Animating
Democracy
A Program of **Americans for the Arts**

Shifting Expectations:
An Urban Planner's Reflections
on Evaluation of Community-based Arts

MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, PH.D.

SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, METROPOLITAN HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES CENTER

DIRECTOR, CULTURE, CREATIVITY, AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

URBAN INSTITUTE

Tony Parker, Nicolas, John Malpede and Chas Jackson celebrating the ball with the community during LAPD's *Round Trip*.

Dr. Maria Rosario Jackson is a senior research associate in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center at the Urban Institute. She is also director of the Urban Institute's Culture, Creativity and Communities Program. Her research focuses on urban policy, urban poverty, community planning, the role of arts and culture in communities, and the politics of race, ethnicity, and gender in urban settings.

Jackson's reflections presented in this essay are based on 13 years of national research on integrating arts and culture into concepts of healthy communities (good places to live) and integrating measures of arts and culture into quality of life indicator systems. She has reviewed a wide variety of arts and cultural activity and related data collection practices in communities around the United States, as well as held hundreds of interviews and scores of focus group discussions with people concerned about tracking community conditions and comprehensively improving communities. Jackson also draws from several years of research on supports for artists, with a particular emphasis on artists working in low and moderate-income communities.[1]

In communities throughout the United States, many artists and arts organizations—visual, media, theater, dance and, craft—are making significant contributions towards improving communities through their work. For example, through the Los Angeles Poverty Department (LAPD)[2], artists working together with homeless residents of downtown Los Angeles and local leaders build community and bring attention to the problems and aspirations of homeless people. Topics including the origins and impacts of the crack cocaine epidemic, alternative solutions to homelessness, and the history of the skid row area of the city are explored through performances, public discussions, and art exhibits and installations.

In the Central Valley region of California, different cultures—mostly Hmong, Mexican, and Mixtec Indian—come together through art and cultural activity, including community theater, comedy, music, dance, film, crafts, and food, as they prepare for and participate in the Tamejavi Festival.[3] At the festival, participants enjoy cultural exchange and have opportunities to engage in forums about important issues in the valley such as health, education, political mobilization, economic opportunity, and environmental issues, as well as needs and concerns that exist in the different communities' places of origin.

At the Ashé Cultural Arts Center[4] in New Orleans, performing and visual artists are revitalizing the Oretha Castle–Haley Boulevard corridor and the surrounding community in the Central City area. The center is redeveloping abandoned buildings for arts uses and provides a range of community art-based programs, including oral histories and storytelling, celebrations, and performances by which the community honors its history and also addresses important social justice issues impacting the neighborhood and broader city.

In Chicago, the National Museum of Mexican Art challenged conventional assumptions about the racial composition of Mexico with a landmark exhibit, *The African Presence in Mexico: From Yanga to the Present*.[5] Using photography, paintings, music, film, and historical artifacts, the exhibit highlighted the significant role that Africans have played in the history and culture of Mexico, a fact not emphasized in Mexican or U.S. education systems and unknown to many people. Public programs complementing the exhibit—lectures, discussions, and participatory cultural events—were designed to foster critical analysis of racial and ethnic labels as well as promote civic responses to the conditions of and relations among African Americans and Mexicans or people of Mexican ancestry in Chicago.[6] Its tour in multiple cities extended similar opportunities nationally and internationally.

Artists and arts organizations working in communities often seek to and are charged by their funders to affect the development of social capital, civic engagement, political mobilization, and even build bridges across divided groups. Moreover, they frequently operate at the intersection of art and other fields, such as economic development, health, environment, housing, public safety, and education. But how does society value the contributions of this type of work in communities? How is the work of artists and arts organizations validated and evaluated in the arts field and in the other areas

Quality of life indicators are groupings of measures that provide an indication of community conditions over time. For example, recurrent measures of crime, education, and housing all help to comprise a picture of a community and some sense of whether things are getting better or worse. Indicator systems are often housed in a range of places such as independent nonprofit research organizations, universities, and local governments. Typically, arts and culture has not been tracked in community assessments. Started in 1996, with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Arts and Culture Indicators Project (ACIP) at the Urban Institute attempts to integrate arts and culture into indicator systems.[7]

impacted by their work? What challenges and opportunities do artists and arts organizations face in communicating their contributions?

This essay reflects on these questions from my perspective—that of an urban planning researcher concerned with a wide range of community improvement issues and with a specific interest in better understanding and measuring the role that artists and arts and cultural activity play in comprehensive community improvement strategies. I seek to advance the efforts of artists, arts administrators, funders, and people working in other fields who see arts and cultural activity as an essential element of social change. More specifically, I seek to help practitioners and funders consider how to recalibrate expectations about evaluation and what it can accomplish, while pointing to basic good documentation practices and strategies for framing more reasonable expectations.

EVALUATION

In conversations with arts administrators, artists, and arts funders about documentation and data collection practices in the arts field, inevitably the subject of evaluation comes up, typically within the context of what funders require in exchange for their investment. Sentiments about evaluation have varied widely in my 13 years of pursuing this topic. Some people, especially early on in my inquiry, expressed frustration and resentment that evaluation was required. Some resisted the notion of measurement and were skeptical that what they did and its impact could ever be quantified. Some were concerned that data might be used against them to indicate limited impact or poor performance. Over time, as requirements for evaluation became more prevalent, more people seemed to just view it as a necessary evil. Still others, in the minority at the beginning, seemed willing to reflect on their work and saw evaluation as a chance to spur better practice and even to showcase their work. They also understood how their individual efforts to document and assess their work could benefit the broader field.

There is still some resistance, but I sense that more people are beginning to accept evaluation as a requirement. Some even see it as a useful process. Additionally, practitioners and scholars have made important strides in documentation and evaluation of community arts. This is evident in various writings on the Community Arts Network and by initiatives such as Animating Democracy[8], a program of Americans for the Arts. Progress has been made through in-depth case studies of arts-based civic engagement initiatives and the development of tools that help capture some of the immediate impacts of involvement in such programs.[9]

Involvement of a trained researcher at the planning stage of an initiative can be extremely helpful. To this end relationships with universities and research institutions can be beneficial. Look for professionals who have training and experience in applied social science with experience in both qualitative and quantitative research, including survey research and knowledge of extant national and local databases that could be relevant to your endeavor. The person also should have knowledge of the local community in which the program will take place.

At its best, evaluation can be a great opportunity to reflect on and learn from one's work. It can be an occasion to clarify, articulate, and share with the world what one does and why it matters. Optimally, evaluation grows out of a genuine desire to understand how stated goals might be achieved best and future work improved. Optimally, evaluation is also understood as part of the initiative itself and is addressed in the planning phase. It involves input from all key stakeholders about their roles in the work and their expectations—short term and long term. At its best, evaluation also involves input from an outside third party researcher. All

players together clarify project goals and intended outcomes and the strategies to pursue them. Based on these, and with some knowledge of the context in which the initiative will be executed, the researcher helps to clarify the questions to be addressed in the evaluation and the kinds of information and data necessary or helpful to document the process, outcomes, and impacts. The researcher, with the group, assesses the extent to which necessary quantitative and qualitative data are available or can be collected. At that point, with clarity about the purpose of the evaluation, a grasp of the information on hand and needed, and a sense of the resources available, an evaluation strategy is designed and agreed upon. Ideally, such a strategy is ongoing and iterative. It is also important to note that for good evaluation to occur, there has to be a willingness to consider failure as a possible outcome. In many cases, community-based arts efforts are necessarily experimental and lessons from the experience, whatever the outcome, are important. However, the ability to learn from failure requires acknowledgement that there is an experimental element to the work in question, trust among all parties involved (including funders), and a "safe space" or context that is conducive to frank discussions and reflection.

At its worst, evaluation is an afterthought that comes out of a defensive posture by the arts organization or the funder, or both, and is driven primarily by the need to justify an investment. It is decreed by the funder or self-imposed by the arts organization well after the initiative's planning process. It has no input from the range of key parties involved, nor from a third party researcher who could recommend suitable and reasonable evaluation approaches. The evaluation questions are likely not to be adequately aligned with the initiative's goals. Quantitative methods of research are either over-emphasized or ignored. Moreover, it is assumed that all the data necessary to answer the questions put forth are readily available (when they often are not). The financial and human resources required to execute the evaluation either have not been considered or seriously underestimated. And last, the trust among all parties involved and the "safe space" required to really learn from the experience are nonexistent.

Consistent with this approach, perfectly sound and worthy community arts programs with social and civic intentions are saddled too often with unrealistic expectations about the impacts that they might have on a community and the ways in which such impacts might be proved. In the quest to convince the funder that the program is worth supporting, arts organizations often promise far more than they could ever deliver within a grant period and may not acknowledge any experimental element to their efforts. On a related note, funders often require proof of the success of their investment that is unrealistic because it is either (a) not possible to get or (b) so expensive that it is prohibitive (and not a good use of resources).

The reality of how most evaluations happen is somewhere in between these two extremes. That said, there are particular practices to embrace and traps to avoid, especially for community-based arts programs and above all for those attempting to achieve social or civic outcomes that tend to be difficult to quantify.

Evaluation practices to embrace and traps to avoid

Community arts programs seeking to foster social capital, civic engagement, and social change frequently have a few basic common characteristics that must be considered in the design of any evaluation strategy.

> They ultimately seek to effect social conditions of great magnitude, such as poverty, racism, environmental degradation, affordability of health care, etc.

They are catalysts for actions that are often beyond their immediate control.

They strive to make change and therefore rely on data that can mark conditions before and after an intervention.

They often rely on a wide variety of collaborators—such as social service agencies, community development corporations, schools and churches, among other entities—to bring their efforts to fruition.

They often work at the intersection of arts and other fields and may feel or be accountable to multiple paradigms of success and possibly competing or conflicting expectations.

Given these characteristics, the following are things to keep in mind as one considers evaluation and how to make the most of it.

First, be clear about who the stakeholders in the arts-based initiative are. Include them when thinking through what program success might look like and, by extension, what an evaluation should or should not include. Gather the group of diverse stakeholders and talk about what outcomes they value. Be prepared to be patient since everyone will be on a learning curve—hearing new language and learning about what constitutes good practice and success in different fields. What do they value most? Least? Are there incompatibilities in how success will be interpreted? What methods of evaluation do stakeholders outside of the arts use and how do they communicate findings within their field and to the public at large? Clarifying goals and outcomes and what success looks like through the artist's or art organization's prism is crucially important. However, understanding what other stakeholders might see as success (or not) is also critical. It is only through these multiple prisms that the work conducted at the intersection of the arts and other fields will ever be understood in its fullness. By extension, it is only through such efforts that the role of the artist in relation to community will be more clearly appreciated.

Second, get clarity about the context and possible constraints within which funders work. Consider these when you decide to apply for or accept funding and when you design documentation and assessment efforts. Frequently, program officers themselves are under the gun—pressured by their boards or organizational policies that require evaluation and outcomes that are not realistic for community-based arts work. Many times arts funders work alongside funders in other fields—such as housing, education, and the environment—that have much more data and research from which to build arguments in support of their investments. In the arts field, compared to many other fields, research and data available to test ideas and build cases in support of specific practices are scarce. Much progress has been made in recent years, but parity with other fields with regard to research and evaluation practices has not been reached.

Third, do not make claims or take full responsibility for impacting conditions over which you have no direct control. The desire to make such claims often grows out of holding a long-term vision for what is optimal—the eradication of a social ill, the redistribution of resources, the lifetime outcomes of program participants. Holding a vision for what would be optimal is not a bad thing. In fact, it is necessary. However, consistent with holding that vision is the need to clearly and realistically see where one fits in it. For example, suppose an arts organization in collaboration with a

health clinic and a church offers an arts-based program to raise awareness about domestic violence. Suppose that it claims "reduction in the incidence of domestic violence" as one of its outcomes. Implicit in that statement is control over personal behavior and the circumstances of people involved in domestic violence as well as access to resources such as shelters and rehabilitation programs. If the organization does not have control over these factors, it is overstating what it reasonably can deliver. This is not to say that the organization cannot make any claims about contributing to the reduction of domestic violence alongside other agencies working in different ways towards that cause. However, it is imperative to have a good grasp about what the organization actually is poised to do towards the ultimate goal. Perhaps the program provides important information about the effects and pervasiveness of domestic violence. Perhaps it makes available referral materials to help people connect with the services they need. Perhaps it encourages people to support public initiatives—laws, policies, new programs—to deal with the issue. In sum, it can help to create the circumstances by which it becomes more likely that the incidence of domestic violence will decline. By taking a more realistic stance with respect to the larger vision, the possible appropriate focal points for evaluation come into relief.

In the previous scenario, the most immediate possible impacts of the program are new or deepened relationships among agencies concerned with domestic violence, direct participation of people who attended the event, increased knowledge about domestic violence among those in attendance, increased knowledge about resources available to deal with the issue directly, and increased knowledge about what public initiatives people might support to address this issue. Longer-term indirect impacts might include increased enrollment at shelter and rehabilitation programs dealing directly with domestic violence, more general awareness about the issue, and actions in support of the relevant public initiatives to address domestic violence. Ultimately, if rates of domestic violence decline, one can comfortably make the claim that it contributed to that outcome. If rates do not decline within the timeframe of the program, it is not a complete indictment of the effort. Such an outcome may trigger a re-evaluation of the range of efforts at work on this—how robust they are and how they do or do not work together.

Fourth, do not be tempted to "prove" through quantitative analysis that an arts intervention "caused" a particular outcome. The mere establishment of correlation with an intended outcome is enough, in many fields, to command attention and make a case about effects. The arts fields, perhaps more so than any other policy area in which I have worked, is particularly concerned with establishing causality to confirm its value. Perhaps this approach stems from the art sector's positioning against issues deemed more important by other fields—housing, health, education, etc. It can also be due to a lack of formal knowledge about what an evaluation strategy can reasonably accomplish.

The quest to definitively prove causality using quantitative analysis is something I strongly advise against. The attempt to isolate the arts activity as the variable that determines the desired outcome leads to ill advised research designs with comparison treatment groups and similar features that are often impossible to execute and would be ridiculously expensive if their execution was even plausible. It is worth noting, however, that programs that are sustained over time (multiple years) and take place in relatively controlled environments (schools or similar settings) might be candidates for studies that can determine causality in some limited instances.

On a related note, it is important to recognize that an isolated evaluation of a local initiative is not and cannot accomplish the same thing as an established body of regional, national, or even international research. Too often, arts organizations and their funders mistakenly expect that a singular evaluation will have the impact of amassed years of in-depth studies by professional researchers. This is just not possible. That said, singular evaluations of local initiatives are important. They provide opportunity for reflection that can lead to improvement of practice and the recalibration of goals and expectations. When made available to the field, they also contribute to a larger body of knowledge about the work in question. An aggregated body of research is required to move the field forward. [10]

Fifth, do not assume that the benchmark data and recurrent measures needed to prove impacts or change as a result of the arts intervention already exist. A common pitfall in making claims about impacts and planning evaluations to prove those impacts is the assumption that the data to track change exists or is readily available. A good exercise during the planning phase of any project is to realistically anticipate outcomes and then investigate the extent to which there is baseline data about what one seeks to effect. This means mining whatever organizational data might be kept on a regular basis. It also almost always means looking beyond the cultural sector for existing relevant data and for methods to collect new information. For example, if a community-based arts program seeks to increase community participation in local elections, does data exist that indicates what turnout has been in the past? Is the mechanism in place to ascertain whether turnout rates will change in future elections? In the case of voter turnout, the answer is probably yes.

While most research methods are geared for large-scale studies by professional researchers and academicians, the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Short Form[10] is intended to be less complicated, cumbersome, and costly. Created through the Saguaro Seminar at Harvard University, it offers direction for people interested in monitoring social capital at the community level. The survey attempts to measure several dimensions of social capital: social trust, inter-racial trust, electoral political participation, protest politics participation, civic leadership, associational involvement, giving and volunteering, faith-based engagement, and informal social ties.

Availability of data for measures of other kinds of outcomes may be more challenging. For example, measures about changes in social capital—community connectedness and a community's capacity to act collectively—may not be readily available. This might require new data collection to measure social capital prior to an intervention and then again after. Change in public sentiment on various issues is another type of outcome for which data may be difficult to obtain. Similar to the previous example, this could require commissioning pre- and post-public opinion surveys, which can be expensive. Even if the measures to ascertain change are not readily available, or the cost of optimal data to indicate change is beyond the resources at hand, this does not mean that the project is not worth pursuing and that evaluation is completely out of the question. What it does mean is that an alternative form of measurement will need to be devised and a corresponding budget developed. So, if a new survey on public attitudes is not possible, perhaps there is an existing recurrent survey (on quality of life, health, public attitudes in general, etc.) to which questions pertaining to the change one wants to measure might be added. This is a less expensive option. In some cases, however, sponsors and grantees alike will need to reckon with the fact that indisputable proof of their investment may not be possible. These circumstances are always useful to know on the front end of a project.

TOWARDS ONGOING ASSESSMENT: SMALL STEPS

Getting to the point where documentation and evaluation is routinely part of how an organization works requires commitment, shifts in behavior, and potentially additional resources. For some agencies involved in community-based work, particularly those that are already significantly strained and stretched, these changes may seem daunting. However, even small steps can lead to greatly improved practices.

Develop your own sustainable methods of systematically, reliably, and recurrently documenting your work and how and why it matters. Developing such a system may not be as difficult as one thinks since there is in fact typically quite a bit on which to build—often more than people think there is. For example, most organizations keep pretty good records of audience counts, ticket sales, and other forms of participation. Some initiatives already employ surveys to assess event quality and immediate intended outcomes, such as knowledge about a particular topic and willingness to participate in future similar events. This kind of feedback coupled with basic demographic information about participants can be very useful. Even minimum computerized information about participants provides a basis for doing quick queries. The resulting responses will lead to a clearer understanding of who is served by these programs and, by extension, who potential stakeholders might be. Understanding who a program reaches is crucial to better grasping what civic and social outcomes might be. Do the populations served go on to act in ways that may have been encouraged by the program? Are there relevant changes geographically or in the communities of interest to which these populations belong? Without good documentation about program participants, such questions cannot begin to be answered.

Another possible source of data is what many respondents in my interviews call "anecdotal" information. Given time to reflect, respondents involved with community-based arts programs can identify many different informal indications of the potential impacts of their work. For example, many receive letters of gratitude from participants and often testimony about why the activity or event in which they were involved was important to them. Inquiries about when programs would be offered again are another frequently cited indication of value as are offers to volunteer to support the activity. Arts practitioners who collaborate with non-arts agencies to deliver their programs often note that their relationships with other community entities, both arts and non-arts, expanded and deepened. Also, the extent to which artists and arts administrators were called on as community leaders to voice an opinion or provide some approval about community plans was viewed as a form of validation.

Although often overlooked, these informal indications can be the basis for a more systematized data collection that transforms anecdotes to solid qualitative and potentially quantitative data. For example, one could expand from a sporadic letter supporting an arts program to the use of inexpensive tools such as blogs, SurveyMonkey.com, and social networking websites to systematically get feedback on more distant (not immediate) impacts.

To demonstrate an initiative's impact and reach, groups can benchmark the density and range of institutional relationships between initiative leaders and staff, and periodically revisit it to gauge changes in networks over time. Social network analysis is a field of social science research that can inform such practices. While this type of research often relies on methods including complicated formulas to determine density and strength of networks, not suitable for use in the context we

are discussing, the main premises about the importance of social networks and the ways in which they work can be helpful. Similarly, it is worthwhile for staff to log their participation in community leadership capacities.

It is also valuable to enlist the assistance of collaborating agencies in developing an organization's ongoing documentation system. Do regular collaborators have ways of gauging the value of the arts initiative in question?

Integrating the data collection function into staff job descriptions is key to ensuring an ongoing assessment system. A big challenge in pursuing documentation and data collection more proactively within the arts community is the fact that this activity is seldom a consistent part of anybody's official job.

Last, do not wait on the funder to require documentation and evaluation. Be proactive and integrate it into program and project budgets on your own terms.

NOTES ON EVALUATION AND CASEMAKING

Ideally, evaluation is driven by the genuine desire to learn about better ways to achieve stated goals, rather than by the urgent need to justify an investment. It is also true that the need to make the case in support of community-based arts activity is a fact of life. The previous recommendations lead to sound documentation and research, whatever the impetus for evaluation. Some additional thoughts to keep in mind when intending to use the results of evaluation for advocacy purposes follow.

In communicating information about the value of community-based arts, keep in mind how this work is situated and validated (or not) within the arts field and in other policy contexts. In my opinion, community-based arts still appear to be at the margins of the cultural sector even though they are at the heart of community life. In the cultural policy arena, as well as in other policy areas, the notion of "arts and culture" is still associated primarily with institutions concerned chiefly with the presentation of professional "arts for arts sake" products to audiences. On a related note, cultural participation is still typically associated almost exclusively with passive consumption—participation as audience or the purchase of professional artistic products. The wide range of ways in which people can and do engage in cultural activity—not only as audience members and consumers, but also as active creators, students, teachers, critics, and supporters—is frequently neglected.

Artists are viewed almost exclusively as the producers of artistic goods, and sadly any understanding of the full power of the artist and the creative process is diminished. Artists' various relationships to communities and individuals alike—as teacher, social critic, organizer, advocate, or provocateur, among other roles—are often not understood or go unacknowledged. Additionally, the work of artists at the intersection of arts and other fields is seldom understood in its fullness, as discussed earlier. While there is evidence that narrow conceptions of art, cultural participation, and artists are changing for the better, these conceptions are still dominant and certainly impact the visibility and validation of community-based arts.

Another factor to keep in mind is that typically arts and culture as a policy area continues to be largely disconnected from other areas such as community development, health, etc. This is of particular concern to me as someone who is not from the arts field but sees the arts as integral to healthy communities. Given the narrow conceptions cited previously, it is often easy for people from other policy areas not to consider the arts as integral or even relevant to their

work or to broader policy discussions and plans. There are exceptions to this, which are evidence of progress. Some municipal and county arts administrators—such as those at the Queens Council on the Arts in New York, the Los Angeles County Arts Commission, the Santa Monica Cultural Affairs Division in California, the City of Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs and the Tucson Pima Arts Council—consciously represent a wide range of collaborative arts activity reflecting the diversity of the communities that they serve. They are drawing or making visible the connections between arts and other sectors, and they also have been proactive about penetrating other policy areas or inviting people from other policy areas to their table.

Last, arguments about the economic impacts of the arts overshadow efforts to make visible other kinds of impacts. The arts, understood primarily as audience participation exclusively in cultural venues, are typically presented as activity that can spur immediate economic development. The arts community feeds this notion with scores of economic impact studies of varying quality intended to make the case that the arts matter. At the same time, other effects of various types of arts activity such as those discussed previously—social capital, civic engagement, political mobilization—are completely overshadowed by a pre-occupation with straightforward economic impacts. Impacts that are not directly economic are often discounted or not considered at all despite the fact that they are crucial to communities and are even in many instances potentially pre-conditions for improving people's economic conditions.

This backdrop—community-based arts at the margins of the arts sector, cultural participation narrowly understood, the full roles of artists in communities un- or under-acknowledged, the arts viewed as separate from or irrelevant to other policy areas, and an over-emphasis on proving the economic impacts of the arts at the expense of documenting and highlighting other possible arts impacts—has important implications for how one thinks about situating an argument in support of community-based arts activity. Addressing and overcoming these barriers is essential to the field and also important for anybody interested in a more useful and adequate way of thinking about the role of arts and culture at the community level. It is essential to contemplate this as one contemplates evaluation and its potential uses in helping to make the case for community arts with social and civic intents. Consider the following concerns: How can one use evaluation to help draw attention to forms of cultural participation beyond just engagement as audience? How can evaluation help highlight the various and significant roles that artists play in communities? How can evaluation make clear the connection to and often centrality of arts and cultural activity in other policy areas?

Addressing these barriers requires a field-wide commitment and participation. No organization can overcome these barriers alone. A few programs addressing these issues can be examples for the field, but this kind of activity is only effective when it involves a critical mass of players bringing the same or similar messages to the arts and other fields as well as the general public. In this regard, leadership from networks of practitioners—such as those involved with Americans for the Arts, Alternate ROOTS, the National Performance Network, and similar entities—is crucial. Also important is the commitment of arts advocacy organizations that represent the value of the arts to society and academic institutions that are training the next generation of artists working in communities.

Endnotes

1 Findings from the Urban Institute research project, *Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for U.S. Artists,* were published in 2003. Building on this study, research at the Urban Institute is currently underway to better assess support for artists pursuing hybrid careers—at the intersection of arts and other fields—often within community contexts and with community improvement and social justice goals.

2 Los Angeles Poverty Department (LAPD) website: http://lapovertydept.org/

3 Tamejavi is a word that was created by Central Valley organizers, activists, and artists who put together the sounds and symbols of three different languages (Hmong, Spanish, and Mixteco) to represent a community marketplace TAJ Laj Tshav Puam, MErcado, NunJAVI. www.tamejavi.org

4 Ashé Cultural Arts Center website: www.ashecac.org

5 Information about the National Museum of Mexican Art exhibit, The African Presence in Mexico: From Yanga to the Present, can be found at www.nationalmuseumofmexicanart.org/af/africanpresence.html.

6 See Jackson, Maria Rosario, "Towards Diversity that Works: Building Community through Arts and Culture." 21st Century Color Lines: Exploring the Frontiers of Americas Multicultural Present and Future, edited by Andrew Grant-Thomas and Gary Orfield. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2008.

7 The Arts and Culture Indicators Project includes the participation of 12 local initiatives in various cities around the United States. The project is currently supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and Leveraging Investments in Creativity.

8 Animating Democracy website: www.AmericansForTheArts.org/AnimatingDemocracy

9 Other documentation and evaluation resources can be found on the Community Arts Network website at www.communityarts.net.

10 To access the form Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Short Form, visit www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/pdfs/socialcapitalshortform.pdf.