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Purpose:
Arts on Chicago began with a grant from ArtPlace to fund creative placemaking projects along a ten-block stretch of Chicago Avenue in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Members of the Arts on Chicago Leadership Team (AOC LT) expressed interest in creating an evaluation plan to measure the impact these projects have on community attachment. A group of students from the Humphrey School of Public Affairs in Dr. Melissa Stone’s capstone class “Managing Collaborations,” worked with the AOC LT to develop a project that focused on the following objectives:

- Developing indicators that measure community attachment through the arts
- Developing recommendations for a shared leadership structure

Methods of collecting and analyzing data:
In order to successfully complete the project the capstone team followed several steps to engage the community and create tools for the collaboration to use in future data collection. These steps included:

- Completing a literature review of arts indicators, social attachment, and collaborative leadership models
- Engaging the community, experts, businesses and AOC LT through interviews, surveys and focus groups
- Developing tools to collect data
- Identifying themes to use in organizing and analyzing the data

Indicators:
From the data collected in the community, four themes of community attachment (support, process, presence and participation) were used to develop and organize the indicators. The indicators within these themes also were divided by level of priority for the collaboration to consider as they implement this evaluation plan. Indicators measuring direct involvement of community members in art projects are deemed to be the highest priority indicators, while those measuring audience participation and presence of artists and art organizations are less important as the collaboration has perhaps less capacity to implement them. Figure 1 is a matrix showing the twelve indicators the capstone team developed, the themes under which each indicator belongs, as well as the level of priority each indicator assumes in engendering community attachment.
Conclusions and recommendations:
The insights we heard from the interviews with the AOC LT indicated a shared interest in continuing the work of the collaboration. Through the literature and interviews, we developed recommendations that may prove helpful in continuing the work of Arts on Chicago. These recommendations are:

- To further the goals of the collaboration and increase community attachment we recommend the LT sustain and continue to build its structure.
- Work to further develop its roles, vision, mission and values.
- Continue the current Community Liaison role.

### Table: Themes

|----------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Direct Involvement   | • Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate art
• Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts | • Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts
• Percent of public art projects made by artists living in the community | • Percent of public art projects made by artists | • Number of community members attending their first event
• Participation of diverse populations in the arts
• Number of people participating in new and existing arts-based groups
• Number of community members participating in public art projects |
| Audience Participation | • Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate art | • Number of reoccurring arts events
• Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate art | • Number of arts businesses and organizations | • Number of community members attending their first event
• Participation of diverse populations in the arts |
| Presence of Artists and Arts Organization & Institutions | • Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts
• Percent of public art projects made by artists living in the community
• Number of grants awarded for art-based projects
• Number of donations to key arts organizations by community residents | • Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts
• Percent of public art projects made by artists living in the community
• Number of grants awarded for art-based projects | • Number of arts businesses and organizations
• Number of ephemeral and permanent public art installations | • Number of donations to key arts organizations by community residents |


Figure 1. Indicator impact chart
INTRODUCTION

Arts on Chicago is an initiative that began with a grant from ArtPlace to fund twenty creative place-making projects in one year along a ten-block stretch of Chicago Avenue, from 32nd-42nd Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota. This geographic location represents an intersection of four neighborhoods and provides a unique opportunity for collaboration and the development of community attachment. Over nearly a two-year period, the Arts on Chicago Leadership Team, comprised of representatives from Pillsbury House + Theatre, Upstream Arts, Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association, the City Council’s 8th Ward, and artist Natasha Pestich worked together to develop public art projects that incorporated local artists, leveraging and “knitting together” the assets in the community.

In this paper, we will review existing indicators that aim to measure the impact of the arts and literature on social cohesion; explain the methods we used to collect and analyze data; present the indicators we identified to measure community attachment through the arts; and suggest recommendations for the continuation of a shared leadership structure for the AOC collaboration.
The topic of identifying indicators that measure the impacts of the arts has recently been explored and intensely scrutinized. Arts-based grant-making organizations are increasingly asking grantees to define the goals of their grant-funded programming and collect data to prove the effectiveness of their programming. With these increased requirements, grantees and scholars have expressed concomitant critiques of the process of defining indicators and methods of measurement and analysis. This criticism is mostly founded in the ‘fuzziness’ of arts indicators and grantees and scholars alike are wondering what exactly these indicators are measuring, particularly within the context of creative placemaking (Markusen, 2012).

The literature review provides both theoretical and methodological evidence to support substantive findings surrounding the current knowledge of arts indicators. It includes theories of indicators used to measure community development, social attachment and social capital; it also reviews how existing arts organizations are both developing and measuring arts indicators.

We identified articles through online research through Google Scholar, from coursework in community development and the arts at the University of Minnesota, and from recommendations by experts and practitioners in the field. The review of literature was influential in our development of indicators for measuring social attachment through the arts.

Our main takeaways from the literature review include:

- Existing arts indicators are focused primarily on economic values and data collection is limited to using the U.S. Census, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and other national data aggregators. This misses the richness of community level data.
- Social scientists advocate for using a survey to collect data on indicators of community attachment.
- An arts activity provides the greatest impact on the individual, and by extension the community, when it brings people together to work collectively.
- The community attachment literature further supports the concept that consistent and meaningful human interaction and activities improve attachment.

**Arts Indicators Literature**
*(A complete list of indicators for each of the below programs can be found in the Appendix A.)*

The following sources provide information of how various arts organizations, both locally and nationally, develop indicators to measure the impact of the arts. Of these five sets of indicators, the *Track it! Hennepin* is the only one designed specifically to measure the impacts of the arts on a particular geographic area. The others share a national scale with the intention of comparing and contrasting cities to cities or neighborhoods to neighborhoods. It is important to note that all five indicators have been developed with in the last ten years. This growing interest in measuring the impacts of the arts may suggest that arts indicators will become more prevalent and may be more heavily relied upon by grant making organizations in the future.
National arts indicators

ArtPlace: Since Arts on Chicago (AOC) is funded by an ArtPlace grant, we began by reviewing indicators that ArtPlace advocates for using to measure the projects it funds. ArtPlace devised “Vibrancy Indicators” in an effort to consistently measure change in neighborhoods in which ArtPlace invests. Since it is necessary to compare communities across the country, ArtPlace uses national data sets for consistency and ease of collection.

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA): Similar in scale to ArtPlace indicators, NEA’s indicators seek to establish a public and web-accessible “national standard for defining, measuring, and conveying the dimensions of livability that NEA hypothesizes are affected by creative placemaking” (NEA, 2012). The data for NEA indicators are primarily informed by the U.S. Census data via its decennial Census and its American Community Survey (ACS).

Americans for the Arts: Indicators created by American for the Arts differ from ArtPlace and the NEA in that they intend to measure perception versus simply economic or demographic data. For example, indicators include awareness of civic or social concerns in the community and the changes in the community’s attitudes or motivations, specifically in regards to activism and capacity to take action (citation needed). Americans for the Arts also intends to measure impacts on a national scale.

City arts indicators

Knight Soul of the Community: The indicators developed by the Knight Foundation seek to measure community attachment. The Foundation undertook a three-year study across several communities to establish what makes people attached to their communities. Utilizing a survey as a tool, the study sought to understand peoples’ perception in areas such as social offerings, openness and aesthetics. Indicators are national in scope although the Foundation also examined certain cities throughout the country, including St. Paul, to arrive at more localized indicators that actually tended to align closely with its national indicators.

City of Minneapolis Creative Vitality Index Report 2013: The Creative Vitality Index (CVI) provides a means for gathering and synthesizing the impact of Minneapolis’ creative sector. CVI was created and trademarked by the Western States Arts Federation (WESTAF) and provides cities nationwide with a dynamic creative economy report for a fee. CVI seeks to assesses the impact of the creative economy by “measuring the share of creative jobs, arts spending, and creative for-profit and nonprofit organizations in a given city or region” (Kayim and Muessig, 2013). The data collected provides a baseline to begin longitudinal studies and a means for comparing and contrasting cities that also use the CVI.

Localized arts indicators

Track-it! Hennepin indicators: This set of indicators was designed to measure the impact of the initiative Plan It! Hennepin, which has a goal to strengthen the Hennepin Cultural District in downtown Minneapolis. Consultant Anne Gadwa Nicodemus created twelve outcomes and indicators that address both the economic and social environment in order to measure these outcomes. For instance, Gadwa included two indicators addressing equitable revitalization in order to monitor the displacement of businesses and people as a consequence of the initiative.
Criticism of Arts Indicators

Some of the indicators described above recently have received criticism from scholars and practitioners of creative placemaking. Main arguments against these proposed indicators include lack of relevance for individual communities and preference for quantitative over qualitative data.

One of the more outspoken critics of indicators is Ann Markusen who admits to be, in her 2012 article, *Fuzzy Concepts, Proxy Data: Why Indicators Won’t track Creative Placemaking Success*, “an evidence gal,” but argues that evaluators need to impart a holistic approach in developing indicators where the creative placemaking initiative is being executed, incorporating the needs and vision of the community. Accordingly, Markusen states that one of the major pitfalls surrounding arts indicators is “… they don’t capture universal value for all people in the community.”

Outside the United States, researchers in the United Kingdom (U.K.) also have identified similar limitations to measuring the impact of the arts. This is the case even provided the country’s experience with utilizing the arts as a national policy tool since the 1980s for dealing with urban social exclusion. In their article, *Arts-led regeneration in the U.K.: The rhetoric and the evidence on urban social inclusion*, U.K. researchers Lees and Melhuish (2012) argue that the evidence base lacks a “holistic and integrated” approach, fails to incorporate an anthropological and sociological perspective, and favors using “predetermined requirements of commissioners” over those of the potential users of the arts program or activity. They provide recommendations that urge developing a more robust evidence base for the impact of the arts and conclude that social scientists develop evaluative indicators in an inclusive process, stressing the importance of artist and community input.

Most arts indicators, save a handful in *Track it! Hennepin* and the Knight Foundation’s *Soul of the Community*, do not incorporate a local context or element of human perception that adds the “robustness” recommended by Lees and Melhuish (2012). In order to move “beyond statistical counts of economic value,” they advocate for using ethnographic methodologies for collecting rich qualitative data to tell the story of the impact of the arts (Lees and Melhuish, 2012). Given the dwindling public and private arts resources, it is important to adequately legitimize their impact.

One way evaluators have tried to measure the impact of the arts locally is by measuring the impact of the arts through the lens of economic development. Many of these economic-based indicators rely on data from the U.S. Census or other data aggregating government agencies, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistic. These statistics are usually collected on an annual basis and viewed through a national lens. As such, the data cannot be collected in real-time or at a level that respects the uniqueness of a locality (Markusen, 2012). Because this data is collected on a national level, linkages between community economic development and the arts are often tenuous.
Community Attachment Literature
For this project, the AOC Leadership Team requested indicators that provide evidence for engendering social or community attachment through the arts. Given the previous criticisms citing a lack of community context, sociological perspective and heavy reliance on measuring economic value of the arts, we subsequently conducted a literature review on indicators of community attachment.

Since “community attachment” is a broad, multi-faceted topic with varying components, the literature review intentionally identified indicators measuring concepts such as social capital, community strength, place attachment and capacity building. While emphasis was placed on identifying articles that related these frameworks through the context of the arts, few exist so we gathered information on general community cohesion.

In Place Attachment in a Revitalizing Neighborhood: Individual and Block Levels of Analysis, authors Brown, Perkins and Brown (2003) discussed the idea of assessing attachment at three different spatial levels of analysis: the home, the block and the neighborhood. Their assessment focused primarily on measuring the frequency of informal neighborly contacts in the community, the extent that neighbors knew one another and feeling of social control.

Besides feeling attached to people in a place, research has also been conducted on attachment to physical environments. Moore and Graefe’s (1994) article Attachment to Recreation Settings: The Case of Rail-Trail Users, proposed that place attachment can be thought of in two distinct ways: “place dependence” and “place identity,” which focus on connection to space through an activity and the extent the user emotionally values the space (Moore and Graefe, 1994).

Several studies use surveys to capture sentiments of community attachment. Western et al.’s paper Measuring Community Strength and Social Capital, provides a multitude of indicators for assessing social capital by using a “structured survey” to collect quantitative data of social capital. In order to organize and collect this data, Western et al. developed a framework matrix of informal and formal structures and norms that influence the behavior of these structures in a given community. Buskner (1988) also found that that many variables could be condensed or synthesized regarding community attachment from multiple concepts of social cohesion and collected using a survey.

Arts and Community Attachment
Finally, we conclude the literature review with research on how the arts can influence community cohesion. One aspect of community attachment is the concept of “capacity building.” Korza and Bacon (2008) proposed that this concept builds and strengthens attachment. Further, they concluded that the more diverse the group of people that comes together to participate in an art-related activity, the more likely capacity building will develop on individual, collective and community levels. Stern and Seifert (2007) found that agglomerations of cultural assets, or “clusters,” foster relationships between producers of and consumers of art and help establish higher levels of collective efficacy.

Providing further evidence for the connection between the arts involvement and community attachment is Geutzkow’s (2002) paper How the Arts Impact Communities: An introduction to
the literature on arts impact studies. Geutzhow aggregated research across various fields (from economic development to community cohesion) on the impact of the arts and deduced that the mechanism of direct involvement in the arts is the most beneficial, providing more significant impact than simply being in the presence of arts organizations or participating as an audience member.

**Collaborative Leadership**

In *Managing with Networks: Adding Value to Public Organizations*, Robert Agranoff discusses the challenges and the array of positive and negative outcome that could potentially exist in a collaboration. This piece was helpful in providing support for the importance of networks, expertise and resources.

In thinking about the collaboration’s structure, Stone, Crosby and Bryson’s (2010) piece provides insight into participant-governed structures, such as the AOC Leadership Team (AOC LT). They develop a framework that pays significant attention to the combined influences of external environments, government processes and governance structure on the outcomes of collaborations. The identification of these fronts helped guide our interpretation of the data we collected while interviewing member of the AOC LT.

Lastly, Huxham and Vangen’s (2000) paper, *Ambiguity, Complexity and Dynamics in the Membership of Collaboration* discusses the inherent ambiguity in some collaborations. This paper provides support for the tenuous self-designed roles ‘established’ among the partners within the AOC LT and the continuation of them moving forward.
By using a variety of data collection strategies, informed by the literature review and informational interviews we conducted with practitioners in the fields of creative placemaking, evaluation, and nonprofit leadership (find a list of interviewees in Appendix B), we hoped to gather diverse perspectives to inform the indicators used to measure the impact of community-based creative placemaking projects occurring in the community.¹ Bryson and Patton (2010) define stakeholders as “individuals, groups, or organizations that can affect or are affected by an evaluation process or its findings” (31). The stakeholders we identified were residents in the AOC geographic area, business owners who own businesses along 32nd-42nd Streets, AOC artists, and members of the AOC Leadership Team (AOC LT).

Through our data collection methods, we hoped to explore the reasons community members feel attached to the people and places in their neighborhoods, relying on individual interviews of business owners and two focus groups with participants from the community. In addition, we interviewed members of the AOC LT in order to recommend future leadership structures. The AOC LT is collecting data from AOC artists so we did not include them in our data collection.

**Focus groups/listening sessions**

We convened focus groups in order to collect data that would allow us to begin identifying locally-based indicators specific to the arts activity in the community. Kruger and Casey note that one way focus groups can be used is to “design an intervention,” in our case, help create an evaluation plan (379). The two focus groups were held at PH+T and we invited community residents through a variety of channels, such as word of mouth and social media.² In order to collect peoples’ ideas on community attachment, we posed questions that allowed participants to discuss their connections to the community and their perceptions of art in the community.

We encountered several challenges recruiting participants for the focus group. Because we relied heavily on PH+T and the neighborhood associations to advertise the focus groups, all of the people who participated in the focus groups had previously been involved in PH+T programming; this involvement varied from attending one performance, to working as an AOC artist, to having a child in PH+T programming. We hoped to attract people not already familiar with PH+T nor familiar with neighborhood associations so as to gain potentially valuable perspectives of those not connected with any of the community organizations.

**In-event survey for people participating in AOC events**

We composed a survey for people to take while participating in AOC events;³ Newcomer and Triplett (2010) write that face-to-face surveys result in high rates of response and are the preferred way to collect data from open-ended questions. In the survey, we posed quantitative and qualitative questions that address participants’ perceptions of the community, attendance at community arts events, and the extent to which they met new people or acquaintances at the event. The survey was translated into Spanish.

---

¹ The term “community” refers to the people and places in the four neighborhoods most directly served by Arts on Chicago (AOC): Bancroft, Bryant, Central, and Powderhorn.
² For a more comprehensive outline of the methods used to plan for and conduct the focus group, see Appendix C; see Appendix D for the focus group guidelines.
³ See Appendix E for the In-event survey.
We attended two AOC events, a stilt-making workshop and a Fiber Sprawl Community Yarn Workshop in order to distribute surveys to the participants, and collected a total of nine surveys. After this initial trial, we met with members of the AOC LT to revise the survey. The revised survey was posted on the AOC website for people to take after they participate in an AOC event; online surveys can come at a lower financial cost and take less time and energy than face-to-face survey collection (Newcomer and Triplett, 2010).

Business owner semi-structured interviews
We conducted semi-structured interviews with business owners; these interviews were comprised of open- and closed-ended questions and allowed us to explore certain questions in more depth depending on the interviewee (Adams, 2010). The purpose of interviewing business owners was to explore the ways in which people who own businesses along Chicago Avenue between 32nd and 42nd Streets feel connected to the community and how they view art as playing a role in their ventures. After receiving a list of business owners that AOC LT had contacted early in the project, we first attempted to make contact through phone calls and emails to arrange face-to-face interactions; we conducted interviews with nine business owners.

One limitation to this method is that we were not able to reach each business owner along the ten-block target area; therefore, our sample is one of convenience. In addition, our sample size is not guaranteed to be representative of the population of business owners in terms of race, ethnicity, and tenure in the neighborhood.

AOC Leadership Team semi-structured interviews
The purpose of conducting interviews with the AOC LT was to gather information pertaining to their initial motivations for being involved in the collaboration, the roles they have assumed, and their visions on the future of AOC. We conducted interviews with members of the AOC Leadership Team: Mike Hoyt, Noel Raymond, Natasha Pestich, Julie Guidry, Elizabeth Glidden, and Becky Timm. Each person was interviewed once by one member of the Humphrey team and each interview lasted 30-45 minutes. Most of these interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed. One challenge to this data collection method is, due to time restraints, we did not interview all of the members of the AOC LT.

Analysis of data
Once we had collected all our data the focus groups, in-event surveys, business interviews, and AOC LT interviews, we needed to sort the data in order to derive appropriate indicators that would measure what we heard was important for community attachment. We organized the data into five themes; four of these themes, “presence,” “participation,” “impact,” and “support” are gleaned from Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement (2002) by Maria Rosario Jackson and Joaquin Herranz Jr. of the Urban Institute. We determined that a fifth theme, “process,” was necessary to complete our analysis.

- Presence: the creative community assets that the community deems valuable
- Participation: ways in which people interact with these creative assets

---

4 See Appendix F for the interview questions we posed to business owners.
5 See Appendix G for the questions we posed to members of the AOC LT.
• Impacts: how the creative assets and participation in these assets contribute to community-building
• Systems of support: resources, such as financial, organization, and human, needed to facilitate opportunities for people to participate in creative assets.
• Process: The actions taken to make creative community-based projects a reality

Pulling out the “impact” theme because each of the other themes facilitate “impact” of the arts, we used the four remaining themes created twelve indicators that aim to measure how increased participation in, support for, presence of, and the intentional process of creating community-based art projects can lead to feelings of strengthen community attachment. Some indicators can measure more than one theme, indicating the richness of the indicator in evaluating community attachment. Figure 2 below shows the categories each indicator falls under; as the indicators improve, the potential for the impact of the arts on community attachment increases. See Appendix H for a chart showing how the twelve indicators fit within the assumptions outlined in the AOC Logic Model and the outcomes we suggest below in the next section of the paper.

Figure 2: Indicators for arts-based community attachment by theme. Chart influenced by Maria Rosario Jackson and Joaquin Herranz, Jr. (2002).
Development Guidelines
In developing the below set of indicators and outcomes we were mindful of the following guidelines.\(^6\)

1. **Validity.** Foundation in data from community input, stakeholders and business owners.

2. **Relevance.** Appropriate and relevant to measuring community attachment through the arts as well as a connection to the vision statements and goals of the collaborative and the community.

3. **Measurability.** Qualitative and quantitative data is present in the community and can be collected with an evaluative tool, such as a survey, focus group or interview.

4. **Clarity.** Unambiguous indicators with understandable and clear statements.

5. **Scalability.** Indicators can be used at varying geographic levels depending on organizational capacity and specific project goals.

Geographic Scale
The scale for the following indicators is for those events, businesses and organizations along the ten block stretch of Chicago Avenue from 32\(^{nd}\) to 42\(^{nd}\) Street. This recommendation is supported by the existing relationships the AOC Leadership Team (AOC LT) has created and strengthened through Arts on Chicago (AOC). Focusing on this geographic area will foster the growing networks and will help provide the resources for collecting data for the indicators. Further, Chicago Avenue is the shared commercial heart of the four neighborhoods and its strength can serve as a proxy for the greater community.

The selection of this geographic area is further supported by the 38\(^{th}\) Street and Chicago Small Area Plan, which seeks to transform its namesake corridor into a prosperous and creative hub that connects the Bryant, Bancroft, Central and Powderhorn neighborhoods socially, economically and physically. Provided this scale recommendation, it is important to note this evaluation can easily scale up or down depending on organizational capacity and resources as well as interest in measuring the arts impact on certain geographic areas.

Section Layout
To help guide the reader, this section is divided into four outcomes associated with community attachment with a subset of three indicators that support these outcomes. The indicators are designed to measure whether the outcome is strengthening or weakening as well as to tell a story about the community’s evolution in terms of community attachment and the arts. Additionally, each indicator contains, in this order, a brief description, the methods used to collect data, calculations (if applicable), and guidance on how to possibly analyze the data. At the end of each indicator subset, supporting evidence from the literature and data collection is discussed to provide relevancy.

---

\(^6\) Guidelines from *Community Indicators, American Planning Association (2003)*
These indicators can be used in tandem with each other to get a pulse of the arts in the target geographic area and measure the extent to which goals are met. For example, they can measure the density of the arts and determine the degree of spatial disparity in the arts, answering the question, are arts or arts-friendly businesses more concentrated in areas that have a predominant ethnic or racial demographic?

**Frequency**
These indicators can be collected in real-time, monthly or annually, depending on the context. For example, data collection from events should occur at the time of the event, while data for grants can be tracked at a more relaxed pace since it is not as time-sensitive. For consistency, all data should be fully compiled and compared on an annual basis.

**Reassessment**
Community perceptions and values have the tendency to change over time. As such, it is important to re-evaluate whether these indicators are accurately reflecting these potential shifts. In order to conduct this assessment, consider utilizing the methodology set forth in the Methodology and Data Collection and Analysis section of this paper.

**Glossary**
“Community” refers to the four neighborhoods of Bancroft, Bryant, Central and Powderhorn; “community network” refers to the connections made between the AOC LT and the businesses and organizations in the geographic area; and “geographic area” is the selected area in which to gather data.

---

Outcome I: Increased community participation in the arts

1. **Indicator: Number of community members attending their first art event**

This indicator measures the extent to which people in the community are experiencing art in the geographic area for the first time, indicating that those not normally engaged in the arts are more aware of opportunities and are interested in these opportunities.

**Measurement**
This indicator can be measured through the in-event survey.

**Analysis**
If first-time participants are engaging in the arts, programming and events are reaching a wider population. Data also will show the number of participants who engage in multiple arts events; as a greater number of community members come together to participate in an arts activity, the potential for relationship-building increases.
2. Indicator: Number of community members participating in public art projects

This indicator measures the extent to which community members participate in public art projects. One of the goals of the 38th Street and Chicago Avenue Small Area / Corridor Framework Plan is to “make artistic activity in our community accessible to artists and non-artists alike” (2008, 60).

Measurement
This indicator can be measured through the in-event survey.

Analysis
The activities in which community members spend their free time is indicative of what they value. Thus, an increase in the number of people who choose to spend time in their community and work alongside other people from the area on a project that is rooted in the context of the local environment, could show that people care more about their community. An increase in participants from outside the community could indicate that the community is being seen as a destination for the arts. However, if the number of the total people participating in planning and implementation of art projects is increasing but the ratio of community participants to participants from outside the community is decreasing, that could indicate that the projects are not of interest to community members or community members do not feel welcome.

3. Indicator: Participation of diverse population in the arts

The 38th Street and Chicago Avenue Small Area / Corridor Framework Plan articulates one of its art-related goals is to “use art-making as a tool for connection between people across lines of ethnic, cultural, and generational difference” for community development (2008, 60). AOC projects are located in four neighborhoods that are very diverse in terms of socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity/culture, native language, gender identity and sexual orientation, political affiliation, and religious beliefs. Therefore, it is important to determine if people participating in art-making in the community reflect the diversity of the community, thus satisfying the goal stated in the community’s Small Area Plan.

Measurement
This indicator can be measured through the in-event survey.

Analysis
With this data, it is possible to analyze the diversity of people who are exposed to the arts. Art events can be compared among each other in terms of the demographics of the participants, noting whether the location or content of the arts event influences the type of person in attendance. This data also can be compiled annually and compared across years to determine if diverse populations are increasingly experiencing the arts.

Support for using these indicators to measure community attachment
Although it is important to note the number of “art fans” (Kayim and Muessig, 2013), those who support the arts by going to events, it is even more important for community members to feel as though they have influence over change in a community. Different from the presence of arts
organizations and audience participation, Joshua Guetzhow (2002) argues that “direct involvement” can help individuals and communities gain social and human capital. And as Roberto Bedoya writes, creating “authentic” placemaking is rooted in a sense of belonging (2013). If the participants feel as though they belong in the art-making process, they may feel a greater sense of ownership of the artwork itself but also the environment in which the art was made. One focus group participant reported: “There’s something about [art made by people in the community] that’s powerful and engaging … if your neighborhood is making art, it’s a different reaction [than if someone from outside the community has made the art].”

It is important to not only measure the number of people that participate and groups that form around the arts but to also note the diversity within these groups. Diversity of participants may indicate that participants are making connections that “cross individual boundaries” (Dwyer, Korza, and Schaffer, 2008) thus resulting in “changes in awareness and knowledge” as well as understanding among people of different backgrounds (Arts Wave, 2008).

Data from interviews with business owners and members of the AOC LT showed that increased participation from diverse populations was desired. Some of the business owners with whom we spoke emphasized the importance of being in a community with people of a variety of backgrounds and expressed wanting to attract more people from the community to their businesses. Members of the AOC LT indicated that it is important to reach a variety of populations in the community, especially people who are unfamiliar with the existing arts-related programming. Many interviewees expressed the concern of gentrification and advocated using the arts as a way to improve the community without playing a role in gentrification.

Outcome II: Enhanced organizational support for community-based art

4. Indicator: Number of community members participating in new and existing art-based groups

This indicator measures the participation level in and formation of informal and formal arts-based membership organizations in the community. The existence of arts-based groups can indicate that community members feel inclined to gather around the arts and have access to the resources to facilitate these formations.

Measurement
With the help of the community network, this indicator can be measured by counting the number of formal and informal arts-based groups and the number of participants. Formal association would be an entity akin to the 38th and Chicago Street Business Association with a leadership structure, organizational by-laws, and mission. In contrast, an informal association would be akin to a group of residents gathering at PH+T to write and share poetry purely for the benefits of socializing and creating.

Analysis
As existing associations grow and new ones form, the implication is that people in the community are coming together around art, perhaps as a result of being inspired by the art they see on the streets or by the artistic infrastructure present in the community. This indicator can
also symbolize capacity in the community to organize and communicate and the availability of space in which to gather.

5. Indicator: Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate art

This indicator determines the level of support for the arts among the businesses and organizations in the geographic area. Support from these entities can indicate growing appreciation for and increased resources for the arts.

Measurement
This indicator can be measured through a survey given to businesses and organizations. Another way in which to measure this indicator would be to ask the 38th and Chicago Business Association and other associations in the community to gather data on actions of businesses incorporating art. “Incorporation of the arts” can include hosting events, displaying art, and collaborating with an arts organization on a specific project. The literature supports the idea the mechanism of direct involvement by non-artists in making art provides the greatest impact (Guetzhow, 2002). Thus, businesses that provide space for art creation could be considered more valuable to building social cohesion. The data collector can make the determination on what type of “incorporation” to capture.

Calculation
\[
\frac{\text{Number of businesses incorporating art}}{\text{Number of businesses in the community}}
\]

Analysis
This indicator can measure the extent to which art is experienced in the community in places other than at arts organizations and the events they implement. Data can show the density of businesses that support the arts in the geographic area and whether certain areas have greater opportunities for people to experience the arts in businesses and organizations than others.

6. Indicator: Percent of public art projects made by artist who live in the community

This indicator reflects the importance of highlighting and valuing the artists in the community and may show the extent to which local artists are active and supported in the community.

Measurement
Data to measure this indicator can be collected through the community network. Additional data collected from the artists who live in the community who produce this art could include length of residence in the community, extent to which they have previously worked in the community, and basic demographic information such as age, race/ethnicity/culture, gender, and sexual identity.

Calculation
\[
\frac{\text{Number of public arts projects by resident artists}}{\text{Total number of public art projects}}
\]
Analysis
Artists who choose to work in their communities perceive that investing their time and resources in their communities is worthwhile. If the number of projects by artists in the community stays constant or increases, it shows continued community and financial support for local artists. In addition, the demographic information on the artists in the community can determine if the active artists are representative of the demographics of the community. It is important to note that the presence of artists from outside the community can be beneficial to the community by offering alternative perspectives.

Support for using these indicators to measure community attachment
Literature on social capital suggests that when community members come together to meet new people and develop deeper connections with existing acquaintances and friends, trust is established. Participating in the arts can aid in community development by fostering a “stronger sense of community identity” and a “decrease in people experiencing social isolation” (Jermyn 2001). According to Lochner, Kawachi and Kennedy (1999), an indicator of social capital is membership in community organizations, this membership could imply a desire to participate and a sense of belonging to the community. It could also imply improved levels of communication and planning in the community (Jermyn, 2001).

It also is important to note the alternative spaces in which to experience the arts, including non-arts business and organizations. The data collected with the business surveys suggest that business owners view incorporating arts as important for connecting with employees, the community and customers. For example, Modern Times Café offers in-house artist space for employees and provides opportunities for artists to exhibit work after regular cafe hours. Similarly, Café Southside has an indoor mural by a local artist and provides open mic opportunities. Additionally, one business owner cited the upcoming celebration organized by the 38th and Chicago Business Association and the AOC LT as opportunity to further engage customers around the arts. All but one business owner was either currently or planning on incorporating art in their business; the remaining business owner was interested in incorporating the arts in his business.

During the interviews and focus groups, people spoke about the importance of supporting local artists. Markusen writes that many scholars assert that “artists serve as the conscience of the society” and can have great influence over the places in which they live, sometimes more influence than the art work that is displayed in communities (Markusen 2006). AOC values artists who live in the community as it is necessary that at least one artist in each AOC artist team is local. Many members of the AOC LT articulated the importance of the networks and relationships being created among the AOC artists. For example, a reading group was started to discuss gentrification. As artists feel more supported in their communities, there is a greater likelihood that they will work with members of their communities and increase the feeling of connectivity to the physical space.
7. **Indicator: Number of grants awarded for art-based projects**

This indicator measures the number of grants awarded for arts-based projects from foundations, governments and other grant making institutions. This measurement could indicate the capacity of artists and organizations in the community to take on high quality, meaningful art projects.

**Measurement**
Through the community network, establish an artist database, such as the one facilitated by Fire Arts Center, that would include information on grants awarded to artists. Additionally, newspaper articles and online media should be viewed frequently to look for such awards. The Foundation Center’s directory through the Hennepin County Library System and Guidestar are great resources for the collection and verification of grant data. Most local, state, and federal government grants are public and easily searchable.

**Analysis**
If grant awards continue to increase both in terms of monetary value as well as in absolute numbers, this could indicate that the community is solidifying itself as an arts hub in the city. It could indicate an increase in high quality and meaningful art as many grants are highly selective with rigorous guidelines and outcomes. Moreover, it could help measure the availability of resources and the capacity of artists to attain grant funding.

8. **Indicator: Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts**

This indicator intends to measure how the community values the arts and the availability and accessibility of art programs for children from diverse backgrounds. If the community intends to develop an arts district accessible to everyone in the community, youth must have the capacity and appreciation to engage with the arts as well as the opportunities to contribute to the arts. This begins through local education.

**Measurement**
Gather budget data on non-magnet, public schools that residents of the community attend in the community and determine percent of budget dedicated to the arts. It is important to note that geographic scope for this indicator is larger than the others, as schools are dispersed throughout the community and not strictly along Chicago Avenue.

**Calculation**

\[
\text{Total budget for arts programs for all schools} / \text{Total school budget for all schools}
\]

**Analysis**
Even after acknowledging limitations established by state, federal and city policymakers, local community leaders do have some influence over school program funding. Monitoring the school arts budgets could be a barometer for the changing values of the community, its needs and its capacity for arts advocacy. Further, it could indicate arts accessibility for youth from families without the resources to participate in afterschool arts programs. If school budgets decrease
significantly it could indicate that the arts community needs to work collectively to increase opportunities and support for youth engagement through the arts.

9. Indicator: Number of donations to key arts organizations by community residents

This indicator is a proxy that gauges the commitment and willingness of residents to support local arts organizations. One of the goals of the 38th Street and Chicago Avenue Small Area Plan aims to “support and promote artistic activity already taking place around 38th Street and Chicago” (2008 60). This measure intends to determine the support coming from local residents through individual giving.

Measurement
As determined by the Small Area Plan, there are “several notable arts and arts-related institution” along Chicago Avenue (2008 61). Accordingly, measuring this indicator involved data collection from the following organizations and institutions: PH+T, Urban Arts Academy, Upstream Arts, Fire Arts Center, and StevenBe Creative Community Foundation. By leveraging the existing community network, this data collection could be organized and shared regularly across organizations. Ideally this data should be collected monthly and compared year-over-year, along with an annual comparison.

Analysis
This indicator shows the extent to which people in the community are deciding to give to arts organizations that serve their community. The amount of the donation is immaterial for this indicator, at least initially. As the number of donors increase, the community may be increasingly understanding and valuing the benefits of the arts. In regards to nonresident giving, it could indicate to the extent that people outside the community perceive the benefits of the organizations, and perhaps the community as an arts destination.

Support for using these indicators to measure community attachment
Grants can act as interventions in a community and the ArtPlace grant was an influential driver for bringing stakeholders to the table to accomplish twenty art projects along Chicago Avenue in a short time frame. Through the collaboration each AOC LT member not only brought knowledge to the group but also built expertise. This assemblage of capacities and competencies provided the means and motivation for accomplishing the work of the AOC LT. Further, the ArtPlace grant helped elevate the members of the AOC LT in the arts and community development sphere in the Twin Cities.

Tracking the amount of monetary resources, such as the ArtPlace grant, that flow into the community in terms of grants and individual giving is a proxy for community’s capacity for strengthening the arts. Support and resources for the arts could indicate that the community is making a statement about what it wants in its community and knowledge about institutions and organizations is increasing (Korza and Bacon, 2008). More specifically, people tend give to causes and organization that they view as beneficial to them both privately and to the greater public (Vesterlund, 2006), indicating a greater appreciation for the arts. These indicators also align with the Small Area Plan’s goal of building support for the arts in the community.
Arts activities in schools can also show community support for the arts. School arts programs can help increase social capital as they provide space and the opportunity for students to work creatively in collaboration with classmates. This direct involvement in the arts has the potential to build social networks, increase collective efficacy, improve attachment to a community and reduce delinquency in high-risk youth (Gueztkow, 2002). Additionally, having arts in public school brings awareness to arts and may deepen the students’ relationships to the arts. This capacity-building is important as it may inspire students to engage more deeply with the arts in the community. The interviews with AOC LT showed that capacity-building and competencies were valued as essential attributes for forming a successful collaboration.

Outcome IV: Expanded access to the arts

10. Indicator: Number of ephemeral and permanent public art installations

The presence of public art installations is reflective of the resources available and interest within the community to engage and create art collectively. High densities of public art can also help establish and identify a geographic area as an arts district where both ephemeral and permanent public art projects present.

Measurement
With the help of the community network, ephemeral and permanent works can be recorded as they occur and are installed. According to the City of Minneapolis Public Art Policies and Planning (2001), public art “may include permanent visual art, performances, installations, events and other temporary works.” Ephemeral installations may include theater, walking tours, and other events that incorporate art-making or viewing that do not produce a permanent installation in a public space. Permanent installations may be defined as works that are meant to last longer than five years.7

Analysis
If the amount of ephemeral and permanent art installations increases, it can be assumed that the perceived value for these types of works in the community is increasing as is the potential for people in the community to experience art. The location of the art should be noted in order to evaluate if the art is evenly distributed along the geographic area of interest.

11. Indicator: Number of reoccurring arts events

This indicator measures the amount of arts events that occur on a regular basis, whether monthly, quarterly or yearly. This indicator intends to measure the interest in, availability of and community capacity to organize reoccurring arts-related events.

Measurement
Data can be collected through the community network; it is important to note the location and

7 The City of Minneapolis defines four types of public art: temporary lasts up to five years, midspan lasts up to 15 years, long term lasts up to 50 years, and permanent is integrated into the site or structure and unable to be removed. These definitions, however, can be redefined based on the views of the Leadership Team.
regularity of these events. In addition, a question about attending reoccurring arts events could be incorporated into the in-event survey.

**Analysis**
The more reoccurring opportunities for people to engage in a variety of arts event, the greater the likelihood people will connect and build relationships. If events are being held on a regular basis, it may indicate that people value the opportunity to reconnect with others over an arts project or event. Similar to the analysis of the indicator above (Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate art), the locations of these reoccurring events can signify where gaps exist in the geographic area.

**12. Indicator: Number of arts businesses and organizations**
This indicator determines the strength of support for arts organizations by the community. The number of arts businesses and organizations can reflect the amount of support the community is able and interested in providing to the arts.

**Measurement**
Data can be collected by tracking new arts-related businesses and organizations as well as ones that have closed. Entities to be counted are those that embrace art-based missions or business plans, such as schools (e.g., Urban Arts Academy) and galleries (e.g., Third Place Gallery).

**Analysis**
An increase or stabilization in the number of art businesses and organizations can indicate the perception that the community is interested in supporting the arts. As these businesses and organizations grow in size and number, it may further indicate the growing capacity of the community to support such businesses, and the growing perception of the area as a “cultural district.”

**Support for using these indicators to measure community attachment**
The volume and variety of types of art installations are intentional aspects of AOC. Many members in the focus groups, business owners, and members of AOC Leadership Team commented on the large volume of art projects and events in the community. As one AOC Leadership Team member said, one of the goals of the AOC is to “saturate” the geographic area with art so as to create an environment where people consistently encounter art. This “saturation” is possible due to the ArtPlace grant and the scale of future projects will probably decrease.

However, a decrease in number of projects does not have to correspond to a decrease in types of art projects. In focus groups and interviews, people communicated that they value different types of art, from murals to architecture, to outdoor theater. Based on the artists selected for AOC, the LT also values facilitating the creation of a variety of art projects. One member of the AOC LT emphasized the importance of implementing ephemeral projects because the process of creating art and building relationships is emphasized. Another member showed preference for permanent installations that physically change the environment, allowing people in the
community to see improvements in the built environment. However, both of these AOC LT members acknowledged the importance of doing both ephemeral and permanent installations.

Besides the volume and types of art projects, it also is important to note that reoccurring events are valued in the community. From our focus groups, participants cited the presence of the May Day Parade as place to “check-in” with people they haven’t seen all year. And since it’s an annual event they can look forward to this “check-in.” Several business owners who display art by artists who live in the community also mentioned that importance of rotating these displays and hosting regular openings for people to gather and appreciate local art.

With regard to presence of arts organization, participants in the focus group appreciated PH+T’s position as a hub for coming together for view and participate in art. The literature also indicates the importance of arts organization as facilitates the engagement of people in the community in the arts (2002 Guetzkow) and an indicator of community strength and social capital is the extent community members engage with formal structures, such as businesses, organizations, and community groups (Western, 2005). Additionally, an indicator of a ‘cultural district’ is the preponderance of cultural participants (Stern and Seifert, 2007). Further supported by the literature is the concept that cultural vitality is engendered through the presence of opportunities for cultural participation (Jackson, 2003).

**Conclusions around indicators:**
As mentioned above, these twelve indicators may measure the increase in the support for the arts, participation in the arts, presence of the arts, and authentic process of creating community-based art. As these indicators are strengthened, the potential for increased community attachment grows. Some of these indicators can easily be collected at the same time, such as the Number of ephemeral and permanent public art installations and the Percent of public art installations made by artists in the community. The AOC LT can choose which indicators to measure depending on interest and capacity. Appendix I shows a chart that prioritizes indicators based on the level of community engagement inherent in the activities the indicators aim to measure.
The following section is dedicated to developing recommendations for the AOC Leadership Team (AOC LT) to implement after AOC projects are completed in June 2013. From our interviews, we concluded that each member of the AOC LT values the work of the collaboration and would like to stay involved. We propose these recommendations under the assumptions that there is the desire and capacity for a Leadership Team (LT) to continue and that the indicators described above will be easier to measure with a LT to support data collection through its strong networks in the community.

Figure 3: Chart from Huxham and Vangen (2000).

This chart demonstrates all the pieces that go into the making of a collaboration, showing that the membership and purpose of the collaboration are interdependent and are both influenced by externalities. It may be useful to use this chart when reading the recommendations below.

**Recommendation I:**
To further the goals of the collaboration and increase community attachment we recommend the leadership team continue to operate while integrating the suggestions outlined below.

**How to follow-through on the Recommendation:**
1. The LT must be housed with an organization that has the administrative capacity to help with marketing and advertising and has expertise to execute projects.
2. Keep a consistent LT in order to continue building trust and shared values. However, allow key organizations in the community the opportunity to become part of the LT if necessary. In identifying key organizations it is important to consider the type of organization, its area of expertise and connection to the community.
3. Continue having monthly meetings similar to how the AOC LT operates currently.
4. Dedicate a portion of the LT’s time to pursuing grants and other resources while continuing to build networks in the community.

**Why this Recommendation is a priority:**
Given the sentiments we heard during data collection and the visible impact the work of the AOC LT has had in the community thus far, we believe it is important to continue the efforts of
the collaborative. The LT should continue to weigh the options in the future in terms of its formation, however we recommend that for now the collaborative continue to operate as it does currently. This is necessary to both help with data collection for measuring indicators but also to continue building the strength, trust and vision of the LT and its work in the community.

Source connection:
This recommendation is supported by the literature as well as by the opinions of the AOC LT. Robert Agranoff (2007) discusses in his piece, “Managing Within Networks: Adding Value to Public Organizations,” the potential positive and negative outcomes that can be associated with being part of a collaboration. Many of the positive outcomes, including expanded network, expertise and resources, are evident in the AOC LT.

Each person we interviewed in the AOC LT expressed a desire to continue in the collaboration after the initial grant-funded time period is over. Members of the AOC LT mentioned that the role PH+T has taken in the collaboration has been “valuable” because PH+T has built a strong structure and foundation for collaborative community-based arts in all the work they do. By viewing PH+T as a “champion at the table,” AOC LT members are reassured to know that the work of the AOC collaboration “isn’t just a passing fad for PH+T … it’s not like [this type of collaboration] is a one-time thing and then they go on to the next thing.” Members of the LT also expressed interest in seeing the leadership change and grow in the future, perhaps including new stakeholders in the community.

LT members also shared that they are discovering areas of expertise they have, adding value to the work they do outside the collaboration. One LT member said that after being part of the collaboration, knowing little about creative placemaking before joining, “I have a better understanding of what relationship my organization can have to this type of work.” LT members articulated that they are forming new and strengthening existing relationships with the community, adding to the argument of keeping the leadership structure in place. A LT member said, “we’re redefining how we have relationships with these communities and what our roles are. I wouldn’t have come to that realization or understanding just with the work that we do.” Another mentioned “for me personally, I’ve met so many people; we have common interests and it makes me excited to see how the artists will do and how can we build on this [work].”

Recommendation II:
The LT should work to further develop its roles, vision, mission and values.

How to follow-through on the Recommendation:
1. The LT should annually implement a workshop or training session to develop shared understandings of expectations, goals and mission among all members of the LT. This will help to define and clarify the goals of the LT and its work.
2. Continue engaging the community in order to get feedback on the LT and its work. In order to do this, the LT should develop and convene regularly occurring focus groups or listening sessions. See Appendix D for a discussion guide we developed as a template for these sessions. We recommend holding these focus groups or listening sessions at least three times a year in order to sufficiently capture community input.
Why this Recommendation is a priority:
This recommendation is a priority due to the importance of developing goals and roles for the LT. It is also a chance for the LT to define how they engage with the community and develop goals and roles will help to enforce accountability within the LT.

Source connection:
This recommendation is broadly supported by the literature. First, Melissa Stone, Barbara Crosby and John Bryson (2012) discuss participant-governed structure, particularly emphasizing a lack of hierarchical structures and a promotion of inclusivity and flexibility. This type of decision-making allows members to have power and autonomy over actions taken by the collaborative. Stephen Page also demonstrates the importance of using a participatory decision process and inclusive methodology in order to best share resources and implement the efforts of the collaboration.

In addition, literature points to the importance of developing shared norms to build trust and accountability among the different actors in a group (Blackmar, Leroux and Romzek, 2012). And to accomplish goals and build trust, individual aspirations must be aligned carefully with the broader goal (Stephen Goldsmith and William Eggers, 2004).

This recommendation is also supported through our interviews with the AOC LT. In our interviews, we heard consistency in the purpose and mission of AOC: to “knit together” the assets in the community and bring people together through the arts. Through our interviews, we heard that members of the AOC LT team have assumed roles that highlight their various areas of expertise and that these different types of knowledge are valuable for making the AOC LT more successful. AOC LT members realize that members have specific roles; for example, Elizabeth Glidden has a support role rather than the “doing” roles that include planning and executing projects that the other AOC LT members take. Most of the AOC LT team expressed comfort at how the roles of the other AOC LT members were informally formed.

Recommendation III:
The collaborative should continue to support the current Community Liaison role.

How to follow-through on the Recommendation:
1. The Community Liaison position will report to the LT and ideally be a full-time position.
2. This position will be housed in an organization that has the capacity required to financially support the position.
3. The Community Liaison will document the work he does and the steps he takes to do his work.
4. The Community Liaison will organize data collection (e.g., focus groups surveys) and analysis of findings.
5. The Community Liaison will be responsible for coordinating projects and networking with community members to execute projects.
6. Offering internships will to be considered in order to help as needed with the data collection and analysis for evaluation.
**Why the recommendation is a priority:**
The feedback from our focus group and interviews suggests that the position of Community Liaison is necessary in a collaboration of this type to connect the LT with the activities happening on the ground and to act as a resource for the community.

**Source connection:**
This recommendation is largely supported by the collaborator interviews. Several AOC LT members expressed appreciation for Mike’s role in the collaboration. One AOC LT member said “he’s just really making all these networks between the four neighborhoods” and acting as a resources for artists in the community; “there wasn’t somebody with their finger on the arts scene and all the artists who are working here [and now Mike fills that role.]” AOC LT members also acknowledge the expertise Mike has gained through his work with the City, “orient[ing] artists … through [loopholes]” and the way he “allow[s] the time and space for artists to unpack [the work done in the Institutes and] share successes and failures and have hard conversations.”

**CONCLUSIONS**

The process of measuring the impact of the arts on communities is challenging; however, through our research in the community, we believe the indicators we propose in this paper could be beneficial in capturing how the arts are influencing feelings of community attachment in the Bancroft, Bryant, Central and Powderhorn neighborhoods. The recommendations for collaborative leadership structure can be used to help the collaboration both manage its expectations, roles, mission and also implement data collection strategies to measure the indicators provided above. Although, we acknowledge that a certain level of capacity is necessary for these indicators and recommendations take resources to become implemented, it is our hope that they help develop attachment in the community and further the mission of the Arts on Chicago.

We would like to thank Dr. Melissa Stone for her guidance, the Arts on Chicago Leadership Team members for their support, and the community members with whom we spoke for sharing their insights.
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### Arts Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Art engagement can be compared to one season (2001, 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Connect and be consistent with well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Result from close collaboration with a diverse group of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly expensive</td>
<td>Number of ephemeral and permanent public art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses and Organizations</td>
<td>Number of arts businesses and organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Budgets</td>
<td>Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Residents</td>
<td>Number of donations to key arts organizations by community residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arts-Based Community Attachment Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>People better equipped to engage or organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>Organizational structure and systems, procedures, policies that support the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Media/new media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Frequency of sustainability of exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Who participates, number of participants, nature or quality of participants, behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Changes in opinion, beliefs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Changes in how the issue is defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Change in opinion, beliefs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Total number of jobs (longitudinal employer data).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni Urban</td>
<td>Number of creative industry business establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts-based Services</td>
<td>Support for artist housing and creative/cultural enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Percent occupied (ACS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Percent owner occupied (ACS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Median earning of residents employed in entertainment related industries (American Communities Survey).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Participation in cultural programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts market</td>
<td>Support for art production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art service organizations</td>
<td>Number of art service organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen</td>
<td>Strengthen arts and cultural enterprises and community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Arts and Civic Engagement: Briefing Paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accountability and responsive governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Openness includes perceptions of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>(1) Awareness of community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>(2) Membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>(3) Perceptions of residents want/do not want in their community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Measures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Practitioners in the fields of creative placemaking, evaluation, and nonprofit leadership with whom we conducted informational interviews

- **Scott Chazdon** is an evaluation and research specialist at Extension Center for Community Vitality at the University of Minnesota. He has experience with a variety of data collection methods, including ripple mapping.

- **Anne Gadwa-Nicodemus** is principal at Metris Arts. Anne has a background in placemaking research and experience with creating evaluation plans for urban placemaking projects.

- **Cindy Gehrig** is the president of the Jerome Foundation and adjunct professor in the University of Minnesota’s Arts and Cultural Leadership Program. Cindy has worked in philanthropy for many years, bringing a valuable perspective on what funders look for in project proposals and evaluations.

- **Mary Ellen Murphy** is an evaluation and planning consultant. She has worked with many arts organizations to design evaluation plans and has conducted extensive data collection and analysis; PH+T is one of her clients.

- **Tom Trow** is principal at Tom Trow Consulting, Inc. and an adjunct professor in the University of Minnesota’s Arts and Cultural Leadership Program. Tom has worked with many cultural institutions on strategic planning.

- **Sara Wiener** is the associate principal at Cunningham Group and a commissioner on the Minneapolis Arts Commission. Sara has experience with community engagement and knowledge of the processes of the Minneapolis Arts Commission.
APPENDIX C: Focus group details

In order to recruit participants for the focus groups, we relied on a variety of outreach techniques, designing a flier with information on the focus groups. We posted fliers in several local establishments and we asked PH+T to send the flier to their list serve and promote the focus groups internally to participants in programming at PH+T; PH+T posted the focus groups, relabeled “Community Listening Event,” on the Arts on Chicago website and PH+T’s Facebook page.

Seeking to recruit participants with a variety of backgrounds living in the four neighborhoods, we made contact with the four neighborhood associations: Bancroft Neighborhood Association, Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization (CANDO), Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association (PPNA), and We Love Bryant. Representatives from all four organizations agreed to disseminate the flier or pointed us to E-Democracy websites.

The two focus groups were both located at PH+T; one was from 4-6 p.m. on a Tuesday and the other was from 6-8 p.m. on the following Monday. PH+T provided food and beverages. One group member took notes; we also recorded the focus groups.

The first group drew two participants, both of whom did not live one of the four neighborhoods. Five kids in the afterschool program joined the group after the two participants had finished. The second focus group drew six participants; half of the participants had lived in the neighborhood for years and the other half, all of whom were white, had moved to the neighborhood in the last year. Two out of eight total adult participants were artists involved in AOC.

Although both focus groups were confidential, the themes gathered were used to help shape indicators and recommendations for the Arts on Chicago Collaboration. These themes and discussions centered on the following topics:

- Permanent vs. Ephemeral Arts
- Institutional vs. Locally made art
- Regularly occurring events
- Art programming in schools
- Notification of arts events
- Community arts dialogue
APPENDIX D: Focus group guide

1. Introduction of Moderator and Ground Rules
   A. Independent, no vested interest
   B. Range of ideas desired, minority views important
   C. Confidentiality and remind people of the video recorder
   D. Explain the purpose and how it’s beneficial to the Community and PH+T

2. Introduction of Participants
   A. Name
   B. Neighborhood of residence
   C. Length of residence
   D. Family size/Kids in school or not
   E. Employment Status and where you work

3. Warm-Up
   A. Briefly share a story about when you relied on someone non-familial in the community for help, or conversely tell us a short story about when you helped someone unrelated to you in the neighborhood. How did you initially meet?

4. Projective technique: Word Association (Written)
   A. Art
   B. Theatre
   C. Music
   D. Community
   E. Collaboration
   F. Nonprofits
   G. Belonging
   H. Community
   I. Neighborhood
   K. Diversity
   L. Social Network

5. What Artistic or Community event have you gone to lately?
   A. What particularly caught your interest about that event?
   B. Where was this event? Was it in this neighborhood?
   C. How did you connect with neighbors or new people at the event?
   D. How were these people different from you?
   E. Would you go to another similar event?
   F. Did it cause you to think or act differently toward others? Your community?

6. How would you describe the art (content, quantity, quality) in your neighborhood?
   A. Do you like having art in your community? Why or why not?
   B. Does passing art on the street affect your view of a neighborhood?
   C. If applicable, what have you heard visitors say about the art in this neighborhood?
   D. What conversations have you had with others in the neighborhood about the art?
   Where did these conversations happen? By the art? At home? At the local store?
E. Who have you met in the neighborhood because of the art? Where is that relationship today?

7. What sort of artistic or community events would you like to see in the neighborhood that is not currently happening?
   A. How do you feel about the development of a new arts district in your neighborhood?
   B. What would/should this ‘district’ look like?

8. What in your opinion are ways in which theatres/art organizations/community can effectively collaborate with each other?

9. Final comments and thoughts?

10. Wrap-up and thank yous
APPENDIX E: In-event survey

For administrative purposes only -- Event: __________________ Date: ___________ Administrator: __________

Arts on Chicago Event Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey! Your information is confidential and provides us with valuable feedback to both better serve our community and meet the increasing demands of our institutional and government funders.

Arts on Chicago (AOC) is a place-based initiative that brings twenty creative projects to ten blocks of Chicago Avenue this spring. AOC events occur in four neighborhoods: Bancroft, Bryant, Central, and Powderhorn. This survey pertains to the AOC that you are currently attending and the term ‘this neighborhood’ refers to the neighborhood(s) in which this project takes place.

1. How many arts events have you been to in the neighborhood in the last six months? (circle one)
   
   This is my first one | 1-3 | 4-6 | 7 or more

2. Describe an arts event you have been to in the neighborhood in the last month.

3. How likely are you to attend another event like the one you’re currently attending in this neighborhood in the future? (circle one)

   Not likely | Slightly unlikely | Neither likely nor unlikely | Likely | Extremely likely

4. Has this event made you feel less or more connected to the neighborhood? (circle one)

   Less | Somewhat less | Neither less nor more | Somewhat more | More

   If you answered ‘somewhat more’ or ‘more,’ how do you feel more connected?

5. Has being at this event changed your perception of this neighborhood? (circle one)

   Not at all | Not really | Neither no nor yes | Somewhat | Yes, very much so

   If you answered ‘somewhat’ or ‘yes, very much so,’ how have your perceptions changed?

6. At this AOC event, have you had a conversation with someone new? (circle one)
   
   • Yes / No
Arts on Chicago Event Survey

7. At this AOC event, have you run into someone you know? (circle one)
   • Yes / No

   If you answered ‘yes,’ how do you know this person? (circle one or more)
   a. neighbor b. friend c. coworker d. relative e. other __________________________

8. In what neighborhood and city do you live?

9. What is your age? (circle one)
   • under 18
   • 18-24
   • 25-40
   • 41-65
   • 66 +

10. What is your gender identity?
    • Female
    • Male
    • Transgender
    • Other

11. Do you identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?
    • Yes / No

12. What is your race/ethnicity/culture?

13. Are you raising kids in this neighborhood? (circle one)
    • Yes / No

14. Would you recommend this event or an event similar to this one to a friend? (circle one)
    • Yes / No

This portion is completely optional:
Participation in this survey provides you with an opportunity to enter into a raffle drawing for tickets to a PH+T performance. If you would like to enter, please provide your name and email address below. Thank you!

Name: __________________________
Email: __________________________

Can we email you follow up surveys about your experience in the community?
Yes / No (please circle one)

The Arts on Chicago initiative is an arts-based community development project in Minneapolis, MN, led by Pillsbury House + Theatre, Upstream Arts, the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association, and MCAD Professor Natasha Pestich with support from the Ward 8 Council Office of Elizabeth Glidden. Arts on Chicago is funded in part by Artplace, a collaboration of twelve of the nation’s leading foundations, eight government agencies including the National Endowment for the Arts, and six financial institutions across the U.S.

Arts on Chicago will implement 20 art projects in one year to knit together existing creative assets in the Central, Powderhorn, Bancroft, Bryant communities along Chicago Avenue from 32nd Street to 42nd Street, using the process to build a framework for the ongoing support of a vibrant arts and cultural district.
APPENDIX F: Business owner interview and summery of data collect

Although the business interviews were confidential, we heard several themes during the course of data collection. All of the business owners reported to be involved in community events in some capacity, from attending 38th and Chicago Business Association meetings to volunteering for candidates running for office. All but one business owner currently incorporate art in their businesses or are in the process of planning on incorporating art. This incorporation included displaying art made by local artists, hiring local artists to paint murals on business walls, hosting events such as fashion shows and open mics. Several business owners mentioned their appreciation for the diverse demographics of the residents of the community and expressed desires to serve more people who live in the community as patrons. Some business owners addressed the crime in the community and many said that they try to foster spaces that are safe and welcoming for people from a variety of backgrounds.
APPENDIX G: AOC Leadership Team interview

For administrative purposes only:
AOC Leadership Team member:________________________ Date:__________ Administrator:__________

AOC Leadership Team Interview

1. How would you define your relationship to the four neighborhoods? (Work? Live? Spend time?)

2. What makes you feel attached to your own neighborhood?

3. How did the four neighborhoods (BBCP) affect your choice to become involved in AOC?

4. Why do you think the work of the AOC Leadership Team/AOC in general is important?

5. How did you get involved in the AOC Leadership Team? What was the process?

6. What is your role in the AOC Leadership Team? Has your role in the AOC Leadership Team changed since the beginning of AOC? If so, how?

7. What roles do each of the other Leadership Team members take in the AOC Leadership Team?

8. How does being in the AOC Leadership Team differ from other collaborations you’ve been part of? (in this neighborhood or another neighborhood).

9. What is getting done as a collaboration that could not have been done otherwise?

10. What would you change regarding the AOC Leadership Team/AOC in general?

11. In your opinion, what will AOC look like in one year, five years, ten years? (will the structure change? Leadership? Content of projects?) What will be your role? What would you change?

12. How do you think folks, constituents, business owners in the neighborhood view AOC? People who live outside the neighborhood?
APPENDIX H: Indicators fit into the AOC Logic Model

The color of the box that each indicator is in corresponds to the theme(s) under which it belongs; indicators that belong to more than one theme are in boxes with more than one color. Grey is participation; blue is support; orange is process; green is presence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development through the arts can produce a vital economic and social area without displacement of existing residents.</td>
<td>1. Number of community members attending first arts event</td>
<td>In-event survey</td>
<td>Increase community participation in the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The arts can be a positive force for community stability, unity, and accessibility.</td>
<td>2. Number of community members participating in public art projects</td>
<td>In-event survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The arts are an effective way of stimulating community engagement and cohesion.</td>
<td>3. Participation of diverse populations in the arts</td>
<td>In-event survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The arts bridge cultural divisions.</td>
<td>4. Number of members of the community participating in new and existing art groups</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging neighbors in art making builds relationships among neighbors and artists and the Chicago Avenue Arts District identify.</td>
<td>5. Percent of businesses and organizations that incorporate the arts</td>
<td>Business survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance or public display is a critical step in the creative process.</td>
<td>6. Percent of public art installations made by artists in the community</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When artists are a vital part of shaping the planning process and the Plan, then the Plan is more likely to authentically reflect the community.</td>
<td>7. Number of grants awarded for arts-based projects</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists and art making contribute unique perspectives, skills, and visions to community development.</td>
<td>8. Percent of school budgets dedicated to the arts</td>
<td>School record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When artists see themselves as change agents they will increase their engagement with and commitment to the community.</td>
<td>9. Number of donations to key arts organizations by community residents</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forging partnerships/coalitions will increase the likelihood of the project being sustained.</td>
<td>10. Number of ephemeral and permanent public art installations</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance or public display is a critical step in the creative process.</td>
<td>11. Number of reoccurring art events</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When activities are seen and people are invited to participate then they are more likely to be aware that change is happening and they might be more likely to be engaged.</td>
<td>12. Number of arts businesses and organizations</td>
<td>Community network record review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I: How the indicators align with Joshua Guetzkow’s scholarship on participation in the arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism of Engagement</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Involvement</td>
<td>Material/Health</td>
<td>Cognitive/Psych</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Build interpersonal ties and promote volunteering which improves health</td>
<td>Increases sense of individual efficacy and self-esteem</td>
<td>Build individual social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td>Community arts programs and arts in education</td>
<td>Example: community arts program and arts in education</td>
<td>Example: community arts program and arts in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Improve health</td>
<td>Improve health</td>
<td>Enhance ability to work with others and communicate ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Number of community members attending their first event</td>
<td>Participation of diverse populations in the arts</td>
<td>Number of people participating in new and existing artist-based groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanisms for Engagement</th>
<th>Audience Participation</th>
<th>Presence of Artists and Arts Organization &amp; Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the arts as an audience members (non-professional artist)</td>
<td>Participation in the arts as an audience members (non-professional artist)</td>
<td>Presence of larger concentration of artists and arts-related organizations leads to higher degrees of arts participation (Guetzkow, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Increases opportunities for enjoyment</td>
<td>Increases opportunity and propensity to be involved in the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td>Example: community arts program and arts in education</td>
<td>Example: community arts program and arts in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Relieve stress</td>
<td>Improves school performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Number of community members attending their first event</td>
<td>Number of community members attending their first event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>