Introduction to Part II

What’s In this Plan?

This cultural plan has been issued in three parts, each bound separately. This is Part II.

Part I introduced the vision and summarized the recommended strategies for San Jose/Santa Clara County.

Part II provides a great deal of detail on the strategies including the financial implications of each. It also provides more background information on how the plan was carried out. Part II is divided into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1 provides an overview of the macroenvironment in San Jose/Santa Clara County and summarizes the research findings from studies conducted for the planning process.
- Chapter 2 is devoted to arts and cultural education which is a central element in translating the vision for the future into reality.
- Chapter 3 covers artistic and organizational development with special reference to the financial and facility needs of artists and arts organizations.
- Chapter 4 addresses the role of community and neighborhood arts in helping to address the as-
pirations of a very broad spectrum of local residents.

- Chapter 5 concerns itself with challenges in leadership and funding.
- Chapter 6 provides a brief review and history of the planning process and also describes the steps that still must be carried out.
- An Appendix lists the many individuals who assisted with the planning process.

Part III provides the complete versions of the research reports that are summarized in Part II, Chapter 1. They include:

- Section 1: Public Surveys of Participation and Attitudes Towards the Arts in Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose
- Section 2: A Survey of Arts Education in Schools in Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose
- Section 3: A Survey of Arts Education Provider Organizations and Programs in Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose
- Section 4: Facility Survey
Chapter 1
The Macroenvironment

Population/Demographics

The population\(^1\) of Santa Clara County is 1.585 million with just over half of its residents living in the City of San Jose (832,500).

Cultural Diversity

The rich cultural diversity of both City and County is an important feature of the area: roughly a quarter of the population is of Hispanic origin; roughly the same percentage is of Asian or Pacific Islander descent. Interviews for this planning process revealed that, in large measure, citizens take pride in the diversity of the area (anti-immigrant provisions on the November, 1996 ballot in California were not reflected in the vote in San Jose/Santa Clara County, for example). There is also pride in the fact that, unlike in other areas of the country, the relations between people of different cultures are respectful and constructive. Political power and leadership is dispersed among people of different ethnic backgrounds. Among groups of individuals working on community problems, it is a

\(^1\) Population, demographic, and income statistics were provided by National Decision Systems and represent estimated 1996 figures.
foregone and unquestioned conclusion that decision-making will be shared.

1.A.1: Implication for cultural planning
The strategies for developing arts and culture in San Jose/Santa Clara County and the related efforts to encourage broad participation in such activities must be informed by the diverse ethnic and cultural groups which help define the area’s demographics.

Age
San Jose/Santa Clara County’s population is young. In the County, 52% of the population is under the age of 35 (in San Jose this age cohort represents 55% of the population). There are many young families and individuals with small children (23% of the population is under the age of 14, County-wide). Most studies of arts participation nationwide suggest that it is more difficult to get this group (younger people with families) to participate in arts and cultural activity on a frequent basis than it is older adults.

1.A.2: Implication for cultural planning
a. Because of the high percentage of young people in the population, increasing arts and cultural participation by a significant margin over the next few years for conventional activities (adult-oriented concerts, exhibitions, plays) will present special challenges and will require a sensitivity to lifestyle and time constraint issues.
b. In the same short term, it will continue to be difficult to secure volunteers and board members for cultural activities and organizations.
c. Family activities and activities for children will have the greatest likelihood of success in increasing participation and support.
**Income**

San Jose/Santa Clara County enjoys great prosperity, though wealth is unevenly distributed. Average household income is $72,000 County-wide ($66,700 in San Jose) while per capita income is $25,600 ($21,600 in San Jose). In a 1994 philanthropic survey by the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, the community ranked third in per capita income of the 50 largest metropolitan areas by population (the ranking may well be higher today given recent prosperity).

The uneven distribution of wealth is reflected in the fact that 20% of the population enjoys household incomes of $100,000 or more while 17% have household incomes under $25,000. Many of the extremely wealthy are young people who have made their fortunes only very recently and the amounts earned have been truly staggering. For example, between 1990 and 1995, fifty billion dollars of new personal wealth was created among the top five officers/executives of those corporations that went public in Silicon Valley (whose geography largely overlaps that of Santa Clara County).

---

**1.A.3: Implication for cultural planning**

Resources exist in the private sector to pay for a very ambitious cultural plan.

---

**Education**

In terms of education, San Jose/Santa Clara County is again unusual in comparison to most metropolitan areas in the United States. In the County, one third of all

---

2 According to statistics provided by the Joint Venture: *Silicon Valley 1996 Index*, the number of children living in poverty in the area has increased from 10% to 13% since 1989 and 7.1% of seniors (over 10,500 people) also live below the poverty line.

3 Source: private confidential interview with Silicon Valley CEO.
people over the age of 25 hold a bachelor’s degree or better (one quarter of San Jose’s population over the age of 25 has achieved this educational status). Almost two thirds of County residents have attended some college (just over half of City residents have attended some college).

San Jose/Santa Clara County’s age, income, and education statistics present a mixed picture for cultural planning. The good news is that high income and high educational attainment are the factors most highly correlated with cultural participation. The less good news, as already mentioned, is that younger-aged Americans tend to participate considerably less than those over age 45.

1.A.4: Implication for cultural planning

In the long run, given income and education statistics, as the large cohort of young residents ages, San Jose/Santa Clara County offers one of the most promising areas of the country for increasing arts and cultural participation of all kinds.

Area Identity

City/County

It is a widely held belief that San Jose lacks the kind of metropolitan identity that is enjoyed by other communities within short driving distances — San Francisco, Berkeley, Palo Alto, Santa Cruz, to name a few. Nor does adding the moniker “Santa Clara County” help much. Despite the fact that the area is the economic engine of the Bay Area and of California, many people in the rest of the country do not realize that San Jose/Santa Clara County is located in the Bay Area (some do not even realize it is in northern Califor-
Others are not aware of the important connection between San Jose, Santa Clara County, and Silicon Valley. As one San Jose resident told the interviewers, "When I travel with my kids, they never say they are from San Jose or Santa Clara County. They say they are from the Bay Area or from Silicon Valley."

This lack of an area identity is reflected in people's perceptions of the area's cultural attractions. San Jose/Santa Clara County is located within easy drive of San Francisco, generally included in anyone's list of the five most important cultural centers in the United States. Many of San Francisco's cultural institutions are large, well established, of international renown, and extremely well funded. They are, in many cases, a major or exclusive reason why people decide to travel to San Francisco.

San Francisco has a significant impact on the extent and impact of San Jose/Santa Clara County's cultural identity and draw. Despite repeated assertions in interviews with San Jose-based arts organizations and with other residents that "San Francisco is not a problem for us" and "we have our own strong cultural identity," fully 47% of the cultural attendance of San Jose residents in 1996 was outside of San Jose and much of that was outside the County in San Francisco.6

4 In an informal random survey conducted by consultants, nine out of ten adults outside of California who were asked where San Jose and Santa Clara County were located were able to identify these areas as part of California. However, less than half could locate them any more precisely or associated them with Silicon Valley.

5 The total earned and contributed annual income of all the cultural organizations in San Jose/Santa Clara County (of which there are nearly 200) is approximately $60 million. The combined income of the two largest cultural organizations in San Francisco alone exceeds this amount (and there are over 800 cultural organizations located in the metropolitan area according to a survey completed in the early 1990's).

6 Source: AMS 1996 Community Survey (described in full later in this section and contained in Part III, Section 1).
The problem extends similarly to cultural philanthropy where significant dollars flow from San Jose/Santa Clara County to the much larger and better known San Francisco-based cultural organizations.

1.B.1: Implication for cultural planning
In order to enhance its identity as an important arts and cultural center, San Jose/Santa Clara County must expand the development of its own unique cultural niche, focusing on organizational, programmatic, and artistic development that can be easily differentiated from its close geographic competitors.

Silicon Valley

While San Jose and Santa Clara County may lack a strong area identity, the term “Silicon Valley” is almost universally known both within the state of California, nationally, and internationally. The identity is positive for a number of reasons. It is associated with success, innovation, excitement, risk, quality—all concepts that one would wish to be associated with the arts and culture of the region. In addition, the geography of Silicon Valley encompass not only the great bulk of the high tech companies that drive the region’s economy but also the private wealth associated with it.

In interviews with area business leaders, there was a strong sense that a regional cultural plan should be “Valley-wide” and that its identity should be linked with Silicon Valley.

---

7 Silicon Valley is not a legal geographic jurisdiction but rather a term that is roughly associated with an area that comprises a part of three counties (including all of Santa Clara County). The most widely accepted boundaries are those that have been adopted by Joint Venture: Silicon Valley and it is those that should be referred to in understanding how the term is used in this report.
1B.2 Implication for cultural planning
During the course of the implementation of the plan, the regional identity should be expanded to encompass all of Silicon Valley. This will have implications for the way organizations are structured and governed, where they produce their programming, how they fund raise and do audience development, and how the area is promoted.

Economy

It is difficult to differentiate San Jose/Santa Clara County’s economic fortunes from those of the slightly larger geographic area called Silicon Valley8 (of which Santa Clara County comprises the largest area). Silicon Valley is an economic engine for the state of California. With only 10% of the population, it accounts for 34% of California’s export sales. Between 1993 and 1994 alone, exports grew from $22 billion to $27 billion.

Since 1992, the area has added 46,000 jobs, a 4.5% increase in three years. Ten percent of these jobs were added in the software industry where the average salary is around $70,000. During this period, average real wages increased 2.6% (as compared to 2.3% nationally). Perhaps more important, in the industries for which the area is best known (computers, software, and related products and services) which employ 35% of the workforce, average real wages increased 4.1% and average annual individual wage earnings were $56,113.

Focus on Innovation and Technology

Silicon Valley’s economy – and therefore the economies of San Jose and Santa Clara County – are driven by high technology. And though some in the northwest’s

---

8 Statistics about the economy come from the Joint Venture: Silicon Valley 1996 Index.
“Silicon Forest” area or elsewhere might dispute the claim, Silicon Valley is generally considered the high technology capital of the world. Technological innovation and change is so much a part of every day life that it is taken for granted. While the computer and software giants like IBM and Microsoft may be located elsewhere, Silicon Valley has a high percentage of the companies and innovators that are shaping the future.

This sense of innovation has spread much more slowly to the local cultural community. Except for the Technology Museum in San Jose whose mission embraces technological innovation, most of the cultural organizations have not incorporated technology into their programming or program delivery in any but the most standard ways. Few of the national models that relate technology to the arts or arts education come from Silicon Valley cultural organizations (though the colleges and universities have developed important curricula in this area as is described later in the chapter). Nor has innovation been especially pervasive in the kinds of organizational structures or initiatives that have developed out of the cultural community. In an informal survey of a dozen national policy makers and funders outside of California, none could point to any models that they considered truly innovative from San Jose/Santa Clara County. Certainly, some of the smaller culturally specific organizations have developed promising new approaches to cultural programming. But these are generally not well known.

1.C.1: Implication for cultural planning
Innovation and technology should drive artistic and cultural development more than it has in the past in San Jose/Santa Clara County. This could well be part of the unique niche that might help define arts and culture in the area and give it national prominence.
Philanthropic Patterns

With so much economic success, logic would suggest that the area is enjoying an extraordinary era of philanthropic generosity. But it may be some reflection of the inaccuracy of that expectation to be faced with a December 30, 1996 Newsweek article entitled “The Wealth and Avarice of the CyberRich.” While Newsweek can hardly be cited as a rigorously dependable source for charitable giving statistics, the assertion that the current generation of Silicon Valley wealthy individuals do not give their fair share to charity is confirmed by a 1994 study in the Chronicle of Philanthropy, a part of which has already been mentioned above. Rated third in per capita income among the fifty largest metropolitan areas by population, San Jose/Santa Clara County ranked 39th in per capita giving.

In comparing its income rank (#3) with its philanthropy rank (#39) and coming up with a difference of -36, the San Jose metropolitan area had one of the worst philanthropic scores of any community in the survey. By way of contrast, the City of Cleveland had a score of +44 reflecting accurately its reputation as one of the most generous cities. Not coincidentally, it has some of the most esteemed cultural institutions in the world.

Philanthropy and Undercapitalization

It should be pointed out that the low level of philanthropy in San Jose/Santa Clara County has had a very negative impact on the development of arts and culture in the area. To be properly capitalized, arts and cultural organizations should be deficit free and have 125% of their operating budgets in a combination of restricted and unrestricted reserves according to a formula developed more than a decade ago by the Ford
Utilizing this formula, the capitalization shortfall in San Jose/Santa Clara County is close to $60 million. This significantly undermines the operational stability and the growth and development potential of arts and cultural organizations as does the very low level of annual philanthropic support for these organizations.

1.D.1: Implication for cultural planning
Tapping the capacity of local private philanthropy for arts and culture in San Jose/Santa Clara County in the next decade is perhaps the single most important factor in predicting the success of cultural development in the area.

Participation in Arts and Cultural Activities

As part of this cultural planning project, consultants carried out two surveys of the general public to ascertain level of participation and attitudes towards the arts and culture among residents of San Jose/Santa Clara County (cf., Part III, Section 1).

Overall Participation

The survey revealed that roughly one in five adults in San Jose/Santa Clara County is very likely to visit museums and to attend live performances of classical music, dance, and theater. This compares to about half

---

9 This formula, originally developed by the Ford Foundation and widely utilized by the National Arts Stabilization Fund and others, has stood the test of time over more than a decade. The 125% reserves are to be divided between unrestricted cash reserves (25% of operating budget) and restricted reserves/endowment (100% of operating budget).

10 This is calculated by taking total operating budgets times 125% and subtracting the assets of the Silicon Valley Arts Fund and the estimates for existing cash reserves and endowment of local cultural organizations.
the population that is very likely to go to the movies and to read books. Unlike adults in other markets studied, those in San Jose/Santa Clara County are more likely to attend live performances than they are to attend sporting events.\footnote{It is important not to overstate the significance of this finding. In comparative markets, there are significantly more professional sports events available than in San Jose/Santa Clara County contributing to the greater amount of attendance.}

About a third of respondents consider themselves to be very interested in arts and cultural activities. However, another third of respondents are not interested, suggesting more polarization along this dimension than is found in other areas of the country.

**Participation Rates**

The large majority of Santa Clara County adults may be termed “casual attenders” (i.e., those with a moderate involvement level in the arts – 33%) or “marginal attenders” (i.e., those with a very modest arts involvement level – 44%). Only 12% may be termed “arts patrons” (i.e., the core audience) and 11% “non-attenders” (no involvement at all). Participation rates for Santa Clara County adults are highest for popular music (47% attended at least once during the past year), folk/traditional music (42%), musical theater (37%), and family programs (35%). The lowest participation rates were reported for country music (13%), opera (10%) and gospel music (10%).

“Leakage:” Attendance Outside the City and County

While participation in arts and cultural activity is higher than in many comparative markets, much of the attendance is not happening in San Jose or Santa Clara County. As was already mentioned in this report, there appears to be considerable “leakage” of attendance at arts events outside the County. Among Santa Clara
County residents, roughly 2/5 of their attendance at events is outside the County (much of it in other parts of the Bay Area). For San Jose residents, half of their attendance is outside the City (split evenly between other parts of Santa Clara County and outside the County).

1.E.3: Implication for cultural planning
Capturing a higher percentage of existing cultural attendance is an important strategy in increasing participation rates in the City and County.

Frequency and Proximity: Attending Close to Home

Comparing the results of whether people attend versus how often they attend, it is clear that frequency of attendance is influenced by proximity of location to events. One obvious explanation for the strength of this trend in Santa Clara County was raised repeatedly in the interview phase of this project: traffic is a major problem in the area and discourages people from driving very far. They will drive to San Francisco occasionally for a special event. But their frequency of cultural attendance overall increases when there are more offerings that they wish to see that are available in quality facilities close to where they live. This has significant implications for facility issues mentioned below.

1.E.4: Implication for cultural planning
Given attendance patterns and preferences, increasing attendance significantly may depend on the City and County creating a network of small and medium sized facilities spread strategically so they are close to where a majority of the population lives.
Other Facility/Venue Issues

The greatest “unmet demand” was registered for programs traditionally presented in mid-sized performance facilities (1,000 to 1,500 seats), including folk/traditional dance and music, and family programs. It should be pointed out that because of the lack of available dates to rent in area facilities, many high quality events from outside the area cannot be presented in the City or County. This may contribute to the small number of high frequency attenders as well as the “leakage” to other presentation venues outside the County.

In a parallel study conducted by the consultants in 1996 that focused on facilities in San Jose/Santa Clara County, over 40 spaces were inventoried and analyzed (cf. Part III, Section 4). As part of this work, the San Jose metropolitan statistical district was compared with fourteen others around the country that had comparable populations. The San Jose area ranked last in the comparison of available seats per thousand residents in the category of mid-sized theatres. It ranked just above average for larger facilities by the same criteria of seats per thousand. The area is underbuilt with respect to cultural facilities and this undoubtedly has an impact on cultural attendance.

1.E.5. Implication for cultural planning

At least one — and perhaps two — strategically located, high-quality, mid-size facilities would have a positive impact on attendance and the availability of more varied cultural product that the public wants to see. Attendance patterns suggest that downtown San Jose would be a likely location for the first of these facilities.
**Attitudes about the Arts and Culture**

The two public surveys assessed people’s attitudes about the arts and culture.

**Elitism and the Arts**

Residents of San Jose/Santa Clara County believe that the arts are for everyone. Seventy percent strongly disagreed with the statement that the arts are only for the wealthy. This finding reflects the non-elitist nature of the community and the strong insistence on balanced arts and cultural development in San Jose where the City has placed strong emphasis on developing culturally diverse and neighborhood-based arts activities and small institutions. Similarly, the County has invested heavily in smaller organizations, grass roots programs, and culturally specific organizations.

1.F.1: Implication for cultural planning

The emphasis on developing the “arts for everyone” appears to be a major priority. Neighborhood and community arts should therefore be an important element of the plan.

**Arts Education**

The public surveys also make clear that there is a great deal of interest in arts education. Support for increased public funding of arts-in-education programs is very high. Over 95% of all respondents believe that “public schools in our community should offer arts education programs in the curriculum,” the highest percentage ever registered in a survey of this type conducted by the consultants. Given the fact that many schools offer very little if any arts education, this is clearly a significant finding. School programs were ranked as the top priority for increased government support by 60% of respondents. Such programs were also
the highest rated in terms of people’s willingness to support a tax increase for the arts.

1.F.2: Implication for cultural planning
Residents place a priority on the need for arts education. No aspect of the cultural plan should get more attention based on the response to the public survey.

Increased Taxes

Two-thirds of respondents would pay an additional $5 a year in taxes to increase public funding for local arts programs, especially if the funds were devoted to arts education programs for public school children. Just over half of respondents would pay an additional $23 a year in taxes. The majority of the survey respondents indicated support for increasing hotel room taxes, as opposed to utility and property taxes.

1.F.3: Implication for cultural planning
With the requirement in California that any special tax increases must be supported by a two thirds majority, it is clear that more advocacy work would be required before a tax measure for the arts should be taken to local residents. However, the basis for beginning such advocacy work during the time the plan is being implemented appears justified.

Arts and Culture in Area Schools

As part of the research for this cultural plan, the consultants carried out an arts education survey of 66 schools in Santa Clara County (cf., Part III, Section 2). Of these, 62 schools constituted a representative sample of public schools in 33 school districts and the remaining four were private schools.
Elementary Schools

Elementary schools spend on average $34,105 or $65 per student per year on arts education including personnel costs (the average for public elementary schools only is $61). For public elementary schools, 50% comes from the regular school budget with 14% coming from PTA’s, 14% from the State, and the balance from a variety of sources. Most arts instruction is by classroom teachers not arts specialists. However, each elementary school on average receives approximately 500 volunteer hours per year directed at arts education activities.

Middle Schools

Middle schools spend on average $135,864 or $182 per student per year on arts education. For public middle schools, 91% comes from the regular school budget. There are an average of 2.7 FTE arts specialists per school with 280 students per specialist. Middle schools receive considerably less volunteer support (an average of 95 hours per year per school) than do elementary and high schools.

High Schools

High schools spend on average $471,478 or $359 per student per year on arts education (the higher expenditure in high school is affected by spending on computer graphics programs). In public high schools, 45% comes from the regular school budget, 26% comes from foundations and corporations, and 17% comes from the State. There are an average of 4.5 FTE arts specialists per school with 291 students per specialist. High schools receive the most volunteer support — an average of 57 volunteers provide 2,651 hours per year per school. Booster clubs play a large role in this high figure.
In-Service Training

Very little money is spent on in-service training in the arts at any level, though school personnel interviewed for this project state that there is a tremendous need. Only $308 is spent on average by each elementary school each year, $233 by each middle school and, $2,865 by each high school. 76% of elementary schools, 55% of middle schools and 13% of high schools offer no opportunities for in-service training in the arts.

Total Spending for School-Based Arts Education

Total spending on public school arts education in San Jose/Santa Clara County is $41,751,104, or $171 per student, of which 52% is provided by school districts themselves. This accounts for 2% of the County’s general fund expenditures for education.

1.G.5: Implication for cultural planning

In the two decades since the passage of Proposition 13, arts education in California schools has been devastated. Locally, with only 2% of per pupil expenditures being spent on arts education, there is a disconnect between what local residents say they want — arts education in the curriculum — and what they are getting. A priority for the plan is to change that situation.

Other Arts Education Providers and Programs

Also as part of the cultural plan, the consultants conducted a separate survey of 76 organizations in San Jose/Santa Clara County (most of them arts organizations) that provide 162 arts education program offerings (cf., Part III, Section 3). The programs that were analyzed were those explicitly for youth as well
as those for other age groups that had an educational component built in.

San Jose/Santa Clara County has a rich variety of arts education programs offered by organizations other than schools. This is in sharp contrast to the schools themselves that offer very little in arts education. These provider organizations are quite generous, allocating a quarter of their total operating budgets on average to arts education.

**The Organizational Providers**

Of the 76 organizations that provide arts education programs, 91% are nonprofit. Of these, 59% are performing arts organizations while only 12% are visual arts organizations.

- 54 of the 76 organizations offered programs to over 600,000 youth in school.
- 62 of the organizations offered programs to 180,000 young people outside of school settings.
- 53 organizations offered programs to 70,000 adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.H.1: Implication for cultural planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Though close to three quarters of a million young people receive arts education programs, only 70,000 of adults do, representing about 5% of the adult population. With so many adults in San Jose/Santa Clara County who do not participate in arts and cultural activities, adult arts and cultural education should also be a priority for the cultural plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budgets and Spending**

The total operating budgets of the 76 arts education provider organizations range from under $100,000 to over $4 million with an average budget size of roughly $745,000. Total direct ($9.4 million) and indirect ($4.1 million) spending on arts education by organiza-
tions in San Jose/Santa Clara County totals $13.5 million (this represents 25% of their total operating budgets). Per capita spending on arts education by organizations in San Jose/Santa Clara County (taking into account the entire population) is $8.52.\textsuperscript{12}

**Programs Offered**

Of the 162 programs offered, roughly a third involve training or classes that extend over more than a few days with 82% intended to expose or introduce people to an art form (about a third are limited to a single day with the presentation or contact time lasting less than two hours). However, approximately a quarter of the programs are more intensive with sessions lasting more than three hours/day and a few (20) are offered five, six, or seven days a week.

For those programs serving young people, there is a fairly good distribution of offerings across age and grade levels (this is generally not the case in comparable communities across the United States where programs are often bunched in the elementary school age levels). Music is the best represented art form—it is included in 48% of the programs. Dance is also well represented (in 41% of the programs).

More than a third of the programs have a specific cultural focus such as American Indian, Mexican, Spanish, Latino, Indian, African-American and multi-cultural, a high percentage nationally. About a third of the programs have parental and family involvement. Roughly the same number of programs take place in schools, in provider organizations’ own facilities, and in other community locations, including arts facilities.

\textsuperscript{12} In the only other location where this survey has been administered—Charlotte/Mecklenburg County (North Carolina)—the per capita spending by arts education provider organizations on education programs was comparable.
1.H.3: Implication for cultural planning
Despite Proposition 13 — or perhaps because of it — nonprofit organizations other than schools have made arts education for youth a priority. These organizational and programmatic resources must be encouraged and be seen as crucial partners in developing the programs that will respond to the public’s demand for more and better arts education.

Higher Education

In addition to the surveys in arts education, the consultants interviewed individuals knowledgeable about the arts education offerings of local colleges and universities. San Jose/Santa Clara County has one of the most impressive higher education infrastructures for a community its size anywhere in the world. These institutions have not only contributed to the engine of economic growth but they have also contributed to the cultural richness of the region.

One area where local higher education institutions play an important role is in the area of arts and technology. The Computer Music Center at Stanford University (CARMA) that offers a formal degree program in computer music and the Computer Art and Design program at San Jose State University (CADRE) are two such examples. Another local higher education institution, Cogswell College, offers degree-granting programs in computer and video imaging and in music engineering technology.

Another area in which local higher education institutions make a significant contribution to the arts and cultural infrastructure is in facilities. In the performing and visual arts, along with Stanford and San Jose State, Gavilan College and Foothill College also have important facilities. Given the need to develop more cultural facilities, these institutions might
well serve as partners in the building of new facilities in the future.

1.4. Implication for cultural planning
Higher education institutions must be seen as critical partners in cultural planning efforts.

The Weather and the Out-of-Doors

The final factor to be discussed in this chapter that can have an impact on the cultural planning process is one which many in the area take for granted—the extraordinary weather and the ambiance of the out-of-doors. This element has played an important role in the development of culture in the region. It has allowed for a rich mosaic of outdoor festivals that has helped foster a sense of inclusiveness and celebration about the arts.

In San Jose alone, there are currently 150 festivals listed by the Office of Cultural Affairs and many additional events take place in local parks and neighborhoods. Festivals of all kinds have allowed communities to display artistic resources and talents, celebrate their cultural heritages, promote neighborhood cohesiveness, develop downtown areas, and attract economic and tourist activity.13

While the public survey of participation and attitudes administered as part of this plan (cf., Part III, Section 1) did not explicitly ask about festivals, one

Almost every city in Santa Clara County has a festival. Of the many examples, Sunnyvale promotes its one-day “Hands on the Arts” event to families from all over the Bay Area. The Garlic Festival in Gilroy draws 140,000 people, garnering tremendous media exposure. San Jose hosts at least four major events annually drawing hundreds of thousand of people, including the Festival of the Arts, the July 4th America Festival, and the Cinco de Mayo and 16th September Festivals, the latter two of which celebrate Mexican culture.
can infer from much of the data that a good deal of the cultural participation is festival related. In addition, the “comments” section that follows the reporting of the quantitative data indicates continued strong interest in festivals, including the desire to have more festivals that are thematically or ethnically based.

**1.I.1: Implication for cultural planning**

The weather and the outdoor festival format helps distinguish San Jose/Santa Clara County from other areas of the country in terms of cultural offerings. These should be seen as a central assets in the cultural development process.
Chapter 2
Arts and Cultural Education

The Vision: An innovatively designed, coordinated network of arts and cultural learning opportunities region-wide that draws on the rich diversity of the area and serves people of all ages, backgrounds, and interests.

Recommended Strategies:
2.1: Instituting “High Five,” an incentive program to get the public school system County-wide to increase the percent of per pupil expenditure on arts education from 2% to 5%.
2.2: Establishing a Professional Development School for Arts and Cultural Education serving teachers, administrators, artists, arts organizations, and parent volunteers.
2.3: Creating the first “Culture Corps” in the nation to provide internships and youth service opportunities in arts and culture.
2.4: Establishing an incentive program for artists and arts organizations to provide cultural education within a network of neighborhood and community cultural centers.
2.5: Creating a “Cultural Passport” program as an employee benefit for families.
2.6: Establishing a “Youth Cultural Council” run by and for young people ages 12 to 20 utilizing existing institutions to develop relevant programs.
In-depth Background

This cultural planning process started with an assumption that arts education would be an important component of whatever set of strategies and initiatives was recommended. Special emphasis was placed on research, focus groups, public meetings, and a task force on arts and cultural education and the topic itself was a major focus for a County-wide conference sponsored by the County Office of Education. What emerged in the process of planning was that arts and cultural education was more important to County residents than anyone had anticipated. Statistics already cited in Chapter 1 indicated that an overwhelming 95% wanted to see arts education in the curriculum and that arts education was the most highly rated culturally-related factor that would encourage residents to vote for a tax increase for arts and cultural uses.

Yet in the face of this demand for arts education, the supply is inadequate. Schools have not made it a priority, devoting only 2% of per pupil expenditure to this area. Cultural organizations and selected other nonprofits have tried to address this and have devoted a substantial part of their budgets (25%) to arts and cultural education (which includes programs for people of all ages and locations, not just young people in school). But this allocation comes to just $8.50 per person in the County, hardly enough to respond to the demand for the programs and services.

A Broadened Approach

For the purpose of the planning process, the usual definition of arts education was expanded to reflect the underlying values guiding the plan that are presented in the Introduction:

---

14 This section amplifies and adds to background information contained in Chapter 1.
• **Cultural education rather than just arts education:** When citizens of all ethnicities and backgrounds participate in and support the lives of their families and their communities, they not only engage with the arts, they participate in culture broadly as part of learning the time-honored practices that form the core of their heritages. It is that broad perspective that must be part of the cultural plan.

• **Cultural education in the community:** In addition to school, arts and cultural education takes place in community institutions of all kinds — social service centers, parks and recreation departments, historical museums, libraries, and the facilities of cultural organizations. The focus of the plan, therefore, must include, but also go beyond, the usual school-based programs, since learning about art and culture is clearly a life-long process occurring both in and outside of formal schooling.

• **Education and instruction in many forms:** This plan is committed to acknowledging the many ways in which artistic and cultural education can occur: whether that be attendance at concerts and exhibitions, in face-to-face internships with instrument makers or theatre technicians, or in the virtual studios created by flexible and imaginative technologies.

**School-based Arts and Cultural Education**

As Chapter 1 of this report made clear, the revenue limitations imposed by Proposition 13 on state and local budgets beginning in 1978 began a process in which communities had to become increasingly self-sufficient funders of arts and culture. The impact on education was, and continues to be, nearly devastating. The bill all but wiped out coordinated and comprehensive arts and cultural education programs in the schools in Santa Clara County. With state and federal support also diminishing, funding for cultural education is even more threatened (cf., Part III, Section 2).
A very few communities in the County, through local funding, parental contributions, and partnerships have been able to rebuild their programs with notable results. Similarly, a few highly visible magnet schools in the arts have been able to flourish due to desegregation-related and other special funds. But in many municipalities, arts and cultural education struggles to find a place in the curriculum of schools and is seen as a minor educational adjunct to learning through supplementary and very occasional exposure programs.

Unfortunately, many teachers in the region lack adequate training in the arts and culture, either in their own schooling or in pre-service programs. Roughly half the schools offer no funds for such programs (cf., Part III, Section 2). This is a critical problem, since it is estimated that over sixty percent of teachers statewide and 80 percent of teachers in San Jose will leave the public school system within the next five years. With similar instability at the administrative level, it can be difficult to plan for sequential, curriculum-based, K-12 arts education. As school administration has become more decentralized through site-based planning, there is rarely sophisticated understanding or high expectations for arts and cultural education available in school sites. The result is that there is little sustained or curriculum-based programming of the kind that yields lasting interest or learning.

But the landscape is hardly barren. The cultural and linguistic diversity of the region’s children, while it poses huge demands, also is an unmatched resource. Perhaps more than in any previous generation, families do not want to erase their first languages and cultures of origin. Thus, California schools are, in effect, the nation’s laboratory for educating a generation of students with all the skills and in-
sights that come of being bi-lingual and bi-cultural.\textsuperscript{15} At the same time, even in the wake of Proposition 13, California has one of the most comprehensive and forward-looking State-approved “Frameworks” of arts and cultural education. The “Framework” has been backed up by the teacher training available through the California Arts Project.

In a barren financial landscape, the educators, families, and artists of Santa Clara County have invented the beginnings of a new and increasingly community-based ecology for cultural and artistic learning: local festivals, the creative use of school funding, partnerships with community schools, well-trained volunteers, active Parent-Teacher organizations through which families can advocate for and support arts and cultural education, and more.\textsuperscript{16} As the region’s colleges and universities have grown, some have realized the importance of turning outward to the community, offering adult and continuing education courses connected to the cultural resources of the region. Many offer high quality programs in the arts, arts and technology, and arts education to their own students.

The development of technology is also changing the picture of arts education. Although some see the arts fighting with technology for resources in schools, there are also many areas where the arts and technology have come together. Certainly in terms of delivery, many resources are now available on CD-ROM and through the Internet, and many arts organizations are participating in technology-related efforts, though

\textsuperscript{15} The bi-cultural/multicultural tradition of the area has a lengthy history that is evidenced by the long history of 5 de Mayo and the 16 de Septiembre in San Jose. Today there seems to be a very high level of recognition and understanding of the role this plays in local culture.

\textsuperscript{16} Educational Foundations, a source of outside support for many schools, have been providing funding for the arts in other communities. In Santa Clara County, however, their track record has been poor in this regard (cf., Part III, Section 2).
given the extraordinary resources of Silicon Valley this is still an underdeveloped area. In the San Jose/Santa Clara County area, the application of the new state “Frameworks” for arts education stresses technology as part of its curriculum plan. The emphasis on technology in the Tech Museum has attracted families with children. Given the area’s tie to technology, any initiative in arts education should take those resources into account.

Community-based Arts and Cultural Education

Similar issues exist in the realm of education about arts and culture for interested families and adults in the community. Again, due to Proposition 13, many potential audience members, buyers, and supporters had little opportunity to learn to enjoy or participate in arts and culture. The consequence of this was that the appreciation of arts and culture that has grown up in the area is in some ways more organic than in other parts of the country. At the same time, its reach is limited.

Certainly in the County there is increasing support for a much diversified and changed cultural world: the available music, dance, and theater performances often come from cultures different from those many citizens grew up understanding; citizens encounter challenging public art; the contemporary work in museums and galleries is different from what one finds in 100-year-old art museums; and technology is ushering in forms of aesthetic experience never seen before.

At the same time, there is a wide disparity in the consumption of these riches. The economic well-being and expansion of technology-based businesses have created a growing population of people with disposable incomes to support arts and culture for themselves and their children. On the other hand, both inner city and rural areas in the County are home to growing numbers of people whose low incomes and life pressures make either continuing their traditional cultures or ex-
ploring other kinds of art and culture almost imprac-
tical hopes (cf., demographic and income statistics in
Chapter 1). The geographic spread and weak public
transportation system can isolate less affluent citi-
zens and families, cutting them off from opportunities
they might otherwise use. As one citizen put it,

"We are lucky, we are young enough as a cultural
community that we can still decide whether we
build temples for the cultured few like every
other city we have ever known, or whether we find
out how to put up a big open air tent with the
flaps wide open. But to build that tent, we are
going to have to decide whether we are going to
be greedy or generous, self-involved or commu-
nity-spirited."

As with school-based programs, there are important
foundations which could be developed. A look at the
robust adult programs at local community schools of
art and music in Gilroy and Mountain View suggests
that there are significant numbers of adults who want
the arts and culture to be an important part of their
individual and family lives. Successful volunteer art
and music programs in the schools corroborate this
fact. Since many of the region’s arts and cultural in-
stitutions are young, they have always had education
programs addressed to families and adults. Currently,
these community-based programs serve a quarter of a
million people (cf., Part III, Section 3).

Many of the families in the region are bi-lingual and
bi-cultural. In seeking to continue, rather than aban-
don their double heritage, families openly voice an
interest in programs and institutions which make this
possible. In the past there may have been less than
enthusiastic responsiveness, but in the region at this
time, there is greater openness than ever before. In
addition, California and the region’s openness to in-
novation has created an interest in non-traditional
forms of learning — such as occur on the World Wide
Web, in exhibits, or in outdoor education. Technologi-
cal possibilities like e-mail, the Web, and innovative software could offer points of entry and continuing access.

A Vision for Arts and Cultural Education in the Region

Any vision for arts and cultural education should be tuned to the particular riches, needs, and opportunities of the region it is meant to serve. Based on numerous interviews, public meetings, and site visits, several major themes have emerged which capture the complex cultural flavor of the San Jose/Santa Clara County/Silicon Valley region and which ought to inform any long term plan. They echo the underlying values of this cultural plan which are sketched out in the Introduction to this report.

• A commitment to innovation: Unlike many other localities, in San Jose/Santa Clara County/Silicon Valley there is an unusual investment in innovation and imagination which links the major industries and the arts communities. “Thinking outside the box” is as important to software design and computer engineering as it is to contemporary art or the work of a Vietnamese poet adapting traditional forms to a new life and landscape. Whatever initiatives are developed should not simply model themselves on successful programs from elsewhere (though these can certainly be studied) but should build creatively on the unique features of the community.

• A commitment to a continuing diversity: The region will continue to be diverse – but in a very different way from previous generations. Rather than giving up their first languages and cultures of origin in favor of English and an American way of life, many residents want to become or continue to be bilingual and bi-cultural. Hence, both school- and community-based programs will have an ongoing responsibility and opportunity to draw on the tradi-
tions of other cultures, in both their traditional and contemporary forms.

- **A commitment to a region-wide network of learning opportunities:** By comparison with other regions of the country, San Jose/Santa Clara County has made a significant investment in creating a broad regional network of large and small artistic and cultural providers, rather than a steep and exclusive hierarchy dominated primarily by major institutions. This was borne out by research which cited 76 organizations actively offering arts and cultural education programming with annual budgets ranging from less than $100,000 to several million (cf., Part III, Section 3). With so many organizations and with over 30 separate school districts, it will be critical to create an integrated, rather than a splintered, cultural fabric County-wide. It will also be important to be certain that programs are well distributed geographically, by age group, and by discipline.¹⁷

- **A commitment to coordination:** A comprehensive arts education initiative cannot happen without central coordination. There are too many participants, too many projects and programs spread over too large a geography. The San Jose/Santa Clara County region celebrates its commitment to non-hierarchical systems and value structures. But there must be a commitment to establishing a coordinating agency or agencies with the authority to make important decisions about arts and cultural education region-wide.

---

¹⁷ Research indicates that with respect to program offerings by age group, the distribution in San Jose/Santa Clara County is more even than in many communities. However, there is an imbalance between performing and visual arts programs with a very large preponderance of the former and many fewer of the latter.
Recommended Strategies

Strategy 2.1: “High Five”

A new program called “High Five” should be instituted to help school districts County-wide raise the total percentage of per pupil expenditure on arts and cultural education from 2% to 5%.

Currently, total spending on public school arts education in the area is $41.8 million of which roughly half is provided by school districts themselves. This investment represents 2% of the per pupil expenditure available through the County’s General Fund. If arts and cultural education is to improve, it is this figure that must increase.

An innovative program is recommended called “High Five.” The goal of the program is simple: in ten years’ time the per pupil annual expenditure on arts education will increase to 5%. At $10.85 million per percent, this is an annual school expenditure increase of $32.55 million, a significant sum. Given the fact that even a 1% increase in school spending will represent a huge victory for arts and cultural education, the program can be incrementally phased such that the goal will be to secure successive 1% increases over time.

To accomplish this ambitious goal, a pool of $10 million in outside funding should be granted each year to selected school districts that are willing to enhance the arts and cultural education programs and increase their own funding (outside funding to supplement the program would be welcome but would not count toward the match).
Applications could be made only by school districts which would have to agree to commit to a minimum of three years in the program (though longer commitments would be encouraged). All of the district’s portion of the funding would have to be used for certified arts specialists. As one school principal put it: “This is the single item that will make the difference. If you want arts in the curriculum and not just as an adjunct activity, we need the trained teachers.”

Grants would be available to schools on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis the first year, diminishing to 40% in the second year, 30% the third year, and so on. Technical assistance would be available to the school district to develop ways to supplement these outside resources with fund raising through Parent-Teacher organizations, Educational Foundations, or other means. But the school would be required to maintain its increased level of funding throughout the life of the grant. The outside funding portion (as opposed to the district’s portion) could be used to hire more arts specialists, to purchase supplies and equipment, or to purchase the services of outside artists and arts organizations. Indeed, it is anticipated that much of the outside funding will actually contribute to the health of artists and cultural organizations by increasing their earned income. Thus, outside funders will not only be benefitting schools and school students but also the viability of the currently under-capitalized local cultural organizational infrastructure.

A grants panel of educators and arts representatives should recommend the grants. Any applicant district should be carefully assessed prior to the awarding of

---

18 If the “Neighborhood Touring” and “Artist-in-Residence” Programs recommended under Strategy 4.4 include schools in their eligibility guidelines, grant funds could be used to subsidize the roster artists in these programs. However, they should not be permitted to utilize “High Five” dollars to match grants through “Neighborhood Touring” and “Artist-in-Residence.”
funds and monitored during the life of the grant. There should be a genuine assessment of the level of commitment, the seriousness of the philosophy, and the school district’s track record.

Finally, it is recommended that the emphasis of this incentive program not be on trying to achieve “coverage” of all the arts in schools. Rather, it should reward schools that are attempting to develop a specific sequential curricular-based program that is focused. The focus could be in a particular art form or an even more specialized program such as a choir or a ceramics program concentration. The important criteria must be that these activities receive academic credit, they are offered during the school day by arts specialists, and that they represent a multi-year opportunity to develop arts/cultural knowledge and skills.

Periodically (perhaps once every four years), a County-wide survey similar to the one described in Part III, Section 2 should be administered to see how well the schools are doing in developing high quality arts and cultural education programs. A part of this survey will determine the level of spending County-wide and should provide a quantitative assessment of how well the program is doing in its financial objectives.

*Estimated Cost:* $10 million/year of outside funding when fully operational, including administrative costs at an estimated 5%.
Strategy 2.2: Professional Development School

Strategy 2.2:
San Jose/Santa Clara County should establish a Professional Development School for Arts and Cultural Education serving teachers, administrators, artists, arts organizations, and others who come in contact with, and develop instructional programs for, students.

Throughout the United States, a growing class of institutions called Professional Development Schools (P.D.S.) have been established for the purpose of improving the quality of instructional programs and teaching in public schools. These institutions are usually collaboratively established, funded, and administered, often involving teacher training institutions as primary partners.

It is proposed that a P.D.S. be established specifically for arts and cultural education in Santa Clara County. Because it may be difficult to site the school in a single location that would satisfy all potential users in the County, a strongly coordinated decentralized network of sites might be an option, though a central headquarters will still be important. Regardless of where the school is located, it should certainly coordinate with other agencies and institutions including those that already run a P.D.S. such as San Jose State University or San Jose Unified School District.

The institution’s primary clientele will be public school teachers — both arts specialists and classroom teachers who teach the arts — but it will also be aimed at school administrators, artists, arts organizations, and parent volunteers. There will be several things taught at this school including:

- basic courses in the arts
• workshops in specialized forms of arts teaching
• culturally diverse art forms
• available materials and resources in various arts areas
• available resources for students and teachers in the community
• curriculum development
• technology and the arts.

Arts organizations and artists will not only be able to avail themselves of these learning opportunities but there will be specific programs designed just for them including:

• basic child development and theories of learning
• practicums on how to work effectively with young people of various ages and backgrounds exploring the questions
  • what do they know?
  • what are they learning?
  • how to reach them?
• practicums on how to work effectively with teachers
• materials development (to assist organizations and artists develop supplementary materials that are curriculum-related, appropriate to students’ level of knowledge, and are designed to accompany their presentations in schools)
• courses on the structure and politics of schools and school districts and how to work with them effectively.

This Professional Development School will be unique nationally and can have several other special features:

• It should have special programs for parent volunteers.
Its faculty should include artists as well as educators who are nationally recognized in arts and education.

It should make available workshops at school sites for all or part of the faculty.

It should be a central locus for many of the community’s existing programs and not try to duplicate what is already provided by higher education institutions (that could well be partners), arts organizations (like Young Audiences), and other service providers.

It should pay for the release time of teachers (estimated currently at $85/day) so that meaningful programs can be provided during the school day.

It should provide pay to teachers and artists/cultural organization representatives for planning time to develop quality programs.

It should disseminate the results of any materials or curricula that are developed, not only locally but nationally.

At this time, no location is being specifically recommended for the hub site for the school. Donated space should be sought for a program of such importance. The County Office of Education could well be one of the partners in the development of the Professional Development School.

Estimated Cost: $500,000 - $750,000/year, exclusive of space costs.

Strategy 2.3: Culture Corps

Strategy 2.3:
San Jose/Santa Clara County should create the first Culture Corps in the nation, a program that would establish internships, work, and training opportunities for young people in cultural organizations.
There are two national trends which could spark the creation of a model program in San Jose/Santa Clara County that would have a dramatic impact not only on arts and cultural education but on the lives of cultural organizations as well.

- The first trend is an increasing interest in developing programs for school-age students that take place in the community and give them real world experience and skills. Many of these are for academic credit.
- The second is the growing interest in “youth service” programs in which young people do work for their communities. An excellent example of this trend is a national program called “City Year,” which has a local affiliate in San Jose.

The proposed program – Culture Corps – would offer opportunities for high school and college students to work in the community on tasks related to arts and culture. Among other things, Culture Corps could provide internships in arts and cultural organizations\(^{19}\) where students could learn real skills and provide assistance. It could also provide opportunities for volunteering as part of a youth service program – City Year might even be willing to pilot this component of the program. The program should be offered both during the school year – when students could pick up credits

---

\(^{19}\) Internship programs already have been initiated in Santa Clara County. As examples, there are two pilot programs that were described in the survey of arts education provider organizations (reported in Part III, Section 3):
- Contemporary Asian Theatre Scene (CATS) Arts Education Internship: Selected high school students participate in learning how a nonprofit theatre arts organization works, including business administration, marketing, graphics, production.
- San Jose Stage Company Technical Intern Program: A program for high school and college students to earn credits while learning the technical aspects of live theatre.
in art\textsuperscript{20} — and during the summer when students could receive financial credits toward future higher education costs.

By putting students in the community, Culture Corps will bring heightened awareness of the arts and culture to people who have no direct contact with young people in the public schools. It will show residents that young people are active and positive contributors to the cultural life of the community. At the same time, it will enhance the importance of culture to the young people themselves and will connect them in new and meaningful ways to institutions with which they might otherwise never come in contact.

\textit{Estimated Cost: $300,000 – $500,000 annually}

\textbf{Strategy 2.4: Artist and Cultural Organization Incentive Program}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Strategy 2.4:}
An incentive program should be established for artists and arts organizations to provide cultural education within a network of neighborhood and community cultural centers serving people of all ages.
\end{quote}

Chapter 4, Strategy 4.1 recommends the creation of neighborhood cultural centers serving a broad array of uses. One of these is the provision of community-based arts and cultural education by local artists and arts organizations.

Payment to artists and arts organizations for providing educational services like classes can include the

\textsuperscript{20} The program should be designed so that student internships would count toward the fine arts requirement for entrance to University of California Schools.
usual tuition, fee-for-service, and grant models. However, another option is to establish a mechanism where artists and cultural organizations can receive free or subsidized use of the facilities in exchange for their work. For cultural organizations, this can be in the form of performance, rehearsal, office, or storage space. For artists, it could be live/work space, free use of equipment like kilns or presses, or gallery space where they can show their work.21

Because the demand for space at neighborhood cultural centers may well exceed supply and there may be more education services and providers available than could fit into available spaces, it is recommended that the program branch out and explore school spaces as well. Many school facilities are empty at the end of the school day. To the extent that there are high quality after-school activities for young people to engage in, many school principals would be advocates for the use of space in their facilities. It is to be remembered that many of the schools are well equipped with ceramics labs, band rooms, and dance studios. The site principal should be asked permission and then it would be up to the district office whether to make the spaces available and whether or how much to charge for them.22

Finally, the educational services provided should be for people of all ages. However, when they are provided for school-age students, efforts should be made to allow students to receive fine arts credits for these offerings.

Estimated Cost: $300,000 - $400,000/year.

21 The new Mexican Heritage Cultural Center in the Alum Rock District of San Jose will provide spaces to “resident” organizations. This may offer an interesting opportunity to pilot the barter arrangement through a soon-to-be operational neighborhood cultural center.

22 School spaces are already used in this way for drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, and other community uses.
Strategy 2.5: Cultural Passport as Employee Benefit

Local corporations – in partnership with the cultural community – should create a cultural passport program as a benefit for employees and their families.

The research for this project has revealed that one of the most important markets for additional cultural participation is young families. What is also the case is that this is one of the most difficult groups to entice into additional attendance and involvement in arts and culture. The reasons are not difficult to understand. Many of those in this age cohort have little discretionary time. Most parents work; when they do have time to spend with their families they either want to stay at home or do something that the whole family will enjoy. And, despite their claims to the contrary, the cultural community on a national basis has not done a good job creating, packaging, and marketing easy-to-access events and activities for families.

What is being advocated here is an entirely new initiative that would be so attractive that young working people, especially those with families, would truly desire it. It would consist not just of a listing of existing cultural programs but a coordinated set of activities with accompanying information that were specifically designed as a package. The package would include:

- an on-line directory that provided schedules and maps related to all activities offered
- cultural activities specially designed for young adults (under the age of 35)
- cultural activities specially designed for families
• a “passport” offering free admission to a specific number of these events per month
• a weekend transportation service that would provide bus service from specific locations to particular institutions on a regular schedule (with hosts on buses that would welcome and orient those attending on what they would see and experience)
• an attractive brochure that serves as an introduction to the program and to the cultural attractions of the area
• a discount to additional attractions offered by participating cultural organizations.

It is important to emphasize that this program will not be successful if it simply lists currently available attractions and expects people to figure out how to attend them. The package not only has to be attractive, providing specially designed offerings, but it must be so convenient and programmed as to make it easy to access and use.

It is therefore recommended that a partnership of human resource officers from local corporations work with cultural organizations (and selected artists) to design the program. The cultural sector must be compensated for planning time, program design, and discounted or free admissions to secure their enthusiastic participation. The corporations in turn must be willing to promote the program as an employee benefit once it is designed and is operational.

*Estimated Cost:* $250,000 annually, including staff to coordinate.
Strategy 2.6: Youth Cultural Council

Strategy 2.6:
A series of programs should be created under the auspices of a Youth Cultural Council, run by and for young people ages 12 to 20 and utilizing existing institutions as appropriate.

Young people between the ages of 12 and 20 are at the critical age range where attitudes, interests, and work habits are established. Actively engaging these young people in positive and exciting activities in the arts and cultural life of their communities can make a tremendous difference as to whether and how actively they will participate as adults. Yet too much of what is offered to them is of little interest because it asks them to be passive observers and doesn’t allow them to use their energy and creativity to become active producers. One person interviewed for this project put it succinctly: “In this area, we have excellent places, events, and organizations for adults and we have excellent offerings and organizations for children. But adolescents do not have any cultural space or an organization to call their own.”

What is proposed here is a series of programs coordinated under a kind of cultural council run by and for young people aged 12 to 20. In addition to identifying and helping to develop exhibitions and performing arts events in conjunction with local institutions, its activities would be designed to capture what is of interest to adolescents and young adults.

It would not be necessary to have a single central location. An office might be housed within an existing organization, but the program would be distributed among a number of locations and cultural institutions depending on what activity was being pursued at any given time. Of particular interest would be activities
that involved many institutions and were community or County-wide.

Estimated Cost: $100,000 - $300,000 annually, depending on how much of the programming cost might be shared with existing institutions.
Chapter 3
Artistic and Organizational Development
The Vision: A strong, well supported, diverse community of artists and cultural organizations, recognized for their unique and innovative work, and supplied with an adequate number of good quality facilities.

Recommended Strategies:
3.1: Providing technical assistance and funding for organizational and program development.
3.2: Developing a technical assistance and grants program for individual artists focused on business and career development.
3.3: Building one or two mid-sized theatres of 750-1,500 seats.
3.4: Creating one or more Civic Galleries to benefit local artists.
3.5: Undertaking a new stabilization/capacity building initiative to provide adequate capitalization of local cultural organizations.
3.6: Implementing a coordinated marketing program linked to other non-arts entities promoting the area.
3.7: Establishing an International Silicon Valley Festival of Culture and Innovation to showcase what is special about the area.
3.8: Encouraging more opportunities to link the arts and technology.

In-depth Background

From extensive interviews with artists and arts organizations, from focus groups, and from task forces, the overwhelming impression of the current situation that is faced by cultural organizations and artists in San Jose/Santa Clara County is of a glass that is either half full or half empty, depending on your point of view.

23 This section amplifies and adds to background information contained in Chapter 1.
• Some people stress how much better things are today than they were at the time of San Jose’s last cultural plan in 1988, Arts 20/20, and certainly since the formation of the Arts Council of Santa Clara County in the beginning of the 1980s. There are more cultural facilities County-wide. There is more funding. There is greater recognition of the importance of the arts on the part of elected officials in various municipalities and at the County level. Culturally specific organizations have emerged as an important part of the cultural landscape. Much credit is given to Arts 20/20, to the Arts Council of Santa Clara County, the San Jose Arts Commission, and to San Jose’s Office of Cultural Affairs in bringing about these changes. Others credit the enlightenment of specific elected officials.

• Other people point to the many problems and challenges that face the cultural community. There are not enough facilities and many of those that exist are poorly maintained. There is not enough visibility for artists and cultural organizations and the media has been unresponsive to addressing the issue. There is a severe undercapitalization problem for organizations which struggle financially from year to year. Artists have been pushed out of downtown San Jose and have little opportunity to exhibit their work locally.

Visibility, Niche, Marketing

Visibility

With respect to visibility for arts and culture, there is undisputedly a problem in San Jose/Santa Clara County. In contrast to many other communities where the consultants have worked, a visitor — and to some extent a resident — has to be determined to get information about what is going on. A significant number of people in the public survey administered by the consultants (c.f., Part III, Section 1) cited lack of
awareness of arts events, not lack of interest, as a rationale for not attending more. Several also mentioned lack of advertising and marketing as a problem. Newspapers, radio, and television are as likely to cover and announce events outside the County as inside (if they do so at all). Hotels and travel personnel, for the most part, do not seem well informed about what is available when they are asked.

**Niche**

As was pointed out in Chapter 1, the challenge for the San Jose/Santa Clara County cultural community is that it is located in proximity to one of the most important and well established cultural destinations in the country (and, to some extent, the world). With what some would claim is a hundred-year head start, a strong capital base, and a City administration that understands and promotes the important relationship between the arts, tourism, and economic prosperity, San Francisco enjoys the highest combined public and private support for the arts on a per capita basis of any city in the country. 24

The impact of all of this on San Jose/Santa Clara County’s cultural community is palpable. Head-to-head competition between the cultural institutions in the Santa Clara County region and in San Francisco is a daunting and impractical challenge. It has already been shown that San Jose/Santa Clara County residents take in much of their cultural entertainment outside of the County, and much of that is in San Francisco. One has only to peruse the donor lists found in programs and annual reports of San Francisco cultural organizations to realize that much Santa Clara County-based arts philanthropy also goes to institutions there. The challenge is how to find the right niche

---

24 Source: McKinsey & Co. comparative statistics developed for The Cleveland Foundation (1996). The comparison was for large performing arts organizations only but it is likely that the same holds true across all disciplines and budget sizes of arts and cultural organizations.
for the San Jose/Santa Clara County cultural community so that what it offers is seen as unique and special.

**Marketing**

Related to the issues of visibility and niche is the challenge of marketing arts and culture. Most marketing in San Jose/Santa Clara County is developed and implemented by specific institutions. There is very little coordinated marketing by or for artists, cultural institutions, or events. There is no centralized phone information service on events and ticketing options, no closed circuit televised information source, nor is there a centralized box office.

On the other hand, an exciting and promising marketing system is being developed by the Convention and Visitors Bureau that is already having an impact on San Jose’s cultural community. Called “Destination San Jose,” it is a World Wide Web promotional and selling strategy that allows a user to find out all kinds of things about what is available in the City and links to the Web pages of organizations, attractions, and services— including cultural organizations. The system has the capacity to allow a visitor to book a hotel room, make a restaurant reservation, and purchase a ticket to a cultural event, all from a distant personal computer. For most cultural organizations, the system is not yet operational and, at least at this point, it is not available to cultural groups outside San Jose. But the potential—at least for organizations based in San Jose—is tremendous. This is an excellent example of a system that has built on one of the unique strengths of the area—technology—to come up with something that could be a model for the rest of the country.

**Facilities**

The arts may be lively and active in San Jose and Santa Clara County, but there are not enough performing or exhibition venues to support the demand for
outlets by artists and arts organizations. Living space for artists is also a problem given the very high cost of real estate. The situation has been characterized as a “lively scene that has outstripped the facility supply.”

**Supply**

The underdeveloped arts facility infrastructure cannot support desired performances and rehearsals of local/regional organizations or those touring from outside the region. In addition to the numerous and persistent complaints of local organizations, the number of touring attractions is limited by the fact that there is such a dearth of facilities. As a result, there is no full-time nonprofit presenting (as opposed to producing) organization in the City of San Jose and the only presenters in the County are university- or college-affiliated. This is one reason why a considerable number of people travel outside the area to see touring attractions that are simply unavailable in the City or County.

The main existing performance venue in downtown San Jose (the Center for the Performing Arts) is shared by the Symphony, the Ballet, and the American Musical Theatre. The Opera performs at a different venue (the ill-equipped Montgomery Theater, which has only 500 seats). The three major organizations tend to control the desirable weekend dates in the Center, making it difficult for private promoters of other events to book that venue at advantageous times or for longer runs. The Center does have excess capacity (not all dates are booked and not all concerts/performances are sold out). But many of the local cul-

---

25 A presenting organization is one that books outside attractions and brings them to a City (as opposed to organizations that produce their own shows with their own personnel). According to the Association of Performing Arts Presenters, the national service organization for nonprofit presenters, there are very few cities across the nation the size of San Jose that do not have at least one full-time nonprofit presenter.
tural organizations are unable to book such a large venue anyway. Indeed, the widespread consensus is not that there needs to be another large facility at this time but that the greatest need is for one or more mid-sized performing arts facilities.

A Priority Need: Mid-sized Performing Arts Facilities

Research summarized in Chapter 1 and reported in more detail in Part III, Sections 1 and 4 confirms the need for mid-sized facilities both from an audience demand and from an organizational demand point of view. The events that the general public would most like to see according to the public surveys are precisely the types that would be presented in a mid-sized theatre. Many of these events simply cannot be presented locally because appropriate venues are in short supply. Indeed, the region ranks last among 15 metropolitan areas in seats per thousand residents in the category of mid-sized performing arts facilities (750-1500 seats) (cf., Part III, Section 4).
A Priority Need: Local Neighborhood Spaces

During the course of the planning process, concern was expressed that a number of communities were thinking of developing smaller, multi-use spaces and this might cause undue competition. But the research indicates that far from being a concern, this would answer a tremendous need and would probably be the single most important development to promote wider and more frequent participation in arts and culture. The research demonstrates that frequency of attendance in San Jose/Santa Clara County is related to the proximity of quality facilities (people in the area prefer not to drive long distances, though they are willing to travel occasionally to San Francisco to take in a major attraction).

The topic of smaller, multi-purpose spaces will be addressed in detail in Chapter 4. It is important to state at this point, however, that such spaces could address a number of needs including those of visual and performing artists, cultural organizations, arts and cultural education activities, and programs that are of interest to people in the neighborhoods.

Festival Spaces

In addition to a mid-sized facility, some of those interviewed for the plan believe that San Jose lacks a good festival site, either indoors or outdoors; and that the largest festivals seem to have outgrown the City’s capacity to handle them. Yet others point out that the very largest festivals would only use a major festival facility a few days out of the year, and that the development of the area as a major festival destination is more than just a facilities issue. Rather, it encompasses issues of marketing, organization, funding, program development, and tourism development.

Artist Spaces
Local artists are having difficulty finding space of all kinds—living space, work space, and exhibition space. The problem is exacerbated by the extremely high cost of real estate—either to purchase or rent. One of the greatest needs is for one or more non-commercial galleries devoted to exhibits and selling the work of local artists. But without affordable living and working space as well, many artists are forced to relocate, leading to a serious creativity drain for the area.

**Facility Maintenance, Operations, Equipment**

Maintenance in many cultural facilities is sub-standard and many facilities are ill-equipped. Part of the problem is that the facilities are largely publicly owned and operated and there is much competition for scarce funds from City General Fund budgets that might be used for ongoing maintenance and equipment upgrades.

Unlike in other communities, there has been little experimentation with private nonprofit operation of facilities. The trend nationally is for municipalities to enter into long-term operating agreements with private parties for this purpose and to fix the rate of subsidy at a level that is adequate but allows the operators to fund raise for upgrades and improvements. It is true that San Jose is beginning to experiment with a variant of this approach: three new facilities—the Tech Museum, The San Jose Rep, and the Mexican Heritage Cultural Center—will be operated by the nonprofits that occupy them.

**Funding for Facilities**

It has fallen to the public sector primarily to fund the creation of new spaces for arts and culture. With the exception of a few university-based facilities that have been privately funded, most cultural spaces

---

26 An important example of a privately funded facility is the newly renovated Museum at Stanford University which will be
have been built exclusively with tax payer dollars. Though this pattern is changing — the new Tech Museum and the San Jose Rep facility have private sector funding involvement — the private sector has pretty much gotten a free ride in the area of facility development or operation.

The funding of cultural facilities is becoming a difficult issue in the region. The San Jose Redevelopment Agency may issue tax allocation bonds to finance construction of cultural facilities within the City’s redevelopment areas. However, the San Jose Redevelopment Authority’s ability to issue new debt for the existing redevelopment areas will expire shortly after the turn of the century unless reauthorized by the State legislature. Taxing authority, in general, has become more difficult in California in the last two decades and it is likely that future projects (whether involving new construction or renovation) will require considerable private funding.

**Stability/Capacity**

**Organizations**

The total organizational budgets of cultural organization in San Jose/Santa Clara County is roughly $60 million.\(^{27}\) To adequately capitalize such institutions at a minimum level, the organizations as a group would have to meet the following criteria according to a widely accepted national formula:\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{27}\) This number was calculated by reviewing the operating budget of all grantees of the City of San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs and the Arts Council of Santa Clara County and adding the operating budgets of any additional groups that reported providing arts education programs in the survey reported in Part III, Section 3. Groups not included in any of these categories do not add substantially to the total budget number.

\(^{28}\) cf., Footnote #9 (in Chapter 1).
• be deficit free
• own or be exclusive beneficiaries of combined assets of $75 million broken down as follows:
  • $15 million in unrestricted cash reserves
  • $60 million in endowment funds.

Yet, some local organizations do have deficits and the total amount of money that could be counted toward meeting this $75 million capitalization requirement is $15 million, leaving a shortfall of $60 million.29

With very little money in reserve and with very little coming in from investment capital (endowment income), cultural organizations in the area struggle to stay afloat. A bad year can be disastrous since there are no reserves available to cover the shortfall. Risk capital to try out new programs and ideas is unavailable. In a region that has made its fortunes largely with the help of freely available venture capital, cultural organizations have been left to struggle from year to year.

Artists

Artists convened for the cultural planning process were emphatic about the difficulties they face and their need for basic business and marketing help. While almost all of them have focused on learning the skills of making art, many fewer have experience in the practical skills of making a living. With an underdeveloped gallery network in the area, many artists

29 cf., Footnote #10 (in Chapter 1). Indeed, the entire non-profit sector in the area does not even command the necessary dollars required by cultural organizations alone. In a 1995 survey in Santa Clara County it was revealed that the entire nonprofit sector—with its operating budgets well over a quarter of a billion dollars—had combined endowments of only $41 million and operating reserves of $27 million [cf., “The Status of the Nonprofit Sector in Santa Clara County,” published by The Community Foundation of Santa Clara County (1995)].
cannot depend on others to market their work but need to become self-reliant and entrepreneurial. As a result, a good number of artists are looking for free or affordable seminars in areas such as business planning, legal and tax issues, and accounting. In many communities these services are provided by chapters of nonprofit organizations like Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts and Volunteer Accountants for the Arts. In San Jose/Santa Clara County, these organizations do not exist and the availability of such targeted services specifically geared for artists are few.

**Recommended Strategies**

**Strategy 3.1: Planning/Technical Assistance (Organizations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 3.1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific technical assistance and planning money should be offered to assist local arts organizations focus on appropriate organizational, artistic, and program development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Far more planning must occur among San Jose/Santa Clara County’s cultural organizations. And it must be strategic planning addressing the particular issue of appropriate organizational, artistic, and program development. Much has been made in this report about the difficult competition faced by older and better capitalized, internationally acclaimed cultural organizations in San Francisco. It is a challenge that must be addressed if San Jose/Santa Clara County’s cultural community is going to achieve the prominence of which it is capable.

As an example of the seriousness of the challenge, take the category of symphony orchestras. Major orchestras – like San Francisco’s – regularly begin with a state-of-the-art concert hall (the cost of which to-
day exceeds $100 million), a large endowment, and the capacity to carry out $100 million plus capital campaigns on a regular basis. Such orchestras have international touring schedules, recording contracts, and the capacity and desire to market heavily and fund raise regionally. For a Symphony like the one in San Jose — or one at an analogous stage of development in another County — this is very stiff competition. Similar challenges are faced by other San Jose/Santa Clara County arts organizations.

In this context, the importance of niche development is key. The model here might well be the San Jose Sharks which have been a successful professional sports team in the area largely because they are not competing head-to-head with a Bay Area team in the same sport. San Jose/Santa Clara County’s cultural community can be equally successful by employing the same type of strategy. It must find a niche that builds on the uniqueness of the area and the specific predilections of local residents. Technology, innovation, a concern for education, family values, cultural diversity, egalitarianism and non-elitism — all these are specific attributes that represent important characteristics and values that help define the area, and there are clearly many others. Cultural organizations — and to some extent the community of artists — need to be cognizant of the fact that their success will depend to a large extent on how well they build on these values and characteristics.

In addition to funding larger organizations to develop strategic plans, there are a variety of other formats in which technical assistance can and should be provided, especially to smaller organizations. For example, the San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs has provided an incubator program and a summer performing arts series serving smaller multicultural organizations. Such a program could be expanded both geographically — County-wide — and in terms of eligible organizations. This would mean not limiting the program to multi-cultural organizations (though they
might still get priority), and expanding the technical assistance to any developing cultural organization.  
Such a program might also involve a next phase of developmental assistance taking organizations from the initial incubation level to a subsequent level of independent production in a professionally and technically well equipped facility.

What is proposed here is then is a multi-faceted and comprehensive initiative to assist local cultural organizations with strategic planning and development. It is suggested that wherever possible planning assistance be linked to operating support/stabilization grants as is done in Philadelphia by the Pew Charitable Trusts and is discussed under Strategy 3.5.

*Estimated Cost:* Cost will be picked up under Strategy 3.5.

**Strategy 3.2: Planning/Technical Assistance (Artists)**

---

**Strategy 3.2:**
A technical assistance and small grants program should be developed for individual artists focusing on the basic elements of career development, marketing, and business planning.

Because of the structure of tax laws in this country and the history of arts philanthropy, it has generally been easier to assist those in the cultural community who are affiliated with tax exempt, nonprofit organizations. Individual artists — who are regarded in much the same way as commercial enterprises from a tax and public policy point of view — have received far less in terms of philanthropic and technical support.

Yet individual artists in San Jose/Santa Clara County have many needs. As was pointed out earlier in this chapter, one of the greatest needs is for technical
assistance in business skills related to marketing, business planning, and tax and accounting laws and procedures.

It is recommended that a technical assistance program and small grants program be established. On the technical assistance front, regular seminars and workshops can be given free of charge for individual artists on topics that will be most useful to them in all aspects of making a living and self-management. Small grants (up to $2,000) can be made available for related needs — the expenses related to preparing slides or a portfolio, developing a press packet, paying for a computer class, and so on. Grant funds should not be made available for expenses directly related to producing work such as purchasing supplies or renting a studio.

Estimated Cost: $100,000 - $150,000 annually

---

30 An excellent model for this type of grants program was developed by the Chicago Office of Fine Arts within the City’s Department of Cultural Affairs almost a decade ago. This should not be construed as suggesting there is no need for artist fellowship programs and other programs supporting artists in doing their work. It simply makes a distinction between such programs — that should be part of the natural program development of local funding agencies — and this specific approach to helping artists with career development concerns.
Facilities

Strategy 3.3: Mid-Sized Performing Arts Facility

Strategy 3.3:
At least one and perhaps two additional mid-sized (750-1500 seats), well equipped, performing arts space should be developed during the next decade.

As has been pointed out, many in the San Jose/Santa Clara County arts community have identified a need for a mid-sized theater and the research for this cultural plan backs up that need. No theater is available in San Jose itself between 575 seats and 2,700 seats other than higher education-affiliated spaces which are difficult to book. An initiative to convert the Fox Theater to a mid-sized hall for San Jose failed some years ago. It is now being seriously explored as a hall for the Symphony which would reduce some pressure on existing downtown venues as will the opening of the new theater for the San Jose Rep. But even these projects will not solve the problem.

Outside of San Jose, the County has a few halls that could be considered at the smaller range of "mid-sized." Dinkelspiel at Stanford University is 716 seats. Mountain View’s facility is 600 seats. University of Santa Clara, Foothill College, and Ohlone College in nearby Fremont all have theaters in the 400 to 500 seat size. At the other end of the spectrum is the Flint Center at De Anza College in Cupertino with 2,427 seats which is not appropriate for events and groups requiring a mid-sized auditorium (for a complete listing of relevant performing arts spaces in

Please cf., also Strategy 4.1 recommending a series of neighborhood facilities that would benefit artists and cultural organizations as well as audiences.
Planning must begin immediately for a mid-sized theatre in downtown San Jose (whether or not the Symphony project goes forward should not impact this initiative). From both an audience and performing group demand point of view, this is the logical place for the first mid-sized theatre.

It is also likely that the region could support a second space of this type within the decade covered by this plan. However, the siting of this second facility would require a good deal more research and feasibility work which is less of a priority at this time if the San Jose facility is built.

In considering the development of mid-sized theatres, one option might be to consider a partnership between a municipalities and higher education institution in which each could contribute to its development and each could benefit. An interesting model is provided in the recently announced joint development of a new library by the City of San Jose and San Jose State University.

*Estimated Cost: $25 million per facility*

**Strategy 3.4: Civic Gallery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 3.4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At least one and perhaps several nonprofit Civic Galleries should be created and operated for the benefit of local artists who wish to exhibit their work.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As has been mentioned, local artists have difficulty finding outlets for showing and selling their work. The commercial gallery system is still in its infancy
in the area and no substantial nonprofit gallery system has been developed to fill the gap.

It is recommended that at least one Civic Gallery be developed in downtown San Jose, the location that the majority of artists feel would be best for an initial effort of this kind. Staffed by artists but funded by the City, the gallery could be housed in rented space.

All shows should be curated and entry should be through competition. Work should be for sale with the bulk of the proceeds going to the artists and a small amount to the gallery for operational costs and marketing. At least once a year, the Civic Gallery could include an exhibition of the work of local school students; but the major thrust of the gallery should be oriented toward the needs of local professionals. It would also be desirable to have periodic shows that demonstrate the techniques and output of artistic media that draw on technological innovation of the area.

While downtown San Jose is a priority area for a Civic Gallery, it is by no means the only possibility and other locations/municipalities should be encouraged to develop galleries of their own. In addition, small gallery spaces should be developed in conjunction with neighborhood cultural centers (as is recommended under Strategy 4.1).

Estimated Cost: $150,000 to 300,000/gallery annually

---

33 The term “Civic” Gallery as it is utilized here is intended to suggest its location and intent, not necessarily who runs it. Some Civic Galleries are governmentally-operated spaces but a number of individuals interviewed for this plan believe that in San Jose/Santa Clara County private operation (with some public funding) would be preferable.
Strategy 3.5: Capitalization/Stabilization/Capacity Building

A new stabilization/capacity building initiative should be undertaken to provide adequate capitalization of local cultural organizations.

Given the severe undercapitalization of the cultural community, it is recommended that a new stabilization initiative be undertaken. Its goal, based on the Ford Foundation formula discussed earlier, should be $60 million.

This will not be the first time that such an initiative has been undertaken. The Silicon Valley Arts Fund represented the first attempt to help local cultural organizations eliminate deficits and build both unrestricted and restricted cash reserves. It raised approximately $12 million which has been factored into what remains to be raised.

However, the stabilization initiative recommended here should be more stringent in its requirements, based on recent research sponsored by the Ford Foundation concerning the long-term impact of stabilization/capacity building programs since 1966 nationwide. The program should at the very least:

- require and underwrite the cost of viable five-year strategic plans that have specific multi-year budgets attached to them (cf., Strategy 3.1)
- require any grant recipient to be deficit free as a condition of receiving a grant in any fiscal year
- meet high artistic and management standards as determined by independent review.

As in the case of the Silicon Valley Arts Fund, money should be raised and held in a central pool. Income from the fund should be used primarily for basic operating grants that would be given annually to organizations meeting the criteria stated above (and any others that might be added). Grant amounts would not be fixed but would be in ranges by budget size and organizations would be rated on artistic, administrative, and outreach criteria to determine the amount they would receive. In this way, very high standards can be maintained and funders can be assured of accountability.35

In developing this program, it is important that it be adapted to meet local needs and conditions. While foundations like Ford, Pew, and others have certainly established national standards that have been mentioned here, it is recognized that whatever program is developed should not follow these models slavishly. They should borrow what has worked and adapt it accordingly.

Estimated Cost: $60 million

**Strategy 3.6: Visibility/Identity/Marketing**

**Strategy 3.6:**
A coordinated approach to marketing should raise the visibility of arts and culture locally and link the cultural community with other entities developing the region as a destination.

In developing a marketing strategy for the arts and culture in the region, several decisions have to be made. What is the cultural product being marketed –

35 As an example of how stringent such requirements can be, The Pew Charitable Trusts rejected the application of The Philadelphia Orchestra for basic operating support for the first time ever in 1996 because the organization ran a deficit in the preceding year.
specific arts events or the area as a destination that combines cultural, recreational, and other assets? To whom is the product being marketed – residents within a 50-mile radius, regional tourists within a five-hour drive, national and international tourists and conventioneers? What strategies will be fruitful with these different markets?

San Jose and Santa Clara County have much to offer: a variety of relatively young and vibrant cultural institutions, the area’s resources in Mexican culture, residents’ focus on family and education, the ease and convenience of many cultural venues, many festivals, and a sense that the area is a safe, affordable, and “pleasant” destination. Any regional approach to meeting the cultural marketing challenge, however, will need to take into account the distribution of cultural assets around the region.

The San Jose Convention and Visitor’s Bureau has implemented a comprehensive and technologically innovative approach to marketing through its “Destination San Jose” program, which includes a strong emphasis on cultural tourism and a goal to increase ticket sales for arts and cultural events. A mayoral press conference, advertising campaign, a County-wide cultural calendar, and on-line booking service are elements of this coordinated effort by various agencies, businesses, and cultural organizations in the City of San Jose. Such collaborative efforts, if sustained over the long run, have the best chance of making a difference in the cultural marketing picture.

What is needed now is a marketing effort that will develop a unified strategy not only for the broad variety of arts and cultural interests but for the many public and private recreational, sports, and municipal entities (and others) that have overlapping promotional interests. The approach should focus on marketing the region as a general destination in which the arts and culture are a particularly attractive asset. At the same time, materials can be developed that pro-
mote the region as an attractive cultural destination, including newsletters, calendars, schedules, and a City/County “cultural freeway” map that shows all the exits where residents and visitors can find cultural organizations and events.

This marketing initiative should also underscore the importance of integrating the arts and culture in regional trade and marketing efforts for Silicon Valley, highlighting the availability of arts and culture for local employees, families, and others who reside in the region. Linkages should be developed with agencies and organizations promoting economic development, visitorship (including tourism), and business relocation to the area.

Estimated Cost: $75,000 for detailed marketing plan and $100,000/year for cultural component when implemented.

Strategy 3.7: International Silicon Valley Festival of Culture and Innovation

Santa Clara County is a major part of Silicon Valley which is an international hub for innovation and technology. Most of the most successful companies in “the Valley” are themselves international in their sales and reach. It seems logical that the area’s cultural community ought to be able to capitalize on this international identity and extend it by drawing on one of the area’s unique and most successful presentation formats – the festival.

There are several elements that should be built into the festival as part of its structure:
• It should be aligned with the whole of Silicon Valley, including areas that are not part of Santa Clara County.
• It should utilize many venues, both indoor and outdoor, and many local artists and cultural organizations (as well as others from around the world).
• It should focus on the international nature of Silicon Valley, celebrate the cultural diversity of the area, and build on the many cultures that are represented in the region.
• It should extend over several days (perhaps a full week plus an additional weekend).
• It should provide opportunities to link arts and technology as well as artistic/cultural organizations and technology companies (though the emphasis should be on the arts and culture).
• It should draw on the multi-national connections of corporations in the Valley.
• It should provide a performance incubator for small and emerging groups as well as a showcase for the area’s premiere cultural organizations.

There are at least two other aspects of the festival that could link into year-round activities tied to other parts of this plan:

• First, year-long international artist residencies could be sponsored by the festival that would be aimed at creating important work — visual, performing, or any other kind — that could be premiered and shown for the first time at the festival.

• Second, such international residencies could also link to arts education and neighborhood activities exposing local resident to people and work from other cultures.

In thinking about this recommendation, it is important that at least one major initiative from this cultural
plan be directed at enhancing the visibility and prestige of San Jose/Santa Clara County/Silicon Valley regionally, nationally, and internationally. This festival, which could not be replicated anywhere else in the world, could be one of the most important steps in accomplishing that goal.

*Estimated Cost: $500,000 - $3 million annually depending on size and scope*

**Strategy 3.8: The Arts and Technology**

**Strategy 3.8:**
The various agencies responsible for planning and supporting arts and culture in the region should set as an explicit goal the encouragement of initiatives linking the arts and technology.

It may seem counter-intuitive that given Silicon Valley’s emphasis on technological innovation, it was difficult during this planning process to gain consensus about how the arts should be linked to technology in the coming years. While there were focus group meetings devoted to the topic and a special task force, the many good ideas that surfaced did not develop into any specific initiatives that were widely supported.

In some sense, it may not be so surprising after all given the subject matter itself. Who can sit in a group meeting and accurately predict what technological innovation will be of paramount importance a decade hence? Who would have predicted that the internet would transform communications, even in arts organizations, a decade ago? Who would have predicted that supertitles (that allow audiences to see the translation of the singers’ words as they sing them) would be embraced by virtually every opera company of any size in the United States (including the Metropolitan Opera) and that they would make opera the only perform-
ing arts discipline nationally with an increasing au-
dience in the mid-1990’s?

As a result, this plan does not recommend any single
strategy in the area of arts and technology. Rather,
it suggests that initiatives linking the arts and
technology be made a priority for attention (including
funding) from those agencies that are involved in
planning and funding arts and culture locally.

Though not prescriptive, there certainly are ideas
that have merit that could be considered, including
the following:

• Provide support for more exhibits of technological
  art throughout the Valley with an annual awards
  ceremony.

• Develop an incentive or grants program to provide
  artists the opportunity to work and experiment using
  technology. Projects could take place in neighbor-
  hood centers, art galleries, corporations, or
  schools (as part of an artist-in-residence activ-
  ity).

• Develop on-line directories including one for or-
  ganizations, another for artists, and another that
  provides intern opportunities and classes.

• Form a special Task Force (not more than a dozen
  people) to continue exploring options in the area of
  arts and technology. This group should include at
  least one artist and representatives from technology
  companies, from higher education, from arts produc-
  ing and exhibiting organizations, and from local
  arts agencies.
Chapter 4
Community and Neighborhood Arts

**The Vision:** Neighborhoods and communities well supplied with facilities where people participate enthusiastically in widely available arts and cultural activities.

**Recommended Strategies:**

4.1: Investing in the development and maintenance of neighborhood/community cultural centers in the City and County serving artists, cultural organizations, audiences, and community members.

4.2: Building the capacity of “anchor” organizations that support arts and culture in the neighborhoods/communities.

4.3: Changing the Percent-for-Art ordinance in San Jose to get more public art into the neighborhoods.

4.4: Instituting a County-wide neighborhood and community-oriented touring/artist-in-residence program.

4.5: Sponsoring an “Arts Open House” and several “Pay-If-You-Want” days County-wide.

4.6: Establishing partnerships between cultural organizations and neighborhood institutions to reach special populations (seniors, the disabled, the incarcerated, drug and alcohol dependent individuals, and youth-at-risk).
The City of San Jose and the communities that make up the rest of Santa Clara County have had differing histories with respect to community and neighborhood arts and cultural development. As a large United States city that competes for conventions and visitors, San Jose’s planning has historically had to address downtown development. The passage of Proposition 13 made the challenge of addressing both downtown development and neighborhood development at the same time with public funds a difficult one. With scarce resources, many of the community centers in neighborhoods in San Jose — institutions that had served as a base for emerging neighborhood arts programs and organizations — were closed. In the subsequent surge of economic growth in the area, the focus of attention shifted to downtown revitalization. The dollars generated by the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) for the arts, coming at the behest of the hotel and tourism industries, also favored arts development in the downtown area.

Meanwhile, in most of the rest of the County, the choice was less sharply drawn between downtown and neighborhood development. In many cases, resources could be invested in facilities or programs that served both interests. At the County level, the Arts Council of Santa Clara County made the funding of community and neighborhood arts programs a priority and was able to do so in part by opening up the grants to smaller organizations and less formalized groups that did not have 501(c)(3) corporation status. With no requirement to support the large flagship organizations in San Jose, half of the Arts Council’s grantees still have budgets of $50,000 or less.

Now San Jose’s attention is also once again on neighborhoods. With a revamping of the local political system to include more district-based representation,

36 This section amplifies and adds to the background information contained in Chapter 1.
the current City Council has made a commitment not only to inclusive government but to the important role that neighborhoods can play in the development of a vibrant community. Through the efforts of the City’s Office of Cultural Affairs, progress is also being made in integrating the arts into neighborhood life.

A major challenge for community arts groups — whether City- or County-based — is access to facilities. Many venues are unavailable, inappropriate, or too expensive. In San Jose, when the network of community centers was dismantled, many spaces were lost for arts use. Further, the City does not have a parks and recreation department structure as exists in many other communities to foster easier access to facilities. Though schools throughout the County have facilities, smaller cultural groups have had difficulty using them, due to lack of experience in negotiating an agreement, scheduling conflicts, or regulations about insurance, janitorial service, and hours.

One solution is to tap into agencies and networks outside the arts, in the educational, religious, and social service sectors to improve access and to reach more neighborhoods with cultural services. This approach is already being used in San Jose/Santa Clara County. Much of the arts work going on in neighborhoods is closely tied in with social purposes and programs such as drug intervention programs. Indeed, this type of activity has become the main source of support for many neighborhood arts organizations. Many organizations are so rooted in the community that such an approach is integral to their missions.

The timing is excellent for a discussion of neighborhood arts in the region and there are clearly many signs that such a discussion can have positive re-

37 The City of Dallas, among others, has developed such an approach, with a touring arts program that delivers arts through churches, recreation centers, and social service providers around the City.
The area is characterized by political and social tolerance. Proposition 187 (the so-called “anti-immigrant” proposition) failed to pass in San Jose/Santa Clara County. Interfaith and mixed ethnic marriages are common. Bilingualism is promoted. People are committed to inclusive political processes. These attitudes are reflected in the current climate of both funding and political interest in a community arts emphasis. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Community Foundation of Santa Clara, as well as the Peninsula Community Foundation, are funding community arts projects that promote a strong neighborhood focus.

In the course of the cultural planning process, San Jose/Santa Clara County has had the opportunity to draw on the existing currents of inclusiveness and tolerance to frame the argument for neighborhood arts in pragmatic terms, emphasizing the value of such arts in communities, families, and educational settings. At the same time, the discussion has identified the very practical needs of the arts on the community level for access, partnership, information, and support from community, political, and educational leaders.

In thinking about specific strategies, it will be important to differentiate between the City of San Jose and the rest of the County in thinking about implementation.

- First, there are important jurisdictional distinctions. The City of San Jose can act unilaterally. However, in most cases in the rest of the County, individual municipalities will be involved in decision-making even if the County, or the Arts Council, or any other entity wishes to assist in planning, funding, or implementation.
- Second, many of the strategies that are clearly have a “neighborhood” orientation in San Jose will comprise a community-wide orientation in smaller municipalities.
Third, there are some who would argue that the need for new or renovated smaller facilities is greatest outside of San Jose and that the key need in the City is for more programs and activities at the neighborhood level, not buildings.

**Recommended Strategies**

**Strategy 4.1: Neighborhood/Community Facilities**

**Strategy 4.1:**
A significant investment should be made in the development and maintenance of neighborhood/community cultural centers County-wide that would serve artists, cultural organizations, audiences, and community members with a wide variety of programs and services.

As was clear from the research for this project, people want facilities close to where they live. If those facilities are available and if they offer a variety of interesting arts and cultural programs, these individuals will participate more frequently. Also clear from the research is that there is a need for more community-based arts education, especially for adults, as described in Chapter 2.

At the same time, there is a tremendous need for rehearsal, exhibition, performance, and office space for individual artists and arts organizations throughout the County. Providing artists and organizations with a place to do their work is a priority as described in Chapter 3, especially given the fact that the cultural landscape is filled with smaller, struggling individu-

---

38 An interesting model for how small cultural organizations can become “residents” in a community facility is provided by the plans for the Mexican Heritage Cultural Center.
als and organizations that do not have access to quality space.

The recommended strategy — to create neighborhood cultural centers — has already been anticipated in Strategy 2.4. The proposed facilities need not be limited to fine arts uses but can be utilized broadly for culture as well as for recreational and social service use. Indeed, synergy can be created in this fashion since many arts and cultural organizations already provide programs and services that overlap these areas. In addition, the facilities themselves might be attached to or be part of existing or planned spaces that will have many other uses — a recreation center, a library, or even a health center. However, each should, at the very least, be equipped with a so-called “black box” theatre that provides flexible seating for a minimum of 100 people (in some cases, a larger performance space will be appropriate) and an exhibition/gallery space.

In some cases, these proposed facilities may involve new construction, in others, adaptive reuse, and in still others, they may be attached to other facility projects (e.g., social service centers, schools, etc.). Some consideration should be given to whether incentives can be created to utilize Unreinforced Masonry funding to adapt existing unused spaces. A strong effort should be made to work with local corporations to equip these facilities with state-of-the-art computer equipment that can provide a local center for community use (both arts applications and more general applications such as access to the World Wide Web). A partnership could be created with a company such that equipment is updated regularly and training is provided by company personnel.

Because of the shortage of affordable housing and studio space for artists in the County, some thought should be given to developing low-cost live/work space for artists in certain of these complexes. In exchange for subsidized rents, artists should be expected to do
some arts-related projects for the facility including giving classes, taking on apprentices, or doing work on the building itself (cf., Strategy 2.4).

These facilities will require funding both for initial construction/renovation and for maintenance, administrative, and program costs. There were numerous complaints in the interviews for this project that because of the high cost of operating new facilities, cities in the County are either neglecting the ongoing maintenance and operations or are charging rents that community groups cannot afford. In addition, since neighborhood arts programs rarely break even, additional program funds need to be provided in this area as well. An endowment can be built into the funding plan in addition to the fund raising for bricks and mortar.

**Estimated One-Time Cost**: $1-$6 million per center depending on whether there is linkage with the renovation or construction of a multi-use facility utilizing other funding. The higher figure could be sufficient to include an endowment fund for operation and programming.

**Strategy 4.2: Anchor Organizations**

**Strategy 4.2:**

A program should be developed to support “Anchor Organizations” that can serve the needs of their local neighborhoods, artists, and cultural groups.

As part of the effort to strengthen neighborhood and community-based arts and cultural development, an investment should be made in selected organizations that can be strengthened to be local service and program providers. In some cases, these organizations may be the same ones that run the new facilities proposed in 4.1. However, in many other cases where no new facil-
ity is being built, there will be candidate organizations that can be identified and strengthened.

In other places where programs like this have been established, it has been found that it is best to invest most often in organizations that occupy and/or manage facilities since one of the services that is most in demand is access to space and technical assistance on how to use it.

The program would award funds to anchor organizations that could utilize them for various purposes:

- strengthening the anchor organization’s own staff expertise and organizational capacity
- creating and administering a rental subsidy fund for local artists, individuals, and organizations that wish to use the spaces in the building(s)
- running a regranting program locally to help very small initiatives get off the ground (often these one-time initiatives do not receive the attention they deserve from a more distant funder)
- providing technical assistance in program development, technical use of a facility, marketing, fundraising, board development, use of computers, etc. to artists and small cultural organizations.

Anchor organizations in some instances can be small arts councils or commissions (local governmental support should be an incentive for supporting a local arts agency in this way). In other cases, it will be some other kind of arts organization though it need not be. Other community-based institutions that have a demonstrated commitment to the arts, are well administered and funded, have good leadership, and are willing to make this activity a priority should be considered. Investment in these organizations should be for a minimum of five years (assuming they are performing adequately) so that the programs and services they bring to the community have time to catch hold and develop continuity and visibility.
Estimated Cost (for 10 Anchor Organizations): $2 million/year

**Strategy 4.3: Neighborhood-based Percent-for-Art**

**Strategy 4.3:** A new look at San Jose’s current Percent-for-Art Ordinance should examine whether smaller, community-based public projects should be eligible to be part of the program.

The City of San Jose’s Percent-for-Art Ordinance which mandates 2% of construction costs for art has been an important positive step in bringing the visual arts more widely to the public and contributing to the visual enhancements of the community. However, the threshold of such projects is currently $500,000. Projects that cost less than that are not subject to the 2% mandate. What this means is few projects end up in the neighborhoods where project costs are often below the threshold.

It is recommended that the threshold for projects be lowered. If that were to happen, many more projects in the neighborhoods would become eligible. Even with a small sum of money available through the 2% mandate, the installation of art could have a profound impact on a local neighborhood.

*Estimated Cost: 0*
Strategy 4.4: Touring and Artists-in-Residence

Strategy 4.4:
The Office of Cultural Affairs together with the Arts Council of Santa Clara County should develop a neighborhood and community-oriented touring/artist residency program.

One of the most effective ways to support neighborhood arts development and support the local artist and cultural organization infrastructure is through a combination “fee support” touring program and a neighborhood-based artist-in-residence program. The beauty of these programs is that one grant can help two different clients.

In a fee support touring program, a roster is established of individual artists (often performers) and performing groups that “tour” to different sites for performances, workshops, residencies, etc. In order to get on the roster, applicants have to apply and be reviewed for artistic and presentational quality as well as basic managerial competence. The roster then becomes a catalogue from which community-based organizations (and, in the case of some programs, schools39) select offerings. The presenting organization then applies for funds to offset a portion of the fee for a specific set of services provided by one of the groups. Fee support levels are established based on a number of criteria (need, target audience, quality of proposed project, etc.). In some cases, performing groups and individuals from outside the area can also be added to the roster. In others, there is an “open” roster which allows the presenting organization to select groups or individuals that have not been pre-screened but do meet certain criteria.

39 As was already mentioned in Chapter 2, if schools are eligible for grants under this program, they should not be able to utilize “High Five” funds to match grants under this program (cf., Strategy 2.1).
The neighborhood-based artist-in-residence program generally works in a similar fashion but it is more oriented to the visual arts (though performing artists, literary artists, and others can be included) and is generally extended over a longer period of time—sometimes several months or a year.

Touring and artist-in-residence programs have, historically, provided a cost-effective way to do outreach to small communities, neighborhoods, and schools. They provide a level of oversight and control that encourages more careful monitoring by the funder. They allow ancillary services to be added such as technical assistance workshops (both to the providers and the presenters) and showcases which bring buyers and sellers together. It is recommended that a program be implemented to begin in the spring of 1998.

*Estimated Cost:* $100,000 – $150,000 annually including all program costs (grants), staffing, technical assistance, printing and promotion, and showcase.

**Strategy 4.5: Arts Open House and “Pay-If-You-Want” Days**

**Strategy 4.5:**
An annual “Arts Open House” and occasional “Pay-If-You-Want” days should be sponsored County-wide to foster greater interest and participation in the arts and cultural activities.

Part of the challenge of raising the level of participation and support for the arts and culture in San Jose/Santa Clara County is to attack the problem from the grass roots. There are many in the community who have never participated in arts events and many others who simply do not take the time to learn what is available.
Garnering high level visibility for arts activities is one of the challenges that was cited frequently in the interviews. Many blamed the media; but most acknowledged that there had never been a concerted effort to work cooperatively on raising the public’s awareness level of all the arts offerings that are available in the area.

Another challenge that was discussed was the cost of events. While San Jose/Santa Clara County cultural events are not expensive by Bay Area standards, they are too expensive for many local residents — 75% of those who were queried in the general public survey for this project suggested that price was a factor in their not attending more often (cf., Part III, Section 1).

There are at least two ways to attack the challenge of visibility and awareness on the one hand and cost barriers on the other. The first is to have an Arts Open House each year. Any organization should be able to participate in any way that seems appropriate (though some minimal criteria and guidelines should be developed if any kind of list is prepared and promoted). Artists should also be encouraged to participate, perhaps through an expansion of the extremely successful “Open Studios” program in Santa Clara County. This type of event has been carried out successfully in Los Angeles and receives much media attention there as well as broad public participation. Given San Jose/Santa Clara County’s propensity for activities that are informal and fun, such an event could be very successful.

Another approach to the challenges cited is to have a series of “Pay-If-You-Want” days where participating cultural organizations make it optional whether people pay admission (and/or how much they pay). Once again, participation by organizations should be voluntary. Selected grants might be made in certain instances to reduce the impact on earned income where it would be significant.
Estimated Cost: $5,000 to $100,000 annually depending on the level of organization and promotion and whether grants are made.

**Strategy 4.6: Partnerships and Linkages to Special Populations**

**Strategy 4.6:**
Formal programs of support should be expanded that encourage partnerships between arts organizations/artists and community and neighborhood organizations, especially those serving special populations.

Many special populations are reached by arts programming in San Jose/Santa Clara County through partnerships among cultural organizations, social service organizations, and/or the populations themselves. These include the elderly with special needs, at-risk youth, the emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, developmentally disabled, as well as the homeless and prisoners. The arts also play a special role in hospitals and other health care facilities in programs that assist in the healing process.40 Collaborations exist with senior centers, hospitals, and other

---

40 Through the Arts Council of Santa Clara County, the Arts Connect program targets young people, working specifically with foster care group homes and the alternative school system. The Children’s Shelter of Santa Clara County, a new facility for children who have been removed from parental care, brings the arts into the shelter through an artist-in-residence program. Other special populations also served by the arts include, among many others:
- the incarcerated (by The Center for Literary Arts’ poetry)
- the developmentally disabled (by Creativity Unlimited)
- the homeless in shelters (by Tapestry In Talent)
- the anti-drug organization Project Crackdown that has an artist as part of the program.
institutions. However, many of these programs are not visible, have small budgets, and are not seen as part of the cultural landscape in the area.

Although excellent programs exist, more are needed for a variety of populations. The County Board of Supervisors has noted the lack of arts programming for at-risk youth. More programs are being requested by senior care facilities — both short and long term — where quality of life could be greatly enhanced by cultural programming. Cultural organizations could play a role in working with parolees and individuals on probation, serving as supervised worksites. The challenge is to identify resources to develop appropriate programs for various groups.

In advocating a “Partnerships” program that would provide funding for collaborations between cultural organizations and social service or other institutions serving special populations, there is a recognition that in the past, such initiatives have fallen outside the guidelines of most private funders (though the City and County have seed money and grants in this area). Private sector arts funders have not wanted to provide money for social service programs and the contrary is true for funders who focus on social service and do not regard arts programs as important. This leaves these sorts of programs for special populations in “the twilight zone” of private sector funding.

The funding dilemma is surprising since arts programs for special populations can be demonstrated to be effective. They help troubled individuals explore themselves and their options in society, serve as a humanizing force in troubled communities, and can often help people deal with all sorts of pain. They build community, preparing special populations to be included in social, economic, and cultural life.

These programs for special populations not only hold potential for service to the community, but they can also benefit artists and cultural organizations. New
audiences can be developed, artists and organizations can find new outlets for their own creativity, and the program activity also provides much needed income. Unfortunately, many lack the special training required to be effective with special populations and others fear working with them.

It is recommended that a special partnership program be established to encourage more cultural programming for special populations. Funds would be utilized to support meaningful collaborations between artists/arts organizations and community- and neighborhood-based organizations serving special populations. In addition, supplementary options could include targeting long-term artist-in-residency programs in institutions with special populations, providing technical assistance to neighborhood agencies to identify and utilize qualified artists and arts organizations effectively, developing mechanisms for artist/arts organization training to work with special populations using appropriate specialists, and convening a symposium to discuss the arts for special populations in the San Jose/Santa Clara County region.

Estimated Cost: $100,000 to $300,000 annually.
Chapter 5
Leadership and Funding

The Vision: A regional leadership group working with a linked network of agencies to provide the necessary identity, resources, public policy, research, and advocacy/visibility for arts and culture to translate this plan into reality.

Recommended Strategies:
5.1: Developing a Silicon Valley identity and geography for arts and culture during the course of the plan’s implementation.
5.2: Assembling a private sector leadership group to help with the implementation of the plan.
5.3: Creating a ten-year private sector fund-raising plan.
5.4: Formulating a plan for increasing public sector support, including the exploration of dedicated taxes for arts and culture.
5.5: Considering new public policies with respect to percent-for-art and the operation and maintenance of cultural facilities.
5.6: Establishing an ongoing system of research and benchmarking to monitor progress on the implementation of the plan.
In-depth Background

Identity/Geography

During the course of this process, it became apparent that the geographic boundaries established for the plan conformed mainly to a political mandate (the legal boundaries of the County). What this constraint failed to address were several very important issues:

- The County is not defined by any pre-existing and easily identifiable “cultural community.”
- The audience for cultural events is drawn from a larger radius than that defined by County limits, with some attendance spilling over into neighboring counties.42
- County residents attend events in a larger geography than that defined by the County (cf., Part III, Section 1).
- Most importantly, the private sector resources on which this plan must draw are spread beyond the County throughout Silicon Valley.

In interview after interview, especially with corporate leadership, there was surprise at the fact that this was not a “Silicon Valley” cultural plan. From both an identity point of view and from a resource development point of view, this alternative made far more sense to people. Interviewees understood the dif-

---

41 This section amplifies and adds to background information contained in Chapter 1.
42 The City of San Jose, working with Cirque du Soleil, the Renaissance Fair, and other large events, found that cultural events in San Jose tend to draw people from within a 50-mile radius (one-hour drive). The large mariachi festival is successful at drawing patrons from within a five to six-hour driving radius.
difficulty of changing the geographic frame of the re-
search during the planning process itself even if that 
had turned out to be desirable. But, as one chief ex-
ecutive put it, “The next time a consultant interviews 
me about a cultural plan, it should include all of 
Silicon Valley.”

Leadership

One of the key recommendations of the 1988 plan — Arts 
20/20 — was that the “Mayor [of San Jose] should es-

tablish a Leadership Forum for the Arts, a core group 
of top level business and corporate leaders from 
throughout the region to advocate for San Jose arts.”43 
The group was not only intended to act as a unified 
and dynamic advocacy body for the arts, but it was to 
enlist the direct participation of chief executive of-

cers while increasing private support and building 
the image of the arts locally.

By 1993, when the San Jose Arts Commission reviewed 
the progress of Arts 20/20,44 this recommended strategy 
had not been implemented and it was highlighted as 
“the highest priority” by the review group. As of the 
writing of this cultural plan, it has still not been 
implemented. Yet it remains the key to the success of 
the plan.

Given all the problems with philanthropy identified in 
Chapter 1, there is simply no other way to mobilize 
the private sector than through a leadership group of 
peers. In Silicon Valley, this will be a special chal-


43 San Jose Arts 20/20, 1988, p.9.
44 Arts 20/20 Master Plan: Five Year Status Report, San Jose 
or even a problem. As one chief executive put it in an interview: “We in the business community tend to come together rarely and generally around emergencies related to our businesses; once we address these problems, we go back to our respective individual worlds. We don’t do our community or philanthropic business — such that we do it at all — at the country club like happens in other places. In many ways, I like that about us. But it does present challenges.”

Resources

The cost of implementing this plan could be $250 million or even more over the next decade if all the strategies recommended are fully implemented. From the perspective of what San Jose/Santa Clara County has done in the past for arts and culture, that is a very large number.

Inspiring confidence while looking at what may appear to be an overwhelmingly ambitious price tag will be a critical challenge for those who champion this plan. It is important that they are able to explain that not every initiative or strategy has to be tackled right away and that the plan can be achieved in phases. Some phases could take longer to achieve than the decade that has been suggested here. Others may be implemented quickly and effortlessly. But it is important that the grand vision continue to inspire those who will be responsible for carrying the plan forward.

In addition, it will be important for people to be able to point out to skeptics that similar projects on this scale have been carried out in other communities around the country and in even less time. Two examples were cited in Part I of the report. One was Pittsburgh, a city that developed its magnificent cultural district through a partnership of public and private investment at a time when its economy was deteriorating. Another was Charlotte/Mecklenburg County (in North Carolina) which in the seven years between 1988 and 1995 invested more on a per capita basis in its
arts and cultural infrastructure than is being recommended in this plan. The overwhelming share of that investment came from the private sector. Seattle and Minneapolis are also good examples.

To assert that the financial capacity exists in San Jose/Silicon Valley to raise the money to implement this plan is to state the obvious. There are extraordinary financial resources on which to draw. One small example of the truth of this assertion is given by the following calculation. As stated in Chapter 1, between 1990 and 1995, fifty billion dollars of new personal wealth was created among the top five officers/executives of those corporations that went public in Silicon Valley. Taking conservative numbers from other communities, imagine the following scenario:

- These individuals decide, on average, to give 5% of their new wealth to charity, a not unreasonable scenario given the tax advantages and the opportunity to do something substantial for their communities (it is significantly less than what an earlier generation of the Valley’s high tech leaders, William Hewlett and David Packard, did with their new wealth). This 5% represents $2.5 billion.

- Under a most conservative scenario, all of this new charitable money is put into endowments or foundations and only 5% of the income is utilized on an annual basis. This leads to $125 million annually available for charitable giving.

- Of this amount, 15% is dedicated to the arts and culture (again a fairly conservative assumption based on national statistics) but only 10% goes to local arts and culture. This leads to $12.5 million annually given to local arts and culture.

- On the basis of a ten-year implementation schedule for the plan, the total giving of these individuals
alone ($12.5 million times ten years or $125 million) could underwrite half of the cost of the plan. Naturally, this apocryphal approach to funding the plan is based on nothing more than a manipulation of numbers. But it should certainly make the point about financial capacity. It would be difficult to find a community in modern times that has amassed so much financial capacity in such a short time to fund the kinds of strategies described in this report. With the potential of wealthy individuals, supplemented by local workplace giving programs, foundations with newly increased assets (like the David and Lucile Packard Foundation), and corporate support, the capacity for private sector funding of this plan is immense.

Public Policy

Both the City of San Jose and Santa Clara County have each developed a set of public policies that are favorable to arts and culture. Each has designated and supported a local arts agency. Each has assigned dedicated annual funding to arts support. Each has supported this cultural plan. In the case of San Jose, the favorable public policies extend to a Percent-for-Art ordinance and a commitment to build, maintain, and operate cultural facilities.

The submission of this plan provides an opportunity for both the City and County to take a close look at the future of arts and culture in the region. It may also be a good time to review some of the public policies that do (or might) exist. For example, the Percent-for-Art Ordinance in San Jose — though generous in its 2% allocation of public construction funds for art — is somewhat dated and not in sync with changing practices across the nation. In the case of the County, this may be an important time to consider a percent-for-art program, since it is involved in developing new transportation and health care systems and other major elements of the public infrastructure.
With respect to public policy and facilities, the City of San Jose may also wish to review aspects of its approach to operations and maintenance, drawing on the experience of other communities. As was mentioned earlier, many of the difficulties municipalities have experienced in this area have been addressed by privatizing certain of these functions.

**Research**

One of the great strengths of this planning process has been the willingness of the client agencies to invest in research. Four separate strands of research projects were launched (reported in detail in Part III) resulting in:

- two random sample surveys of City and County residents to gather information on arts and cultural interests, attitudes, opinions, and attendance of the general public
- an inventory of cultural facilities, activities, and attendance at more than thirty venues in the City and County together with a comparison of the available facility supply in fifteen metropolitan areas around the country
- a quantitative survey of arts education offerings, personnel, and funding provided by public schools in more than thirty school districts and selected private schools throughout the County
- a quantitative survey of arts education programs (both school based and community based) and the organizations that provided them.

This research made possible a high level of quantitative specificity leading to greater reliability of findings. It also allowed the consultants to test many of the widely held beliefs about the local arts and cultural landscape, some of which did not stand up under rigorous analysis (as discussed earlier in this report).
Valuable as this information is, it would become infinitely more so if it was part of a benchmarking process that allowed the community to chart trends in the arts over time. Very little of this kind of longitudinal research is currently done in San Jose/Santa Clara County in the area of arts and culture. If the plan is to be monitored in any kind of rigorous way, systems have to be established so that the research can take place.

**Recommended Actions**

**Strategy 5.1: Identity/Geography**

**Strategy 5.1:**
During the course of the period of plan implementation, a new “Silicon Valley” identity and geography should be developed to encompass the boundaries of cultural development.

The success of the plan will depend on the positive acceptance and involvement of a number of important individuals who neither live nor work in San Jose/Santa Clara County. Many others who will be important to the plan may live or work in the area but identify far more with the larger geographic area called Silicon Valley. In time, as implementation moves forward, there would be many advantages to expanding the scope of the cultural geography to encompass this larger area.

Silicon Valley takes in a part of three counties and the complexities of negotiating appropriate public and

---

45 Joint Venture: Silicon Valley collects a limited amount of information on the arts for its annual survey.

46 Though there is no legal boundary for Silicon Valley and opinions differ about which areas are included, most people are content with the definition of the area that is utilized by Joint Venture: Silicon Valley.
private sector relationships and understandings will not be easy. As but one example, the California Arts Council has long established granting relationships with county-based local arts agencies and independent, designated arts councils would have to be willing to work out a way to participate or give up some autonomy. Whatever needs to be considered and examined, it is recommended that a start be made early in the implementation phase of the process.

What is being recommended here is nothing new. When it came time for the City of San Jose to update its original arts plan, Arts 20/20, it made the enlightened decision to collaborate with the Arts Council representing County interests. As this report — 20/21 — gradually is translated into reality, a further shift should be made to expand the geographic bounds of the plan once again. Not only will this allow greater potential for arts support locally, it will immensely enhance the potential identity of the plan for national funders.

Estimated Cost: 0

**Strategy 5.2: Leadership**

**Strategy 5.2:**
A private sector leadership group with access to the wealth of the area should come together and plan how resources and support of all kinds can be marshaled to implement and fund this plan.

Since 1988, the need for a leadership group has been clear. Today, with such an ambitious plan, it is even clearer. High level private sector leadership must come together to provide the necessary identity, resources, public policy, research, and advocacy/visibility for arts and culture to translate this plan into reality. One can point to great cities of arts and culture in the United States which have lit-
tle or no public sector leadership or support for the arts (e.g., Cleveland, Philadelphia). But no such city exists without the kind of private sector leadership group recommended here. For those cities that successfully transformed themselves into world-class cities of arts and culture in a very short time (e.g., Seattle, Minneapolis), it was again a private sector leadership group that was largely responsible.

Based on the experience of other communities and key interviews in the region during the planning process, it is critical to the success of this effort that all of the following recommendations are adopted:

- **First**, if a primary goal is to tap private wealth, limiting the group to corporate executives may be counter-productive (as has been tried in San Jose). Much of the wealth of the area is in the hands of private individuals and foundations and these representatives should be at the table.
- **Second**, only individuals who have direct access and/or control of financial resources should be part of the group. This means individuals of wealth, corporate chief executives, and foundation officers.
- **Third**, only members of the group should be allowed to attend meetings. There should be no delegation to others or it will soon deteriorate into a second or third-level group.
- **Finally**, if the intent is to have the private sector take the primary leadership role, it will be most appropriate for the private sector representatives themselves to be responsible for convening the group. *Arts 20/20* recommended otherwise which at the time may well have been wise. But today, the importance of this group being perceived as the result of private sector initiative is crucial.

*Estimated Cost: 0*
Strategy 5.3: Private Sector Fund Raising

Strategy 5.3:
A ten-year private sector funding strategy should be put together by the leadership group, including mechanisms for who will be responsible for raising different types of money and which agencies will be responsible for administering the various categories of funds.

It is one thing to assert that the resources required to implement this plan are available in the private sector. It is another to develop the plan and implementation strategies to raise the money. The classic way to accomplish a task like this is to do a feasibility study and to follow that up with some consulting assistance with implementation, helping the leadership group develop their strategies in approaching givers. One of the more successful capital campaigns to date — that of the Tech Museum — was done this way with research and professional consultation.

In this case, the analysis and the fund raising will be more complicated. No single group or organization will do all the fund raising or distribute all the money and the mechanisms by which money will be raised will be complex, multi-faceted and many layered. Indeed, the success of this plan will be that there will be many fund-raising efforts for different aspects of the plan, some involving the leadership group directly, some occurring within specific cultural organizations, some aimed at increasing earned income.

Thus the fund-raising planning will involve not only the classic analyses of the giving potential and possible predilections of wealthy individuals, corporations, and foundations (including national foundations), but it will also involve an analysis of other types of private fund-raising efforts — such as workplace giving (where employees designate a portion
of their pay to arts and culture) or the special efforts of Parent Teacher organizations and school-based support groups. Because the funding will come from many streams — including increased earned income to cultural groups — a broad-based community cultural budgeting process may also be required.47

Once the leadership group is in place, the next order of business will be to develop the overall resource development plan. Because it will be a ten-year plan, it will need to be regularly updated. Adequate funding should ensure that this work gets done by a qualified and experienced professionals.

Estimated Cost: Feasibility study: $75,000 - $100,000 (one time); cultural budget: $35,000 (one time); plus possible ongoing fund-raising consulting @ 70,000-110,000/year.

**Strategy 5.4: Public Sector Support**

Strategy 5.4:
The leadership group should develop a plan for recognizing public sector leadership and increasing public sector support, including the exploration of dedicated taxes for arts and culture.

---

47 A community cultural budget takes all current culturally-related revenue and expense for a community and develops multi-year projections based on a number of factors including the strategies identified during a planning process. The projections are derived from data collected about current earned and contributed income and spending. The data generally include one year of historical financial information and one year of approved budgeted data, and the projected budgets are based on assessments of income potential, audience trends, population, and inflation projections. Capital expenditures for facilities are included in the projections, but they are differentiated from program expenses.
While the success of this plan will depend partly on the effectiveness of the leadership group in mobilizing the private sector, the public sector will also have a major role in funding. A crucial step in this process is creating a milieu in which public officials receive public affirmation and acclaim for advocating public support for the arts. The private sector leadership group should develop the proper advocacy and public relations mechanisms to assure that this occurs.

Another important step must include convincing current public funding bodies that their support is necessary and must increase. Some areas of the plan — such as community and neighborhood arts — relate directly to public priorities that extend well beyond the arts and are natural for enhanced public funding. Others will also dramatically improve the area as a destination and will contribute directly to economic development. The development of San Jose in particular has been positively impacted by the investment of public funding in the arts — in facilities, organizations, programs, and initiatives. This is a story that can be documented and used in continued advocacy for increased dollars.

There are also a number of other obvious ways that public sector commitment can be increased:

1. Any of the various municipalities and/or the County could allocate more General Fund dollars for arts and culture.
2. Increases in revenues from Transient Occupancy Taxes (TOT) should be allocated to arts and culture — there should be no attempt to cap the amount of these funds flowing to arts and culture.
3. A greater share of existing dedicated or special taxes could be allocated to arts and culture from these same sources depending on the language of the particular tax legislation.
4. New ordinances and regulations could be enacted at the local level — such as percent-for-art — that
5. School districts will be required to allocate more of their County General Fund dollars to arts and cultural education if they wish to participate in the “High Five” program described under Strategy 2.1.

6. Special public grants can be sought from all levels of government especially for specific programs such as those in arts and cultural education or in neighborhood and community arts.

In addition to all these, there is the option of seeking special dedicated taxes for arts and cultural activities, programs, and/or facilities. Most people interviewed for this plan rejected the idea that dedicated taxes were a practical option, especially after the passage of yet another anti-tax proposition in California during the November, 1996 election. Nevertheless, the time frame for this plan is a long one. Dedicated taxes for the arts have been successful in many other locations and the option should not be ruled out.

In the public survey for this report (cf., Part III, Section 1), roughly two-thirds of those polled said they would pay an additional $5 a year in taxes to increase public funding for local arts programs, especially if the funds were devoted to arts education programs for public school children. However, as Chapter 1 made clear, with the requirement in California that any special tax increases must be supported by a two thirds majority, more advocacy work would be required before a tax measure for the arts should be taken to local residents. It would be up to the leadership group – with advice and assistance from others knowledgeable about the process – to spearhead the research and advocacy efforts.

*Estimated Cost:* Unknown at this time. May require polling and specific advocacy strategies based on results.
Strategy 5.5: Public Policy

**Strategy 5.5:**
Elected officials should review existing public art ordinances as well as policies related to the maintenance and operation of public facilities in light of contemporary practices from around the United States.

As was suggested earlier in this chapter, this is an opportune time for elected officials to review public policies that could have an impact on the future of arts and culture in general and the success of this plan in particular. Two areas are specifically recommended for review:
Percent-for-Art

San Jose’s Percent-for-Art program has now celebrated the end of its first decade. The program, appropriately designed for its time, has served the City well, creating much new work that can be enjoyed by local residents and visitors. But in the intervening ten years, the public art field has changed considerably. One of the most important changes is a movement away from using every percent-for-art allocation to adorn the site (usually the building) being developed. Today, there is a great deal of interest in utilizing the funding more creatively for urban design projects connected with public infrastructure—projects along highways, land fills, sound walls, etc. At the same time there is a recognition that there needs to be a mechanism to address long term care of what in many places has become an extensive public art collection. In addition to creating public art, a percent-for-art ordinance has to provide for its maintenance. Finally, any review of the existing ordinance could explore some of the art in private development models that have been so successful in other cities.

At the County level in Santa Clara, there is no percent-for-art ordinance. As was mentioned earlier in the chapter, this is a major short-coming since transportation and health care systems and other major elements of public infrastructure are being built by counties at this time. Santa Clara County, despite a fairly enlightened view about the place of the arts in the community, is one of the few counties in California that does not have an ordinance or a program. This may be an excellent time to address the issue.

Facilities

Just as cities (and counties) across the nation are addressing the issue of caring for public art, so too are they dealing with the maintenance and operational issues connected with the cultural facilities they own. The cost of operating, maintaining, and con-
stantly modernizing and upgrading public arts facilities is increasing at just the time when there are fewer General Fund dollars in many places to pay the bills.

Increasingly, cities are turning facilities over to private operators — generally nonprofits (and occasionally arts organization tenants) who, in many cases, are able to operate the facilities less expensively. In addition, these private sector facility managers (when they are nonprofits) have an advantage over a municipal or county governmental unit — it is easier for them to fund raise from the private sector. A gift of or for upgraded theatrical equipment, for example, can be secured much more easily by a private operator than by a governmental unit.

There are a number of municipalities in the region that operate facilities and all could review the policies they have established. In San Jose, where there are the largest number of publicly operated cultural facilities, the situation is complicated by the fact that cultural organizations share these facilities in many cases with convention interests that are, again, part of City government. Nevertheless, a thorough review is still warranted.

Estimated Cost: $35,000 - $50,000 for each review to the extent that they require an outside planner/consultant.

**Strategy 5.6: Research**

An ongoing system of research and benchmarking should be established to monitor progress on the implementation of the plan.

One absolute prerequisite for this plan — if it is to be implemented — is that it will have to have clear
and measurable targets in a number of areas and that a program of rigorous data collection and analysis will have to be built into the process.

The planning process itself established initial data sets from which specific benchmarks and targets can be established. But those who invest in the plan need to be assured that the systems are in place to analyze whether these have been achieved. According to some of the interviewees for this plan—especially those who were potential funders of this plan—there was a persistent complaint that arts evaluation is soft and not very dependable. This plan has underscored the point that this does not have to be the case. Building on its credibility can be an important step in reassuring the skeptics.

There remains the question of who should do the research. In other communities, one inexpensive way to collect information—at least from the cultural community itself—is to require it as part of the routine business of grantmaking. Several arts agencies, for example, have designed their application forms such that much basic information is routinely collected. Some years ago, the National Endowment for the Arts developed standards for much of this data collection and the so-called NISP standard would allow San Jose/Santa Clara County to compare itself to other communities using the system.

Another option is to work through other organizations that routinely collect data about the area. One of these is Joint Venture: Silicon Valley that does collect some “arts” data as part of its annual survey. Though the data it currently collects is not specifically appropriate to the what would be required, perhaps some accommodation could be made, especially if it were seen to be in the best interests of the community at large. Indeed, the credibility that this organization would bring to the process would make it an excellent “objective” partner in carrying out this strategy.
Estimated Cost: 0 to $50,000/year depending on complexity of data collection and analysis and whether it could be secured on a donated basis.
Chapter 6
The Planning Process

This section details the elements of the cultural planning process in San Jose/Santa Clara County including its history and accomplishments to date and subsequent steps to be taken. In addition to summarizing the major elements of the process, it highlights the two features of the process that were unique:

• First, this planning process marked the first time that a public City arts agency and a private non-profit arts agency (in this case, representing a County) successfully joined forces to create a single planning process. The process allowed them to create a common vision for their overlapping constituencies but also made it possible for each to maintain its autonomy and distinctness in developing separate agency plans for implementation.

• The plan is the most comprehensive of its kind ever carried out in the United States. The public process involved over fifty open meetings conducted in various parts of the County. There were hundreds of interviews, two statistically-based surveys of the general public, a facility inventory, and special research on arts education in schools and in the community. Three national consulting firms — each noted for its work in cultural planning — assisted with various parts of the process.
The Decision to Plan Together

In 1995, the City of San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs met with the Arts Council of Santa Clara County to discuss their intentions of carrying out planning processes. Each saw some advantages in working with the other. Yet both wanted to maintain enough autonomy in planning to preserve the ability to develop independent implementation plans.

The Concept

The two agencies agreed on an innovative idea of developing a “parallel” and linked strategic planning process. In this way, they could address the issues of overlapping constituencies and mutual concerns while at the same time acknowledging what was distinct about each agency – administrative structure, the mix of programs and services each offers, and the specific agency issues each faces. A parallel planning process also allowed for economies of scale by combining those elements (such as formal research) that were not uniquely tied to either group. But it did not preclude autonomous action and independent lines of thought.

The Agencies

As already mentioned, the two agencies that oversaw these linked planning processes were quite different in administrative structure and history:

- The City of San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs (OCA) is a division of a larger department of the City (the Conventions, Arts, and Entertainment Department). It administers a citizens’ advisory commission appointed by the City Council that was originally established a quarter century ago.

- The Arts Council of Santa Clara County (ACSCC) is a private, nonprofit organization governed by a Board of Trustees of nearly thirty who are appointed, designated, and elected. It receives some of its fund-
The overall goals of the plan required a regional needs assessment with a strategic vision for the cultural life of the area. This involved considerable public process and broad community input. It also required research on such areas as education, facilities, cultural diversity, and support for institutions and artists. The goals made it logical to examine the specific program options of the two agencies, developing an initial plan that maximized coordination, effective use of resources, and dynamic synergy. Finally, the planning process was intended to address the overall question of funding, developing strategies to assure adequate resources to implement whatever ideas developed.

**Precedents**

Though there have been merged city/county cultural planning processes in the past in such areas as Houston/Harris County (Texas) and Charlotte/Mecklenberg County (North Carolina), in each case a single agency took responsibility for planning and developed the plan for both jurisdictions. In the case of Houston and Charlotte, only a single agency existed to carry out the plan. However, in other cases – such as the Portland, Oregon area where a plan was carried out for a City and four counties – very much smaller County agencies were happy to cede responsibility to the large City entity. In San Jose/Santa Clara County, there existed two agencies that were capable of carrying out independent plans on their own. Yet, they chose to cooperate on the process described below.

**Review Processes for the Plan**

At the time the planning process was conceived, it was recognized that each agency would require a different process of review. For the Office of Cultural Affairs, a several step City review process would precede final
review and ultimate acceptance by the San Jose City Council. For the Arts Council of Santa Clara County, the review process would be simpler and would require only a review and approval by the organization’s Board of Directors. Each would also have differing processes whereby implementation strategies would be developed. The spirit of cooperation and collaboration was to guide this part of the process as well.

**Overseeing the Process**

**Steering and Oversight Committees**

At the beginning of the process, it was decided that the City and the Arts Council should have separate committees to oversee the process of planning. Thus, an Oversight Committee for the City appointed by the Mayor of San Jose and a Steering Committee appointed by the Arts Council met on subsequent nights periodically throughout the spring and early fall to review and comment on the work. By late fall of 1996, it was clear that there was no need to maintain two separate oversight bodies. The two committees were merged in the name of cooperation, efficiency, and developing a coordinated advocacy strategy.

**The Coordinating Committee**

Finally, in setting up the structure of the planning process it was agreed to establish a Coordinating Committee to supervise the day-to-day details of planning. This Committee was composed of an equal number of representatives from each agency. The group met frequently during the process and developed liaison with the oversight groups through their respective chairs.
Mechanics of Pre-Planning

Selecting Consultants

In late 1995, a Request for Proposals was jointly developed by the two agencies. A joint selection committee was appointed to select the consultants (with an equal number of representatives from both agencies). It resulted in the selection of a number of consulting firms as follows:

- The Wolf Organization, Inc.48 of Cambridge, Massachusetts was selected as the overall coordinator of the planning process. Several individuals were added to the team who had particular knowledge of the Bay Area and were representative of the many cultures in San Jose/Santa Clara County. The Wolf Organization, Inc. suggested a number of other firms to assist that were approved for the process:
  - Keens Company of Falls Church, Virginia assisted with public and community process.
  - Harvard Project PACE of Cambridge, Massachusetts oversaw the arts education research and planning.
  - AMS Planning and Research Corp., with offices in Petaluma, California, conducted general public surveys and research on cultural facilities.

The Timeline

March, 1996

Background Information

The planning process officially got under way in March of 1996 with intensive interviews with representatives of both agencies, people in the community with an in-

interest in the arts and culture, and general background research on San Jose/Santa Clara County. A library of information was collected about the area that included:

- current demographic information and planning studies related to San Jose and Santa Clara County
- information about the Office of Cultural Affairs and the Arts Council of Santa Clara County
- information about arts organizations, events, and artists in the City and County
- recent studies and other relevant projects undertaken by City and County, especially those that had relevance for the cultural sector
- information about industry and economic development in the region
- information on private philanthropy and public funding for arts and cultural activities and institutions in the City and County
- information on City and/or County agencies that might have interest or involvement in cultural activities in the broadest sense.

**Introductory Meetings**

Introductory meetings were held with each of the agencies and with the larger public to provide information about the plan and the process. This provided an opportunity to gather names and contact information on individuals who might become involved in the process in some way. Many individuals volunteered and gave names of others who might be interested. Everyone who wished to become involved was able, during the course of the planning process, to play a key role in one or another of the components of effort.

**April to June, 1996**

**Focus Groups**
During this period several Focus Groups were held on the following topics:

- Artists
- Arts Education
- Arts and Technology
- Cultural Diversity
- Economic Impact, Marketing, and Cultural Tourism
- Facilities
- Festivals and Events
- Grantmaking and Arts Organization Stabilization
- Neighborhoods and Community Arts
- Partnerships and Collaborations
- Public Art
- Regionalism
- Special Populations
- Technical Assistance
- Traditional Arts.

For each Focus Group, a background “Situation Paper” was prepared by the consultants based on their research as well as on discussions with agency staff. Each paper provided background on the particular issue and suggested planning options. Some participants were invited and others volunteered to participate in a focus group. Each was sent the paper in advance. During the meeting, participants discussed the issue and reacted to the options listed in the paper. The paper was then revised for further discussion in public meetings. Each paper was revised over the next several months as people reacted to it.

Two additional issues were originally highlighted for consideration as focus group topics:

- Leadership
- Resources.
After some consideration, it was decided that these should be researched and discussed in a different way (which is described later in this part of the report).

**Establishing Internet Communication and Discussion**

As part of the planning process, a World Wide Web site was developed. This provided another opportunity for the public to react to the process as it moved forward and to communicate directly with the consultants and with each other. All situation papers were posted both in their original and revised versions and comment was invited on each.

In addition to the Web site, a small e-mail group was established among consultants and staff of the two agencies to carry on daily discussions about the progress and the logistics of the plan as it moved forward.

**June to October, 1996**

**Statistically-based Survey Research**

In the next phase of planning, much of the statistically-based research phase was initiated. This included:

- two random sample surveys of City and County residents to gather information on arts and cultural interests, attitudes, opinions, and attendance of the general public
- an inventory of cultural facilities, activities, and attendance at more than thirty venues in the City and County together with a comparison of the available facility supply in fifteen metropolitan areas around the country
- a quantitative survey of arts education offerings, personnel, and funding provided by more than thirty school districts and selected private schools throughout the County
• a quantitative survey of arts education programs (both school-based and community-based) and the organizations that provided them.

This research is summarized in Part III of the report and reproduced in more complete form in the appendices.
Organizational Assessment Work

The consultants conducted an organizational review of existing programs, activities, funding, structure, and staffing of the San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs through a series of interviews with key staff and Commission members and at a Saturday retreat. They also conducted an organizational needs assessment of the existing programs, activities, funding, structure, and staffing of the Arts Council of Santa Clara County, as well as a strategic visioning process at a Saturday retreat to explore such issues as governance, programs, funding, staffing, and other related issues. This organizational assessment work helped clarify roles that each agency might play in the future development of the arts and culture in San Jose/Santa Clara County.

Open Public Meetings

A series of public, community meetings were held in order to assure easy access to the planning process by City and County residents. It also provided an opportunity for artists and representatives of cultural organizations who might not have had an opportunity to add their concerns, ideas, and opinions to do so. These open meetings were designed to gather ideas and concerns on a broad range of topics. In one case — the public meeting in Palo Alto — the meeting was televised.

October, 1996 to January, 1997

Task Forces

Based on the work of the Focus Groups, several areas were identified for further analysis by local participants. These included:

- Arts and Technology
- Artists’ Issues
Groups of interested individuals convened several times to discuss the related issues and options and to develop specific strategies that could be provided to the planning process.

**Preparation of Preliminary “Themes and Initiatives” Paper**

In November, a Preliminary “Themes and Initiatives” paper was prepared for review by the Steering Committees. The intent was to try to synthesize all the information collected to date and to develop an outline and structure for the plan itself. After the Steering Committees made suggestions for revision, the paper was circulated to the staffs of the two client agencies for their comments and was also utilized as a background information piece for many of the concluding interviews with community members, arts groups, and corporate leaders.

**Community and Neighborhood Meetings**

Based on the explicit desire to penetrate deeply into the community and neighborhoods of San Jose in order to assess the aspirations and reactions of people on the future of arts and culture in the region, members of the San Jose Arts Commission agreed to conduct thirty meetings with community and neighborhood groups. In these sessions, the goals and process of the plan were explained to people and participants were invited to give their own views about what the plan should contain.

**Leadership Interviews**

In order to address the specific questions of leadership and resource development, the consultants interviewed leaders in the business and philanthropic
community. Several Silicon Valley chief executives agreed to participate in this phase of the process and their opinions form the basis for much of the material in Chapters 1 and 5 of this report. During this phase, the consultants also interviewed selected elected officials throughout Santa Clara County as well as leaders from the higher education, legal, and financial communities.
February to May, 1997

Initial Review and Revision of Draft Plan

A preliminary draft of the plan (the first version of this report) was prepared for review by the joint Steering Committee in February, 1997. This March, 1997 version reflects their comments and suggestions as well as those of others who reviewed the draft. With the Steering Committee’s official endorsement, this version is moving forward to other review bodies for acceptance. Public reaction to the plan will continue to be solicited for six months and additional written comments — submitted either to the Arts Council of Santa Clara County or the City of San Jose Office of Cultural Affairs — will be made part of the public record.

Development of Agency Plan

The Arts Council of Santa Clara County will work with the consultants to develop its own agency plan that reflects its particular role in carrying out aspects of the initiatives and strategies contained in this report. This agency plan is being commissioned separately and will not be reviewed by the Steering Committee or representatives of the City.

After May, 1997

Follow-up Planning and Piloting

Based on the final list of what is approved, further planning work will have to be done in such areas as facility development, arts education, fund-raising feasibility work, and other areas. Several programs may be initially piloted and tested before they are implemented.

Fund Raising
Initial fund raising can begin as soon as the plan is approved (ground work can be laid even before the approvals are complete). It is likely that a few components of the plan that will be of particular interest to specific donors/funders may receive some initial funding to begin quickly. Other funding may take several years to secure. A fund-raising plan will be an important component of the follow-up work.