

Higher education, taken as a single entity, is the largest supporter of the arts and arts education in the United States. Universities, especially those located in and integrated into metropolitan areas for decades, have provided direct support for faculty in arts education programs. These faculty, as practitioners of their arts, and in pursuing their research, scholarly work, and creative activity, have in turn been significant contributors to the cultural and artistic scene of the cities and regions in which they live.

Because of the economic stress of the 1980s, as well as for mutually beneficial programmatic reasons, arts organizations and arts programs in public school systems have begun to form collaborative relationships with university arts programs at an ever increasing pace. Through these relationships, the metropolitan university has become an even more thoroughly integrated partner in maintaining and developing the arts and arts education fabric of the surrounding region.

Because of this direct support, and through these collaborative associations, higher education has become one of the most significant patrons of the arts. This fact is at the same time unrealized and ignored by some, and recognized as important, if not crucial, to the life of the arts by others. Let me note two divergent examples which occurred last fall.

As part of the August 1993 meeting of the National Council of the Arts (NCA), an advisory board of the National Endowment for the Arts, the Arts Education Advisory Council Steering Group presented its report. The steering group serves as a subcommittee to the NCA. It was making its report in light of the fact that federal legislation had mandated in 1990 that 50 percent of any appropriation over \$174 million be focused on education. In a somewhat startling statement, the head of the subcommittee reported that his presentation was about education in the arts and not arts education, and that the council should not trust the "educationists" with any appropriation. What a gratuitous slight to the musicians, painters, sculptors, dancers, actors, filmmakers, playwrights, composers, printmakers, video artists, and choreographers who make up our arts faculties -- all, with few exceptions, dedicated to their art and their students, and supported by the institution to which they contribute their individual artistic expressions.

In October of 1993, I was invited as part of a two-person team, along with twenty such teams from across the country, to plan a national conference on arts partnering. Entitled "Arts for Universities and Communities: Daring To Do It Together," and funded by the Nathan Cummings Foundation and the University of New Mexico, the meeting brought together people from 19 states and 18 metropolitan areas who were involved in establishing collaborative relationships between universities and arts agencies or public school arts programs. The conference, in June of 1994, will be the first national conference to focus on arts partnering, and recognizes the need to form such relationships between university arts programs and arts presenting, producing, and educational programs in the region. I have listed further information about the conference at the end of this overview. The mounting of such a conference emphasizes that establishing collaborations, partnerships, and associations of this nature is an important strategy for the arts in universities.

In the main, the articles in this issue deal with these relationships and the outreach mission of the arts at metropolitan universities, and detail both the results and the processes used to achieve them.

My article, **The Outreach Role of the Fine and Performing Arts**, leads into those dealing with collaborations, and also analyzes the outreach activities that are a natural outcome of arts education programs in higher education: the production and presentation of fine and performing arts events; and the role of the arts in providing non-degree educational programs for people of all ages. I also point out that higher education, as a single entity, far outpaces the National Endowment for the Arts and private, corporate, and community foundations in its direct support of the arts and arts education in the United States.

D. Jack Davis and R. William McCarter review their success in forming a collaboration with museums of the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, arts councils, and regional public school systems. They also discuss the role of the visual art specialist as it relates to the classroom teacher, and provide successful models to incorporate visual art education into public school curriculum.

Kathryn Martin also illustrates cooperative programs with school systems, and challenges us to make changes in university arts education programs in her article, **The University and Arts Education**. She notes that recent research at the University of Illinois points to the fact that "high schools which stress the arts... have stronger attendance, higher student test scores, and a higher percentage of graduates going on to higher education in comparison to other public high schools..."

In many instances, metropolitan universities can equitably share and benefit from the co-sponsored appointment of artistic staff, those who serve as educators to the university, and artists and performers to the community. **Rhoda-Gale Pollack** clearly delineates the strategies and techniques to successfully share such staff and preserve the identity of collaborating partners.

In his article, **"The Future by Design: The Donaghey Project for Urban Studies and Design at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock,"** **Lloyd W. Benjamin III** asserts that "urban grant institutions should focus on urban issues in their region just as land grant institutions address agrarian problems." He goes on to illustrate how the Donaghey Project has assisted small and large towns in Arkansas to cope with problems inherent in development.

Philip Arnoult and Carol Baish, in **A Collaboration: The Artist's View**, give us the view from outside the academy of an arts presenter who sought a collaborative relationship with a metropolitan university. They state that "by the mid-eighties, it should have been clear to everybody working in the non-profit arts world, that collaboration was a matter of survival..." In their analysis of developing and nurturing this partnership, they illustrate what needs to be avoided and what needs to be central in conceiving a collaborative venture.

With the formation of a growing number of colleges of communication and fine arts, many of us wonder how we can achieve associations and relationships between these disciplines that go beyond the administrative convenience of grouping them together. In his article, **Cooperative Programs Between Telecommunications and the Fine and Performing Arts: A Coalition for the 90s**, **Joseph Misiewicz** relates a number of curricular successes and how collaboration between the fine arts and public radio and television stations can create a coalition that will thoroughly educate people for these growing channels of communication. Involving students in these relationships is the key.

In having **John P. L. Roberts**, of the University of Calgary contribute to this issue, we get a clear view of the economic crisis that exists in Canada and the role of arts advocacy in mitigating its impact. He notes that, "... governments have difficulty in grasping the economic impact and the job creation aspects of the arts and

cultural industries...,” and that this information is useful in influencing economy-oriented legislators.

Those who might be interested in having members of their institution join in the conference, “Arts for Universities and Communities: Daring To Do It Together,” should contact Marcos T. Sanchez, Conference Coordinator, College of Fine Arts, Fine Arts Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-1396; Tel: 505-277-5553; Fax: 505-277-0708. The conference is scheduled for June 24 and 25, 1994, at the University of New Mexico.