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Executive Summary

Project Background
Continental Harmony is a new music program; in its inaugural millennium year round, in partnership with the National Endowment for the Arts, fifty-eight community-based commissions and residencies, at least one in every state, were mounted. The program’s guiding principle is for American Composers Forum to provide assistance and encouragement to local groups to define a theme which provides a meaningful way for the community to celebrate itself with music. Each composition is written for local musical forces, by a composer selected by the people in the local community. This program is unique in both its scope and in its “grass-roots” organizational structure. American Composers Forum staff serve as brokers, facilitators, and occasionally coaches in bringing the participating communities together with composers for their artistic partnership. The Forum believes that local groups in small towns and urban neighborhoods have both the aesthetic judgment and organizational ability to carry out such a partnership.

Based on this firm commitment to a community-based model of art-making, the Forum issued a call for community hosts in the fall of 1998. A national panel chose the communities and the projects were advertised to composers; composers then applied directly to the sites in which they were interested. The site committees completed their composer selections by Spring of 1999.

Assessment Methodology
Continental Harmony evaluators used an eight-fold multi-dimensional data collection procedure, both qualitative and quantitative, to provide information on two basic research questions:

1. Can programs be developed to create enduring links between artists (composers in this case) and communities?
2. If so, what processes or practices contribute to or limit the creation of those links?

The specific procedures used were: composer journals, pre- and post-tests, general program questionnaire, third party interviews, radio documentaries, demographic and socio-cultural analysis, participant observation at sites, and program documents (press, programs, etc.)

Very early in the project, participating composers and community sponsors were asked to define what a successful outcome of this community-based composer residency would look like. The contributed criteria for determining success were transformed into testable thesis statements to guide the process of data collection and analysis.

Long term composer residencies that are community-initiated and community-based will:
1. have a measurable and lasting positive impact on local music and/or arts communities
2. have a measurable and lasting positive impact on sponsoring organizations
3. have a measurable and lasting positive impact on local community development.
4. increase awareness, understanding and appreciation of composers and their work among participants and other community members.
5. produce works of merit.
6. be judged positively by those who participate directly.
7. demonstrably benefit participating composers.

Well into the project an eighth thesis emerged:
8. be judged to have been well-managed and coordinated by participants

To allow for both breadth and depth of data, some information was collected for all 58 sites, while 15 sites (the target sites) representative of the program were selected for intensive observation.

Findings
A. General Findings
Quantitative data is drawn from four sources, three of which (interviews, survey, radio documentaries) focus on the 15 target sites and the last from the pre- and post-test analysis of 22 sites and 20 composers for whom complete data was available as of 6/30/2001. Qualitative data is drawn from these four sources as well as composer journals, program documents, and impressions gained from site visits and other forms of interaction with participants.

1. An overview of all data sources shows the generally positive evaluation of the program.
2. The majority of the 58 projects feel they were successful in achieving the artistic and community impact goals of the program.
3. The area evoking the largest positive response was the question of the program’s impact on the local arts community and on the participating composers.
4. The overall impact of the Continental Harmony projects was greater in the rural communities than in the urban.

B. Specific Findings Related to the 8 Thesis Statements
1. Impact on the Arts in Community
   1.1. Both composers and community respondents felt that the program’s impact on the community arts environment was very positive.
   1.2. Interdisciplinary collaborations were an important contributor to project success in many communities.
   1.3. Positive impact on the music community was seen as particularly strong.
   1.4. The relationship of the local sites to governmental bodies, especially state arts agencies, in this project was mixed.
   1.5. Similar mixed results characterized relations with the media.
1.6. A notable minority of communities studied has committed to similar future projects.

2. Impact on Sponsor Organization.
While the *Continental Harmony* program had many positive effects on the participating sponsor organizations, the organizational demands of the program also produced a number of negatives. Many organizations cited both positive and negative impacts.

2.1. *The most common organizational benefit to sponsors was organizational growth or improvement.*
2.2. *Many of the 15 organizations studied had management problems during the course of the program.*

3. Impact on Community Development
3.1 The *Continental Harmony* program made substantial contributions to community development in participating communities.
3.2 Relations between estranged or divided communities were perceived as having improved as a result of participation.
3.3 Many *Continental Harmony* communities saw cultural participation expand and diversify during the project.
3.4 The *Continental Harmony* program was often seen as contributing to the community’s ability to work together on common problems and to enhance a sense of community, especially among the young.
3.5 The *Continental Harmony* program was seen to have contributed to the community’s sense of place, including its environment.

4. Impact on Awareness, Appreciation and Understanding of Composers and Their Work.
A majority of sites found their interaction with a composer to be satisfactory, in many cases quite gratifying.

4.1 The *Continental Harmony* program increased the awareness and appreciation of composing in a majority of the communities studied.
4.2 School based aspects of the program did not meet expectations at most sites.
4.3 Formal and informal composer interaction and presentations were the most effective public education aspect of the program.

5. Production of a work of merit.
There is, of course, no objective way, especially over the short-term, to measure the merit of a work of art. However, it is possible to measure opinions at a particular point in time, in this case a few months after the performance of the music.

5.1 Many communities and composers are still assessing the relative quality of the work produced. While opinions are not yet firmly established, at this point both composers and communities believe that a work of merit was produced.
5.2 Composers and sponsors perceived the performance aspect of the program differently.
6. Impact on those who participate directly or indirectly.
6.1 The prevailing opinion is that a significant number of people were touched directly by the project and that this experience generally was of quality and depth.

7. Impact on Participating Composers
7.1 Composers saw Continental Harmony as benefiting their musical development.
7.2 Composers saw the program as beneficial to their careers.
7.3 Continental Harmony provided a wide variety of creative and stimulating opportunities for composers.

8. Continental Harmony is Judged to Have Been Well Managed and Coordinated by Participants.
8.1 The number of partners involved increased the complexity of the project.
8.2 Composers were positive about ACF support.
8.3 Composers were somewhat less positive about the management of their residency by their site hosts.
8.4 Sponsor views on the interaction with ACF and their composers were more mixed.
8.5 The program was seen as well designed and well organized by sponsors and composers.

Implications for the Field
As Continental Harmony unfolded, American Composers Forum realized that the program held the potential for more than locally planned musical celebrations of the millennium: organizational, artistic, and community development results beyond what had been expected were occurring. Thus, ACF now sees the lessons learned from its Continental Harmony program as contributing to the emerging field of arts-based community development. By arts-based community development we mean using the arts as one strategy to:

- Broaden and deepen cultural participation
- Create and/or strengthen collaborative partnerships
- Enhance community awareness of and pride in history, culture, and natural environment
- Build bridges among possibly estranged community groups
- Increase skills in planning, leadership, consensus-building, fund-raising, and program administration
- Contribute to individual and community health and wellness

Arts-based community development is a new, evolving field. It is not uncommon to speak of conflict resolution, public safety, economic development and community revitalization as potential outcomes of arts projects. The findings in this report suggest that these are not spurious assertions. However, while there have been many local projects, well-articulated theory and rigorous, replicable research protocols are still being developed. Therefore, much study remains to be done before comprehensive theoretical models can be developed.

The implications of the place of artist residencies for this new area of arts-based community development, as derived from the Continental Harmony evaluation data, are directed in turn at Funders, Community Hosts, and Artists.
For Funders

Effectively implemented community-based artist residencies have the potential to:

- Develop organizational infrastructure in relatively small and/or inexperienced arts organizations and encourage more inclusive modes of operation in larger ones.
- Provide a win-win approach to community development issues.
- Strengthen community ties and sense of place.
- Expand and deepen cultural participation.
- Raise the bar of aesthetic practice for artists and participating communities.
- Increase awareness and appreciation of the work of artists.

To enjoy these results, the residencies need:

1. Careful brokering and nurturing.
   1.1 An outcomes based investment strategy can build capacities and promote creativity among all partners.
   1.2 The building of organizational capacities and leadership can be an outcome of such residencies, even in relatively inexperienced organizations.
   1.3 Planning and design are as important as creation and presentation and should be supported as such.

2. To be structured as collaborative partnerships among sponsor, artist, and, in some cases, an outside agent seen as creditable.
   2.1 Collaborative relationships among community groups, although often very difficult to establish and maintain, provide one of the best ways to ensure wide participation in and identification with the project.
   2.2 It is useful to view community partnerships as developmental relationships which evolve over time.

3. To speak to important aspects of the community’s story.
   3.1 The ecology of the histories and stories that form a community’s identity need to be treated with utmost care and respect.
   3.2 Community ownership is pivotal and requires participatory processes throughout, i.e. opportunity for and full participation in critical decisions.
   3.3 Invest in quality over quantity.
   3.4 Avoid unfunded mandates.

For Community Hosts

Having an artist work in a community has the potential to:

- Bring various segments of the community together in a cooperative effort.
- Heighten the sense of pride, place, and social solidarity.
- Enhance the reputation of the sponsoring organization to funders, potential supporters, and the community at large.
- Provide opportunity for honing organizational skills in public relations, fund-raising, collaborations.
- Establish potentially long-lasting connections among community organizations, both arts and non-arts.
• Result in a prideful telling of the community’s story
• Strengthen the arts community as a whole

To enjoy these results fully, community leaders will probably need to:

1. **Commit a substantial amount of time and other resources, including money.**
   1.1 Anticipate that the project will need more time and money than initial estimates.
   1.2 Free labor is expensive.
   1.3 Just one person cannot accomplish a large, community-based arts project.

2. **Work collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders.**
   2.1 Cross-sector collaboration is a very desirable part of a project that is designed to have broad support and impact on the community.
   2.2 Collaborative art making is difficult, cumbersome and messy.
   2.3 Healthy community partnerships are built on trust.
   2.4 Work to continue the collaborations and connections once the project is complete.

3. **Be flexible and adaptable in project design and implementation.**
   3.1 Anticipate change.
   3.2 Distinguish between those activities that can accommodate amateur support and those that require professional experience.
   3.3 Consider non-traditional venues, locations, and audiences.

4. **Establish a professional relationship with the resident artist, and provide him/her with the resources needed to learn and create.**
   4.1 Use the highest quality artists.
   4.2 Put the resident artist in touch with as broad a spectrum of community people as possible and provide him/her with sufficient unstructured opportunities.
   4.3 Artists need time to reflect in order to spark a creative telling of the community’s story.
   4.4 Negotiate and document a partnership agreement.

**For Artists:**

**Community-based artist residencies have the potential to:**
• Provide new aesthetic and technical challenges
• Establish deep relationships with community hosts
• Create collaborative creative partnerships
• Widen the range of artistic opportunities available, and hence benefit career

**To experience these results, the artist needs to be:**

1. **Willing to work with others of varying levels of artistic sophistication.**
   1.1 Amateur and professional artmaking are different.
   1.2 Stay the course artistically.
2. Genuinely interested in the community’s story.
   2.1 The disciplined learning of a community’s culture is an indispensable part of building community trust.
   2.2 Local landscape, literature, culture, history, etc. are wonderful sources of artistic inspiration.

3. Sensitive to community social, political, and economic structure.
   3.1 Community work demands a new and complex skill-set from artists, including artistic ability, diplomatic skills, and a strong interest in community collaboration.
   3.2 Artists competing for commissions that involve community engagement should pay as much attention to a sponsor’s “street” credibility as they do the bottom line.
   3.3 Communication skills are key.

4. Able to articulate one’s role and needs as an artist.
   4.1 A contract which clearly sets the parameters of the residency is a must.
   4.2 Learn how to say no.
   4.3 Be aware that art making on commission to a community is different from answering only to one’s own inner artistic vision.
**Continental Harmony: A Case Study in Community-based Arts**

This report describes the findings from the assessment study of *Continental Harmony*, a millennium initiative of American Composers Forum in partnership with the National Endowment for the Arts.\(^1\) The structure of the report is as follows:

1) **Program Background**: A description of the program and the observation model devised to assess the impact of this community-based arts program on its participants and sponsors.

2) **Findings**: An analysis of data from the 58 project sites, including in-depth data from 15 of these (hereafter “target” sites)\(^2\), organized according to the eight study theses which emerged throughout the process.

3) **Recommendations and Indicators**: Suggestions for ACF and others in the field regarding positive and negative indicators that are predictive of success in community-based arts projects.

4) **Implications for the Field**: Relevant observations for future program design, evaluation, training and investment strategies for arts-based community development. This section also includes provisional schematic models showing the interplay between art-making and community development.

**I. Program Background**

**A. Program Description**

*Continental Harmony* is a new music program; in its inaugural round, culminating in the year 2000, fifty-eight community-based commissions and residencies, at least one in every state, were mounted.\(^3\) The program’s guiding principle is for American Composers Forum to provide assistance and encouragement to local groups to define a theme which would be a meaningful way for the community to celebrate itself with music. Each composition is written for local musical forces, by a composer selected by the people in the local community. This program is unique in both its scope and in its “grass-roots” organizational structure. American Composers Forum staff serve as brokers, facilitators, and occasionally coaches in bringing the participating communities together with composers for their artistic partnership. The Forum believes that local groups in small towns and urban neighborhoods have both the aesthetic judgment and organizational ability to carry out such a partnership.

In his provocative book, *A Snake’s Tail Full of Ants: Art, Ecology, and Consciousness*, British writer and artist John Lane proposes that the place of art in Western society needs to undergo a

---

\(^1\) Additional funding was provided by Rockefeller Foundation, the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Land O’Lakes, Ecolab, and the state arts boards of Illinois, Minnesota and Ohio.

\(^2\) A list of the 58 projects and associated composers is Appendix A.

\(^3\) Only one of the 58 projects, that for New Jersey, had not yet been completed as of 6/30/01. The premiere of the work for Newark Boy’s Chorus and North Jersey Philharmonic Glee Club occurred in February, 2002.
fundamental transformation. He argues that in the modern age art has become disconnected from society, that “Art (produced by Artists) exists solely for its own sake … and that it must be assessed in the manner we call ‘aesthetic’.” While this has unquestionably resulted in the creation of masterful works, Lane argues a tragic consequence has been neglect of the imagination and creative potential of ordinary people, with negative effects both on individuals and cultures.

However, recognition of the responsibilities of the arts toward the wider civic culture is becoming more widespread. For example, Americans for the Arts and the Institute for Community Development and the Arts recently launched a major initiative, “Animating Democracy: Strengthening the Role of the Arts in Civic Dialogue.” Similarly, in the foreword to the new edition of his book on the community arts movement, William Cleveland notes: “What started out seeming like a fairly contained universe has mushroomed into an ubiquitous presence in grant applications, community cultural plans, public agency initiatives, and thousands of new programs.”

From the beginning, Continental Harmony was directed especially to smaller communities and urban neighborhoods. The Forum’s significant experience and history of success in attracting new audiences, including bringing composers into rural communities or other areas less likely to have access to new music, were attractive to the National Endowment and other funders. In addition, the idea that each state should have a project seemed admirably appropriate for a national music project in celebration of the millennium year.

Acting partly on faith and partly from a firm commitment to a community-based model of art-making, the Forum issued a call for community hosts in the fall of 1998. A national panel chose the communities in late 1998. The projects were advertised to composers early in 1999; the composers then applied directly to the sites in which they were interested. The site committees reviewed the applications and selected the composer they determined best suited to their needs.

B. Assessment Methodology
ACF understood very early in the development of Continental Harmony that the project offered a unique opportunity to study the impact and processes of arts-based community engagement. The program’s focus, in terms of time, resources and intent, and the number and variety of communities, partnerships, and artists, provided a community-based lab for studying both outcomes and research methodologies applicable to the broader community arts field. It also presented major challenges, the most daunting of which was the volume and diversity of data that could be made available. Another obvious challenge was how to document and study the diversity of perspectives represented by each project’s three principal partners: the site sponsor, the composer and ACF.

---

4 p. 10.
5 pp. 25-27.
6 http://www.artsusa.org/adiweb/
7 Cleveland, *Art in Other Places*, p. xvii.
In response to the wide range and complexity of information available, research protocols were selected to provide a picture of each project’s evolving story. The researchers realized that this would have to be done in a way that did not intrude on the composer’s work and the site's project management. Another concern was balance: it was critical that the effort to document community development objectives did not take precedence over the study of aesthetic goals and processes. To accomplish all of this in a way that was manageable a two-tier evaluation process was designed. For the first tier, each of the 58 sites provided general reports, evaluations of residency activities and performances, documentary data (press coverage, photos, programs, e.g.), and a final report. For the second tier, 15 target sites, reflective of the diversity of environments and conditions of the program's full cohort, were chosen for more intense study.

1. Defining Success
A core principle guiding the Continental Harmony effort was community/composer collaboration and ownership. This meant that, although the American Composers Forum had outlined its own goals for the program, it would not impose its definition of success on the participating communities and composers. Therefore, the evaluation process would need to document, measure and test the many definitions of success that were emerging from these community/artist partnerships. A multi-stage process allowed researchers to define how the 15 target sites viewed the project’s potential outcomes.

A pre-test sent to all host sites and composers soon after their selection provided the first data. In this instrument, both groups projected what a successful outcome of the project would be. In addition, sites identified potential beneficial impacts on their organizations and communities and composers identified potential impacts on their careers. This instrument, thoroughly analyzed for the fifteen target sites, provided an extraordinary range and mix of “desired outcomes,” including everything from the celebration of community heritage, to economic revitalization and conflict resolution. Summaries of these responses were then organized on a large spreadsheet. The program sponsor, composer, and project description were listed along with four outcome/impact categories for each of the 15 programs. These categories were:

♦ Project Outcomes  ♦ Impact on Sponsor Organization
♦ Composer Outcomes  ♦ Impact on Community

In all, 178 success indicators were identified by the composers and site sponsors for the 15 target sites. Table A. below is an example of how this information was organized for Arizona’s Grand Canyon Music Festival, one of the programs studied.

---

8 The research design was devised and implemented by the staffs of American Composers Forum and The Center for the Study of Art and Community.
Table A. Detail excerpted from An Inventory of Desired Outcomes (15 Selected Sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Sponsor</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact on Organization</th>
<th>Impact on Community</th>
<th>Composer Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon Music Festival (AZ)</td>
<td>Brent Michael Davids</td>
<td>15 minute work for 3-5 musicians including flute, percussion (Native American). Two performances in 350 seat theater in Grand Canyon Park. Piece will become part of school outreach to schools on and off reservations. Musicians and composers will travel to school. Piece will become a part of Park's Environmental ed. programs</td>
<td>Piece will celebrate Grand Canyon. Students will have a new understanding of European culture. Students will have a new understanding of their own past. Students will have a new understanding of how they can fit their heritage into a contemporary American life. Lay groundwork for continuing future commissioning projects. Reach a larger public. Gain National recognition. Attract greater support.</td>
<td>Community members will have a better understanding of the artistic process. Community members will have a better understanding of meaning of culture in lives.</td>
<td>Work played in Grand Canyon setting. Bring stability to career. Opportunity to experience the land and NA culture. Chance to try new spatial techniques in a natural setting. Learn to create bridges between traditional and classical musics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, to gain insight into how the American Composers Forum defined success for *Continental Harmony*, relevant staff were asked to elaborate on the project goals outlined in the program’s planning documents and funding proposals. The collected responses from sponsors, composers and ACF showed the range of success definitions. Grouping similar responses resulted in 7 success indicator categories:

- Audience Development
- Community Cultural Dev.
- Organizational Development
- Arts Education
- Community Development
- Continental Harmony Prog.
- Artist Development

These categories reflect many of the specific domains that define the ACF mission: “the linking of composers and communities.” The research provided the additional opportunity of investigating and testing the assumptions and/or theories that informed both the program and the ACF mission. Therefore, an additional goal of the evaluation became measurement of the efficacy of that mission as it played out through *Continental Harmony*.

The process of grouping the success indicators also showed the need to draw a distinction between the project’s impact on the sponsoring organization and its effect on the community at large. The researchers decided to treat “the community” as a separate program partner in the study. The evaluation, therefore, looked at definitions of success from 4 perspectives: site

---

9 It should be noted that from their inception, many of the *Continental Harmony* projects had an impact on the Forum itself. This occurred because *sustainability* and *sense of place*, core elements in the site-inspired thesis statements, became a part of ACF’s internal discussions about what standards should guide the organization as it defined successful achievement of its mission. As a result, the standard of emphasizing programs that promote “enduring impact” has become an important part of ACF corporate practice.
sponsor, composer, community and ACF. The following example shows how the resultant matrix looked for 2 of the 7 impact categories, audience development and community development.

**Table B. Detail excerpted from CH Success Indicators Matrix (15 selected sites)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>ACF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aud. Dev.</strong></td>
<td>Large audience (project events)</td>
<td>Large audience (project events)</td>
<td>Large Audience (project events)</td>
<td>Large Audience (project events)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased participation (other events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More diverse participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. Dev</strong></td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased appreciation for heritage, history and/or environment.</td>
<td>Increased appreciation for heritage, history and/or environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal sense of contribution to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two overarching questions structured the investigation:

- Can programs be developed to create enduring links between artists (composers in this case) and communities?
- If so, what processes or practices contribute to or limit the creation of those links?

2. **Theses tested by the Continental Harmony evaluation**

The criteria for determining success were transformed into testable thesis statements:

*Long term composer residencies that are community-initiated and community-based will:*

1. have a measurable and lasting positive impact on local music and/or arts communities
2. have a measurable and lasting positive impact on sponsoring organizations
3. have a measurable and lasting positive impact on local community development.
4. increase awareness, understanding and appreciation of composers and their work among participants and other community members.
5. produce works of merit.
6. be judged positively by those who participate directly.
7. demonstrably benefit participating composers.

Well into the project an eighth thesis emerged:
8. be judged to have been well-managed and coordinated by participants

3. Designing an Evaluation
To test whether these theses were being achieved at the 15 target sites and to document project processes and stories, data from multiple perspectives and sources were required. Through brainstorming, numerous traditional and non-traditional evaluation methods, many more than could possibly be used, were identified. The final selection emphasized reliability, ease of application, ability to provide a uniquely interesting perspective, and capacity of an instrument to test multiple thesis statements.

Table C on the next page is a matrix of the evaluation instruments that were used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Composer electronic Journal</th>
<th>Site Visit Reports</th>
<th>Third Party Interviews</th>
<th>General Program Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre and post questionnaire</th>
<th>Radio Documentaries</th>
<th>Demographic Data</th>
<th>Other Documentary Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Instrument</strong></td>
<td>3 journal questions to each composer responding through 10 minute spontaneous writing</td>
<td>Pat Shifferd visits documented using modified Co-Arts approach.</td>
<td>Consultant phone interviews using patterned questions</td>
<td>Questionnaire to test study thesis reflecting success indicators articulated by composers and sponsors.</td>
<td>Standard narrative pre-post questionnaire soliciting expectations and outcomes.</td>
<td>Radio documentaries of individual sites site programs by independent producers.</td>
<td>General demographic descriptive information on program sites garnered from existing census and economic data sources.</td>
<td>Articles, reviews, programs, recordings, marketing materials, letters, photos, videos, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Composers</td>
<td>Pat Shifferd</td>
<td>Bill Cleveland</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Pat Shifferd, composers and sponsors</td>
<td>Regional producers.</td>
<td>Pat Shifferd</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3X</td>
<td>2X, middle-end.</td>
<td>2X</td>
<td>2X</td>
<td>1X</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Composers</td>
<td>Sponsors, Composers, participants, others</td>
<td>Sponsors, composers</td>
<td>Sponsors, composers, other significant participants and collaborators</td>
<td>Sponsors, composers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Start 10/15/99</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>March-Nov</td>
<td>Jan, Oct.</td>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applies to thesis questions:**
- will produce work of merit. |  |  |  | X | X |  |  | X |
- will be judged positively by those who participate directly. |  | X |  | X | X |  |  | X |
- will increase awareness, understanding and appreciation of composers and their work among participants and other community members. |  | X |  | X |  |  |  | X |
- will have a measurable and lasting positive impact on sponsoring organizations. |  | X |  | X | X |  |  | X |
- will have a measurable and lasting positive impact on local music and/or arts communities. |  | X |  | X | X |  |  | X |
- will have a measurable and lasting positive impact on local community development. |  | X |  | X | X |  |  | X |
- will demonstrably benefit participating composers |  | X |  | X |  |  |  | X |
- will be judged to have been well-managed and coordinated |  | X |  | X |  |  |  | X |
Comments on Data acquired from the Evaluation Instruments:

1. Composer electronic journals: The plan was to e-mail the 15 target site composers approximately once a month, asking them to respond in free writing to three questions: What has been going well, what has not been going well, and what has been surprising. In practice, the e-mails went out a bit more sporadically than that, probably averaging every six weeks. The return from these was definitely sporadic, with some composers responding every time and others responding only once.

2. Site visit reports: Each target site was visited at least twice by someone from the Forum staff, with over half being visited 3 or more times. Visitors kept field notes in small notebooks. In addition, notes of other interactions (phone, e-mail) were kept in these notebooks. Evaluators attended the premieres of each of the 15 new compositions. Other visits were timed to coincide with composer residency activities. Unfortunately, 3 of the 15 sites, provided minimal opportunity for observation.

3. Third party interviews: in order to overcome some of the bias introduced by in-house observation, an independent consultant twice (late Winter, 2000, and Spring, 2001) interviewed site organizers and composers from each of the 15 target sites. A total of 54 interviews were conducted; site representatives and composers for 9 sites were interviewed twice; composers from West Virginia, Arizona, and Nebraska and sponsor representatives from Idaho, Florida, and Massachusetts were interviewed once. The interview instrument used for all interviews consisted of a set of 16 patterned questions designed to elicit broad comments and impressions about the conduct and outcomes of the Residency project.

Transcripts from interviews were analyzed in three ways: 1) documentation of specific outcomes, impacts and impressions described by the interviewees, 2) identification of representative quotes from the 60 pages of transcripts, and 3) quantitative analysis of how interviewee comments reflected positively or negatively on the fulfillment of study’s 8 thesis statements. In this review each outcome or impact cited, positive or negative, was categorized according to the 8 thesis statements and 45 subsidiary success measures articulated by composers and sites prior to the start of the program. A total of 584 specific responses were obtained from the 54 interviews. Approximately half of the total came from composers and site sponsors respectively.

4. General program questionnaire: this instrument was formulated from the success indicators articulated by the composers and site sponsors in the pre-test document. The general question format provided respondents with an opportunity to respond quantitatively and qualitatively. Using a 4-category Likert scale, the questionnaire asked for opinion on 38 different aspects of the project (see Appendix B for the complete questionnaire) ranging from impacts on the community and sponsor to assessments of the music and its performance.

Here is an example:

Continental Harmony has:
Brought new resources to our/my efforts:  Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree.
What specifically leads you to this conclusion? ____________________________
Each of the 15 target sites was asked to nominate up to 10 persons from their community to be an evaluation panel for that site. The 143 people whose names were obtained in this manner were sent the document in January of 2000 as the projects were getting under way, and the second time in November, 2000, as the projects were coming to a close. While this group bears no relationship to a random sample, it does extend the input somewhat beyond the organizers. In addition, the 15 composers were added to the sample, giving a total population of 158. 104 completed questionnaires were received, 56 from the initial mailing and 48 from the second.

5. **Pre-and post questionnaire:** as noted, the pre-test asked all 58 site sponsors and their selected composers to envision what a successful outcome would be; from these the general program questionnaire was formed. The post-test, similarly, asked each to reflect on the project as a whole, including positive and negative features, and to estimate what impact it has had and will have in the future. As of 6/30/01 completed pre-and post-tests were in hand from 31 sites and from 43 composers. Findings reported are for 22 sites and for 20 composers not from one of the target sites. The opinions of participants in the target sites are well covered in the radio documentaries, survey, and interviews, so the post-test analysis provides comparative information from groups whose projects were not so closely scrutinized. The pre- and post-test forms are found in Appendix C.

6. **Radio documentaries:** With the assistance of executive producer Claudia Daly, independent radio producers were contracted to produce a 5-7 minute audio piece on the 15 target sites. Although the producers were given background information about the project as a whole and on their site in particular, the only direction given was to “tell the story” of the project. Thus, the results are the stories as told by the site people and composers, filtered through the eyes and ears of the producer. A content analysis of the documentaries provided 111 separate comments to apply to the study theses.

7. **Demographic data:** a demographic profile of each target site community was assembled from U.S. Census and other published sources.

8. **Documentary material:** each site was asked to archive copies of program documents, PR materials and news articles. In the large majority of cases, the program documents (programs, posters, notices) produced by the host communities were very attractively and professionally done. The program artwork, logos, etc. made available to sites were used to good effect by many organizers; others developed their own “look.”

We had originally planned to ask the sites to do audience surveys. In fact, we did not do this. The logistics of putting on a major community event made consistent application of these instruments difficult; as a result we decided not to impose yet another evaluation-related requirement on the target sites. This important data source will most likely be applied by a third party for future community residencies sponsored by American Composers Forum.
II. Findings

Background Description of The Program Participants
The community hosts and performers for Continental Harmony were diverse: professional and amateur performers, paid and volunteer staffs, and rural communities and large metropolitan areas. Some were experienced at commissioning new work but most had not worked with a composer before. The large majority of hosts saw their participation in a high-profile national program as a major honor and undertaking; a few saw it as a small addition to established projects.

Diversity characterized the participating composers as well. They came from all over the country, most often from large metropolitan areas. While many are fairly early in their careers, a good number are well-established. The large majority of composers were either already committed to community-based work or became committed over the course of the project; for a few, the commission was just another gig.

The 15 target sites were the source of most of the in-depth data collected on the process and outcomes of Continental Harmony. They were (purposively) chosen to represent the geographical and demographic range of communities as well as musical genres. In population, they range from Harris County, Texas (Houston), with 3.2 million people to Valley County, Idaho (McCall), with less than 8000. Population growth from 1990-1999 exceeded 15% in Valley and Harris Counties and in Coconino County, Arizona (Grand Canyon) and Madison County, Mississippi (Madison). On the other hand, Franklin County, Maine (Farmington), St. Louis County, Minnesota (Cotton), Newport County, Rhode Island (Newport), and Wood County, West Virginia (Parkersburg), lost population in that time period. Some are more ethnically diverse than the general U.S. population, some are less. Some have a larger percentage of people or children in poverty, some have less. The complete socio-demographic data for these 15 communities is Appendix D.

Of interest here are the two Cultural Density measures to be found in the last 2 columns of the data in Appendix D. Cultural Density I is taken from Places Rated Almanac, 2000. Cultural Density II

10 The measure is an index (range 100-0) based on 8 variables: number of art museums, annual museum attendance (total and per capita), annual ballet, opera, professional theater, and symphony performances and touring artist bookings. Six of the target sites (Grand Canyon AZ, McCall ID, Farmington ME, David City NE, Osceola WI, and Cotton MN) are not included in Places Rated’s 354 so the score for the nearest metro area was used. From site visits in these communities, researchers are confident that this is reasonable; community members often travel to the
is calculated from the 1997 Economic Census of Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation Industries.\footnote{The index is the sum of performing arts establishments, museums, promoters and agents of arts and artists, and the number of independent artists, writers, and performers, both total and divided by population.} What should be expected of the relationship between existing cultural resources and the character of a community’s participation in the Continental Harmony program? On the one hand, one might expect a positive association, since artistic and organizational models are numerous (the “rich get richer” model). On the other, one might expect a negative association, since the relative paucity of cultural resources might generate more effort to compensate. This question will be revisited at the end of the section describing the findings.

A. General Findings
Quantitative data is drawn from four sources, three of which (interviews, survey, radio documentaries) focus on the 15 target sites and the last from the pre- and post-test analysis of 22 sites and 20 composers for whom complete data was available as of 6/30/2001. Qualitative data is drawn from these four sources as well as composer journals and impressions gained from site visits and other forms of interaction with participants.

1. An overview of all data sources shows the generally positive evaluation of the program. Both the interviews (see Table A) and surveys with the target site samples confirm this.

- On the November, 2000, version of the survey, the percentage of respondents who indicated strongly agree or agree (the positive direction) on the 38 items:
  - 90+\% = 23 items
  - 80-89\% = 11 items
  - 70-79\% = 1 item
  - below 70\% = 4 items

  No item received less than 50\% agreement

Not surprisingly, there are no negative comments in the 15 radio stories. However, one might expect more negative feedback on the final reports (post-tests), since negative outcomes and opinions were expressly sought. An analysis of these post-tests of the 22 sponsors yielded 84 general indications of success or approximately 4 per site, and 27 negatives for 1.2 per site. Thus of the total 111 statements, 76\% were positive. There were a comparable number of success outcomes indicated on the pre-test. While the specific successes indicated by each site before and after the project are not identical, the comparable numbers indicate that

- Cotton, Minnesota, band, chorus, children’s homemade instruments
- Madison, Mississippi, suite for orchestra, chorus and narrators
- David City, Nebraska, chorus and ethnic ensembles
- Newport, Rhode Island, work for woodwind quintet and gospel chorus
- N. Charleston, South Carolina, adult and child chorus
- Houston, Texas, multimedia work for orchestra and narrator
- Parkersburg, West Virginia, multi-movement work for massed choruses
- Osceola, Wisconsin, piece for band and chorus.
expectations were in general achieved.

2. **The majority of the 58 projects feel they were successful in achieving the artistic and community impact goals of the program.** Less than 10% of the projects were characterized by 2 or more of the following negative outcomes: 1) failed to connect in a meaningful way with the larger community, 2) were marked by administrative and logistical failure, 3) exhibited strained or ineffective interaction between the site and the composer, and 4) resulted in mediocre artistic results.

3. **The only area of investigation that did not reflect the overwhelmingly positive nature of the feedback was related to the coordination and management of the program.** A number of site sponsors found that the organizational and financial demands of the project were more challenging that had been imagined. Despite ACF efforts to communicate clearly from the very beginning the responsibilities and expectations of community hosts, understanding the reality of mounting a major community arts project and performance proved to be difficult for some. On the other hand, quite a few site sponsors came away believing that they had met the various challenges successfully and had gained organizational strength thereby.

Analysis of the site post-tests shows that of the 27 negatives, 9 (33%) related to management issues, 7 (26%) related to composer-site interaction, 5 each (18.5% each) related to performance and media issues, and the 2 referred to other issues. Thus, management concerns were the largest single negative, although they did not account for a majority of negative comments.

4. **The area evoking the largest positive response was the question of the program’s impact on the local arts community and on the participating composers.** Composers and community respondents were similarly positive about the program, although composers who served the target sites were slightly more positive in their assessment of the program than their site sponsors. For example, in the interviews 82% of composer comments were positive as compared to 70% from sponsors. Of the survey’s 38 items, composers’ responses were more favorable than sponsors on 17 (46%) items. Sponsors were more positive on 5 (13.5%), and on the remaining 15 items there was no difference between the two groups.

On the post-tests, the reverse was true: favorable comments about the project’s success were 76% of the total for site sponsors, but only 65% of the total for composers.
5. The overall impact of the Continental Harmony projects was greater in the rural communities than in the urban. To begin with, the response rate on the survey was far higher in the 9 rural communities than in the 6 urban communities, in spite of the fact that the respondents had been nominated by their site sponsor in every case. The response rate averaged 48% (range 25-80%) from the rural communities and averaged 18% (range 0-44%) from the urban. Nevertheless, both urban and rural respondents were generally favorable about all aspects of the project.

Respondents from rural sites were more positive that the project:
- Attracted large audiences
- Attracted more diverse audiences
- Brought new resources to the organization
- Improved relations among disparate groups
- Improved the health of the music community
- Improved the health of the arts community
- Increased student understanding of composers
- Increased teacher understanding of composers
- Received a good critical response
- Provided a significant depth of experience
- Provided aesthetic growth for the composer
- Established long-lasting composer relationships

Respondents from urban sites were more positive that the project:
- Created new school curriculum
- Improved local arts education
- Garnered new recognition for organizational efforts

B. Specific Findings Related to the 8 Thesis Statements

1. Impact on the Arts in Community

1.1 Both composers and community respondents felt that the program’s impact on the community arts environment was very positive. Arts participation was perceived as having been increased, although not in every case as much as had been hoped. For example, on the interviews five communities mentioned greater than expected crowds and four mentioned that attendance was smaller than expected. Survey data, on the other hand, show strong agreement that CH had produced large audiences.
1.2 Interdisciplinary collaborations were an important contributor to project success in many communities. All data sources agree that collaborative efforts were key to project outcomes. For example, asked the impact of Continental Harmony on their organization, 8 of the 22 post-test group mentioned collaboration with others as a positive result.

Several communities (Carson City NV, Farmington ME, Osceola WI, Gadsden AL, e.g.) sponsored poetry contests or had the composer work with local poets to develop the texts for the work. The premiere in Osceola featured readings of some of these works by poets of widely differing ages. The poems, focused on the St. Croix river which was the thematic basis of the project, were published by the sponsoring organization. The Carson City NV project was similar. Local writers served as narrators of their own work, accompanied by the symphony.

Museums worked very fruitfully with composers and performers in several communities. For example, the Edmond (OK) Historical Society organized a series of displays and presentations as part of the residency leading up to their production of the historical opera “Showdown on Two Street.” The Blanden Memorial Art Museum in Fort Dodge IA used the Continental Harmony project as the occasion for a year-long series of symposia, exhibitions, publications, and dramatic productions to encourage wide community awareness and consideration of the issues facing rural Iowa. Composer Jonathan Chenette’s “Rural Symphony” was performed twice as part of these celebrations. Similar creative collaborations took place in Gettysburg PA, Fitchburg MA, and Grand Forks ND.

1.3 Positive impact on the music community was seen as particularly strong. Since Continental Harmony is a music program, respondents were most specific about the impact of the residencies on the health of the local musical community, both performers and audiences. However, there was also a strong sense that the entire arts community had benefited; in some cases, for example, in Colorado, Georgia, Maine, Nebraska, and Texas, the projects mounted collaborations between the musicians and dance, visual, or literary artists.

Sponsors and Composers alike noted specific positive changes in local music in all of the sites. Specific evidence cited included:

- The increased stature and reputation of local music organizations
- The generation of new resources for music activities
- Validation for previously under-appreciated music forms

90% of survey respondents agreed that CH produced new and successful interdisciplinary arts collaborations. Over 85% agreed that the program had spawned new relationships among arts organizations and between arts and non-arts organizations.

“We were able to involve all of our representative disciplines in the making and presentation of our work.”
Sponsor

“Musically, our community has matured and developed technically and experientially. We have new people engaged, we have old timers energized.”
Sponsor

“Working on this piece stretched the musicians enormously.”
Sponsor

91.6% of the survey respondents agreed that the project had improved the health of the local music community.
• New collaborations spawned among local musicians and music organizations
• The artistic growth of the musicians
• The highly appreciative audiences

1.4 The relationship of the local sites to governmental bodies, especially state arts agencies, in this project was mixed. Although ACF notified state arts agencies, governors, U.S. senators and representatives, and local officials of each community’s selection early in the process, the response of these officials was mixed. In one city, the mayor and other public officials were enthusiastic partners of the project throughout while in others the project remained below the radar screen of local officials. Three sites were disappointed with the fact that state arts agencies did not respond with special funding, while in three others special grants were made to help fund the project. The site organizers in one very rural community received a special award from their state arts agency; in another, the site organizers feel that their participation in the project harmed their relationship to the agency.

1.5 Similar mixed results characterized relations with the media. It is fair to conclude that the project did not attract the high degree of national publicity ACF had hoped for, in spite of substantial resources being dedicated to press relations nationally and locally. The exception to this is PBS, which produced an hour-long documentary and award-winning web site on the project. Several projects enjoyed substantial coverage in statewide newspapers and broadcast media, while a few expressed disappointment in the notice received.

1.6 A notable minority of communities studied has committed to similar future projects. For example, in the interviews 5 of the 15 sites indicated that future composer residencies were likely, as did several of the 22 communities from the post-test group; similarly, 96.4% of the survey respondents agreed that the likelihood of similar projects was increased.

2. Impact on Sponsor Organization.
While the CH program had many positive effects on the participating sponsor organizations, the organizational demands of the program also produced a number of negatives. Many organizations cited both positive and negative impacts.

2.1 The most common organizational benefit to sponsors was organizational growth or improvement, both internal and in their relationship to their community and funders. However, the demands on the organizations in terms of staff and money were

“We are a 2,500 person town. Now we are the light of the whole town. The whole state thinks we have done something special. We got an award from the state arts council and recognition from the NEA. We feel very good about this.”
Sponsor

“We have actually lost statewide funding since we were awarded the CH grant.”
Sponsor

“The project made future projects like this much more possible.”
Sponsor

“We are a 2,500 person town. Now we are the light of the whole town. The whole state thinks we have done something special. We got an award from the state arts council and recognition from the NEA. We feel very good about this.”
Sponsor

“We are a 2,500 person town. Now we are the light of the whole town. The whole state thinks we have done something special. We got an award from the state arts council and recognition from the NEA. We feel very good about this.”
Sponsor

“We have actually lost statewide funding since we were awarded the CH grant.”
Sponsor

“The project made future projects like this much more possible.”
Sponsor
problematic in many cases.

For example, on the site post-test, 10 of the 84 general success comments dealt with the impact on the sponsor; most common was the belief that their prestige and reputation had been enhanced. Of the 27 general negatives, 7 (26%) related to management issues; most commonly expressed was the fact that the time and money required for a project of this magnitude had been underestimated. When we turn to the post-test question which asked specifically about the impact on their organization, 57 specific comments were elicited. Of these 53 (93%) were positive and 4 (7%) were negative, the latter focused on staff and financial burdens.

A majority of target site sponsors interviewed cited organizational growth or improvement as an outcome of their participation. Examples included:

- 5 sponsors felt that their organization’s management capability and/or capacity had improved.
- 5 sponsors pointed to new artistic partnerships as a positive impact of the program.
- sponsors indicated that new resources (monetary and/or non-monetary) had come to them.
- Improved public relations and publicity was another perceived benefit.

Additional examples of organizational benefits noted by the post-test group:

- artistic growth
- enhanced reputation
- new audiences

2.2 Many of the 15 organizations studied had management problems during the course of the program. Problems most often cited included:

- Monetary hardships
- Lack of adequate personnel
- Poor internal and external communication

Moreover, sponsoring organizations did not in general note an increase in membership or affiliation as result of Continental Harmony participation.

Interestingly, composers were largely unaware of many of the difficulties cited by sponsors.

“We have been asked to partner with civic organizations. We now have a much greater relationship with the business community. We now have broad community support. This will contribute to the long-term health of our organizations. Collaborations will be our future.”

Sponsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table E. Continental Harmony Benefits Identified by Sponsors, Volunteers, Local Musicians &amp; Music Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Reputation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“We took a big financial hit. We are still recovering from that. We did not get the funding we anticipated.”

Sponsor

In interviews, negative comments related to organizational impact were very high (40%) compared to other areas of inquiry.

Over half of all negative comments concerned funding issues.

“In interviews, negative comments related to organizational impact were very high (40%) compared to other areas of inquiry.

Over half of all negative comments concerned funding issues.

“We took a big financial hit. We are still recovering from that. We did not get the funding we anticipated.”

Sponsor
3. Impact on Community Development

3.1 The Continental Harmony program made substantial contributions to community development in participating communities. These contributions include: improved inter-group relations, expansion of cultural participation, strengthened community ties, and heightened sense of place. While ACF staff had hoped for these results, the apparent breadth and depth of expressed positive impacts on civic infrastructure has far exceeded the organization’s expectations. What is unknown as of this point in time, a few months after the conclusion of the projects, is whether the new or strengthened sense of community will persist and be transferable to other community issues that emerge.

Ninety-three percent of all interview comments related to community development were positive; feedback about community development was specific and diverse, with composers and sponsors citing 26 different examples.

Seven survey items elicited opinion about the community development impact of the CH project, including improved relations between disparate communities, increased appreciation for heritage and landscape, and increased tourism. The overall mean for these 7 items was 1.7. Only one area, “increased tourism” produced an unfavorable response with a mean of 2.56. However, very few sites had projected tourism as a possible outcome.

Moreover, community development benefits were the outcomes most often noted in the radio documentaries, far more than for any of the other study foci. Fully 50 of the 111 comments derived from the radio pieces refer to the positive impact of the project on community development.

Site post-tests showed a similar result as did site visits. In the latter case, researchers witnessed numerous examples of strong emotional outpourings of pride in community, of a sense of unity, and of connections to the land.

3.2 Relations between estranged or divided communities were perceived as having improved as a result of participation. Over half of the examples of community improvement cited in the interviews reflect a perceived improvement in community relations.

- Both composers and sponsors saw this as a significant positive outcome of CH
- Three communities cited the mixture of western and non-western musics as an important bridge-building aspect of the project.

“Involvement with the community has been dynamite. The number of people and the variety--politicians, farmers, college people, kids, and parents and many others who had not talked to each other before this. There has been a separation among the various communities. They would never mix. The ethnic communities, the chorus, the orchestra, these people would never commingle. But now we have a Continental Harmony Chorus that represents all of us and will remain after the project is over.”

Sponsor

“We had one of the most diverse audiences: 50/50 black and white. The whites learned a lot. They heard a lot about slavery and the civil war. That’s a big deal here in the South, but it was presented sensitively. People felt proud.”

Sponsor
• Three communities identified the exploration of difficult or contentious community histories as contributing to healthier community relations.

Several of the community impact comments on the site post-tests made specific reference to community reconciliation.

3.3 Many Continental Harmony communities saw cultural participation expand and diversify during the project. Six of the fifteen target communities cited changed patterns of participation as a significant outcome. Some of the program elements identified as contributing to this include:

- The development of intergenerational programs
- *The inclusion of youth and youth culture in the program*
- The mixture of diverse musical styles and genres
- Performances in non-traditional venues
- The involvement of large numbers of community members in the creation and performance of the work.

3.4 The Continental Harmony program was often seen as contributing to the community’s ability to work together on common problems and to enhance a sense of community, especially among the young. Continental Harmony’s national scope and media coverage was cited by 5 of the communities as a major image-enhancing factor. Many pointed to enthusiasm and support from local non-arts community as improving the sense of community ownership and cohesion.

Over one-third of the 50 community development comments extracted from the radio documentaries focused on this impact. Examples include:

- Pride in the project made one community person feel that things will improve.
- A composer noted that he hopes his music will give people lasting novel ways to solve problems creatively.
- The deep connection of people to their community is evidenced in the creation of the lyrics to the piece of music, grounded in their everyday experience.
- One site organizer noted that they wanted people in the community to recognize that “just being who we are” is good.
- Another noted that community doesn’t just happen, and that the Continental Harmony program has focused on the community making music together.
- Many comments revolved around the benefit to children and youth of a strong community. One teenager noted that she is motivated to help make her town the “happening place” it used to be.

85.4% of the survey respondents agreed that the Continental Harmony program had improved relations between disparate communities.

16 of the 50 radio comments talked about how people whose lives are often divided were brought together.

“I think there are relationships that have emerged that will continue to grow. There has been a cross-pollination of interests among the faith community, among politicians, and the educational and music communities. This cross-pollination will continue. This is what the art reflects. The notes on the page are not genuine without the soul and hearts and minds of the people.”

Composer

95% of survey respondents agreed that CH had improved community identity and self-image.

""
Similarly, a majority of site post-test comments referred to this outcome, with 56% of the comments describing general or specific impacts on the community’s ability to be a vibrant place.

3.5 The *Continental Harmony* program was seen to have contributed to the community’s sense of place, including its environment. For example, 20% of the radio documentary comments on community development referred to the hope/need to celebrate the place where people live and the beauty of the landscape.

Indeed, themes regarding sense of place characterized the majority of the 58 *Continental Harmony* projects. For example, rivers were celebrated in Wisconsin and North Dakota, mountains in Colorado, Idaho, and Pennsylvania, the prairie in Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa, the desert in Nevada, and forests in Maine and Minnesota. One investigator, whose research interests focus on understanding environmental values and sense of place as a factor in community development, was startled and moved by the outpouring of place sentiment in *Continental Harmony*.

4. Impact on Awareness, Appreciation and Understanding of Composers and Their Work.

A majority of sites found their interaction with a composer to be satisfactory, in many cases quite gratifying.

4.1 The *Continental Harmony* program increased the awareness and appreciation of composing in a majority of the communities studied. Interview data reveals that 89% of the comments on this subject were positive in nature. Several of the comments from the radio documentaries expressed appreciation for the work of the composer—in challenging them, in creating excellent and meaningful music, etc.

Similarly, 10 of the 22 post-test sites mentioned their work with their composer as an example of the general success of the CH program, while only 2 mentioned difficulties working with the composer. In one of these cases, the relationship with the composer was quite unsatisfactory overall. The main problem cited in composer/site interaction, when it occurred, was lateness of score delivery. At some sites this created fairly substantial problems with the preparation of amateur local performers.

The smaller, rural participating communities reported slightly more positive opinions in this area than urban sites. For example on the survey, respondents from the rural communities were more in agreement than the urban that the composer had increased...
teacher and student understanding of composers. 100% of the community respondents in rural communities agreed that new and lasting relationships had been established with their composer. Urban respondents also agreed with this statement, but to the level of 88.6%, a very substantial percentage.

4.2 School based aspects of the program did not meet expectations at most sites. A comparison of the January and November surveys reveals that on the former 78.8% thought that new school curriculum would be created, but in November only 54.3% agreed that this had happened. Similarly in January 92.8% of the respondents thought that Continental Harmony would improve local arts education but in November only 78.4% agreed with the statement. Clearly, there was some impact on school-based aspects of the program, since a majority of respondents agreed these results had been achieved. However, their expectations had not been completely fulfilled. This is likely due to an unrealistic expectation of how easy it is to impact school curricula, rather than a negative evaluation of the school activities of composers.

However at least four sites created school curricula which were used in their communities to complement the Continental Harmony project. This activity was mentioned by each as a major success of their participation in the program.

4.3 Formal and informal composer interaction and presentations were the most effective public education aspect of the program. Composers gave formal presentations about the compositional process at libraries, museums, and to civic groups. Informally, they talked to many community residents, including local poets, visual artists, folk musicians, and kids at summer camps. They were seen at the senior citizens center and heard on talk radio. At most sites, this type of interaction made deep connections with the people involved.

Over half (59%) of the interview comments from composers and sponsors in this area identify community-based interaction as helping change public perception and understanding of composers and their work; one-third of the sponsors and composers interviewed felt informal interaction was the most effective.

5. Production of a work of merit.
There is, of course, no objective way, especially over the short-term, to measure the merit of a work of art. However, it is possible to measure opinions at a particular point in time, in this

“Our educational component allowed us to raise money. We developed an educational resource book for schools. The idea was to bring the community together. It worked.”
Sponsor

“Most sites brought the composer into the schools, but none saw it as the strongest contributing component to the project’s success.”

“There was an incredible amount of community interest. Some of the people involved were good at spreading the news. The smallness of the community made it so that is the right people were contacted, everybody knew.”
Composer

“It is an extraordinary piece of music. We have two renditions, one for orchestra and one for marching band. It has an intangible, immeasurable quality. We wanted music that would change the community’s image. This did it.”
Sponsor
case a few months after the performance of the music.

5.1 Many communities and composers are still assessing the relative quality of the work produced. While opinions are not yet firmly established, at this point both composers and communities believe that a work of merit was produced. Many of those interviewed did not express an opinion about the quality of the work and performance (only 6% of all comments recorded addressed artistic quality); of those who did comment on artistic quality most (94%) reflected on performance aspects of the presentation.

On the other hand a substantial proportion (20%) of the comments from the radio documentaries refer to the music itself, most specifically in describing the interesting compositional elements used and the thematic structure of the pieces.

On the November survey instrument (post-premieres), composers’ view that a musical program of high quality had been created was very similar to the community residents (mean 1.5 cf. 1.44). Similarly, the composers and communities were almost identical in their assessment that the composition had contributed to the field of music (mean 1.43 cf. 1.48).

Three of the post-test sites indicated that high quality music was an important outcome of their project. On the negative side, one site was very unhappy with the composition in terms of its suitability for the ensemble and one noted that audience reaction to the music was mixed.

5.2 Composers and sponsors perceived the performance aspect of the program differently. Interviewed composers were evenly divided in their positive and negative comments about the performance. Positive comments reflected satisfaction with sponsor approval of program. Composer criticisms reflected problems with:

- Inadequate rehearsal
- Inadequate musicianship
- Inadequate facilities, including recording ability and outdoor venues.

These opinions were echoed by several of the group of 20 composers whose post-tests were analyzed. On the other hand, interviewed sponsors were far more positive with 84% reflecting positively on the performance. Similarly, many of the 22 other sites whose final reports were analyzed noted that the performance was excellent and well received. A few noted problems in preparation (too little rehearsal time primarily) or in the quality of the performance itself. One site noted that the outdoor venue...
created problems while 2 others felt the venue posed challenges which the organization was able to meet creatively.

6. Impact on those who participate directly or indirectly.

6.1 The prevailing opinion is that a significant number of people were touched directly by the project and that this experience generally was of quality and depth.

The majority of actual participants surveyed thought audiences and participants had a positive Continental Harmony experience. Fourteen of the survey’s 38 items were calculated using project participant as a filter (sponsor, program volunteer, performer, music director). These items related to the performance, the music itself, and to the impact of Continental Harmony on the local music community. The opinions of the 50+ respondents to these items were overwhelmingly positive with an overall mean of 1.48.

Just under 15% of the comments on the radio documentaries were made by project participants. Some of the more prevalent opinions reflected in these comments were:

- The piece was interesting and challenging.
- Being involved in the project was very satisfying to visual and literary artists.
- Celebration of community tradition and landscape was meaningful.

About half of the composers and sponsors interviewed felt a significant number of people were touched directly by the project. However, in these interviews, which by definition were more open-ended, few opinions were volunteered on participants’ quality and depth of experience.

7. Impact on Participating Composers

A large majority of composers found the project beneficial in one or more aspects. By calculating the results on 10 survey items just for composers, we were able to measure the artists’ views of the project’s impact on themselves. Composers from the 15 target sites saw Continental Harmony in overwhelmingly positive terms, with an overall mean on the 10 items of 1.39.

7.1 Composers saw Continental Harmony as benefiting their musical development.

- Twenty percent of the composers interviewed indicated that the scope or genre of their new work was new for them.
- One-third identified the opportunity for new musical colla-

---

**Table G: Estimates of Project Impact by Direct Participants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>% Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant experience</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large # of active participants</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in development</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New musical collaborations</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences satisfied</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

“‘The people in the audience were really struck with the power and depth of the work and the community’s involvement. More experienced neighbors supported neighbors who were less comfortable with being involved. The music director rose to the occasion. He got to grow with the project.’”

**Sponsor**

“This was a real confirmation that this is where my path as an artist lies. Professional and amateur--I have begun to draw these two together. When you mix them, the quality of the amateurs is better and the professional really gets turned on. The impact on the professionals may be the most important.”

**Composer**
boration as a specific program benefit.
- Working with community members was aesthetically stimulating to some composers.
- Cross-cultural experiences were also described as stimulating.

On the survey, 100% of this same group of composers agreed that Continental Harmony had provided an opportunity for them to develop both aesthetically and technically.

These opinions were echoed by the 20 other composers. Asked about the impact of Continental Harmony on their work as artists, 90% listed one or more of the above factors as a result of their experience. All felt that their skill as “craftsmen” had improved.

7.2 Composers saw the program as beneficial to their careers. Interviewed composer comments about benefits to career were 80%:
- One-third indicated that they felt well compensated.
- Composers at half of the sites described CH as enhancing their reputations.
- Composers at half of the sites identified specific post-project benefits such as commissions, recordings and follow-on projects.
- Half of the negative comments were about unanticipated costs to the composer.

7.3 Continental Harmony provided a wide variety of creative and stimulating opportunities for composers. Composers felt that learning about a new and unfamiliar culture and/or history was a benefit. Other benefits included learning how to communicate effectively about new music and acquiring new musical skills. Particularly important was the development of strong relationships with community members.

These feelings were not universal. A few of the participating composers had disappointing relationships with the site or performers. However, the large majority found the interaction with community organizers and performers to be very rewarding.

In several cases, this led to a new commitment to the value of community-based work. In others, the existing commitment was validated and confirmed.

“Any fairly extended work is going to have an impact on one’s work as an artist. When I talk about ‘the best part of a year,’ I mean it in all senses! We are always learning, but a longer work, especially one with words, challenges you to find the right notes, establish the right mood for those words, and then make the succession of moods right.”

Composer

~

93.7% of the composers surveyed believe that the project has improved their career stability. 100% felt that new resources had been brought to them, that perceptions of their efforts had been improved, and that new recognition had been garnered for their work.

~

“My project only confirmed and strengthened my feelings about the value of [community-based] work. The positive aspects include discovering wonderful things about people and communities, having the opportunity to celebrate them, and collaborating with my partners to ensure that the work we do together accomplishes our goals and feels rewarding to us all.”

Composer
8. Continental Harmony is Judged to Have Been Well Managed and Coordinated by Participants.

8.1 The number of partners involved increased the complexity of the project. The scope of the Continental Harmony project (i.e. 58 communities, 59 composers—one site had a composer team) meant that there were numerous players with their own interests whose activities needed coordination. In addition to the many local interests the project’s National partners included: American Composers Forum, the National Endowment for the Arts, a public relations firm, and other funders.

At the same time, the community-based nature of the program required providing sites and composers with substantial leeway in carrying out the residency and premiere. ACF provided each site with an extensive Host Site Handbook early in the process. An edited version of this document suitable for a wide variety of composer/community residencies is available at www.pbs.org/harmony/toolkit/index.html. Of course, reading about management of a residency and actually experiencing its demands are two different things.

In addition, an initial idea was to ask sites to hold their premieres on July 4, 2000, if possible, with the goal of a nation-wide music festival in celebration of the millennium on a single day. More than 30 of the premieres were held over the Fourth of July holiday weekend in 2000. This turned out to be something of a logistical problem. How is a Continental Harmony staff of two, part of an American Composers Forum staff of 14, going to attend premieres in over 30 states? How is the TV crew going to capture the stories of three sites on film when all three are premiering their piece on July 4th? In fact, ACF managed to attend all but one of the 30-odd premieres by enlisting every available staff person plus several board members. The project director herself attended 4 premieres that week-end, from New Mexico to Massachusetts. Of the 57 premieres which have occurred as of 6/30/01, ACF staff, board, and chapter directors attended all but 3.

8.2 Composers were positive about ACF support. Interviewed composers expressed this view with 86% of the comments on the positive side. The majority of these composers felt supported and respected by ACF and many mentioned the helpful attention paid by ACF staff. Negative opinions on ACF’s role were expressed by just 2 of the 20 other composers.

8.3 Composers were somewhat less positive about the management of their residency by their site hosts. For
example, 12 of the post-test group of 20 composers expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with the arrangements on site.

8.4 Sponsor views on the interaction with ACF and their composers were more mixed. The management difficulties experienced by site hosts have already been described. Of those interviewed, 57% of the comments reflected some dissatisfaction or problem. These included: inadequate funding, unclear guidelines, unrealistic administrative and evaluation demands, and minimal orientation. Among the 22 other sites, negative comments about administrative demands were similar, if less numerous. At the same time, sponsors were particularly happy with ACF staff conduct and support. “Patient,” “supportive” and “not overbearing” were typical comments. A few sites, as already noted, had some degree of difficulty in their interaction with the composer. The most common complaint, lateness of score, was not a negligible problem for some.

8.5 The program was seen as well designed and well organized by sponsors and composers.

Half of the positive comments on this subject reflected on the project’s good design.

“The original application did not have adequate information about the research and documentation effort. As a result, the subsequent budgeting for time and money was off.”

Sponsor

“I encourage you to create more such opportunities for composers and communities, as you are planting many seeds that will flower in the future. I am sure there are many ways a project such as this could be structured, but your structure worked perfectly for me: the structure, support, organization, host partners, welcome and enthusiasm to make the work possible, combined with the perfect blend of professional collaboration and the artistic freedom to create.”

Composer

“Cultural Density” and Continental Harmony

In the introduction to the Findings section, the question was raised about possible relationships between the richness of the cultural landscape in a community and a local organization’s participation in Continental Harmony. To provide a quasi-objective and tentative answer to this question, the fifteen target site projects were coded on four variables: 1) connection to the larger community, 2) administrative/logistical performance, 3) site interaction with composer, and 4) artistic results. The simple ordinal code of low, medium, high was assigned to each of the 4 variables based on the lead researcher’s overall knowledge of each project from all quantitative and qualitative data sources. Then Kendall’s rank order correlation coefficient was calculated for each of the 4 variables with the Cultural Density indices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Indicator</th>
<th>Cultural Density I (Places Rated Index)</th>
<th>Cultural Density II (sum)</th>
<th>Cultural Density II (per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection to community</td>
<td>-.40 (p = .034)*</td>
<td>-.42 (p = .021)*</td>
<td>-.12 (p = .281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative performance</td>
<td>-.32 (p = .074)</td>
<td>-.51 (p = .005)*</td>
<td>-.23 (p = .121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer/site interaction</td>
<td>-.05 (p = .412)</td>
<td>-.19 (p = .183)</td>
<td>-.23 (p = .289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic results</td>
<td>-.31 (p = .075)</td>
<td>-.33 (p = .056)</td>
<td>-.24 (p = .123)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the results were negative; that is the communities with fewer cultural resources were more likely to have experienced a greater impact from their participation in the project.
However, only a few of the correlation coefficients were statistically significant, using the conventional .05 level of probability as a standard. Both Cultural Density I and Cultural Density II (sum) measures exhibited significant negative correlations with Variable 1: “connection to the larger community.” Variable 2: “administrative/logistical performance” showed significant or close to significant association with both these measures. The percapita measure, interestingly, was not significant. Finally, both previously noted measures approached significance with Variable 4: “artistic results.” Composer/site interaction was not significant when paired with any density measure.

Thus, we can tentatively conclude:

1) A program like *Continental Harmony* is more likely to carry substantial community impact in locations in which it does not have to compete with a large array of cultural opportunities
2) Communities with few formal cultural resources often possess informal artistic networks and resources translatable into quality artistic production.
3) Composers are capable of performing successfully in a wide variety of contexts

This brief analysis also draws our attention to another variable which had not been specifically attended to so far: leadership. Our experience with the 58 projects strongly confirms the importance of the committed and creative leadership of a single individual or core group. In some communities, the leadership spark was provided by a paid staff member of a cultural organization, but in many others the leader(s) were volunteers or part-time staffers. Indeed, a notable number of communities were able to mobilize amazing levels of volunteer effort, to establish broad cooperative ties, and to exceed what they thought possible in terms of organization, publicity, fund-raising, and logistics. The pressure of being part of a large national effort was undoubtedly important, but one gets the decided impression that the organizational and leadership skills found in many fairly small communities provides a profound resource for engaging with a variety of issues. The strongest community impact was found in locales in which someone(s) saw the community-building implications of *Continental Harmony* and were able to “run with it.”


III. Recommendations and Indicators

The evaluation data on the initial round of the Continental Harmony program suggest that community-based artist residency programs can make a substantial contribution to art-making and to organizational and community development in many kinds of locations. Large urban contexts and a highly developed arts infrastructure are not a prerequisite for success. However, a high level of commitment and the ability to mobilize latent community resources are important if the impact of an extended artist residency is to be maximized. It is possible at this point to suggest general indicators, both positive and negative, which point to ways in which such residencies might be structured to assure that the project contributes positively in the community in which it occurs.

While the indicators derived from the Continental Harmony assessment data focus on a composer residency, it is likely that many of the indicators are generalizable to other kinds of artist residency. However, music is probably a more widespread phenomenon in communities than other kinds of art-making. Virtually everyone has some contact and familiarity with music. Not only is music omnipresent through the media; many if not most community gatherings and events include some sort of music: church services, parades, sporting events, school programs, community performing ensembles, etc. Therefore, it seems likely that people can identify more easily with music-making than with the visual arts, theater, and dance. Nevertheless, we believe that the indicators derived from the Continental Harmony residencies are suggestive for the other arts disciplines.

The following matrix provides a more general perspective than the data discussed in the previous Findings section of this report. Returning to the major findings associated with each study thesis, positive and negative indicators for each are suggested.
Table I: Indicators of Successful Composer Residencies drawn from the *Continental Harmony* Evaluation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>POSITIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **IMPACT ON ARTS IN COMMUNITY** | • Host leadership establishes consensus on project purposes with other stakeholders in the arts community early in the project.  
• Host organization is committed to broad participation in and lasting impact of the project.  
• Host organization views the project as a major undertaking consistent with organizational mission, worthy of substantial resource commitment. | • Host organization views the project as a supplement or minor addition to its artistic programming.  
• Host leadership does not include significant arts community stakeholders in the project’s planning and execution. |
| 1.1 Both composers and community respondents felt that the program’s impact on the community arts environment was very positive. | • Potential audience is aware of the special nature of the project through effective media relations and word-of-mouth.  
• Composer effectively interacts with a variety of community people.  
• New, tangible resources emerge in support of local arts. | • Project is only one of many arts programs available.  
• Composer spends little time in the community. |
| 1.2 Interdisciplinary collaborations were an important contributor to project success in many communities. | • Collaboration among organizations and artists strengthens existing ties and builds new partnerships. | • Project fails to attract the interest or exacerbates existing schisms in the arts community |
1.3 Positive impact on the music community was seen as particularly strong.
Specific evidence included:
- The increased stature and reputation of local music organizations
- The generation of new resources for music activities
- Validation of previously under-appreciated music forms
- The artistic growth of the musicians
- The highly supportive audiences

Composer is an effective educator and advocate for music and composing.
Composer establishes musical expectations that appropriately “raise the bar” both aesthetically and technically
- Has a good understanding of the capacity of local participating musicians but does not write down.
- Validates and showcases local talent
- Local musicians and musical groups are involved in the development of the original proposal and the composition.

Composer’s work is not reflective of local musical culture or expertise.
Important musical partners do not commit to the project.

1.4 The relationship of local sites to governmental bodies and the media was mixed.

- Communication and cooperation with state arts agencies is established early in the project
- Local and national PR coordination meshes.

Site funding needs are out of synch with state grant cycles.
Site is unable to commit sufficient resources to publicity.
National PR efforts on behalf of sites are ineffective

1.5 A notable minority of communities studied has committed to future projects.

- Project success contributes to heightened organizational strength, coalitions, and resources.

Exhaustion of resources, exacerbated schisms, or unmet expectations lead to unwillingness to repeat the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>POSITIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. IMPACT ON SPONSOR ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2.1 The most common organizational benefit to sponsors was organization growth or improvement.** Specific examples included:  
  • Improved management capability and/or capacity  
  • New artistic partnerships  
  • New resources (monetary and/or non-monetary  
  • Enhanced reputation | • Leadership in sponsor organization is committed, even in conditions of transition  
  • Sponsor is adaptable, open to change, and responds well to unanticipated challenges.  
  • Sponsor has both an interest and capacity to collaborate with other community organizations.  
  • Sponsors exercise fiscal astuteness: accurate cost estimates, generation of new funding sources, etc.  
  • Project has significant volunteer participation that responds well to increased labor demands.  
  • Addition of program elements is realistic given community resources | • Changes in key leadership positions weaken commitment to project.  
  • Leadership group is too small  
  • Inadequate personnel and cost overruns weaken project.  
  • Project goals and response to challenge is realistic given available resources.  
  • Cooperation of key players is missing |
| **2.2 Many of the 15 organizations studied had management problems during the course of the program.** Specific problems included:  
  • Monetary hardships  
  • Lack of adequate personnel  
  • Poor internal and external communication | • Sponsor is able to attract sufficient funds for program goals  
  • Sponsor enjoys labor time, either paid or volunteer, adequate for program demands.  
  • Sponsor establishes regular and open channels of communication with local and national partners. | • Sponsor has little or no fund-raising experience  
  • Labor needs are not met: staff or volunteers insufficient for project demands.  
  • Sponsor has little experience working with professional musicians or music organizations.  
  • Composer and sponsor do not communicate well about the demands and stress they each face. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>POSITIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. IMPACT ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The CH project made significant contributions to community development in participating communities. Specific examples included:</td>
<td>• Composer and sponsor focus on community history and culture to produce work which reflects some universal aspect of the community’s story.</td>
<td>• Community development expectations are either unrealistic or not clearly articulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved intergroup relations</td>
<td>• A significant portion of composer interaction with the community is informal and occurs recurrently throughout the project.</td>
<td>• Composer is not supportive of community development aspects of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expansion of cultural participation</td>
<td>• Composer is diplomatic and respectful</td>
<td>• Composer spends little time in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthened community ties</td>
<td>• Composer is guided by clear, well articulated artistic and community engagement standards.</td>
<td>• Community interaction is pro forma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heightened sense of place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Relations between estranged or divided communities were perceived as having improved as a result of participation.</td>
<td>• Project has broad representation from disparate or divided communities.</td>
<td>• Composer or sites have little experience working with different community groups or cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Patterns of cultural participation are diversified.</td>
<td>• Some communities are ignored, or some cultural element of the community is perceived to have been inaccurately represented by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Composer integrates multiple local musical traditions into piece.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New cross-cultural mixtures of music and other art forms attract a new mix of audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Composer or sites have little experience working with different community groups or cultures. • Some communities are ignored, or some cultural element of the community is perceived to have been inaccurately represented by the project.
3.3 Many CH communities saw cultural participation expand and diversify during the project. Specific contributing factors included:

- The development of intergenerational programs
- The inclusion of youth and youth culture in the program
- The mixture of diverse musical styles and genres in the program
- Performances in non-traditional venues
- The involvement of large numbers of community members in the creation and performance of the work.

- The project is intergenerational.
- Key community leaders are active promoters and participants.
- Through word-of-mouth or other community communication channels, the performance is seen as an event for everyone.
- The performance is seen as a regular part of a formal arts institution’s offerings, rather than a special community celebration.

3.4 The CH program was often seen as contributing to the community’s ability to work together on common problems and to enhance a sense of community, especially among the young.

- The project is intergenerational.
- Community development goals of the project are clearly articulated from the beginning.
- Key community leaders are active promoters and participants.
- Youth are not included in the project or their input is not respected
- Sponsor or key community leaders do not follow up on the good community feelings created by the project.

3.5 The Continental Harmony program was seen to have contributed to the community’s sense of place, including its environment.

- Sponsor and composer have an understanding of how geography impacts and defines community and culture.
- Important issues of land use or landscape are identified as central to project goals.
- The arts are seen as irrelevant to issues of landscape and environment.
- Land use issues are dealt with using an adversarial model.
### Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Impact on Awareness, Appreciation, Understanding of Composers &amp; Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The CH project increased the awareness and appreciation of composing in a majority of the communities studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer and sponsor respect and make use of existing organizational and community based networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The composer is a good communicator and educator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer draws aesthetic inspiration from interacting with community people from many walks of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer residency is a “big event” in town, thus making a significant impact on music and arts awareness and understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer has little interaction with community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban environment overwhelms project profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 School based aspects of the program did not meet expectations at most sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor integrates residency into an active and well-organized arts education initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer carries out fewer, more-in-depth school-based activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors and composers underestimate the complexity and demands of creating quality arts education programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer interaction with specific school groups is brief and superficial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3 Formal and informal composer interaction and presentations were the most effective public education aspect of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor provides opportunities for composer to interact in both formal and informal community contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project administration distracts sponsor from planning and coordinating creative residency activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PRODUCED A WORK OF MERIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.1 Many communities and composers are still assessing the relative quality of the work produced. The tentative conclusion of both composers and communities is that a work of merit was produced. | - Composer regards quality of composition to be high.  
- Credible critic deems work to be of high quality. | - Quality defined very differently by composer and sponsor. |
| 5.2 Composers and sponsors perceived the performance aspect of the program differently. | - Composer considers work to have been well performed and is pleased with the quality of recording.  
- Local musical partners are enthusiastic and competent.  
- Composer and local musicians put extra effort into preparation.  
- Composer does not feel compromised by working with amateur musicians | - Performance is negatively impacted because of lack of adequate rehearsal time, unsuitable venue, or other factors.  
- Work is too challenging for local musicians. |
| 6. JUDGED POSITIVELY BY THOSE WHO PARTICIPATE DIRECTLY/INDIRECTLY | | |
| 6.1 The prevailing opinion is that a significant number of people were touched directly by the project and that this experience was of quality and depth | - Collaborative program design.  
- Many community members are involved in the development and presentation of the work.  
- Work incorporates important elements of the community’s story  
- Interdisciplinary focus  
- Performance is well attended and well produced. | - Production values are low or compromised by competing artistic priorities, lack of adequate rehearsal.  
- Few people involved in the planning, development, and presentation of the work.  
- Composer is late with score, unavailable for rehearsal, makes unreasonable demands on volunteer musical partners, etc.  
- Low attendance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>POSITIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Benefited Participating Composers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.1 Composers saw CH as benefiting their musical development | • Composer is flexible, adaptable and mature  
• Composer establishes one or more meaningful, stimulating artistic relationships during the residency.  
• Composer is challenged by new genre, aesthetic traditions, or available performing forces. | • Composer does not respond well to changing conditions.  
• Composer arrives with preconceived musical notions that do not reflect local interests and needs.  
• Composer is too busy to pay adequate attention to the project. |
| 7.2 Composers saw CH as benefiting their careers | • Composer is interested in learning about new genre, aesthetic traditions, or combinations of performing forces.  
• Composer is open to a variety of career paths and experiences | • Composer does not see work as advancing artistry or career.  
• Composer sees work as site specific |
| 7.3 CH provided a wide variety of creative and stimulating opportunities for composers | • Composer is interested in learning about community history, aesthetics and culture and in working with a variety of community people  
  *Composers have previous experience with collaboration and partnerships  
  *Composer is adaptable, open to change, well organized and can communicate and listen well.  
  *Composer has a commitment to long term engagement | • Composer and sponsor/community are disrespectful of each other.  
• Composer is unskilled at dealing with community processes and culture |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>POSITIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **8. Judged to have been well managed and coordinated by participants**   | • Outside validation, technical assistance, support, advocacy and marketing provided by national sponsor  
• Developmental relationships among funder, on-site program sponsor and artists actively supported  
• In-depth information on project goals and administrative expectations available to sites and artists prior to the forming of partnerships  
• All partners fulfill their responsibilities in a timely, cooperative manner.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | • Inadequate guidance and coordination provided by national sponsor.  
• One-size-fits-all approach to program management leads to ineffective coordination of diverse partner needs                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| **8.1 The number of partners involved increased the complexity of the program** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| **8.2 & 8.3 Composers were positive about American Composers Forum support but somewhat less positive about the management of their residency by their site hosts** | • Appropriate balance struck by site and national sponsor between providing guidance to artists on expectations and allowing free rein for creativity  
• Flexible, collaborative approach to the project continues throughout its duration  
• Stable, respected, well-organized community sponsor provides efficient, optimistic administration of residency.  
• Mutual expectations between site and artist clearly articulated and not subject to frequent, unwarranted change                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • Artist’s needs to carry out the creative process not understood or respected by site  
• Residency or performance events not well organized, funded, or publicized  
• Inadequate guidance provided artists on program expectations                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
### 8.4 Sponsor views on their interaction with American Composers Forum and their composers were mixed.

- Mutual expectations between site and artist clearly articulated and not subject to frequent, unwarranted change
- National sponsor provides prompt, supportive aid to sites when problems occur
- Program vision of egalitarian partnerships carried out in practice

- Inadequate personnel and/or funds, leadership gaps lead to management problems
- Artists and/or national sponsor do not carry out responsibilities in a timely manner
- Artists and/or national sponsor impose unforeseen demands on site managers

### 8.5 The program was seen as well designed and well-organized by sponsors and composers.

- Program design and administration reflects needs of sponsors and artists.
- Program mission/goals clearly articulated to all parties.
- Adequate funds and guidance provided to sites and composers
- Appropriate balance struck between centralized guidance and local, artistic initiative

- Management of program is not consistent with program mission/goals
- Excessive demands placed on artists and local sponsors, given support available
IV. Implications for the Field

*Continental Harmony* began with the goal of brokering connections between composers and communities so that locally planned musical celebrations of the millennium could take place throughout the land. As the program unfolded, however, American Composers Forum realized that the program held the potential for something more: the celebrations were resulting in organizational, artistic, and community development beyond what had been expected. Thus, ACF now sees the lessons learned from its *Continental Harmony* program as contributing to the emerging field of arts-based community development.¹²

Arts-based community development is a new, evolving field and should be treated as such. Twenty-five years ago advocates for public and private investment in the arts used words like *beautification*, *quality of life*, *design integrity* and *community animation* to make their case. Programs like *Continental Harmony* have upped the ante considerably. These days, it is not uncommon to hear terms like *conflict resolution*, *public safety*, *economic development* and *community revitalization* employed by partner communities. The findings in this report suggest that these are not spurious assertions. We do caution that they dramatically raise the stakes and broaden the playing field for arts funders and policy makers.

Using terms like these does more than broaden the dictionary of public art. It greatly alters the nature of the work. Goals like improved economic or social health mark the emergence of a new field, referred to as arts-based community development. This is a realm of cultural practice in which public participation and artistic creation are mutually interdependent. The basic assumption is that there are significant and tangible community benefits, beyond the aesthetic realm, that accrue from certain kinds of community art endeavors.

Arts organizations have always known that their work contributes to the general cultural environment, and hence to the quality of life, of at least some portions of their communities. But, viewing the arts specifically as a means to a variety of community development goals is less commonly articulated by either arts organizations or other stakeholders concerned with the overall health of a location. By arts-based community development we mean using the arts as a strategy to:

- Broaden and deepen cultural participation
- Create and/or strengthen collaborative partnerships
- Enhance community awareness of and pride in history, culture, and natural environment
- Build bridges among possibly estranged community groups
- Increase skills in planning, leadership, consensus-building, fund-raising, and program administration
- Contribute to individual and community health and wellness

This is not to say that community development goals should be the only or even the primary focus of arts organizations’ activities. These organizations also are repositories of important collections, transmitters of artistic works (music, dance, theater) proven to be central to our

¹² We define this field as artistic effort that contributes to the sustained advancement of human dignity, health and productivity.
cultural heritage, supporters of innovation in artistic experience, catalysts of insight into the fundamental nature of humanity, sources of artistic education to people of various ages, and contributors to the reputation and economic viability of their communities.

But we submit that artistic activities of many kinds, including artist residencies, hold the potential for contributing significantly to broader community issues. In particular, the participatory nature of arts-based community work lends itself particularly well to achieving the developmental goals listed above. While there have been many local projects, well-articulated theory and rigorous, replicable research protocols are still being developed. While the assessment of the *Continental Harmony* program may be a contribution to the latter, much study remains to be done before comprehensive theoretical models can be developed. Here are some areas for further research that have emerged from this study:

- Comparisons of communities of various size and location (e.g., suburban, urban, rural)
- Contributors to sustainability
- Capacity: professional vs volunteer
- Success indicators in general

For example, with regard to the last, how do these expanded aims of the emerging field effect definitions of success or failure? For one thing, the “we” has expanded. In addition to citizen participants, every new sector that becomes involved, be it public safety, human services, or community development, now has a say in desired outcomes. In fact, artists doing community work often find themselves contending with a greatly expanded range of scrutiny and judgment. And, given the difficulty of measuring outcomes in these instances, some fall prey to charges that they are dealing in false promises.

Thus, community-based, participatory art making offers not only opportunity, but also serious challenges for the growing number of artists and communities that are helping to define the field. With this in mind, three needs for this expanding universe are training, program evaluation and continued research.

The Implications for the Field which follow should be understood in the context just laid out; “the Field” is the place of artist residencies in the new, but promising area of arts-based community development. The Implications, derived from our work with the *Continental Harmony* evaluation data, are directed in turn at: Funders, Community Hosts, and Artists.

1. For Funders

**Effectively implemented community-based artist residencies have the potential to:**

- Develop organizational infrastructure in relatively small and/or inexperienced arts organizations and encourage more inclusive modes of operation in larger ones.
- Provide a win-win approach to community development issues.
- Strengthen community ties and sense of place.
- Expand and deepen cultural participation.
- Raise the bar of aesthetic practice for artists and participating communities.
• Increase awareness and appreciation of the work of artists

To enjoy these results, the residencies need:

1.1 Careful brokering and nurturing.

1.1.1 An outcomes based investment strategy can build capacities and promote creativity among all partners. In the context of a dynamic community-based creative environment, it is likely that traditional directive approach to grant and service program design cannot accurately and appropriately anticipate the scope and variety of community project needs and opportunities. This presents a unique opportunity for funders to question the assumptions and expectations that have informed their efforts and to develop new programmatic strategies.

We encourage funders to respond by using a venture capital, community development investment model. This approach solicits requests based on very clear and specific investment goals and objectives. This differs from the traditional grant approach in that is driven by the field—the assumption being that the most productive ideas and opportunities will come from artists and partner communities.

With this type of program orientation the specific design or methodology employed by applicants to achieve these objectives is not mandated or directed. The onus then is on the applicant to articulate how the proposed investment will produce one or more of the funder’s desired outcomes. The object here is to provide broadly defined program guidelines and categories that:

a) Allow the broadest range of artists, organizations and communities to apply.
b) Minimize mandates and restrictions.
c) Are responsive rather than directive.
d) Are focused on systemic outcome and impact.
e) Invite authentic articulation of needs and opportunities.
f) Encourage proposals along a continuum that ranges from the mundanely practical to the wildly inventive.
g) Support the development of innovative leadership in the field.

1.1.2 The building of organizational capacities and leadership can be an outcome of such residencies, even in relatively inexperienced organizations. Community leadership is as important as artistic quality and skill in collaboration in this work. Our experience is that in most communities the potential for leadership is present and available. But, a few pre-conditions are needed to call it up. First, the project must be seen as important to the community. Second, the community must sense that it will, in some way, own the results. More often that not these conditions will be satisfied when the community is treated as a full partner in the cultural endeavor. Then the quality people needed to drive the project are more likely to invest their time and energy. While these collaborators may not have all the needed experience, these skills can be honed and nurtured, either in prior training/orientation or in careful mentoring as the project develops.
Given this, it follows that the lack of a non-profit arts infrastructure does not mean a lack of potential cultural leadership. We encourage funders to invest in small communities with the caveat that they should be prepared to support the varying levels of pre-program training and on-the-job learning that may be required. Skills in collaboration, communication, fund-raising, and public relations are the most important. Community sponsors and artists may have these skills already, but training that involves both sponsors and artists can dramatically increase a program’s management and collaborative capacity.

1.1.3 Planning and design are as important as creation and presentation and should be supported as such. Completing a participatory arts project within budget and on time is difficult, particularly for small, inexperienced communities. The most successful projects are built on thorough planning and a conservative budgeting of time and money. “Conservative” in this context does not mean short or small, but what we would call “over-realistic.” This type of preparation takes time and money. The field will benefit greatly if funders support in-depth planning and relationship-building processes as intrinsic to the achievement of both artistic and community development goals.

1.2 To be structured as collaborative partnerships among sponsor, artist, and, in some cases, an outside agent seen as creditable.

1.2.1 Collaborative relationships among community groups, although often very difficult to establish and maintain, provide one of the best ways to ensure wide participation in and identification with the project. These can be encouraged as part of the project design or can be developed over time. And time is crucial, especially if relationships among previously estranged groups are to be bridged or if charged community issues are to be raised. Often the artist can function as a link if s/he has skill in communicating with people at many levels.

1.2.2 It is useful to view community partnerships as developmental relationships which evolve over time. Successful investment in arts programs with community based development objectives need maximum flexibility to respond creatively to the opportunities, needs, and ideas coming from communities and their creative partners. One such approach is to treat grant recipients as developmental partners rather than grantees. As projects evolve and change, this approach can give funders and fundees opportunities to work more closely together over time. Another developmental option is using requests for proposals (RFP’s) to solicit innovative approaches to specific community and or artistic issues or problems

1.3. To speak to important aspects of the community’s story.

1.3.1 The ecology of the histories and stories that form a community’s identity need to be treated with utmost care and respect. Often, funders unknowingly set the stage for superficial artist/community relationships through the level and form of their investments. Many communities are slow to trust. To build trust artists need to take the time to respectfully engage the layers of a community’s cultural landscape. We are convinced that exemplary community based art making requires a significant investment in this aspect of the work. Along with this support, in some circumstances funders may need to facilitate, partnership training to help build a foundation and a safe space for in-depth community/artist collaboration.
1.3.2 Community ownership is pivotal and requires participatory processes throughout, i.e. opportunity for and full participation in critical decisions. *Continental Harmony* demonstrated that the desire and ability to envision a meaningful project theme is widely found in communities of all sizes and levels of organizational sophistication. Artistic products, especially created for a community with their participation, have a strong likelihood of attracting attention and support from many citizens. Thus, broad community ownership and support is enhanced if the content of the project is locally-defined and speaks to important aspects of the community’s history, culture(s), landscape, etc. While the artistic outcome is important (the mural is painted, the music performed, the play seen, etc.), a creative process which is inclusive, participatory and respectful will go a long way toward realizing the full beneficial impact of the residency.

1.3.3 Invest in quality over quantity: Because empirical research often defines success in community development work, there is a tendency to steer resources toward activities that will translate in terms of volume rather than depth. When this happens resources are often spread too thin in efforts that mitigate specific symptoms for short periods, while ignoring the underlying root causes. Because it is new and for the most part untested, arts-based community development is particularly vulnerable to this pattern of investment. We encourage funders to apply the highest standards of quality to both sides of the community/arts equation. There are no shortcuts when striving to make a work of quality in either arena. When combined, both creative and community development processes require even greater care and attention. Our communities deserve and need the best of both.

1.3.4 Avoid unfunded mandates. Funders need to be sensitive to the fragile economic and social ecologies that undergird arts-based community development efforts. The labor required for administrative and evaluative requirements should either be funded or designed so they can be adapted to a wide variety of economic and labor conditions. Since the goals of community-based artist residencies are large, the resources necessary are correspondingly large. Artists and community hosts need sufficient money, time, personnel and encouragement to “think big.”

2. For Community Hosts:

**Having an artist work in a community has the potential to:**

- Bring various segments of the community together in a cooperative effort
- Heighten the sense of pride, place, and social solidarity
- Enhance the reputation of the sponsoring organization to funders, potential supporters, and the community at large
- Provide opportunity for honing organizational skills in public relations, fund-raising, collaborations
- Establish potentially long-lasting connections among community organizations, both arts and non-arts
- Result in a prideful telling of the community’s story
- Strengthen the arts community as a whole
To enjoy these results fully, community leaders will probably need to:

2.1 Commit a substantial amount of time and other resources, including money

2.1.1 Anticipate that the project will need more time and money than initial estimates. By their very nature community arts endeavors are both time intensive and costly. Many large-scale community oriented projects often find themselves running on empty. In small communities with little experience these projects are often under-budgeted. No matter who is deemed responsible, there is usually only one option—raising money for a work that is unfinished and over budget. There is no harder fundraising challenge. Unfortunately, many artists and communities attracted to the idea of weaving public participation into the fabric of public art exacerbate the problem by trying to do it on the cheap. Don’t!

2.1.2 Free labor is expensive. Involving volunteers from various parts of the area in the project is extremely helpful in widening awareness and support of the project throughout the community. However, recruiting and managing volunteers is time consuming in itself. Think twice about taking on free labor. When you do, make sure its care and feeding is in capable, compensated hands.

2.1.3 Just one person cannot accomplish a large, community-based arts project. A project with broad vision and goals is more difficult to pull off than mounting an arts event for the usual audience in the usual venue. The benefits to the host organization, the broader arts community, and the community as a whole can be great, but the work involved in such an endeavor can be daunting.

While core supporters of the arts can probably be counted on for support, effort will need to be expended in informing and attracting support from a wider swath of the community—school administrators, political officials, agency personnel, business people, etc.

2.2 Work collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders

2.2.1 Cross-sector collaboration is a very desirable part of a project that is designed to have broad support and impact on the community. However, these collaborations are difficult to establish and maintain. And the more partners to the collaboration, the more complex the process of carrying out the project becomes. Fortunately, the skills of leadership and coalition building—trust, communication, negotiation, delegation, understanding of power—can be learned and utilized throughout the project and beyond.

2.2.2 Collaborative art making is difficult, cumbersome and messy. Participants in successful creative collaborations know that a good partnership is like a good marriage. That means that even though it takes 10 times more energy to find consensus and get things done, the results make the journey worthwhile. Successful partners also know that at various times on that journey the partnership will be tested, and that those tests will not only be a measure of the strength and resiliency of the partnership, they will also be the crucible upon which the strength and resiliency of the collaboration will be forged.
2.2.3 Healthy community partnerships are built on trust. Community engagement is collaboration intensive. Successful partners learn quickly that the driving force in fruitful relationships is trust. They know that real trust is built on deeds and practice, not words. There are trust-engendering practices that can be learned and utilized. This practice is characterized by the continuity, predictability, regularity, and consistency of work together over time. The benefits, both short and long-term, of healthy collaborations are great. The trust and mutual sharing of responsibility which result from successful partnerships, even among people from different walks of life, can persist beyond the life of the project and be brought to bear on new, challenging issues.

2.2.4 Work to continue the collaborations and connections once the project is complete. Communities new to collaborative art projects often find themselves investing more time and money than they planned for. More often than not they are also surprised by the community’s capacity to provide the unanticipated resources. Unfortunately, when the curtain is drawn on the final performance some consider the work over and done. Many of the Continental Harmony sites finished the project with a larger resource base and collaborative capacity than they started with. For some of these communities this has proven to the one of the most valuable outcomes of the project. To remain vital though, the accumulated relationships and trust need to be put to use or they will dissipate quickly.

2.3 Be flexible and adaptable in project design and implementation

2.3.1 Anticipate change. While a consistent and creditable vision of the ultimate goal of the project is important, it is important to remember that the creative process itself is significant as well. Given the number of heads and hands involved in community collaborations, new ideas and approaches not originally thought of are very likely to emerge. These can add to, or detract from a successful outcome. Anticipating these potential detours can go a long way toward making sure they are considered in the context of the larger goal and that they do not sidetrack project participants.

2.3.2 Distinguish between those activities that can accommodate amateur support and those that require professional experience. Volunteers are a necessary and important part of many community collaborations. Sometimes eager volunteers take on critical tasks that are beyond their experience. Finance, marketing, and the legal arena are program areas that do not lend themselves well to on-the-job training. To avoid problems, program coordinators should recruit dependable and knowledgeable volunteers for duty in these sensitive areas.

2.3.3 Consider non-traditional venues, locations, and audiences. Project events which take place in community centers, school gyms, churches, outdoors, at meetings of civic organizations, etc. are much harder to organize and mount than events in performing arts centers or galleries. But taking the art to places where people gather will expand and deepen participation. These efforts will often have long-term benefits to the arts community.
2.4 Establish a professional relationship with the resident artist, and provide him/her with the resources needed to learn and create.

2.4.1 Use the highest quality artists: One of the most critical contributors to success, as defined by artists and community partners alike, has been a clear artistic focus and the quality of the artists involved. The most successful programs are developed by artists making art, not artists doing something else. These artists created art programs, not community development programs that used art as a vehicle. This does not mean that they were not concerned with community-building effects of their efforts. Quite the opposite, in fact. Most would contend that these benefits are the unavoidable consequence of making in partnership with community members.

2.4.2 Put the resident artist in touch with as broad a spectrum of community people as possible and provide him/her with sufficient unstructured opportunities. Many artists are skilled ambassadors in developing awareness and interest in the project; by gathering information from many sources, the artist not only learns, but also provides fresh insight into community strengths taken for granted by local residents.

2.4.3 Artists need time to reflect in order to spark a creative telling of the community’s story. Every artist brings unique requirements to their creative projects. But most artists agree that time without outside distraction is central to their ability to create. Often, when artists and community partners forge working relationships the communication back and forth is frequent and intense. This level of interaction is, of course, critical to a project's success. Inevitably, though, there comes a point in all creative endeavors when artists need to separate themselves from the ongoing tumult of the program site and concentrate on their art. Community sponsors and the artists they engage should take the time to discuss and plan for this aspect of the project.

2.4.4 Negotiate and document a partnership agreement. There needs to be a clear understanding between the host and artist about key aspects of the project: when will the work be delivered, how extensive will the artist’s interaction with the community be, what kinds of residency activities is the artist able to do, what is included in the fee and what is excluded. The host community must have these understandings to marshal needed resources and as a recourse if the artist does not perform as expected. The artist needs the parameters of the project spelled out to plan and coordinate research and creative work. And, both parties often need to refer to their mutual agreement as unanticipated opportunities and obstacles arise.

3. For Artists:

Community-based artist residencies have the potential to:

- Provide new aesthetic and technical challenges
- Establish deep relationships with community hosts
- Create collaborative creative partnerships
- Widen the range of artistic opportunities available, and hence benefit career
To experience these results, the artist needs to be:

3.1 Willing to work with others of varying levels of artistic sophistication

3.1.1 Amateur and professional artmaking are different. Working in a participatory art-making situation requires the ability to tell the story asked for in a way that can be understood. In some cases this may require adapting the techniques used to the available resources: performers, exhibition spaces, visual artists, writers.

3.1.2 Stay the course artistically. For artists the impetus for a change in artistic direction can come from many sources. Amid the chaos of community work, artists sometimes need to remind themselves that they know what works for them. When considering creative changes artists should resist altering the heart of what they came to do. In the best of circumstances work can be geared to both the artists and the community’s needs. Making quality work that responds to the assets and limitations of various communities without compromising artistic goals is an art unto itself. Artists that are able to do this successfully often find aesthetically and technically satisfying modes of expression suitable for local performers and other artists. Sometimes new artistic ideas and colleagues are found in unexpected places. Artists should also keep in mind that their definition of quality might not be shared by some of the people in the community. It would be unreasonable to expect otherwise. And at times, requests for adequate preparation time, or proper materials, can in fact give rise to resentment. It is up to artists and their sponsors to educate the broader community about these important issues.

3.2 Genuinely interested in the community’s story

3.2.1 The disciplined learning of a community’s culture is an indispensable part of building community trust. The single most important key to successful community engagement in public art is being aware that there are no easy short cuts to participatory art making. Every community’s cultural, social and political ecology is unique. Assumptions and expectations accrued from other sites should be checked at the door—not because those experiences are not potentially valuable and informative, but because scrupulous engagement with a community’s culture is an indispensable part of building community trust. And, in the end, you will find that trust is your most valuable resource.

3.2.2 Local landscape, literature, culture, history, etc. are wonderful sources of artistic inspiration. But to mine these sources takes a lot of effort to research, talk with people, absorb the landscape, attend community events, and listen. One of the most important reasons for doing this is to measure expectations against reality. Artists should use their artist’s eyes and ears to filter and evaluate their impressions. What does one feel from the place? Is it open or closed physically, emotionally, spiritually? What are the stories being told? Is the town aware of its histories? Consider the architecture, the geography. These and many more observations should be made. This may seem a lot to ask of a simple visit to a community. It can and should be done, though. Once again, this takes time.
3.3 Sensitive to community social, political, and economic structure

3.3.1 Community work demands a new and complex skill-set from artists, including artistic ability, diplomatic skills, and a strong interest in community collaboration. Social, economic, political and artistic goals are not necessarily incompatible. But, their combination increases both the complexities of the work and the potential for extraordinary outcomes on all fronts. This combination also makes the work far more demanding. Some visiting artists have to be reminded that they are joining an already existing culture. Resident artists should resist seeing themselves as cultural missionaries. The work requires showing respect to new and different communities and cultures. It also demands a strong interest in creative partnerships. The most successful artists in community settings are those who see the process of collaboration as part of their palette.

3.3.2 Artists competing for commissions that involve community engagement should pay as much attention to a sponsor’s “street” credibility as they do the bottom line. Visiting artists usually rely on community-based sponsors to generate necessary resources and relationships. With community collaborations this partnership determines the success or failure of the venture. Artists working in this field should pay utmost attention to the reputation and collaborative capacity of their prospective community partners. They should also not mistake their community-based sponsor for the voice of the community.

3.3.3 Communication skills are key. Community residencies require a two-way flow of communication. First, the artist needs to be able to interpret his/her work to a variety of publics. Teaching, public presentations, media appearances may all be part of expected activities. But second, the artist needs to be able to ask questions, converse with many people, elicit information, and participate in planning in order to get the background needed to complete the commission.

3.4 Able to articulate one’s role and needs as an artist

3.4.1 A contract which clearly sets the parameters of the residency is a must. What kind and how many residency activities, when is the work of art to be completed, where and how will it be presented, what is the compensation, what is included in the fee, etc.? It is essential that both artist and community host live up to these agreements. For example, it is crucial that the artist deliver promised work on time, especially when a local rehearsal schedule is at stake.

3.4.2 Learn how to say no. While engagement with the community’s planners and people can be quite gratifying, ultimately the artist is an artist, not a social worker, politician, stage hand, or fund-raiser. As such, sufficient time to reflect and create is necessary. Some artists working in community settings speak of confrontations with sponsors about expanded programs or unfulfilled expectations. For some, these confrontations marked dramatic turning points for their programs. Faced with inappropriate demands they balked at any move they felt would compromise the value of their work. Although this might mean the end of the project, it is likely that insistence on good work and adequate support will be the catalyst needed to maintain their identity and commitment the community.
3.4.3 Be aware that art making on commission to a community is different from answering only to one’s own inner artistic vision. Truly, community-based artist residencies are nothing new; they are a return to the patron-artist relationship that has marked artistic endeavor through time. The difference is that the patron, in this case, is a community arts organization or a whole community, not a sovereign or impresario. As such, the relationship between artist and host is likely to be quite egalitarian and satisfying.

The success of a large national project like Continental Harmony cannot, of course, be ascribed to a single individual. But, we would like to acknowledge those who were most instrumental in the project:

- Linda Hoeschler, Executive Director of American Composers Forum, for the impulse and vision that such a program was feasible
- Michael McLaughlin, Director of Leadership Initiatives, and Wayne Brown, Director of Music and Opera, of the National Endowment for the Arts, for putting the resources of the Endowment behind this experiment in art-making
- The other funders of the program:
  - Lynn Szwaja, Joan Shigekawa and Peter Helm of the Rockefeller Foundation for seeing the potential of the program and their insight into the importance of an in-depth assessment
  - Gary Burger of the John S. & James L. Knight Foundation for support and advice throughout the program and beyond
  - Land O’Lakes Foundation, the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, Eco-lab, and the arts boards of Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio for assuring that the program could be mounted in all 50 states.

- But most of all, many, many bravos are due to the people in the Continental Harmony communities and to the group of inspired and dedicated composers who helped them celebrate the millennium year.
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## Appendix A: Continental Harmony Sites and Composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and State</th>
<th>Title, Composer, Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden, Alabama</td>
<td>“I am a Song”, Philip Koplow, Covington KY Etowah Youth Orchestras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau, Alaska</td>
<td>“Glacier Blue”, Evan Solot, Philadelphia PA Bruce Paulson’s LA Big Band, Linda Rosenthal violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon, Arizona</td>
<td>“Guardians of the Grand Canyon”, Brent Michael Davids, Minneapolis MN, Claire Hoffman, Brent Michael Davids, Havasupai Dancers and other players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blytheville, Arkansas</td>
<td>“Song for the Delta”, Steve Cooper, Rogers AR Ritz Community Band, Choirs of both local high schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City, California</td>
<td>“Symphony #3: Portraits in Jazz”, Thomas Oboe Lee, Cambridge MA, American Jazz Philharmonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, California</td>
<td>“The Navigator Tree”, Jaron Lanier, Sausalito CA Handbell Ensemble Sonos, gamelan, taiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont, California</td>
<td>“The OH of Moon &amp; Piano”, Mark Winges, San Francisco CA Piedmont Children’s Choirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td>“Pictures of Years: Nianhua”, Han Yong, New York NY Camellia Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>“Freedom Dreams”, Jennifer Higdon, Philadelphia PA San Francisco Gay-Lesbian Freedom Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Work Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz, California</td>
<td>“Glossary”, Henry Brant, Santa Barbara CA New Music Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge, Colorado</td>
<td>“Nature’s Universal Throne”, David Heckendorn, Kew Gardens NY,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Repertory Orchestra, singers and dancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Connecticut</td>
<td>“Convergence: Some Parades for Charlie’s Dad” Neely Bruce, Middletown CT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>various ensembles as part of the International Festival of Arts &amp; Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td>“Delaware Rhapsody”, Robert Macht, Baltimore MD Delaware Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>“Migrants Journal”, Lukas Ligeti, New York NY Furacan Caribe at the Sub-Tropics Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw, Georgia</td>
<td>“The Unsung”, Eric Alexander, Acworth GA Wings Dance Ensemble of Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailua-Kona, Hawaii</td>
<td>“The Channel”, Christopher Roberts, Hawi HI Kona Chorus &amp; Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall, Idaho</td>
<td>“Breath of the Mountains”, Linda Tutas Haugen, Burnsville MN, McCall Chamber Orchestra &amp; Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeport, Illinois</td>
<td>“Song of the Earth”, Patrick Beckman, Freeport IL Highland Community Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park, Illinois</td>
<td>“A Symphony of Place”, James Kimo Williams, Chicago IL Oak Park-River Forest Symphony, choruses and narrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel, Indiana</td>
<td>“Liberty for All”, James Beckel, Indianapolis IN Carmel &amp; Indianapolis Symphonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Dodge, Iowa</td>
<td>“Rural Symphony”, Jonathan Chenette, Grinnell IA Fort Dodge Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas City, Kansas</td>
<td>“Carl Sandburg’s Prairie”, Eugene Friesen, Townshend VT The Paul Winter Consort, Prairie Wind Dancers, PrairieFest Chorus, Winfield Regional Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsville, Kentucky</td>
<td>“Three Songs: The Song of the Redeemed, We’re Singing Heaven’s Song, Heaven’s Jubilee”, Depp Britt, Nashville TN Allen County Community Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>“My Name is Citizen Soldier”, Frank Proto, Cincinnati OH Louisiana Philharmonic, Paul Winfield, narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, Maryland</td>
<td>“Hallelujah, In Praise of. . .”, Lisa DeSpain, New York NY Liz Lerman Dance Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg, Massachusetts</td>
<td>“Raging River, Rolling Stone”, Barbara White, Princeton NJ Thayer Symphony, Fitchburg H. S. Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, Michigan</td>
<td>“Lokananta”, Gabriel Gould, Ann Arbor MI Ann Arbor Symphony &amp; Univ. of Michigan Gamelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, Minnesota</td>
<td>“Cotton Cantata”, Tyler Kaiser, Duluth MN Cotton Schools Band, community chorus and, children on made instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td>“Descendants of the Dragon”, Zhang Ying, Minneapolis MN CAAM Dance Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, Mississippi</td>
<td>“Traces of Mississippi”, Anne LeBaron, Pittsburgh PA orchestra, Tugaloo College Choir, narrators and soloists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>“Bushy Wushy Rag”, Phillip Bimstein, Springdale UT Equinox Chamber Players and tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula, Montana</td>
<td>“Walt Whitman’s Dream”, William McGaughlin, New York NY, orchestra and massed choruses of the International Choral Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David City, Nebraska</td>
<td>“Heartland”, Debbie Fischer Teason, Hamden CT Butler County Community Choir, Children’s Choir, brass band, accordions, David Neely violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson City, Nevada</td>
<td>“A Land of Sage and Sun”, Jim Cockey, McCall ID Carson City Symphony and Chamber Singers, soloists and narrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth, New Hampshire</td>
<td>“Voices of the Lakes”, of the Jim Clemens, Downers Grove IL Friends of the Arts Youth Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, New Jersey</td>
<td>“Jersey Polyphony”, Raymond Torres-Santos, San Juan PR Newark Boys Chorus, N. Jersey Philharmonic Glee Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto, New Mexico</td>
<td>“Keepers of the Land”, Jerre Tanner, Kailua-Kona HI Paul Ortega, Los Romanticos, Mescalero and Hispanic Dancers, Chorus, and Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td>“Dance Mix”, Rob Smith, Houston TX, Society for New Music, Mallets Ensemble of the Syracuse Brigadiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord, North Carolina</td>
<td>“Building Bridges”, Ronald Nelson, Minneapolis MN Orchestra, All-County Chorus, narrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks, North Dakota</td>
<td>“What the River Says”, Steve Heitzeg, St. Paul MN Grand Forks Master Chorale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton, Ohio</td>
<td>“Suite Carroll County”, Mona Lyn Reese, Santa Clara CA Carroll County Chorale and Children’s chorus, chamber orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmond, Oklahoma</td>
<td>“Showdown on Two Street”, Sam Magrill, Edmond OK Univ. of Central Oklahoma Opera, Millennium Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>“Wind, Water, Wood “, Kenny Endo, Honolulu HI Portland Taiko with Kenny Endo, Obo Addy, Jeffrey Peyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>“South Mountain Echoes”, Robert Maggio, Media PA Adams County Bicentennial Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport, Rhode Island</td>
<td>“Testimonials”, Stephen Newby, Everett WA Northeast Chamber Ensemble, Community Baptist Church Choir and Antioch Church Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls, South Dakota</td>
<td>“Spiritscapes: A South Dakota Cantata”, Bruce Roter, Albany NY, Sioux Falls Master Singers, Sioux Falls Municipal Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City, Tennessee</td>
<td>“Appalachian Harmony”, Daniel Kingman, Sacramento CA East Tennessee Children’s Choir, soloists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George, Utah</td>
<td>“Desert—Spirit—Valley”, George Arasimowicz, Winfield IL Southwest Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury, Vermont</td>
<td>“Reflections of the Sky”, Peter Hamlin, St. Paul MN Middlebury Community Chorus, Middlebury College Choir, Harlem Spiritual Ensemble, Emory Fanning, organ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintergreen, Virginia</td>
<td>“From Time to Time”, Anthony Iannaccone, Ypsilanti MI Richmond Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkersburg, West Virginia</td>
<td>“The Unknown Region: A Journey to Faith”, Kenton Coe, Johnson City TN, Community, Youth, and Children’s Choirs with instrumental accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola, Wisconsin</td>
<td>“River Spirit”, Craig Naylor, Kalispell MT, ArtBarn Community Chorus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Success Indicators Matrix
## Appendix B: Continental Harmony Success Indicators Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Indicators</th>
<th>Comm. Engagement Indicators</th>
<th>Composer Indicators</th>
<th>ACF Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience Dev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large audience (project events)</td>
<td>Large audience (project events)</td>
<td>Large Audience (project events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased participation (other events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased membership</td>
<td>More diverse participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org. Dev</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased funding for org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased public awareness of org. (marketing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved morale/identity (Board/volunteers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. Dev</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved community identity &amp; self image</td>
<td>Improved community identity &amp; self image.</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased appreciation for heritage, history and/or environment.</td>
<td>Increased appreciation for heritage, history and/or environment.</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
<td>Improved relations between disparate communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Cultural Dev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness/appreciation: local music resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased awareness/appreciation: local music resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness &amp; appreciation: local arts resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New partnerships among music groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New relationships among arts groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New relationships among arts and non-arts groups</td>
<td>New relationships among arts and non-arts groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>New relationships among arts and non-arts groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Continental Harmony Success Indicators Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Cultural Dev. (cont.)</th>
<th>Sponsor Indicators</th>
<th>Comm. Engagement Indicators</th>
<th>Composer Indicators</th>
<th>ACF Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased health &amp; vitality of local music community.</td>
<td>Increased health &amp; vitality of local music community.</td>
<td>Increased health &amp; vitality of local music community.</td>
<td>Increased health &amp; vitality of local music community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased health &amp; vitality of local arts community.</td>
<td>Project sustained in some way beyond Continental Harmony sponsorship.</td>
<td>Project sustained in some way beyond Continental Harmony sponsorship.</td>
<td>Project sustained in some way beyond Continental Harmony sponsorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts Education</strong></td>
<td>New integrated curriculum</td>
<td>New integrated curriculum</td>
<td>New integrated curriculum</td>
<td>New integrated curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New music curriculum</td>
<td>New music curriculum</td>
<td>New music curriculum</td>
<td>New music curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased arts ed. resources</td>
<td>Increased arts ed. resources</td>
<td>Increased arts ed. resources</td>
<td>Increased arts ed. resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger advocacy position</td>
<td>Stronger advocacy position</td>
<td>Stronger advocacy position</td>
<td>Stronger advocacy position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased student understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased student understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased student understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased student understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased teacher understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased teacher understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased teacher understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased teacher understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased public understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased public understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased public understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
<td>Increased public understanding &amp; awareness of composers &amp; composing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td>High quality program</td>
<td>High quality program</td>
<td>High quality program</td>
<td>High quality program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good critical response</td>
<td>Good critical response</td>
<td>Good critical response</td>
<td>Good critical response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audience satisfaction</td>
<td>Audience satisfaction</td>
<td>Audience satisfaction</td>
<td>Audience satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large # of direct participants</td>
<td>Large # of direct participants</td>
<td>Large # of direct participants</td>
<td>Large # of direct participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant depth of experience for those participating</td>
<td>Significant depth of experience for those participating</td>
<td>Significant depth of experience for those participating</td>
<td>Significant depth of experience for those participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality recording produced</td>
<td>Quality recording produced</td>
<td>Quality recording produced</td>
<td>Quality recording produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artistic Dev.</strong></td>
<td>New work of high quality produced</td>
<td>New work of high quality produced</td>
<td>New work of high quality produced</td>
<td>New work of high quality produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work challenging &amp; accessible</td>
<td>Work challenging &amp; accessible</td>
<td>Work challenging &amp; accessible</td>
<td>Work challenging &amp; accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New artistic challenges</td>
<td>New artistic challenges</td>
<td>New artistic challenges</td>
<td>New artistic challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic growth</td>
<td>Aesthetic growth</td>
<td>Aesthetic growth</td>
<td>Aesthetic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Dev. (cont.)</td>
<td>Sponsor Indicators</td>
<td>Comm. Engagement Indicators</td>
<td>Composer Indicators</td>
<td>ACF Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical growth</td>
<td>Technical growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New and successful interdisciplinary collaboration.</td>
<td>New and successful interdisciplinary collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local participation in the development of new work.</td>
<td>Local participation in the development of new work.</td>
<td>Bridges built between musical genres.</td>
<td>Bridges built between musical genres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to the field</td>
<td>Contribution to the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased career stability.</td>
<td>Increased career stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased composer recognition</td>
<td>Increased composer recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td>New friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: General Program Questionnaire
Continental Harmony Participant Survey

Here is an opportunity for you to share your feelings and ideas about the composer residency you are a part of. Your answers will help us learn what you think about the impact and effectiveness of this project. It will also help us improve future programs of this sort. Thank you for taking the time to respond. We value your input.

(1) Survey version: ...........................................  □ January 2000  □ November 2000

(2) Name: ________________________________  State __________________

(3) Organization (if any): ____________________  (4) Position: _________________________

(5) Participant Category

☐ Composer  ☐ Music Director  ☐ Program Volunteer
☐ Continental Harmony  ☐ Educator/School Official  ☐ Civic Official
☐ Sponsor  ☐ Performer  ☐ Other:

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Please also provide any specific information you may have that supports your opinion or observation. If you have no opinion or are unfamiliar with a specific program area, please skip. Use back of sheet if necessary.

The Continental Harmony Composer residency has:

(6) attracted large audiences.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree
☐ Disagree

(7) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(8) increased participation in other local events.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree
☐ Disagree

(9) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(10) increased membership in our organization.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree

(11) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(12) attracted more diverse audiences.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree

(13) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(14) attracted new audiences.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Agree

(15) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?
(16) brought new resources to our/my endeavors.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(17) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(18) improved perceptions about our/my efforts.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(19) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(20) improved relations between disparate communities.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(21) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(22) improved community identity and self image.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(23) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(24) increased appreciation for our heritage, history and/or environment.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(25) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(26) increased tourism.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(27) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(28) increased awareness & appreciation of local music resources.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(29) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(30) increased awareness/appreciation of other local arts resources.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

(31) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?
(32) spawned new relationships among arts organizations.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(33) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(34) spawned new relationships among arts and non-arts organizations.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(35) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(36) improved health of local music community.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(37) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(38) improved the health of local arts community in general.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(39) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(40) increased the likelihood that similar projects will occur.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(41) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(42) created new school curriculum.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(43) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(44) improved local arts education.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(45) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(46) increased student understanding and awareness of composers & composing.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(47) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(48) increased teacher understanding and awareness of composers & composing.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

(49) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?
(50) created a musical program of high quality.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(51) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(52) received good critical response.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(53) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(54) resulted in satisfied audiences.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(55) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(56) involved a large number of people as active, contributing participants.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(57) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(58) provided a significant depth of experience for active participants.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(59) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(60) provided an opportunity for the resident composer to grow aesthetically.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(61) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(62) provided an opportunity for the resident composer to grow technically.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(63) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(64) produced new and successful musical collaborations.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(65) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

(66) produced new and successful interdisciplinary arts collaborations.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree

(67) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?
(68) involved local participants in the development of the new work.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(70) built bridges between musical genres.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(72) contributed to the field of music.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(74) improved the career stability of the resident composer.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(76) garnered new recognition for our/my work.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(78) provided new learning experiences for the resident composer.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(80) established new and lasting relationships among composer and community members.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree

(69) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________

(71) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________

(73) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________

(75) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________

(77) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________

(79) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________

(81) What specifically leads you to this conclusion?

________________________________________________________
Appendix D: Pre- & Post-test Forms

Community Hosts
Composers
Brief Questionnaire
Outcomes of *Continental Harmony* for your community.

Although your community’s celebration of the millennium is just beginning, we’d like you to reflect briefly on what your hopes for the project are.

Imagine it is the end of the year 2000, the music you want has been written and performed, the composer has left after interacting with people. Describe what a great success it was.

What impact do you expect the project will have on your organization?

What impact do you expect the project will have on your community in general?

What are your expectations of American Composers Forum staff?
Final Community Report

Organization__________________________________________ Date_______________

Report Completed by _______________________________________________________
        (name, title)

1. Describe the aspects of your participation in Continental Harmony that were most successful.

2. What aspects were in need of improvement? (In your organization, with your composer, in your interaction with American Composers Forum)

3. What impact has this project had on your organization?

   What observations or evidence lead you to these conclusions?

4. What impact has the project had on your community as a whole?
What observations or evidence lead you to these conclusions?

5. How can your organization ensure that any positive impacts of *Continental Harmony* on your community continue in the future?

6. How can your organization help to mitigate any negative impacts in the future?

7. Are there any other comments or observations you would like to share with American Composers Forum as we plan the continuation of *Continental Harmony*? How could our assistance have been more effective? How could the project have been structured differently?
Continental Harmony

Community Financial Report

Organization__________________________________________ Date_______________

Report Completed by _______________________________________________________
(nname, title)

In order to complete our reports to the National Endowment for the Arts and other funders, we need estimates of your expenditures. Please estimate as best you can the amount of money or hours spent on Continental Harmony in your community. You do not need to send any receipts or proofs of expenditures.

I. Project Administration: e.g., cash value of paid staff time spent in planning, carrying out these plans, working with the composer, arranging and participating in residency and performance activities, etc., and/or the number of hours of volunteer time spent on these activities.

Staff compensation for CH administration $_________________
Volunteer hours # of hours___________

II. Composer Accommodation: e.g., housing, entertainment, food, transportation while on site.

Cash expenditures $_______________
Cash equivalent of donated services $_______________

III. Performance Costs: e.g., advertising, programs, performers/conductor fees or time (rehearsals and performance), recording, venue, sound and light, performing rights license fees, score/part copying, etc.

Cash expenditures $_______________
Cash equivalent of donated services $_______________
 Volunteer hours # of hours___________

Total cash & cash equivalent: $_______________
Total volunteer hours: # of hours___________
Composer Questionnaire

At the beginning of your participation in Continental Harmony, we’d like you to focus briefly on what your hopes are for your involvement in the program. In this way we’ll be able to determine what kind of impact Continental Harmony has had on composers.

Imagine you have completed the residency and commission, and your work has been given its premiere performance. Describe what a great success it all was and what happened to make it so.

What specific impact do you expect your participation will have on
—your career?

—your work as an artist?

—your work with performing groups?

—your work in residency-based programs?

How would you describe where you are in your career as a composer?
__ emerging/new
__ mid-career
__ established

Why do you compose music? (please rank in order of importance to you, with 1 being the most important)
__ to earn income
__ to have an impact on the lives of others
it is something I’m compelled to do
it gives me pleasure
to leave a legacy that will outlive me
to contribute to the betterment of society—as a sacred act
—other (please describe):

What advice would you give to a high school student considering a career as a composer?

In addition to composing, in what other ways do you support yourself? (please check all that apply)
—composition is my sole means of support
—performing
—conductor
—teaching
—private means
—other work (please list):

What is the composer’s role in society? (please rank in order of importance to you, with 1 being the most important)
to challenge existing conceptions of music; to “push the artistic envelope”
to create art to enrich the lives of those who encounter it
to supply performers and conductors with new music
to effect political change
to express what it means to be human
—other (please describe:)

What are your expectations of American Composers Forum staff?
Final Composer Report

Composer________________________   Date_______________

1. Describe the aspects of your overall participation in Continental Harmony that were most successful.

2. What aspects were in need of improvement? (with your community, in your interaction with American Composers Forum)

3. What impact, if any, has your participation in Continental Harmony had on your work as an artist?

4. What impact do you think your work in Continental Harmony will have on your career?
5. Has your perception of working on a community-based project altered because of your participation in *Continental Harmony*? What are the positive aspects of this work? What are the negative aspects? What has been surprising?

6. What comments or observations would you like to share with American Composers Forum as we plan the continuation of *Continental Harmony*? How could our assistance have been more effective to you as a composer? How could the project have been structured differently?
Appendix E: Target Site Demographic Data
# Appendix E: Demographic Data, 15 Target Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population 90-99 (7/1/99)</th>
<th>%change 90-99</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Hispanic</th>
<th>% Asian</th>
<th>% Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>114,498</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1,184,586</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2,175,634</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>7,858</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington &amp; Jay</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>28,797</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>852,174</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>738,629</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>St.Louis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>193,433</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>74,562</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David City</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>8,607</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Charleston</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>319,921</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>3,250,404</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkersburg</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>86,337</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>39,363</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>1996.0</td>
<td>Age Composition</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>IMR*</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>,1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%all</td>
<td>%children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington &amp; Jay</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>St.Louis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David City</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Charleston</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkersburg</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Infant Mortality Rate
### Appendix E: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Economic Data</th>
<th>Cultural Density I</th>
<th>Cultural Density II</th>
<th>Index per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>max=100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median $</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,005</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>$27,960</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>24.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>$39,461</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>74.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>89.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>$33,587</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>75.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington &amp; Jay</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>$30,712</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>$62,130</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>99.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>$40,489</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>St.Louis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>$36,254</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>74.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$37,445</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>49.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David City</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$34,451</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>69.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>$43,684</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>77.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Charleston</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>$35,150</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>61.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>$39,037</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>89.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkersburg</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>$33,410</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>41.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>$36,282</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>98.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>