 President Shirley M. Tilghman released a report outlining the university’s

plans to provide substantially increased support to the creative and performing arts. Soon after, it was announced that Princeton would receive its landmark \$101 million gift to pursue this initiative. Princeton's plans for the arts include the establishment of the Lewis Center for the Creative and Performing Arts; the creation of a new interdisciplinary Society of Fellows in the Arts; the expansion in size, resources, and visibility of Princeton's existing undergraduate certificate programs in the arts; the establishment of a scholarly research program between the Council of the Humanities and the newly established Lewis Center; the provision of additional space for new and expanded programs, ultimately in the form of an "arts neighborhood" on campus; and the establishment of a fund to provide financial support for extracurricular arts activity (Tilghman, 2006). The President's arts initiative is a component of Princeton's campus plan, which was released in January 2008 in an effort to outline the key strategic and development goals of the university over the next ten years.

In 2004 Columbia University hosted the Creative Campus convening of the American Assembly, and President Lee C. Bollinger served as co-chair. Bollinger is a strong advocate for the arts in the university setting, and he launched the Arts Initiative at Columbia University that same year. The Arts Initiative was established to "enliven the arts on campus, link the university to the artistic diversity of New York City, connect the arts with other ways of understanding the world, provide support for art that would not otherwise thrive, and help prepare a new generation of artists" (Columbia University News, 2005). Directed by Gregory Mosher, the Arts Initiative provides students with discounted tickets to arts events both on and off campus (which are sold at its Ticket and Information Center), as well as grants and marketing support for student groups. The

Arts Initiative's website, CUArts.com, serves as a central web portal for all information about the arts at Columbia, and it provides information on arts internships. The Columbia Arts Experience, a program of the Arts Initiative, places students in internships with a variety of arts organizations in New York City, including theaters, museums, TV and film studios, and publishing houses, providing them with a stipend that is matched by the employer. In addition, the Arts Initiative collaborates with Columbia's academic departments on seminars and residencies with major artists and cultural figures. In October 2006, for example, the Arts Initiative brought Václav Havel, the former president of the Czech Republic, as well as a playwright and activist, to campus for a seven-week residency that included lectures, conversations, interviews, classes, performances, and panels focused on his life, ideas, and the links between citizenship and the arts.

In December 2008, Harvard University released a report on the findings of its Task Force on the Arts, a yearlong assessment of the state of the arts at Harvard. Over the past year, the task force's committee members interviewed members of the campus community and benchmarked Harvard against peer institutions through visits to other campuses. "While the report acknowledges the significant amount of artistic activity on campus, the relatively few academic programs dedicated to arts practice have largely relegated the arts to the extracurricular lives of students" (Harvard News Office, 2008). Based on these findings, Harvard plans on beginning work to bring the arts to the center of the academic experience, among other goals. Duke University released a new strategic plan in 2006, with the arts being one of its major areas of focus. Within the arts, Duke plans on focusing on five points of emphasis: enriching the student experience in the arts,

increasing faculty strength in the arts, building national and international arts programming, creating vibrant arts facilities on its campuses, and strengthening arts leadership (Duke University, 2006). The University of Alabama, Carleton College, Emory University, and The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill have also undergone similar strategic plans in recent years, reflecting wide commitment to integrating the arts into institutional objectives for years to come.

Models of the Creative Campus

As illustrated in the previous section, universities and colleges are taking the idea of the Creative Campus seriously and are beginning to realign university priorities around the arts through strategic planning initiatives. APAP's Creative Campus Innovation grant program, funded by a \$1.5M grant from the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation and announced in 2006, built upon this momentum and provided university-based presenters with large-scale funding to develop cross-campus interdisciplinary projects around the arts. Each of the eight schools that received the grant developed models of how the Creative Campus can manifest itself and each structured its project differently in an effort to explore a diverse set of issues.

The eight institutions received funding ranging from \$50,000 to \$200,000 for one- to two-year projects that would help to better integrate the work of each school's presenting body into the academic environment on campus and the surrounding community. The time span for the projects is April 1, 2007 through May 31, 2009. The grant program encouraged applicants to propose unique projects that featured innovative approaches and perspectives, attempted to stimulate debate and discussion, and connected arts and non-arts constituencies. The program has several goals, including strengthening interest in the arts and the academy and exhibiting the importance of the arts to the educational, service, and scholarly missions of the academy; identifying programs that can provide examples and lessons for arts-based action at campuses across the country; and documenting and disseminating a set of case studies to be made available to institutions of higher education (Association of Performing Arts Presenters, n.d.1). The eight applicants were selected on the merit of their ideas and the degree to which they

fulfilled the objectives of the grant program. The eight grantees include: Hostos Center for the Arts and Culture, Hostos Community College, CUNY (Bronx, NY); Lied Center of Kansas, University of Kansas (Lawrence, KS); Lied Center for the Performing Arts, University of Nebraska-Lincoln (Lincoln, NE); Stanford Lively Arts, Stanford University (Stanford, CA); The Hopkins Center, Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH); Hancher Auditorium, The University of Iowa (Iowa City, IA); Carolina Performing Arts, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Chapel Hill, NC); and Center for the Arts, Wesleyan University (Middletown, CT).

In an effort to get a sense of the projects carried out by each grantee, during the summer of 2008 I conducted a combination of telephone and in-person interviews either with the executive directors of the presenting body at each institution, or a staff member designated to manage that school's Creative Campus project. The main goal of the interviews was not just to learn about the theme of each university's project, but also to gain perspectives on how to structure and navigate such an undertaking. I was particularly interested in the development of each project from the planning stages to execution, the goals of each project, the type of collaboration that resulted, as well as the various lessons learned throughout. We discussed the unique environment and geographic area in which each school operates and how such context influenced the conception and implementation of the projects. In addition, I was interested in the strategies that these individuals would recommend for their colleagues in carrying out similar projects, as well as modes for evaluating whether or not project goals were achieved. Despite facing a variety of challenges along the way, each grantee emerged

with a different approach on how to develop a thriving Creative Campus. (See Appendix B for interview questions.)

Evaluation and measurement were a key component of the grant program, as each grantee was assigned a consultant from the firm WolfBrown to assist in the development of metrics to gauge success. The consultants helped the grantees to conduct interviews, surveys, and focus groups to provide qualitative feedback, in addition to more traditional quantitative measures, such as ticket sales. The goal was to provide a “road map” for evaluation that the presenters could use for future projects, utilizing tools at every step of the project for measurement of productivity. Evaluation in the arts is challenging and often puzzling, as it is difficult to “define the success of a process, which may be made up of many projects—and many relatively invisible and unmeasurable activities—ongoing or over an extended period of time.” In the “absence of clearly defined, articulated, and communicated criteria for how to view the process, [outsiders’] measures of its success will inevitably be applied,” potentially resulting in criticism that misconstrues the goals of the process at hand (McDaniel & Thorn, 1997, p. 72). It is for this reason that campus-based presenters must be able to outline clearly their evaluation methods and ultimately the effectiveness of their programs, especially when engaging with upper-level administrators and funders.

Hostos Center for the Arts and Culture, Hostos Community College, CUNY (Bronx, NY)

At Hostos Community College in the Bronx, the Hostos Center for the Arts and Culture, directed by Wally Edgecombe, has long drawn on the cultural and ethnic makeup of the community in the development of its programming. Hostos is a bilingual

institution with a Latino focus, and the college charges Edgecombe with the mandate of serving the cultural needs of the south Bronx community. This community, composed largely of residents of Puerto Rican and Dominican descent, inspired him first to develop a biennial festival around Afro-Puerto Rican culture, called BomPlenazo, held in October. With the Creative Campus grant, however, he wanted to delve deeper, creating another festival focused on Afro-Dominican culture, and tying student coursework and study abroad programs into both of these festivals.

Basing his project on the roots of his community was an easy choice for Edgecombe. “These types of projects need to be organic to the institution at hand. You can’t just invent something,” he said (interview, July 21, 2008). Edgecombe began by collaborating with the college’s Humanities department, which focused considerable attention on the study of Afro-Puerto Rican and Afro-Dominican culture. The Humanities program ran a study abroad program where it brought students to both islands to study their respective cultures. Edgecombe worked with the faculty to gear the course of study more acutely to the festivals, where the students went into specific communities to conduct interviews with artists and field research on cultural practices still upheld by the peoples living there. Then a selection of the students from the study abroad programs were trained as cultural guides for groups that came to the festivals in the fall, teaching others about their fieldwork and the cultures being celebrated. The festivals also included seminars on how globalization was affecting these endangered cultures. In addition, exhibitions and concerts were planned for the six-day festivals.

In the summer of 2007, students traveled to the Dominican Republic in preparation for the inaugural Quijombo festival of Afro-Dominican culture, to be held in

October 2007. The Dominican artists that were invited to perform at the festival were denied visas, however, forcing Edgecombe to utilize Dominican artists based in the United States. The students were still utilized as cultural guides for the festival, though, taking groups through an exhibition at Hostos that featured photographs and footage from their fieldwork. Edgecombe attempted to bring the artists again in March 2008, but they were denied visas again. He is currently working with local and national politicians to ameliorate this issue with the hope of bringing these artists to Hostos in the future. In the summer of 2008, students performed field research in Loíza, Puerto Rico, in advance of the BomPlenazo festival held in October 2008. The festival ultimately featured more than 60 guest artists and featured collaborative events with an assortment of community partners. In addition to navigating visa issues for artists, the Center for the Arts and Culture at Hostos is working on evaluation methods of the study abroad and cultural guide programs in an effort to improve the overall festival experience. The Puerto Rican festival will continue every other year in the even years, and the Dominican festival will continue every other year in the odd years. Ultimately, Edgecombe is excited about his office's marriage with the Humanities department, and he is hopeful about future synergies and collaborative efforts.

Lied Center of Kansas, University of Kansas (Lawrence, KS)

The Lied Center of Kansas developed a project entitled *The Tree of Life*, which focuses on evolution. Karen Lane Christilles, Associate Director at the Lied Center, was initially drawn to presenting because of its relationship to the campus, and she believes that the University of Kansas' Creative Campus project is allowing the Lied Center to be

even more of a creative force in the Lawrence, Kansas community. The Lied Center saw the Creative Campus grant opportunity as a natural continuation of what its staff is always trying to do—strengthen collaboration between the arts and the academy and engage community members, both on and off campus, in a meaningful way. Christilles noted, “It was very exciting for us to be able to highlight that dialogue [at the American Assembly] and really use the project as a case study on all of the issues surrounding creativity and the arts at a major research university” (telephone interview, June 30, 2008). When the grant opportunity came about, the Lied Center put out an open call to the Kansas faculty and campus to see who wanted to come to the table and join the conversation on what the project topic should be for the application. A series of conversations followed, and the Lied Center committed itself to continuing such dialogue regardless of whether or not it received the APAP grant. A steering committee of faculty was assembled and this body partnered with The Commons at KU, an institute meant to engender dialogue between the arts and the sciences. The Lied Center had the ultimate goal of taking this case study to the provost, who wanted to hear recommendations from the steering committee on the resources, both personal and financial, that the University of Kansas would need to look at to have a sustainable Creative Campus atmosphere.

Given the nature of the attendees at these various discussions, an idea emerged focused on scientific research on campus and the artist responding to that research. Ultimately, evolution was chosen as a topic—both what evolution means to the campus but also in Kansas in general, as the university’s chancellor asserted that the university needed to take more of a forward stance on evolution being taught in the schools. The Lied Center wanted to invite and include resident artists in this conversation, and it

wanted to select a touring artist and ensemble to work with the artists working on campus. David Balakrishnan, founder of the Turtle Island String Quartet, was ultimately chosen to work on the project, as the Lied Center had commissioned him previously and he had been in residence. In addition, the dance and theater departments came forward to see how their art forms fit into this dialogue.

The Lied Center ultimately received the project grant, and over the course of two years, Balakrishnan has been working with the various fine arts faculty and students at KU to develop an evening of music, dance, and theater to premiere in April 2009 inspired by evolution and the interconnectedness of humanity. The “tree of life” concept is a way to map or visually illustrate how this works. One KU faculty member noted that there are essentially two trees, Darwin’s biological tree as well as a cultural tree, which speaks to the evolving realities of humans and their cultures. Various workshops and colloquia have been held throughout the process in which faculty have been able to present their research on evolution and life. The artists working on the project have attended these colloquia to learn about their colleagues’ research on evolution and the origins of life. In turn, the artists have taken this information and incorporated it into their own creative processes. Two resident choreographers will choreograph the performers for the piece, who will all be students. Balakrishnan is composing a part of the piece for the KU Wind Ensemble and another portion for the Turtle Island String Quartet. In addition, the chair of the theater department is directing a spoken-word component of the piece, which will be captured by a videographer and projected while it is being performed.

The Lied Center surveyed the entire faculty to see if the Creative Campus project was reaching into their disciplines and to understand any barriers that might be limiting

such engagement. A significant barrier that emerged was the notion of “publish or perish” for faculty members. Faculty felt that there was the constant expectation for them to publish their research and work, and they felt that it was hard to collaborate with the Creative Campus initiative unless incentives were provided for them, such as developing interdisciplinary research papers based on the Creative Campus projects. In addition, faculty needed the assurance that such interdisciplinary, cross-campus work would be rewarded by the university administration for promotion and tenure. Furthermore, Christilles noted that it was important for all collaborative entities to be open to adapting and learning throughout the course of such a broad-based project. In addition, she stated that such work cannot be imposed on a community; rather, there must be a sense of ownership for all involved and the community needs to be honest about its goals and motivations for working in this manner.

Lied Center for the Performing Arts, University of Nebraska-Lincoln (Lincoln, NE)

At the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, the Lied Center for the Performing Arts developed a relationship with the Madonna Rehabilitation Hospital, the College of Fine and Performing Arts, and the student body at large to develop a Creative Campus project focused on rehabilitating victims of major injuries through art. In 2009, Troika Ranch Digital Dance Company, a troupe based out of New York City interested in combining digital technology with dance, will premiere a piece called *Loop Diver*, which developed from interviews with rehab patients at the Madonna Rehabilitation Hospital. Omaha-native and Troika Ranch artistic director Mark Coniglio’s development of Artistic Rehabilitation Therapy (ART) technology also inspired this work. ART is a computer

application that uses cameras to translate dancers' movements onstage into a three-dimensional digital image. This software has tremendous implications for the hospital as well, as it can capture and analyze patients' movements, providing instant feedback for doctors and researchers. The hospital is collaborating with Coniglio to combine his software with the hospital's pre-existing motion-capture technology to improve both platforms in an effort to improve methods of physical rehabilitation. Coniglio has met regularly with Dr. Judy Bernfield at Madonna, who has been a huge advocate for the project and has demonstrated incredible commitment to the arts and her patients.

Laura Kendall, Assistant Director of Community Engagement and Learning, manages the project for the Lied Center and has worked to develop partnerships with the UNL departments of theater, architecture, education, digital media, and computer engineering, along with NET Television and the Lincoln Arts Council. "The Lied Center hopes to encourage research breakthroughs, innovative teaching, and the creation of a unique work of art" (University of Nebraska-Lincoln Communications, 2007). The Lied project feeds into the university's "Collaborative Academy," an idea of the dean of the College of Fine and Performing Arts to bring students and faculty from different departments together to form a think tank to confront various issues and topics relevant to the university and world community. In addition, the project is being documented for a film created by students at the Johnny Carson School of Theatre and Film, with the hope of airing the documentary nationally on PBS.

Kendall stated that there has been an ongoing struggle to gain attention from upper-level administration for the work that the Lied Center does. "We are a big institution and we move slowly. The focus of the university is not on the

interdisciplinary projects, it is more on the sciences and research. [The Lied Center] is not moving along as fast as we would like” (telephone interview, July 2, 2008). Kendall acknowledged that interdisciplinary work around the arts at Nebraska is a “slow-moving train,” and it is hard to develop an understanding among the upper echelons at the university that having artists at the table is important. An additional obstacle was that the Lied Center had to operate through the university’s grants office, which provided resistance, as the Creative Campus grant did not fit into its typical grants, which are focused on science, research, and technology. The university was not familiar with the concept of commissioning an artistic work, and there is an ongoing dialogue about the university’s claim to the intellectual property and patent resulting from the technology developed. Ultimately, it is important to help administrators learn how artists work and the implications of that process for the university as patron.

Furthermore, Kendall stated that this type of project is incredibly demanding and requires a tremendous amount of time, resources, and work. “We’re trying to build the bike and ride it at the same time,” Kendall said. Thus, one has to be patient but also communicate with the university so that artists can work efficiently while in residence on campus. Kendall argued the importance of thinking critically and creatively about the development of project, as well as learning how to think through failure. Additionally, she emphasized the importance of engaging students in this type of work and having a support system that encourages interdisciplinary student arts participation. “If kids aren’t provoked out of their coma of regurgitating information, how will they come out of it?”

Stanford Lively Arts, Stanford University (Stanford, CA)

Stanford Lively Arts artistic and executive director Jenny Bilfield learned firsthand the importance of being adaptive when managing a Creative Campus project. When she came on board at Lively Arts in 2006, the organization was developing a project proposal focused on bringing the South Africa-based Handspring Puppet Company to be in residence. The company's manager, however, became concerned that it was not in the best interest of the company to be off the road for three months, instead proposing occasional visits by the artistic director to campus. Lively Arts had to say no to the project in November 2007, as it did not want to compromise the sustained residency and engagement that were originally envisioned.

Bilfield and Lively Arts responded to this obstacle, however, and conceived a new project that combined the gadgetry and technological richness of Silicon Valley with Stanford's arts and technology resources. Trumpeter Dave Douglas and filmmaker Bill Morrison were ultimately commissioned to develop a piece that combined the resources and inspiration of Silicon Valley with Stanford's Center for Computer Research in Music and Acoustics, as well as the university's faculty and students. The piece will premiere in April 2010. One of Bilfield's main goals was to support a new work that made sense in the context of the Stanford community. "At Stanford people join high-tech companies and start-ups. It is an engaged, rigorous, and exciting intellectual environment. There's a buzz in this community," stated Bilfield, who wanted to develop a project that built on the themes of invention and egalitarianism, as well as the vibrancy that informs the work being done at Stanford (telephone interview, July 7, 2008). Douglas is using soundscapes he developed at Stanford's Center for Computer Research in Music and Acoustics. Douglas also consulted the archives at Stanford's Cantor Arts Center and the Hoover

Institution on War, Revolution and Peace for inspiration. Douglas and Morrison are working with Stanford's programs in documentary film and music to develop a course that looks at notions of creativity.

Lively Arts is currently working to interweave its Creative Campus work with the Stanford Arts Initiative and the Stanford Institute for Creativity and the Arts (SICA). The challenge is creating a seamlessness in which Lively Arts, the presenting body, works closely with the entities spearheading both the Arts Initiative and SICA. Bilfield recognized that at Stanford there is a large amount of expectation that there will be equal interaction in interdisciplinary arts projects by faculty, not just the presenter. Thus, there is the challenge of incentivizing faculty for collaboration, which is often an "unstated discomfort in the background." Collaboration requires that the entities involved give something up for the greater good, and it has proven to be a difficult concept to rally around, as faculty and other stakeholders carry skepticism from the past. Thus, Bilfield insists, "All of this baggage needs to be outed." Faculty need to be brought into the basic planning process and one must assume the best of one's peers. Bilfield acknowledges that this effort will require the longest amount of time and the most amount of effort, but it is worth it, as faculty bring immeasurable value to the table. Universities have cultural and intellectual assets that provide a unique environment for fostering and incubating new work; thus, it is important to energize the "human capital" on one's campus.

Bilfield learned when transitioning to Lively Arts' new project that it is important to activate one's campus around a concept from the beginning. It is especially important to engage with faculty interested in developing coursework that will help to get students motivated. At the end of the day, though, Bilfield asserted that one grant will not effect

change on a campus—it is campus commitment that matters. It is up to institutions of higher learning to support this connective behavior and carry such support into the future. Bilfield stated, “APAP support gives rocket fuel to an engine and gears that are starting to lubricate and work. It’s not moving as fast as it will move a couple years from now.”

The Hopkins Center, Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH)

The Hopkins Center (“The Hop”) at Dartmouth College is currently in the third-year of a three-year Creative Campus project called “Class Divide,” which has sparked dialogue on campus focused on class differences, both economic and social, through a broad series of programs and workshops. It was felt that three years was required to fully allow the subject matter to sink into the psyche of the campus community. The Hop completed its first year of Class Divide without grant support from APAP and then continued the project last year and this year with the funding from the Creative Campus grant. The first year of experience from the project gave the Hopkins Center staff a fair amount of knowledge of what it wanted to propose for the grant application. According to executive director Jeffrey James, it was felt that economic and social class differences were almost never discussed at a place like Dartmouth, although subjects of racial and ethnic difference were regular topics in campus conversations. “Class difference had a degree of discomfort or invisibility that we were noticing, and we felt that artists could take a look at these differences and frame them for people in a way that could help to overcome this resistance, both on campus and beyond,” James said (telephone interview, July 14, 2008).

The highlight of the project has been a series of work-in-progress readings by the San Francisco-based playwright Anne Galjour, who was commissioned to write a play inspired by field research and interviews conducted in Hanover, NH and other nearby communities. Galjour met with community members and held story circles to gain different perspectives on class in the area. The Hop also had aims of addressing issues of accessibility, and it started a staff-composed task force to ascertain whether or not the venue was welcoming for people who may not see themselves in the economic class of Dartmouth students. Class Divide has enjoyed tremendous reach and impact on the Dartmouth campus, particularly because the Hop was invited to join the research-based Dartmouth Centers Forum (DCF). The DCF “seeks to respond to growing political, ideological, social, and intellectual dissonance in the academy and society” and “hopes to create an enabling environment for constructive thinking and open dialogue campus-wide about current issues of the day” (Dartmouth Centers Forum, n.d.). In 2007-2008, the DCF chose Class Divide as its theme, helping to feed discourse on campus around the Hop’s Creative Campus project.

The Hop is already beginning to see university-initiated change around the Creative Campus concept. The Dean of the Faculty put aside funds to encourage faculty to consider new classes that consider class differences. The hope is that students will have more intensive arts experiences, beginning in their coursework. James acknowledged, though, that a challenge is finding another subject matter that “resonates as loudly and persuasively” as Class Divide has. He asserted, though, that it is important to take risks in an effort to move students, faculty, staff, and community members out of their comfort zones. He hopes that the powerful moments that resulted from the Creative

Campus artist-residency experiences will inspire administrators to provide sustained support for similar efforts in the future.

Hancher Auditorium, The University of Iowa (Iowa City, IA)

In June 2008, flooding devastated parts of Iowa, and as a result, the University of Iowa's Hancher Auditorium, a recipient of a Creative Campus Innovation grant, was forced to adjust its timetable for its project. Hancher is involved in an interdisciplinary project focused on the loss of vision entitled, "The Eye Piece." For the project Hancher collaborated with UI's Center for Macular Degeneration (CMD), the Writing Program of the College of Medicine, the Theatre Arts Department, and faculty in the English, Psychology, and Physics departments. The UI hospital is one of the largest hospitals in the country with a world-renowned Center for Macular Degeneration that is committed to the goal of curing blindness. Hancher invited artist Rinde Eckert—an actor, singer, writer, and performer, and alumnus of the UI opera program—to write a play based on stories he captures from patients, family members, medical students, doctors, and fellows at CMD. The play is about a fictionalized painter confronted by his loss of vision, and Eckert collaborated with the director of CMD, Ed Stone, to get a better sense of such an experience. This theater piece ultimately revolves around vision and the loss of vision, and Eckert is working with UI theater students to stage the production, which will premiere in January 2010. The first performance will be a private performance for families, patients, doctors, and medical students based at CMD.

According to Hancher executive director, Chuck Swanson, "The project aims to help doctors and medical students become more compassionate when people lose their

sight. Alternatively, it is a neat way for theater students to learn about the arts, healthcare, and healing” (telephone interview, June 23, 2008). Hancher invited the support of faculty members from the English, Physics, and Psychology department to incorporate the subject matter into their classes, and medical students in the Writing program at the College of Medicine, an elective program, are helping to document the project. Eckert explains, “My task will be to stand at the center of this diverse community of experiences, ideas, and passions in order to orchestrate them into a work of art” (University of Iowa News, 2007). Eckert’s statement is indicative of the very nature of the Creative Campus experience—discovery, dialogue, and the creation of new artistic work build on the synergies of diverse communities across a university.

From the beginning of the Creative Campus project, Swanson said that the many parties involved, including a blind faculty member, came on board immediately and have been mobilizing the project through both collaborative and independent work. For the 24 years that Swanson has been at Hancher, he said UI has always been supportive of the arts, as there is a great openness to learning through new mechanisms. He hopes that the project strengthens the relationship between CMD and the College of Medicine, and he also hopes that the project reinforces that the arts can be used as a means of learning. “This project has really shown that the arts are a way to reach across boundaries,” Swanson remarked.

Carolina Performing Arts, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Chapel Hill, NC)

Despite being established only in 2005, Carolina Performing Arts has made tremendous strides since, embarking on a campus-wide arts initiative and receiving one of APAP's Creative Campus grants for the 2007-2008 academic year. UNC's Creative Campus project, entitled "Criminal/Justice: The Death Penalty Examined," focused on the issue of capital punishment. Guided by Executive Director for the Arts, Emil Kang, and Campus and Community Engagement Coordinator, Reed Colver, the death penalty project involved a great deal of lateral campus interaction and department-initiated projects, as opposed to primarily top-down projects and initiatives dictated by Carolina Performing Arts. In the same spirit, UNC undertook a cross-campus project focused on gender and identity this year.

The death penalty project included a series of performances, lectures, exhibits, and seminars around campus in addition to several highlight events. These events included a performance of Tim Robbins' adaptation of Sister Helen Prejean's *Dead Man Walking* (which was staged by students in the drama department); a staged reading of Prejean's *The Death of Innocents* (which was the summer reading book for the summer of 2007); a premiere of the commissioned play, *Witness to an Execution*, by Mike Wiley at the Playmakers Repertory Theatre; and a major photography exhibit by documentary photographer, Scott Langley. The alignment of the summer reading program with Carolina Performing Arts' project gave legs to the summer reading book, and it created a broader base of awareness around the death penalty project. The staging of Langley's large documentary photography exhibit required the development of an advisory board, which included the Dean of the Law School, the Dean of the School of Public Health, a representative from the Sonja Haynes Center for Black Culture and History, and other

entities around campus. This helped to generate a multidisciplinary dialogue on the focus of the project.

Colver was particularly gratified to see that events were cropping up around campus during the course of the project initiated by the various schools and departments at UNC without her prodding. This work energized the conversation on campus and allowed Carolina Performing Arts to support this organic work that was already happening (R. Colver, telephone interview, July 14, 2008). Colver underlined the importance of meeting with constituents around campus and forming partnerships that foster collaboration, ownership, and open communication. It was imperative to reinforce that the project was not meant to dictate whether the death penalty was right or wrong. Rather, it was meant to initiate a dialogue around the issues surrounding capital punishment and their implications. Open debate and dialogue, Colver stated, are key to such broad, cross-campus projects. In an effort to raise further awareness around the project, Carolina Performing Arts created a visual identity for the project that incorporated a specific look, wording, and imagery into advertising and the project's own website and blog. Similar to several other projects, UNC was forced to adapt to unexpected events, including the passing of invited guest artist Sekou Sundiata as well as cancellations by major guest speakers that formed the core of several anchor projects. The project became even more grassroots as a result, though, as various smaller campus projects stepped up to fill the void left by those major events. Ultimately, Colver underscored the importance of choosing a topic of interest to the entire community. "Having something that other people find interesting is critical. Otherwise, you're just doing [the work]."

Center for the Arts, Wesleyan University (Middletown, CT)

The Center for the Arts at Wesleyan is currently in the midst of a two-year exploration of global warming and climate change in a project entitled “Feet to the Fire.” Prior to receiving a Creative Campus grant, Pamela Tatge, director of the Center for the Arts, stated that non-arts departments began actively collaborating with the Center on programming, attempting to link performances on campus to what was happening in the classroom. Thus, the Feet to the Fire project was a natural extension of the relationships that had already begun to develop between faculty and the Center for the Arts. When APAP sent out its request for proposals to the field for the grant program, Wesleyan had just gone through the experience of commissioning a work of art that incorporated the investigation of non-arts disciplines. The Liz Lerman Dance Exchange developed a piece entitled “Ferocious Beauty: Genome” over the course of three years that focused on genetics. Wesleyan’s Dean of Sciences turned out to be a stem cell biologist as well as a Merce Cunningham-trained dancer, and thus provided immense support for a project that ultimately succeeded in bringing the arts across the campus.

Wesleyan was interested in developing a follow-up project to Ferocious Beauty. Tatge noted, “The presenter should look at the strategic objectives of the university and see how the presenter’s work can mirror that” (telephone interview, August 29, 2008). Aware that Wesleyan was interested in expanding the role of the sciences at the university, Tatge consulted with several scientists on campus, who emphasized the burning need for the community to understand the significance of climate change. With the support of the Center for Creative Research, a multi-year pilot project funded by the

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and administered by the New England Foundation for the Arts, “designed to re-engineer institutional contexts for artists,” Tatge worked with Environmental Studies professor Barry Chernoff and visiting artist and dancer Ann Carlson to develop a proposal for a project that related to climate change and the Earth (Center for Creative Research, n.d.). The Center for the Arts announced that it had received the Creative Campus grant on Earth Day in April 2007. In addition, Wesleyan put out a call for “white papers” from staff and faculty looking for ideas for specific areas of inquiry on campus. Tatge authored a proposal focused on Wesleyan becoming a model of the Creative Campus, and her topic was ultimately one of five papers chosen to be researched and implemented.

Tatge notes that she and her colleagues wrote six months of planning into the grant timetable, as such projects cannot operate without planning time to get faculty together and to get “bureaucracy moving.” The project was officially launched in January 2008. During that spring semester, Carlson and Chernoff co-taught a class related to climate change where students conducted field research at a landfill in Middletown, where Wesleyan is located, resulting in a series of works based on text and movement. These works were performed at the first Feet to the Fire Festival, which was held that May. The Center for the Arts also commissioned Carlson to develop a dance piece, “Green Movement,” which was premiered at that festival as well. At the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year, Feet to the Fire was the focus of the freshman common moment program called “First Year Matters,” in which approximately 550 new Wesleyan students came out to stage a dance based on climate change, led by the Liz Lerman Dance Exchange. In the spring of 2009, Carlson and Chernoff will take a group

of students to the rainforests in Guyana to extend their scholarship from Feet to the Fire. Several Feet to the Fire modules were also co-developed by both arts and non-arts faculty to supplement courses across the university in architecture, anthropology, environmental studies, government, art, and dance. The project will culminate in May 2009 with a final festival that will feature the work of students and faculty developed over the course of the project.

Tatge is particularly interested in how one sustains this type of work. She believes such work is hard to accomplish unless initiated by a senior-level person on campus who has the clout to navigate the vast terrain of a university. Tatge also underscores that the job description of a university presenter needs to be rewritten, as presenters must spend more time on relationship building and must possess a distinct level of intellectual rigor and diplomacy. The most gratifying experience for Tatge was seeing students energized by the project. A sophomore, in particular, developed a blog about Feet to the Fire that featured data and information on the topic, as well as that student's reflections. "What is most exciting is seeing what this project has given birth to. It is far more rewarding than the old days of booking an artist, doing a residency, and then they leave. The presenter is no longer a peripheral entity, but is a central part of the conversation," Tatge stated. Furthermore, Tatge underscored that it is imperative to figure out a way to balance the work of visiting artists with resident arts faculty, as it is important to not alienate resident arts faculty who have students longer than the visiting artists. It is important to commission works by resident faculty as well, so as to not exclude them from the conversation. The faculty, besides the students, are the lifeblood of the intellectual life of the university, and thus it is important to represent their voices.

Analyzing the Creative Campus and Moving Forward

The Creative Campus conversation is sparking dialogue among universities across the country about the tremendous potential of the arts in facilitating cross-campus, interdisciplinary work and discourse. There is a rich history of the arts on college campuses. Now, however, there is a national conversation that was largely initiated by the American Assembly. Universities began to envision what could be achieved when campus-based presenters are transformed into active producers working with artists, faculty, staff, students, and community members in a manner that embeds the arts into the everyday life of the school. While it is hard to tell how this work will be sustained, Creative Campuses are cropping up all over the country, and the APAP Creative Campus Innovation grant program illustrates that there are lessons to be learned and shared about how to engage an entire campus community through the arts.

What can we learn from the Creative Campus, specifically, interviews with university presenters and other stakeholders in the field who have experience with this transformative work?

Ownership

It is important for campus leadership and upper level administrators to buy in to the notion of the Creative Campus and the importance of the arts in fueling creativity. University presenters have an opportunity to actively educate these administrators about this work occurring at campuses across the country and outline the various benefits for the university, including the achievement of the university's strategic objectives, such as more competitive recruitment of students and faculty, more interdisciplinary projects and

dialogue, greater opportunities for fundraising, and improvement of the public face of the university. In addition to administrators, students, faculty, staff, and community members must feel a sense of ownership of Creative Campus projects and work. The presenter must not dictate initiatives in a top-down manner. Instead, the presenter should actively seek out collaborators and form advisory committees in which all stakeholders and campus entities are brought into the conversation and planning process. Silagh White, Director of Arts Lehigh at Lehigh University, holds annual Creative Campus caucuses of campus arts directors. White stated, “Campus arts administrators need to act as connectors and appeal to both arts and non-arts students. Change does not happen from a state of inertia. We need to work laterally in institutions that understand vertical structure. We must re-frame the debate” (telephone interview, May, 29, 2008). Additionally, meaningful interaction and learning will only result if the topics of inquiry are of relevance to the context in which the university operates. As one presenter stated, “Whatever you do has to be true to who you are.” This manner of work must be organic to the institution and cannot be invented without proper rationale and motivation.

Adaptiveness, collaboration, and learning

Creative Campus agents emphasize the importance of being adaptive and open to learning. Broad-based projects require time for planning and implementation, and it is important for presenters to develop partnerships and trust with various collaborators across the entire campus. Sandra Gibson acknowledged, “It is hard to develop partnerships. How do you get people out of their tunnels and silos?” (telephone interview, August 11, 2008). One must also occasionally respond to conditions that are

out of one's control. Rather than abandon plans, though, it is important to be creative in one's thinking about how to proceed in a manner that will not drain an effort of its momentum. These projects are processes, and it is important that the entities involved document the experience to facilitate ongoing learning and institutional memory. While these efforts require time and resources, they have tremendous potential for new learning, especially when organizers are proactive about taking risks and pushing boundaries in cross-disciplinary experimentation. It is important to foster an atmosphere of open debate and dialogue in an effort to incorporate all perspectives and opinions. Presenters should aim to align Creative Campus projects with shared student experiences, ranging from summer reading to orientation activities. This helps in building a consciousness among the student body of the work being done and helps to invite them as active collaborators.

Partnerships with faculty and artists

When developing programs and courses, presenters emphasized the importance of working with administrators to provide incentives for faculty, as many faculty members are expected to publish or create as a means toward tenure. Creative Campus work by faculty members should be rewarded, easing any reluctance associated with taking on such projects. It is important for the university to find artists that are open to long-term residencies and engagement, and it is also imperative for universities to balance the work of visiting artists with that of resident arts faculty, so as to not marginalize the latter. How can presenters and administrators work with arts faculty so that faculty members

take this work seriously? Furthermore, evaluation and reflection are key to improving learning and collaborative partnerships.

Recommendations

Ultimately, by taking into account these lessons learned from the various Creative Campuses thriving around the country, colleges can move towards developing sustainable programs that incorporate the arts into the university setting. Campus-based presenters will need to raise new funds, forge new partnerships, and be insistent on long-term support from upper-level administrators. In the same vein, universities should reach out to alumni in an effort to develop financial support for Creative Campus work. Alumni should be engaged in discussions, as they can be invaluable resources in terms of mentoring current students, providing guidance on the development of new arts facilities and programs, and expanding awareness of their universities' work around the arts elsewhere. In the long run, the hope is that such commitment will produce lasting change on college campuses, significantly altering the understanding of the role the arts can play in spheres of higher learning. The arts help to produce vibrant communities, and intellectual substance and rigor in programming and partnerships help to propel these communities forward.

Creative Campus advocates must not forget the importance of fostering the arts for arts' sake. Before the arts can be utilized as a tool for cross-campus learning and interdisciplinary dialogue, the arts on a campus must be valued and supported. A campus without a strong arts foundation lacks the richness and the intrinsic benefits that the arts bring to the table. Ultimately, such a campus would be limited in its potential to achieve

true creativity. As Howard Gardner and Maxine Greene have asserted, the arts are an essential ingredient for students and other community members to find their individual and collective voices, which are such a vital part of the exchange that characterizes the Creative Campus. Rather than simply lobbying for top-down ideological initiatives and short-term programs, it is important for university arts presenters to dig deeper and develop relationships and a community invested in long-term engagement with the arts. As the role of university presenters evolves, these administrators have the unique opportunity to teach their communities about the Creative Campus work happening across the country and continue the conversation sparked by the American Assembly. By matching the arts with the strategic and educational objectives of the university, presenters will have more bargaining power in their collaborations with upper level administrators and faculty, potentially attracting new sources of funding.

Continuing challenges

In addition to the excitement around the work being done on the Creative Campus, there are several concerns that must be raised in the discussion of the intersection of the arts and higher education. How does a university acting as arts patron move beyond short-term themed projects to creating real campus-wide cultural change in the arts? Are campuses provoking work that is not solely theme-based and creating an environment that fosters art making and collaboration among students, faculty, and community members? While thematic programming is one way to provide focus for arts engagement, it cannot and should not be the only manner in which universities attempt to build Creative Campuses. In order for such work to be sustained, it cannot be

shortsighted and solely program-driven. It is important to look at the various arts constructs that exist from campus to campus and learn from the strengths of each, whether presenter-initiated projects or more generalized offices that help to provide students and community members access to the arts. In addition, it is important to benchmark Creative Campus work against underlying objectives, so as to ensure impact and future viability.

Another point of consideration is the effect of Creative Campus initiatives on the relationship between research universities and conservatories. Does mass participation in the arts demean the work being done at conservatories? As individuals become increasingly engaged with the arts on college campuses, more and more amateur artists may emerge. Essentially, would Creative Campus work lead to tension between professional and amateur arts makers? In addition, are research universities working with conservatories, and what types of connections can be crafted? Perhaps presenters at research universities could facilitate artistic collaborations with students and faculty at conservatories to help expand their community engagement. Such concerns must be acknowledged and addressed, and such lessons should help to inform Creative Campus discussions in an effort to effect positive change.

In conclusion, university arts engagement is being redefined in a significant way today. The Creative Campus conversation is energized and many respected and powerful stakeholders are listening, as evidenced by the number and diversity of entities engaged in the conversation. University presidents such as Nancy Cantor at Syracuse University, Ellen McCulloch-Lovell at Marlboro College, and Lee Bollinger at Columbia University are role models for how university leadership can embrace the notion of incorporating the

arts into the fabric of the university. Discussions and research must continue, and the work currently being done at institutions of higher learning can serve as case studies for the rest of the field as a new paradigm for university arts engagement. This work, however, is only just beginning.

References

- The American Assembly. (2004). The Creative Campus: The training, sustaining, and presenting of the performing arts in American higher education. Report published by the 104th American Assembly. March 11-13, 2004. Arden House, Harriman, New York. The American Assembly, Columbia University.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP). Retrieved January 13, 2009, from <http://www.aacu.org/leap/index.cfm>.
- Association of Performing Arts Presenters. The Creative Campus Innovation Grant Program Guidelines. Retrieved January 9, 2009, from <http://www.artspresenters.org/services/creativecampusgrants.cfm>.
- Association of Performing Arts Presenters. History. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.artspresenters.org/about/history.cfm>.
- Association of Performing Arts Presenters. (2002, Jan.). Toward cultural interdependence: The fourth phase of the performing arts in America. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from www.artspresenters.org/about/cultural.pdf.
- Berger, J., and Wolf, B. A message from the Stanford Arts Initiative leaders: Engaging the arts and creativity. Stanford Arts Initiative. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from http://thestanfordchallenge.stanford.edu/get/file/g2sdoc/arts_l2CaseStatement.pdf.
- Brown, A.S., and Novak, J.L. (2007, Jan.) Assessing the intrinsic impacts of a live performance: commissioned by 14 Major University Presenters. WolfBrown Consultants.

- Cantor, N. (2005, May 3). Collaborations on the “Creative Campus.” Conference on Campus Community Art Connections and the Creative Economy in Upstate New York. Cornell University. 1-18. Retrieved Dec. 19, 2008, from <http://www.syr.edu/chancellor/speeches/cornellSpeech.pdf>.
- Carolina Performing Arts. National advisory board. Retrieved January 13, 2009, from <http://www.carolinaperformingarts.org/aboutus/national.aspx>.
- Center for Creative Research. About. Retrieved January 13, 2009, from <http://www.centerforcreativeresearch.org/live>.
- Columbia University News. (2005, Oct. 10). University arts initiative launches CUArts.com. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/10/cuarts.html>.
- Dartmouth Centers Forum. Retrieved January 12, 2009, from <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~centersforum/DCF/DCF/Dartmouth%20Centers%20Forum.html>.
- Duke University. (2006). Making a difference: The strategic plan for Duke University. Retrieved January 13, 2009, from <http://stratplan.duke.edu/ch04/20.html>.
- Foster, K. J. (2006). *Performing arts presenting: From theory to practice*. Washington, DC: Association of Performing Arts Presenters.
- Garber, M. (2008, Oct. 5). Higher art: Universities should become society’s great patrons of the arts. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved Oct. 6, 2008, from http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2008/10/05/higher_art/?page=4.
- Gardner, H.E. (1984). *Art, mind, & brain: A cognitive approach to creativity*. New

York: Basic Books.

Harvard News Office. (2008, Dec. 10). Task force releases report on the arts. *Harvard University Gazette*. Retrieved Dec. 11, 2008, from

<http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2008/12.11/99-arts.html>.

McCarthy, K.F., Ondaatje, E.H., Zakaras, L., & Brooks, L. (2004). *Gifts of the muse: Reframing the debate about the benefits of the arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

McDaniel, N., & Thorn G. (1997). *Learning audiences: Adult arts participation and the learning consciousness: The final report of the Adults Arts Education Project*. Washington, DC: The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Association of Performing Arts Presenters, ARTS Action Research.

Mike Curb Creative Campus Program at Vanderbilt University. About. Retrieved Dec. 23, 2008, from <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/curbcreativecampus/about.html>.

NewMusicBox. (1999, Dec.) Can creativity be taught? Retrieved Feb. 10, 2009, from <http://www.newmusicbox.org/first-person/dec99/8.html>.

Pogrebin, R. (2006, Jan. 21). Princeton to receive record gift for the arts. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 13, 2009, from http://www.nytimes.com/2006/01/21/arts/21prin.html?_r=2&oref=slogin.

Tepper, S.J. (2004, Oct. 1). The Creative Campus: Who's no. 1? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51 (6), B6. Retrieved Apr. 26, 2008, from <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/curbcenter/creativecampus>.

Tepper, S.J. (2006a). Taking the measure of the Creative Campus. *Peer Review*, 8, 4-7.

Tepper, S.J. (2006b, July/August). Riding the train: The creative campus initiative has

left the station. One of its engineers explains where the tracks lead and how to sound the whistle. *Inside Arts*. Retrieved Dec. 19, 2008, from <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/curbcenter/insidearts>.

Tepper, S.J. (2008). The next great transformation: Leveraging policy and research to advance cultural vitality. In S.J. Tepper & B. Ivey (Eds.), *Engaging art: The next great transformation of America's cultural life* (pp. 363-385). New York: Routledge.

Tilghman, S.M. (2006, Jan.). President's Initiative. Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton University. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from http://www.princeton.edu/arts/presidents_initiative.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign News Bureau. (2006, July 20). Krannert Center receives major grant from Duke Foundation. *Inside Illinois*, 26 (2). Retrieved January 13, 2009, from <http://news.illinois.edu/ii/06/0720/dorisduke.html>.

University of Iowa News. (2007, Apr. 13). UI Hancher Auditorium wins "Creative Campus Innovations" grant. Retrieved April 19, 2008, from <http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/news/2007/04/13theatre.shtml>.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln Communications. (2007, Nov. 8). Grant fuels dance, computer science collaboration. In *Scarlet*. Retrieved April 19, 2008, from <http://www.unl.edu/scarlet/archive/2007/11/08/story4.html>.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill News Services. (2008, Jan. 30). UNC

Chapel Hill joins elite group of arts presenters. Retrieved May 7, 2008, from <http://uncnews.unc.edu/news/arts/unc-chapel-hill-joins-elite-group-of-arts-presenters.html>.

WolfBrown Consultants. Major University Presenters value and impact study: Resource guide. Retrieved December 19, 2008, from www.wolfbrown.com/mups_downloads/MUP_resource_guide.pdf.

Appendix A: List of Interviewees

Jenny Bilfield

Artistic and Executive Director, Stanford Lively Arts, Stanford University
Stanford, CA

Ben Cameron

Program Director for the Arts, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation
New York, NY

Karen Lane Christilles

Associate Director, Lied Center of Kansas, University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

Reed Colver

Campus and Community Engagement Coordinator, Carolina Performing Arts, University
of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC

Wally Edgecombe

Director, Hostos Center for the Arts and Culture, Hostos Community College, CUNY
Bronx, NY

Sandra Gibson

President and CEO, Association of Performing Arts Presenters
Washington, DC

Aaron Greenwald

Director, Duke Performances, Duke University
Durham, NC

Jeffrey James

Executive Director, The Hopkins Center, Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH

Laura Kaminsky

Former Dean of the Conservatory of Music & Interim Director of the Performing Arts
Center, Purchase College, SUNY
Purchase, NY

Laura Kendall

Assistant Director of Community Engagement and Learning, Lied Center for the
Performing Arts, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE

Jack Megan

Director, Office for the Arts, Harvard University
Cambridge, MA

Gregory Mosher
Director, Arts Initiative at Columbia University
New York, NY

Chuck Swanson
Executive Director, Hancher Auditorium, University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA

Pamela Tatge
Director, Center for the Arts, Wesleyan University
Middletown, CT

Silagh White
Director, Arts Lehigh, Lehigh University
Lehigh, PA

Appendix B: Interview Questions for APAP Grantees

1. Please describe the work that you do. What type of training do you have, and how did you become involved in campus arts presenting?
2. What is the mission of your organization? What types of programs do you offer?
3. Why did your organization apply for an APAP Creative Campus Innovation grant? What were your motivations and goals? How did you become aware of this opportunity?
4. What project are you carrying out with the APAP grant funds?
5. What was the goal of this project?
 - a. What types of arts engagement resulted from this project? How did this project engage students, faculty, and community members?
6. How would you describe the nature of arts engagement at your campus prior to receiving the APAP grant?
7. What highlights or memorable programs from this past season embody the work done through this project?
8. What types of collaborations and partnerships developed as a result of this project, both on an off campus?
9. What did you learn through these partnerships?
10. How did you evaluate or measure the success of your efforts? What type of feedback have you gotten?
11. How did your project affect audience demographics or ticket sales (in comparison to prior to implementing the Creative Campus program)?
12. How did your project engage students and other campus constituencies in new ways?
13. Did your project result in new avenues for campus dialogue?
14. What strategies employed during the course of your project worked the best? Which did not work?
15. What were the biggest challenges and opportunities associated with your project?
16. In your opinion, what has been the impact of the 2004 American Assembly

conference? Why do you think universities are investing in the arts at this moment in time?

17. How would you describe performing arts presenting and arts engagement at universities in the past?
18. What would you cite as innovative work being done by peer institutions across the country? Are there any people that you would recommend I speak with concerning my research?
19. Do you believe the role of university arts presenters is changing now? Do presenters meet to discuss these issues?
20. What types of funding does your school provide for your programs? To what extent are the arts a part of everyday campus life? How well do you think your university supports the arts?
21. Has your university supported any of the following initiatives: arts strategic plans, arts endowments, research on arts involvement, an office for the arts?
22. Is there anything else you would like to share concerning the role of university arts presenters and administrators in engaging campus communities through the arts in the future?