DANCE HERITAGE COALITION
National Dance Heritage Leadership Forum

Results of Field Survey
October 2009

Report by

Cathy Maciariello

Guiding Group

Elizabeth Aldrich

Genie Guerard

Norton Owen

DANCE HERITAGE COALITION
National Dance Heritage Leadership Forum

Results of Field Survey 2009
Table of Contents

DANCE HERITAGE COALITION
National Dance Heritage Leadership Forum

Results of Field Survey 2009

INTRODUCTION: Purpose and Scope of This Report

This report summarizes field responses to the April 2009 survey conducted to help Dance Heritage Coalition (DHC) and the National Dance Heritage Leadership Forum (Forum) design and undertake a process for developing vision, goals and strategies for the next decade. The intent of the report is to provide DHC and the Forum's leadership with important information that will help them:

- evaluate current programs and services to the field;
- determine success in achieving previous 10-year goals;
- understand DHC's "reach" or penetration in the field;
- identify field needs and priorities in the areas of dance documentation, preservation and access; and
- establish a framework for discussions that will create a new vision, complete with goals and 10-year strategies.

Equipped with the findings of this report, the Forum will convene representative leaders from the field in Fall 2009 to initiate the visioning and goal-setting process. A separate group will work over the ensuing months to develop strategy in support of the vision and goals. The final document, *Dance Heritage 2020* will be published in Spring 2010.

METHODOLOGY

In April 2009, DHC sent an electronic survey to approximately 1,000 individuals in the dance field, including educators, archivists, librarians, historians, scholars, critics, producing dance companies, presenters, individual artists, service organization professionals, funders, policy makers, and others. The survey included "yes/no" questions, questions asking respondents to rank priorities in the areas of interest to DHC, and opportunities for respondents to provide open-ended written feedback,. Results were collected and compiled using SurveyMonkey. Because there were few respondents in some categories, consultants combined some categories to establish the following cohorts of respondents: educators; archivists and librarians; presenters and producing dance companies; historians, critics and scholars; policy makers and funders; individual artists; service organization professionals; and others.

In analyzing the survey responses, consultants examined both numerical data and the specific content of write-in responses. There were approximately 1,800 pieces of information gathered from written comments. While there were variations in language among individual responses, several consistent themes emerged. Responses generally fell into the following "theme" categories: *Resources and Tools*; *Cultural Issues*; *Content and Availability*; *Education and Training*; *Communication, Outreach and Awareness*; *Fair Use and Copyright*; and *Partnership and Collaboration*.[1]

For specific comparison, consultants used these theme categories to compile individual constituent responses in the following areas: external and internal forces affecting the field of dance documentation, preservation and access; priorities for dance preservation and access over the next 10 years; and outcomes of a successful strategy for dance preservation and access. Once consultants had compiled a list of priorities for each constituency, they then identified the leading theme categories across all constituencies as well as more specific priority issues within each category. In order to determine the degree of priority the field placed on a given issue, consultants used a point system, assigning three points to responses identified as highest priority, two points for responses listed second, and one point for responses listed third.[2]

In the following areas, compiling aggregate comments was a more useful approach, primarily because of the low number of responses from certain constituencies: DHC's success in achieving previous goals and the impact of specific programs toward meeting those goals; factors leading to more awareness in the area of dance preservation and examples of accomplishments that demonstrate increased competency; and examples of increased access to dance materials over the past 10 years. A compilation of these comments is included in Appendix A.

SURVEY RESULTS

The survey generated 161 responses—a response rate of 16.1%.[3] The following table reflects the number of respondents in each category:

---

[1] *Resources/Tools* includes financial resources, technology, data, research and teaching aids, finding aids, etc. *Cultural Issues* encompasses public attitudes, field behaviors, aesthetic differences, among others. *Content/Availability* includes comments about the body of archived work, contextual information, access to materials, libraries (as pertains to location and accessibility), and digitization (as pertains to making work more easily availability to wider audiences. The other categories are self-explanatory.

[2] Consultants also looked at the number of responses in a given category in order to ensure that a low number of "first priority" responses did not negate a much larger number of lower priority responses, i.e. that a few people who felt strongly about a single issue did not overturn a widespread interest by the field as a whole. Using both the point system and counting individual responses produced the same outcome.

[3] Response rate was likely affected by SurveyMonkey access issues and also the coinciding Passover and Easter holidays.

Breakdown of Survey Respondents

CATEGORY	RESPONDENT COUNT	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Educators	58	36.0
Archivists & Librarians	27	16.8
Historians, Critics, Scholars	21	13.0
Service Organizations	11	6.8
Presenters & Producers	10	6.2
Individual Artists	9	5.6
Policy Makers & Funders	8	5.0
Other*	17	10.6
TOTAL	**161**	**100.0**

*includes 1 videographer, 2 consultants, 3 publishers/editors, 1 student, 2 curators/exhibition specialists, 1 anthropologist, 1 notation bureau employee, and 6 identifying themselves as having multiple roles

By far, the largest g of respondents to the survey is the "academic" community (educators, archivists, librarians, historians, critics, and scholars). They represent 106 responses—65.8% of the total. With just 30 respondents, practitioners (artists, presenters, producing dance companies, and service organizations) represent 30% of the total, with policy makers, funders and "others" close behind at 25 responses and 15.5% of the total. Results, therefore, are skewed more toward academic interests than dance practice. On issue for DHC and the Forum is what the high concentration of responses from academics really means in the context of planning: Is this DHC's "natural" constituency?" Was there some problem with the identification of potential respondents or with the distribution of the survey itself that reduced the response rate from other constituencies? Or could it be that other constituencies simply are not invested in DHC's mission and programs?

External and Internal Forces Affecting the Field

Respondents were asked to identify the three leading external forces and the three leading internal forces affecting dance documentation, preservation and access. When "money, funding, and the economy"[4] are removed from consideration, the group generally agrees that _Resources/Tools_ is the leading factor in both the external and internal environments. It is ranked as either first or second by all eight constituencies as the leading external force and first or second by seven of eight constituencies as the leading internal force. _Cultural factors_, including such things as aesthetic politics and lack of interest (by the public in the case of external factors, and by practitioners in the case of forces within the field itself) follows in second place. The group places _Fair Use_ third as an external force, and _Content/Availability_ third as an internal force. A

---

[4] Not surprisingly, funding and financial resources ranked consistently high among responses to all questions. We have eliminated these responses from the analysis in order to get a better picture of what else matters to the field, understanding that economic issues, while important and relevant, are not under the control of DHC.

breakdown of priorities by constituents is included in Appendix B. The following chart reflects the **combined** constituent responses:

Leading External and Internal Forces by Category
Combined Constituent Responses

CATEGORY	LEADING EXTERNAL FORCES	LEADING INTERNAL FORCES
Resources/Tools	1. Technological Obsolescence (52)* 2. Internet Competition (46) 3. "Technology" (36)	1. "Technology" (84) 2. Human Resources, Expertise (65) 3. Information (23)
Culture	1. Lack of Interest, Priority (34) 2. Aesthetic Politics (22) 3. Pop Culture (14)	1. Lack of Interest Priority (41) 2. Aesthetic Politics (40) 3. Artist Behavior (31)
Fair Use	1. Rights Issues (52) 2. None 3. None	NOT APPLICABLE
Content/Availability	NOT APPLICABLE	1. Losing Old Canon (15) 2. No Good Projects, Material (9) 3. Lack of Access to Materials (4) 4. Lack of Coordination (4)
Ranking of Individual Issues (across categories)	1. **Tech. Obsolescence (52)** 2. **Rights Issues (52)** 3. **Internet Competition (46)** 4. **"Technology" (36)** 5. **Lack of Interest, Priority (34)** 6. **Aesthetic Politics (22)**	1. **Technology (84)** 2. **Human Resources, Expertise (65)** 3. **Lack of Interest, Priority (41)** 4. **Aesthetic Politics (40)** 5. **Artist Behavior (31)**

*Total Points

Preservation Priorities and Outcomes

There is also general agreement among constituents around general preservation priorities. *Resources/Tools* and *Content/Availability* consistently take first or second place, with an occasional nod to *Education/Training* or *Outreach/Awareness*. The same holds true for the outcomes identified by the group. A breakdown of responses by constituency is included in Appendix C. The following chart shows the group's **combined** preservation priorities and outcomes:

CATEGORY	LEADING PRIORITIES (3)	LEADING OUTCOMES (2)
Content/Availability	1. Digitization Projects (94)* 2. More Diversity of Mat'l (40) 3. More Contextual Info (26)	1. More Works Preserved, Safeguarded, Archived (32) 2. More Diversity of Mat'l (13)
Resources/Tools	1. Technology (45) 2. Standard. Methodologies (22) 3. Cataloguing (10)	1. "Technology" (17) 2. Quality Documentation (8)
Education/Training	1. More Expertise (28) 2. "Education" (17) 3. Prof. Dev. Workshops (10)	NOT APPLICABLE
Ranking of Individual Issues (across categories)	**1. Preserving Existing Archives (89)** **2. Technology (45)** **3. Creating Expertise (40)** **4. Increasing Awareness (38)** **5. Contextual Mat'l (26)** **6. Work of Senior Chor. (26)**	**1. More Works Preserved, Safeguarded (29)** **2. More Diversity (27)** **3. Increased Awareness (26)** **4. Technology Solutions (22)** **5. Dance More Respected (16)**

*Total Points
**This response is included here because of the number of points garnered (23). Even though as a category, Resources/Tools ranked higher, the number of responses that indicated "increased awareness" as a desired outcome was greater than "technology."

Access Priorities and Outcomes

Once again, respondents agree on both priorities and desired outcomes. The group's top three priorities by category are *Resources/Tools*, *Content/Availability*, and *Outreach/Awareness*. Their desired outcomes mirror this response, with *Resources/Tools* and *Content/Availability* being ranked number one and two. *Outreach/Awareness* ranks third on the priorities list A breakdown of responses by constituency is included in Appendix C. The following chart shows the group's **combined** priorities and outcomes for access over the next ten years:

Leading Access Priorities and Outcomes by Category
Combined Constituent Responses

CATEGORY	LEADING PRIORITIES (3)	LEADING OUTCOMES (2)
Resources/Tools	1. Technology Tools (130)* 2. Information, Databases (39) 3. Research Tools (16)	1. Technology Tools, Online Repositories & Access (24) 2. More Information, Databases (19)
Content/Availability	1. Increased Access (41) 2. Exhibitions, Traveling Mat'l (6) 3. More Contextual Material (4)	1. More Activity, Works Preserved (15) 2. Broader Access (14)
Outreach/Awareness	1. Expand Awareness (35) 2. Outreach to donors, teachers, public (9) 3. Publicity (5)	NOT APPLICABLE
Ranking of Individual Issues (across categories)	**1. Technology (137)** **2. Information, Databases, Catalogues, etc. (55)** **3. Increasing Access (41)** **4. Expanding Awareness (35)** **5. Creating Expertise (22)**	**1. Technology Solutions (24)** **2. Dance More Respected, Popular** (23)** **3. More Information (19)** **4. Increased Awareness (18)**** **5. Broader Access (14)**

*Total Points
**These responses ranked high even though the categories of Culture and Outreach/Awareness did not fall in the top two categories identified by respondents.

CRITICAL ISSUES FOR DHC AND THE FORUM LEADERSHIP GROUP

While charts can give a snapshot of what the field tells us, they only show part of the picture. There are four major themes that appear throughout the general comments and the written responses to survey questions: *technology, access, resource coordination* and *diversity*. Three others—the need for *expertise*, efforts to build new *content*, and increased *visibility and awareness*—also receive much attention.

Technology

Technology is the critical thread that weaves through all these discussions. No less than one-third of the written comments mention technology, and the issue appears in a variety of contexts. It is identified as the leading internal and external force affecting the field, and it is at the top of the priority and outcome lists for both preservation and access. Respondents also cite technology as the leading factor in having led to more awareness in the area of dance preservation over the past ten years, with special emphasis on the emergence of new Internet resources such as YouTube and Facebook, the culture of image capture and sharing, and a whole host of younger generation behaviors. Technology is also cited as the leading factor in demonstrating increased competency in dance preservation and in increasing access to materials, thanks primarily to the availability of equipment and the emergence of online dissemination tools.

Issues related to technology find their way into nearly all the responses to survey questions. On the most fundamental level, there is the reasonable (and not unexpected) concern about the instability of old materials (and hence the need to continue and expand digitization projects) and the desire to find a more permanent medium. Technology is central to discussions of education and training as respondents express the need to train artists, in particular, to document and preserve their work effectively as well as the need to expand the curriculum of dance programs to include better education in capture technologies and practices. Many express concern about the ease of *poor* digital recording, saying it is easy get a camera and to capture work, but without clear standards, good equipment and knowledge of technique and format, the result may not add to the body of work available for research and study.

Nowhere is the discussion of technology more resonant than in the areas of culture and access. For those who talk about more widespread access, especially in remote areas, technology plays a huge part in providing access for both dance professionals and the general public. This in turn puts technology at the heart of discussions about increasing audiences for dance, stimulating an appreciation of history and dance history, and enabling students of dance to work with primary source materials. Repeatedly, respondents cite new generational behaviors and call for new standards that take into account the way young people use technology and share material. Since it is impossible to have this discussion without talking about Fair Use, the conversation immediately shifts to issues of rights management, cost, content, availability, and distribution/dissemination. Clearly, any conversation about the next ten years must have at its center an exploration of technology, its impact, and its role in shaping future preservation activity and the use and dissemination of material. The field provides a clear priority list for consideration:[5]

- Central online resources and access, including digital archives, dance websites, online museums, library archives and "hidden" collections, updated finding aids that include both national and international sources, automated Web-indexed searching, etc. (175)
- Digitization of Current Archives (101)
- New practices that interface with new generation technological behavior (59)
- User-friendly, accessible databases, such as a catalogue of archives and where they are located, international listings of material, lists of available research and scholarship, dance class curricula, lists of research librarians and dance historians, among others (47)
- Technological Obsolescence (45)
- "Technology"—not defined (43)

What is important is not so much the "wish list" presented by the field, but the critical questions that are embedded in the responses—questions that will help DHC shape its technology agenda, seek partners and collaborators, develop priorities and guidelines, and

---

[5] Based on total number of points

anticipate future needs of the field. For example, among the questions DHC and the Forum must ask themselves are:

- How has technological behavior changed and what are the key behaviors that must be considered when developing guidelines and methodologies?
- How should these new behaviors shape the field of dance documentation and preservation?
- How can technological access to existing materials be increased? Are there redundancies in delivery that might be eliminated, and are there partnerships that could improve the dissemination of material?
- What resources are already available that DHC could use to improve the coordination and virtual "centralization" of information?
- How could "ease" of access be improved—both for sophisticated researchers, for dance students, and for the general public?
- What is the role of increased technological access in creating audiences for dance, and how can that goal be balanced with service to the academic and professional dance community? What do these constituencies need "in common" and what do they need that is discrete to their place in the ecology of the field?
- What must be done to improve technological proficiency in the field?
- How can the field continue to build the competency, resources, and will to safeguard existing archives, particularly those of senior choreographers, and to create new ones?
- What role might technology play in engaging artists in a meaningful discussion of documentation and preservation?

Access

Comments about access generally fall into three categories: greater *ease* of access, including more user-friendly databases and finding aids; greater *availability* of material online; and *open access* to material for practitioners, researchers, teachers, students, and the general public. Clearly, these priorities reflect a greater dependence on technology, but they also suggest a desire to ensure that archived material reaches the largest possible audience and is more widely used—not only by scholars, historians and writers—but also by students, K-12 teachers, dancers and choreographers, and the general public. Greater access to material, say many would help raise the profile of dance, establish its place in the general historical context, increase its respect in the international community, and produce larger audiences.

Many respondents say that they don't know where information is or how to access it. Others comment that using the finding aids is difficult and that they often reach "roadblocks" beyond which they cannot go without having a "key." They want more accessible digital materials; library loan and distribution policies that encourage use; online access to as much material as possible, including contextual material and theoretical content (not just technique); and increased access for students so that they can learn how to work with primary source materials. Everyone, of course, acknowledges the

obstacles to achieving broader access, including lack of international coordination and standards, fear of piracy or other misuse of material, and rigid definitions about what constitutes "educational use." While DHC has made considerable progress in this area, it remains a priority. The challenge to DHC is how to shape a meaningful "next generational" discussion around the issue of access and technology that takes into account new behaviors regarding content. Among the key questions are:

- What are the benefits of open access to choreographic and contextual material, and what are reasonable uses of publicly shared material?
- How should shared information and material be acknowledged and credited in a world that "borrows" freely from open reservoirs of information?
- How can broader sharing of material inform artist choices, improve choreography, stimulate interest in dance history, enrich scholarship, and improved dance's standing nationally and internationally? And how can artists be convinced of that?
- How can new policies and behaviors around content create a more informed and enthusiastic public?
- How can DHC and the Forum ensure that their leadership in this area both honors past traditions and moves the field forward in a world in which technology has already changed general behavior?

Coordinated Resources: "One-Stop Shopping"

At the heart of the discussions of technology and access is concern over how online resources might be more centralized. No one suggests that DHC should be the one and only source of information, but over and over again respondents express frustration in their attempts to navigate the "information system." Clearly, they would like to know that there is a single source or portal to which they can go for links to all the information they seek—whether that is a database of dance librarians, modules of dance curricula, general dance archives, archives of a single choreographer, K-12 teaching aids, a list of commercially available dance DVDs, etc. This raises several questions for DHC as it considers its future agenda:

- What resources—national and international—already exist to which DHC could provide links?
- What partnerships or collaborations—national and international—could be cultivated that would ensure that material is collected, made available and regularly updated?
- What reasonable role might DHC play in shaping and coordinating a network of "information providers"?
- What guidelines should be employed to manage the volume of available information, and what tools and training need to be provided to the field to increase competency and use?
- What is DHC's role in relation to regional and locally held material that is not readily available, i.e. how could DHC establish a "centralization" policy that would increase both access to locally held materials for the wider dance

community and the ability of isolated populations to access both major and minor archives outside their communities?

Diversity

Issues of diversity also arise repeatedly throughout the survey. Many of these comments are reflected in language about aesthetic politics, territorialism and competing agendas. Comments range widely—from those that reflect concern about the lack of ethnic or culturally specific work available through existing archives to those that call for more attention to non-European traditions, to those that question who controls what is archived and what is not. Many comment that the definition of "dance" is too narrow, excluding folk traditions and popular dance, for example. Others mention the tendency of funding institutions, the lack of financial resources for artists and companies, archival policies of libraries to favor collections from larger companies. The question of "who decides" is a powerful and recurrent theme throughout the survey. Responses do not indicate any clear direction for DHC and the Forum beyond trying to "sort" the issue. Some respondents, for example, call for guidelines for archivists to help them decide what should be archived and what should not, while others suggest that artists should control the decision so as to remove aesthetic barriers. Besides concerns about cultural diversity, a number of respondents also mention the conflict between "old and new," suggesting that the dance community itself does not place sufficient emphasis on history, rushing always to produce the next new project rather than focus on preserving dance heritage and legacy.

It is important to note that these comments are not coming predominately from artists (since so few artists responded), but rather from the academic community— researchers and historians who seek broader understanding of dance's cultural influences, and educators who want students to study work in its cultural context, for example. Many talk about the role of diversity in creating more awareness of dance preservation in the field, greater knowledge among dancers and choreographers, more appreciation from audiences, and better choreography from artists who are more informed of their cultural heritage.

Clearly, a planning agenda that does not include serious discussions of archival policies and guidelines, the role of popular or folk dance forms in the country's dance heritage, and the inclusion of ethnic or culturally specific work would fall short of the field's expectations. Among the questions DHC and the Forum might consider are:

- Who are the arbiters and "gatekeepers" of archival content? What role do resources play in determining archival projects and policies, and what is DHC's role in ensuring inclusion and broad access to resources?
- How does rapid technological advancement shape discussions of aesthetic content and diversity? To what extent is technology already redefining dance, and what should be DHC's response? Is access to technology, as well as knowledge of use and format substantially broad as to ensure equitability and participation?

- What is DHC's role in aggregating resources and stimulating cultural dialogue that focuses on content and availability?
- Is DHC's perspective substantially global enough to answer US and international requests for diverse material, including culturally specific work, legacy works and new material, national and regional content, a variety of genres, and work from both small and large companies?
- How does DHC communicate with the field about these issues?

Other Concerns: *Developing Expertise, Building Content and Increasing Visibility*

The survey identifies a widespread need for more expertise as a key resource for successful preservation and access programs—including better dance teachers (K-12, colleges and universities), qualified videographers and archivists, outstanding researchers and writers who have deep knowledge of dance history, artists who understand the value of creating an archive and leaving an accessible legacy, and an informed public and funding community that will support documentation and preservation efforts. The value of the DHC fellowships is mentioned often as an invaluable resource in this effort.

In addition to better formal training and mechanisms to place qualified archivists in the field, many respondents also cite ongoing professional development, particularly workshops, as critical to building field competency. Formal affiliations, especially between artists and archivists, are cited as important in developing expertise. Such collaborations, they say, would help artists understand how to preserve their work so as to be meaningful for scholars, improve their ability to work methodically, and increase awareness of the importance of estate planning. They would also help archivists better understand the process of making dance, the context in which dances are created, and the artist perspective about his/her own choreography.

Closely linked to academic programs and ongoing professional development are comments about the regular and systematic dissemination of important information that expands capacity and encourages use, such as conferences, email blasts, newsletters, improved databases, journals and publications, teaching aids, curricula, etc. People want to know what is available and where to find it; they need access to expert advice and assistance; they need information about how to use the tools that are available; and they need regular updates about what is new in the field, what new collections have been added, etc. At the heart of these comments is a call for knowledge-building that again spans categories. Whether considering materials and information for K-12 education, university dance curricula, databases of graduate level research, professional development workshops, standardized guidelines and methodologies, journals and publications, media coverage, or programs that "train trainers," the challenge to DHC is to identify a strategy for using information to increase competency and build both individual and field expertise.

There is a continuing hunger for more material—both new material and the digitization of existing endangered archives. Overwhelmingly, the field calls for continued preservation and more archives, particularly the work of senior artists who are

reaching the end of their careers; the addition of culturally specific and more "popular" work; and the inclusion of work by younger artists and smaller and/or regional companies. By far the most often repeated desire is for more contextual material: interviews, oral histories, cultural background and context, personal documents, etc. that will deepen understanding of dance and dance history, expand research capacity and stimulate broader interest in the field. Not only is there interest in contextual material from originators, but there is also a yearning for insights that can be provided by dancers who were "there" with the masters. Since many of them are passing, there is some urgency to this issue.

To be successful, DHC will have to overcome what appears to be a general lack of visibility in the field. This is reflected in the low response rate to the survey, the general lack of practitioner participation, and the comments from many respondents asking for services that DHC already provides. Among many of those who responded to the survey, there is a clear lack of understanding about DHC, its programs and role in the field. For example, when asked how well DHC had done in achieving its five goals, respondents mark "not sure" between 40.6% and 51.1% of the time. When asked to rate the impact of specific programs on achieving these goals, the response is even worse, with "not sure" marked between 48.2% and 58.4% of the time. This lack of awareness is reflected in individual written comments as well. When commenting on the degree of success DHC has had in achieving its goals, 40 respondents report they are unaware of DHC programs, and most cannot comment on the impact of specific programs. When respondents are asked how DHC could help their particular constituencies, issues of outreach and awareness outpace even the need for more resources and tools. More information and increased awareness also rank high on the field's list of desired outcomes of a successful strategy for accessing dance materials.

Among the questions DHC and the Forum might consider as they plan for larger group discussion of these issues are:

- Do the field's individual constituencies adequately understand the needs of other constituencies, and how might DHC and the Forum use cross-constituent learning processes to build a sense of common purpose and responsibility?
- Are there models of partnership in other art forms (such as commissioning clubs so often seen in the music world) that could increase awareness of and commitment to dance preservation?
- How should DHC and the Forum approach the issue of creating context for dance—whether in providing ancillary research materials, more contextual perspective for audiences, etc.? What are the best avenues for increasing the availability of contextual material (trusted repositories, online archives, journals, etc.)?
- Do DHC and the Forum have a role to play in influencing dance curricula and teaching methodologies that place the study of history on equal footing with technique and practice?

- What does the lack of interest in preservation really mean? Is it only a lack of visibility or resources that cause it to lose priority status? What connections does DHC and the Forum need to make inside and outside the field to demonstrate the importance and viability of dance preservation?
- What are the consequences or "opportunity costs" of preservation being "outside the mission" of dance organizations, of a general lack of public interest in preservation, and of preservation being a low priority within the field itself? As the field describes a culture in which preservation carries little value, what is the field saying to DHC and the Forum about who is responsible for building the case, for monitoring progress and for vigilantly communicating the message?

FEEDBACK ON DHC'S PROGRAMS AND PERFORMANCE

Has your organization benefited from specific DHC projects?

The low number of responses to this question raises questions about the degree of exposure DHC programs and services receive in the field and about the field's perception of the usefulness of the programs, tools and services. When considered alongside later questions about whether or not DHC has achieved its goals as well as together with written comments, it is clear that the concern is more one of awareness than of quality. People simply say that they are not qualified to answer because they are unaware of the programs or services.

By far the most useful tool is *Documenting Dance: A Practical Guide*, with 45% of respondents indicating that they have benefited from using it. However, from a possible 161 positive responses, only 45 people identified *Documenting Dance* as a useful tool. One must assume that the rest either do not know what it is or do not consider it useful to them. Following is a chart that illustrates how the field rates nine of DHC's resources:

Response Counts and Percentages
Value of DHC Projects, Materials and Services

Resource	Response Count	Response Percent (based on 100 responses)	Response Percent (based on a possible 161 responses)
"Documenting Dance"	45	45	28.6
Finding Aids	30	30	18.6
Fair Use Project	30	30	18.6
Online Materials	28	28	17.4
Focus Groups	22	22	13.7
"Dance Treasures" Exhibits	22	22	13.7
Videotape Reformatting	18	18	11.2
"Dance Treasures" Grants	16	16	9.9
Fellowship Program	11	11	6.8
Other*	4	4	2.5

***Choreographing Your Search; AIDS Artist Documentation Brochure; conferences, panels, workshops**

To what extent have the following DHC goals been achieved and what has been the impact of specific programs on DHC's ability to realize its goals?

Response counts are greater for these two questions, with between 135 and143 people choosing to answer. That said, the number of "not sure" responses still indicates a widespread lack of awareness and understanding of DHC's purpose and programs. Only in the area of improving dance documentation and archival practices do more than 50% of respondents (55.3%) say that there has been "some progress" or "significant progress" toward achieving goals. DHC is reasonably well recognized for having improved dance heritage and dance heritage education, with nearly 48% of respondents indicating progress, and it does slightly less well in terms of building alliances and advocacy. On the other end of the scale, 65.3% of respondents say they are "not sure" or that there has been "no progress" in building local and regional coordination, and 58% fail to note progress in mediating intellectual property rights issues.[6]

In evaluating the impact of specific DHC projects or programs, the majority of respondents say they are "not sure" or that there has been "No impact." The good news, of course, is that 40% of those surveyed believe that the programs have had an impact in the field. The following chart reflects the field's uncertainty:

---

[6] These responses measure perception only and do not necessarily give an accurate picture of DHC's progress.

Extent to Which DHC Goals Have Been Achieved

GOAL	Response Count	Not Sure	No Progress	Some Progress	Significant Progress
Improve Dance Heritage & Dance Heritage Education	144	48.6%	3.5%	40.3%	7.6%
Build Local & Regional Coordination	141	51.1%	14.2%	31.9%	2.8%
Mediate Intellectual Property Rights Issues	143	51.0%	7.0%	29.4%	12.6%
Improve & Broaden Implementation of Dance Documentation and Archival Practices	143	40.6%	4.2%	39.9%	15.4%
Build Alliances and Advocacy	143	47.6%	6.3%	37.8%	8.4%

Impact of DHC Programs on Achieving Goals

RESOURCE	Response Count	Not Sure	No Impact	Some Impact	Significant Impact
"Documenting Dance"	140	52.1%	1.4%	35.7%	10.7%
Finding Aids	137	58.4%	0 .7%	30.7%	10.2%
Fair Use Project	138	56.5%	2.9%	24.6%	15.9%
Fellowships	137	57.7%	2.2%	28.5%	11.7%
"Saving America's Treasures" Grant Program	139	48.2%	3.6%	29.5%	18.7%
"America's Irreplaceable Treasures" Exhibitions	135	54.1%	4.4%	30.4%	11.1%

Has the field increased in knowledge and capacity in the area of dance preservation over the last 10 years? Has access to America's dance heritage increased?

Here the news is better, and it seems to negate some of the uncertainty reflected above. A total of 76.6% of respondents say that the field has increased in competency with regard to dance preservation, and 55.7% say that access has improved. Still, 19.5% say they are "not sure" about the field's progress in the area of dance preservation, and 36.4% say they do not know whether access has improved.

FINAL THOUGHTS

The survey is rich in material for future discussions, and it provides the building blocks of a transformative platform for the next decade. As DHC moves forward, it must take into account the questions raised earlier in the report and set an agenda that grapples with several broad, but critical, questions:

- How instrumental might technology be in informing future strategy, programs, and practice?
- How does the changing use of technology affect DHC's approach to its interaction with and leadership of the field?
- How can DHC and the Forum expand and diversify archival content and increase easy access to that content?
- How can DHC and the Forum continue to build knowledge, capacity and expertise in the field?
- How can DHC and the Forum enhance awareness of and participation in its programs?
- What can DHC and the Forum do to stimulate a wider, more inclusive and richer conversation among its constituents about history, dance heritage, the needs of individual constituencies with regard to documentation and preservation, and the relationship of documentation and archival practices to building audiences for dance?
- How can DHC be more effective in making preservation an integral part of the creation, performance, presentation and study of dance?

Implicit in these questions (and implicit in survey responses as well) is another question about how DHC sees its mission in the context of the wider dance community—a community that includes both the academic and scholarly community and a wide range of diverse practitioners. For example, how does DHC see its discrete mission to document and preserve work (and to make that work available) in relation to a larger, integrated system that is about preserving dance as an art form, building a public for dance, and creating a deeper, richer dance heritage through better choreography, more informed educational practice, and more rigorous scholarship? How do successful preservation and access strategies affect other components of the system, and how can DHC leverage its knowledge, experience and leadership to positive long-term effect? How can DHC bring more people to the table and develop in a conversation about shared intent, mutual responsibility and coordinated activity?

DANCE HERITAGE COALITION
FORUM LEADERSHIP GROUP

<u>**Combined Constituent Comments**</u>

<u>**What other services have you benefited from?**</u>

- Conferences, panels, workshops (5)
- Choreographing your Search
- America's Irreplaceable Dance Treasures
- **AIDS artist documentation brochure**

<u>**Comments on the degree of success in achieving previous goals.**</u>

Low DHC visibility/lack of awareness: (40)

DHC accomplishments (6):
- While DHC has worked admirably to extend awareness of IP issues, self-documentation, & concerns of education, more work is still required.
- Progress is being made.
- Work that is being done is in the right direction, but it takes more than a decade to change a cultural milieu. I appreciate the work & wish for more progress.
- Have appreciated efforts like American Masterpieces Dance.
- DHC did work with a Historical Society to create & preserve DC dance materials.
- "Documenting Dance" is a gem that is underknown & underused.
- As I am in rural TN, just having the community identify dance as significant contributor to education is challenging. But it is well worth the effort—improvements have been made but more can be done.

How DHC's work could be strengthened (6):
- How can DHC advocate with a strong "brand?"
- Building local & regional coordination should be strengthened.
- Training those who train is essential to moving forward.
- Alliances need to be a priority.
- An e-letter 2-3 times a year would help keep us informed.
- **I'm not sure about a lot of these issues—that's why I feel the need for a spokesperson & distribution mechanisms.**

IP Comments (2):
- Feel my IP rights have been infringed upon
- Property rights in some areas are more complicated than others, i.e. the notion of ownership that relates with historical context.

Other Comments (3):
- I was a choreographer & was told in no uncertain terms by the head of a service organization that my work was of no interest because I work with traditional dance.
- Dance accreditation organization has really obsolete ideas about what is a credible dance major, but their vision is imposed.
- China is devoted to the ethnic dance culture protection—there is a lack of communication & collaboration with world-wide scholars & practitioners

Comments on the impact of specific programs/projects toward meeting goals.

Not sure/no clue (23)

Comments on Programs (8)
- These programs have been of some benefit to companies & institutions with robust infrastructure in place, but I'm not so sure about smaller groups or institutions.
- Website is very helpful. I hope links to member collections can be completed soon.
- Documenting Dance guide is useful, but I have no knowledge of other programs.
- The Dragon's Gift: The Sacred Arts of Bhutan touring musem exhibition
- The America's Treasures Project received wide recognition, was first of its kind, & had significant impact.
- I am not in the Halls of Academe & had no knowledge of these programs except that I was nominated to be one of the national dance treasures.
- I only know about Fair use/IP initiatives.
- Know only about America's Dance Treasures which was denied us.

Other Comments (3)
- Between "some" & "none" is not the fault of DHC—within my own department we argue about how to spend our money: on newly created works or on sharing our heritage with our students.
- Getting these resources into the field is a giant project in and of itself. Even though I have some of these pamphlets available for my community, the expertise and expense issues don't even get addressed because of limited resources and time.

Comments on *factors* leading to more awareness in the area of dance preservation over the past 10 years.

Technology (43)
- Internet/culture of image capture/YouTube (10)
- Technological obsolescence (15)
- Increased digitization (2)
- Technology (6)
- Availability of technology equipment (3)
- Need for artists to market themselves via DVD
- Field has integrated more film, video
- Online access to material (3)
- Emergence of dance technology as university focus (2)

Cultural Changes (19)
- Government's strategy in growing investment
- Emergence of dance as commercial product & tool for cross-cultural studies, requiring that recordings be made for multiple uses
- Increased awareness & appreciation of dance (2)
- An awareness of the significant passing away of elders (12)
- People growing old & wanting to preserve past
- Improved consciousness about history as a resource for art-making

Advocacy/Media Exposure/Visibility of Work (17)
- Press, media coverage (2)
- Conferences (8)
- Publicity by established dance companies (2)
- Educational outreach
- Increased circulation of artists internationally
- Increased performances of classical work by dance companies
- General discussions throughout field
- Exposure & advocacy

Increased Preservation/Collecting/Archival Activity (13)
- Commitment to larger collecting repositories
- Collaborations between dancers & archivists
- Archives/libraries (3)
- My work (2)
- Greater interest by artists
- Interest in dance preservation methodologies
- More efforts to establish meaningful archival projects
- Dance libraries
- Coordinated efforts in field to understand challenges of preservation
- Activist work of dance preservation experts

Changes in Education/Training/Research (7)
- Education dancers, pointing them to finding aids
- Institutions of higher learning teaching dance history/developing libraries & collections
- Growth in dance studies scholarship
- Lack of access to materials for classroom use
- Spread of Ph.Ds in dance & accompanying research (2)
- Greater interest in dance history

DHC (7)
- DHC (6)
- Irreplaceable Dance Treasures

Increased Resources (2)
- SDHS & CORD materials & journals, recent book publications (5)
- Cunningham's brilliant online living archive

Other (10)
- Realization that dance is ephemeral
- Brown University
- NEA's American Masterpieces Program
- Lack of funding
- Controversy over Graham's work (3)
- Highly publicized lawsuits
- Good dance—not just clips from latest TV show—not available
- Inability to view work of older pioneers

What are examples of accomplishments that demonstrate increased competency in dance preservation over the last 10 years?

Technology (24)
- Web resources more available, YouTube, etc. (4)
- Online archives, digital access (2)
- Dance on Video online database
- Collections getting processed to DVD
- Discussion of DVD/video lack of permanence
- Technology/technological documentation (3)
- Increased knowledge/priority due to available technology
- More dancers learning dances via DVDs
- Better, less expensive capabilities of video, digital technology, photo gives more access to artists (4)
- More young people facile with technology
- More documentation taking place thanks to technology (5)

Enhanced Content & Activity (16)
- A few companies have established archives & record management programs (2)
- Preservation of major choreography in Labanotation
- More published resources, writing (4)
- More research being done, growth of dance scholarship (2)
- More workshops, seminars, classes in video technology, documentation, archiving
- Oral history workshops
- Establishment of documentation centers
- More degree programs
- Increase in international dance festivals, fairs, dance documentaries
- Integration of dance into educational curricula
- Notation of dances

Additional Tools & Resources (9)
- Archival materials readily discoverable through DHC finding aids & other sites
- Finding aids (2)
- More availability and ability to document work with video
- More available information about techniques & practices
- DHC's Moving Image Registry
- DHC's internships
- Cameras & software for uploading to internet
- NEA Legacy Grants

Increased Competency (5)
- Dance companies know to keep originals, label tapes, keep lists (2)
- DHC fellowship program provides fellows with archival skills, knowledge (2)
- More young people facile with new technologies

Fair Use & Copyright Progress (3)
- Fair Use groups getting word out
- Fair Use being defended
- Understanding of what "fair use" means

Increased Awareness (2)
- Country-wide dissemination of dance culture
- Much greater awareness but also a shift in values on how to approach issues across generations

Other (4)
- Awareness of need has spread faster than capacity
- Understanding of dance as cultural practice that contains cultural knowledge
- Libraries
- Expectations, but not necessarily competence

What are examples of increased access to dance materials over the past 10 years?

Technology (33)
- Distribution off videos & DVDs (6)
- Online archives for research (2)
- Online access (6)
- Internet, YouTube, open access, discovery options (16)
- Greater accessibility of equipment (2)
- More informative websites & resources

Enhanced Content & Activity (17)
- New collections acquisitions increased (3)
- More records created each year
- More exhibitions by collecting repositories (2)
- Seminars & lectures
- More companies recording work
- More young people K-12 exposed to dance study & performance
- More dance companies do outreach with schools
- Video documentation leading to mass production of dance events
- Public TV dance programming
- Greater emphasis on dance research in higher education
- Performing arts library reopened in NY
- Increased exchanges between artists in US & Africa
- Digital collections processing material in hidden collections
- More venues for preservation

Additional Tools & Resources (12)
- Smithsonian's online footage of K. Dunham's field work
- Library of Congress American Heritage site
- Jacob's Pillow enhanced archives
- More online finding aids (3)
- Cunningham Flickr page gives more access (improved quality?)
- More recordings available for classroom use
- DHC shared cataloguing
- # of low-cost DVDs increasing rapidly
- more publications
- NEA Legacy reconstructions

Increased Awareness & Communication (8)
- More communication
- More press
- More visibility through DHC's Fair Use, traveling exhibits, Treasures website (4)
- Presidential attention
- Popular culture promotion of dance

Cultural Change (2)

- More support on campus for multi-cultured interdisciplinary departments
- Growing interest in dance history at university level

Other (5)

- I am constantly amazed at how many graduates of dance programs haven't seen even on video the great works that comprise our heritage, much less live performance or opportunity to learn the works
- America's heritage should include study of diverse ethnic populations that make up its social fabric. How much is known about how Chinese, Japanese, Filipino dances are preserved in US as compared to countries of origin? What transformations do danscapes reflect? Of all written material how much reflects Native Americans?
- The same people are excluded as have always been.
- At my university there is no interest except for my seminar—if there were a published journal, there would be more interest.
- Globalization—access is not where it should be, but it is has improved.

<u>Additional comments</u>

Limited Knowledge, Want to Know More (11)

- As is probably obvious from my responses, I'm not especially knowledgeable regarding this topic, but I may be able to help spread the word.
- Very few people know about DHC.
- I know very little about DHC and accept some responsibility for that lack of awareness.
- I just submitted a survey and after pressing "done" was directed to your website. Good to know about you folks. If you would like more input, I would be happy to work with you.
- I don't think that enough people in various locations or levels within the dance community are aware of DHC and what it does... making us more aware of your services in some way might be very productive.
- This is the first time that I have heard of this coalition, which I find surprising and unfortunate as I've written about dance and been involved with Dance/USA substantially. I'm looking forward to learning more.
- I'm sorry I can't be more helpful on this survey. My dealings with dance documentation issues were several years ago, and I can speak only for preservation of audiovisual/special collections in general.
- Since I am retired and now work as a consultant I am less able to answer the above questions based on first hand knowledge of change. My impressions are based on some reading and meeting colleagues presently involved in the field of dance in higher education. Thank you for soliciting my comments.

- Prior to receiving this survey I've never heard of DHC. I probably wasn't much help here.
- I would love to know more about your organization and be in better contact with you about events and funding opportunities. Have you thought of creating a Facebook page?

More Partnership, Outreach, Sharing (5)
- I recommend DHC become more involved directly inside the preservation, archival and library communities to learn from them and raise awareness with the professionals who assist. DHC is doing a good job of assisting with preservation activities, relieving dance companies of activities they are unlikely to have in-house; and which, being well outside their core missions, are unlikely to be able to devote sufficient time and money to.
- Not living in NAmerica may invalidate most of the above--does DHC want an international role? What is to be gained by this? Is it possible or desirable for one country to establish standards/strategies in isolation? It may be unrealistic and difficult to achieve but at least the English speaking nations might get together in this globalized, web-based era.
- Engage with Grantmakers in the Arts, regional grantmakers in key dance markets.
- Dance companies tend to isolate themselves. Create more collaborations and sharing of resources
- As of last week, I have tenure at Rutgers. SO, I can now focus my attention on what I am passionate about: this is one of my main passions. So use me!! Last month there was a conference on preserving visual artists' legacies. I could see a very similar conference on the on the same topic for the performing arts here. Find ways to get info you need while I'm in Germany and likely in Korea next May. Gather those interested in developing that theoretical framework and let's start consolidating.

Educational Concerns (4)
- I am semi retired from higher education, having taught dance history through the years at 3 different colleges via the traditional classroom, lecture/audio visual, quizzes and final term paper routine. My last dance history course occurred in winter 2004 semester -- 5 years ago. Since, I understand, the current dance history at this college is being taught "on-line," with little or no student/teacher contact. I question whether this is better or worse for the student of dance. history. Meanwhile, "bon chance" on the successful results of this survey. Thank you!
- As the director of our MA program, I am finding many students coming in with an interest in dance documentation and digital archiving. Are there internships available for these students. It seems to be a burgeoning interest.
- Questions 12 and 13 stumped me, as I think DHC has more than provided access to dance materials...I think it is a matter of How to get that access, and How much are the materials going to cost? Archiving takes not only time, but money. Also, in Universities there are no classes in Archiving. No one wants to become a Dance Archivist. History, Theory, Performance, Choreography, Education are emphasized, rarely is Dance Archiving a subject in which Universities consider as

a high priority. Perhaps, a class or two on specific Archiving Techniques can be established, which then will set forth a new generation of archivists invested in helping preserve dance.
- I only want to repeat what I've said. I feel that as a teacher of jazz dance and musical theater, I would be even better if I could teach repertory of Jack Cole's or some other famous dance choreographer. I know not to claim the material as my own. I would be more valuable to students if I could give them this one thing.

Thanks and Kudos (12)

- Thank you.
- Thank you for all you are doing!
- Thank you for all your hard work. Nothing happens by accident, and DHC continually keeps things at a very high professional, and friendly, open level. A lot of it is plain old work. DHC staff I know does a lot of that.
- Excellent survey questions. I hope this helps you focus the work of DHC, and NDEO hopes we can work together for the greater good of dance preservation and dance education.
- The work of DHC is commendable and needs to be extended across borders to create more awareness and add more value to the aspect of dance preservation.
- Thank you for giving me the opportunity to answer the questions.
- Great project and I will support whatever i can in my way and participation.
- Thanks. Greatly appreciate all your good work! Always lots to be done and it's wonderful to have an organization that focuses on preservation.
- Thanks for all you try to do.
- Thanks for everything you're doing.
- Thanks for allowing me to give input.
- Thank you for your acknowledgment and preservation help to our little archive!

Other (4)

- I am not able to answer questions 12 and 13, because as a state arts agency this is not an area that we have been addressing. This survey has made us take a closer look at the needs of the field and what tools/informational resources we would need to help our constituents.
- My personal path has taken me away from this field over past few years. I do see online documentation of materials as exciting, particularly the ability to put photographs of costumes, designs etc online where they can be studied, and also enjoyed by the non-professional public.
- Pre 20th century dance does not receive enough attention and support.
- Get material online. I cannot stress it enough.

Ranking of External and Internal Forces By Constituency
(Based on Total Points)

CONSTITUENCY	EXTERNAL FACTORS*	INTERNAL FACTORS*
Educators	1. Resources/Tools (55) 2. Culture (44) 3. Fair Use (30)	1. Resources/Tools (74) 2. Culture (61) 3. Content/Availability (33)
Archivists & Librarians	1. Resources/Tools (25) 2. Fair Use (10) 3. Culture (4) 4. Education/Training (4)	1. Resources/Tools (25) 2. Outreach/Awareness (18) 3. Culture (15)
Historians, Critics, Scholars	1. Resources/Tools (26) 2. Culture (16) 3. Outreach/Awareness (10)	1. Culture (20) 2. Resources/Tools (15) 3. Content/Availability (10) 4. Fair Use (10)
Service Organizations	1. Resources/Tools (21) 2. Culture (9) 3. Fair Use (7)	1. Resources/Tools (12) 2. Culture (11) 3. Education/Training (5)
Presenters & Producers	1. Resources/Tools (19) 2. Culture (10) 3. Education/Training (6)	1. Culture (8) 2. Content/Availability (7) 3. Resources/Tools (5)
Individual Artists	1. Resources/Tools (11) 2. Culture (4) 3. Content/Availability (1)	1. Culture (13) 2. Resources/Tools (12) 3. Content/Availability (6)
Policy Makers & Funders	1. Culture (6) 2. Resources/Tools (4) 3. Education/Training (4)	1. Resources/Tools (20) 2. Culture (19) 3. Content/Availability (5)
Others	1. Resources/Tools (15) 2. Content/Availability (6) 3. Outreach/Awareness (5)	1. Resources/Tools (6) 2. Culture (6) 3. Content/Availability (5)
<u>Combined (all responses)**</u>	**1. Resources/Tools (176)** **2. Culture (98)** **3. Fair Use (54)**	**1. Resources/Tools (169)** **2. Culture (152)** **3. Content/Availability (68)**

*Excluding Financial Resources
**Combined responses do not necessarily equal the total of individual constituency responses. For example, "culture" receives more points overall because it was cited by respondents in the "other" category even though it did not receive enough points to rank in the top three external factors identified by that constituency. Similarly, "fair use" receives 47 points on the constituent list, but 54 points overall. "Resources," on the other hand, shows no difference as it is identified as one of the top three external factors by all constituencies.

Ranking of Preservation Priorities by Constituency
(Total Points)*

CONSTITUENCY	TOP THREE PRIORITIES	LEADING ISSUES
Educators	1. Content/Availability (76) 2. Resources/Tools (41) 3. Education/Training (31)	1. Diversity of Material (22) 2. Increased Awareness (15) 3. Work of Sr. Choreographers (13) 4. Contextual Material (12) 5. Preserve Existing Archives (12)
Archivists & Librarians	1. Content/Availability (55) 2. Resources/Tools (17) 3. Education/Training (10) 4. Partnership (10)	1. Preserve Existing Archives (43) 2. Clear Fair Use Policies (9) 3. Standardized Methodologies (6)
Historians, Critics, Scholars	1. Content/Availability (23) 2. Resources/Tools (15) 3. Fair Use (7)	1. Online Tools (11) 2. Contextual Material (11) 3. Diversity of Material (4) 4. Awareness (4)
Service Organizations	1. Education/Training (11) 2. Resources/Tools (10) 3. Content/Availability (7)	1. Existing Archives (7) 2. Teaching Aids (3) 3. Technology (3)
Presenters & Producers	1. Content/Availability (20) 2. Education/Training (8) 3. Fair Use (6) 4. Resources/Tools (6)	1. Preserve Existing Archives (14) 2. Awareness (6) 3. Technology (3) 4. Standardized Methodologies (3)
Individual Artists	1. Content/Availability (10) 2. Resources/Tools (5) 3. Education/Training (3)	1. Digital Archives (3) 2. Preserve Existing Archives (3) 3. Expertise (3) 4. Diversity of Material (3)
Policy Makers & Funders	1. Resources/Tools (10) 2. Content/Availability (6) 3. Partnership (5)	1. Central Archive (5) 2. Aesthetic Politics (3) 3. Broad Access (3) 4. Inter-arts Collaboration (3)
Others	1. Content/Availability (26) 2. Outreach/Awareness (18) 3. Resources/Tools (6)	1. Preserve Existing Archives (15) 2. Diversity of Material (15) 3. Expertise (5)
Combined (all responses)**	1. Content/Availability (223) 2. Resources/Tools (110) 3. Education/Training (73)	1. Preserving Existing Archives (89) 2. Technology (45) 3. Creating Expertise (40) 4. Increasing Awareness (38) 5. Contextual Mat'l (26) 6. Work of Sr. Chor. (26)

***Excluding Financial Resources**
** The leading issues by constituency do not necessarily reflect the priorities of the group. For example, "increased awareness" ranks high as an overall priority issue (meaning it was cited by nearly all constituents), even though Outreach/Awareness as a category did not generate sufficient responses or points to make the list of top three priorities.

Ranking of Preservation Outcomes by Constituency
(Total Points)*

CONSTITUENCY	TOP TWO OUTCOMES	LEADING ISSUES
Educators	1. Content/Availability (32) 2. Resources/Tools (18)	1. Quality Documentation (8) 2. Greater Diversity of Mat'l (11)
Archivists & Librarians	1. Content/Availability (14) 2. Outreach/Awareness/(10)	1. Existing Works Safeguarded (10) 2. More Archives Created (3)
Historians, Critics, Scholars	1. Culture (8) 2. Resources/Tools (7)	1. Dance More Respected (4) 2. Standardized Methodologies (3)
Service Organizations	1. Content/Availability (19) 2. Culture (11)	1. Preservation Projects (11) 2. Increased Access (5)
Presenters & Producers	1. Content/Availability (14) 2. Resources/Tools (6)	1. Teaching Aids (4) 2. Dance More Respected (3)
Individual Artists	1. Content/Availability (9) 2. Outreach/Awareness (2)	1. Better Performances (3) 2. Complete Record of Dance Heritage (2) 3. Help for Small Companies (2) 4. Creative Use of New Mat'l (2)
Policy Makers & Funders	1. Culture (5) 2. Education/Training (3)	1. Dance More Respected (4) 2. Dancers Know More (3)
Others	1. Content/Availability (11) 2. Outreach/Awareness (3)	1. More Works Preserved (5) 2. More Archives Created (2) 3. Regional Networks (2) 4. Regional Centers (2)
Combined (all responses)**	1. Content/Availability (99) 2. Resources/Tools (31)	1. More Works Preserved, Safeguarded (29) 2. More Diversity (27) 3. Increased Awareness (26) 4. Technological Solutions (22) 5. Dance More Respected (16)

*Excluding Financial Resources
** The leading issues by constituency do not necessarily reflect the priorities of the group. For example, "increased awareness" ranks high when responses from all constituencies are combined. It does not, however, rank high enough among most constituencies to make the list of top two preservation outcomes.

Ranking of Access Priorities by Constituency
(Total Points)*

CONSTITUENCY	TOP THREE PRIORITIES	LEADING ISSUES
Educators	1. Resources/Tools (86) 2. Content/Availability (17) 3. Fair Use (16)	1. Online Central Resource (24) 2. Digitization (6) 3. Web-based Indexing (6)
Archivists & Librarians	1. Resources/Tools (56) 2. Fair Use (16) 3. Outreach/Awareness (16)	1. Online Central Resource (10) 2. Standard. Methodologies (7) 3. Catalogue of all Archives (5)
Historians, Critics, Scholars	1. Resources/Tools (33) 2. Content/Availability (9) 3. Outreach/Awareness (5)	1. Online Central Resources (18) 2. Catalogue of all Archives (5) 3. Digitization for Increased Access (5)
Service Organizations	1. Resources/Tools (12) 2. Outreach/Awareness (9) 3. Fair Use (4)	1. Increased Awareness (9) 2. Online Access (3) 3. Web-based Presence (3) 4. Mass Production of Documentation & Lit. (3) 5. Clarify Rights (3)
Presenters & Producers	1. Resources/Tools (22) 2. Content/Availability (19) 3. Outreach/Awareness (6)	1. Online Central Resources (9) 2. Ease of Access (4) 3. Digititization for Increased Access (4) 4. Standard. Methodologies (4)
Individual Artists	1. Resources/Tools (14) 2. Content/Availability (6) 3. Fair Use (4)	1. Online Access (10) 2. Exhibits, Traveling Mat'l (6) 3. Artists Maintain IP Control (3)
Policy Makers & Funders	1. Resources/Tools (10) 2. Partnership (3) 3. Content/Availability (2)	1. External Collaborations (3) 2. More Contextual Mat'l (2) 3. Technology (2)
Others	1. Outreach/Awareness (12) 2. Content/Availability (12) 3. Resources/Tools (6)	1. Ease of Access (6) 2. Diversity of Mat'l (3) 3. Increased Awareness of Diversity of Field (3) 4. Database of Dance Historians (3)
Combined (all responses)**	1. Resources/Tools (255) 2. Content/Availability (62) 3. Outreach/Awareness (43)	1. Technology (137) 2. Information, Databases, Catalogues, etc. (55) 3. Increasing Access (41) 4. Expanding Awareness (35) 5. Creating Expertise (22)

*Excluding Financial Resources
**Combined totals reflect all responses from all constituencies for each theme category and therefore do not equal the total of the individual constituent responses shown on the chart. For example, if responses from educators totaled 16 for Outreach/Awareness, that category would not make the priority list for that constituency. The 16 points, however, are reflected in "combined responses."

Ranking of Access Outcomes by Constituency
(Total Points)*

CONSTITUENCY	TOP TWO OUTCOMES	LEADING ISSUES
Educators	1. Resources/Tools (25) 2. Culture (15)	1. More Teaching Aids (6) 2. More Technology Tools (4)
Archivists & Librarians	1. Resources/Tools (21) 2. Content/Availability (14)	1. More Technology Tools (7) 2. Broader Access (5) 3. Awareness of Where to Find Material (5)
Historians, Critics, Scholars	1. Resources/Tools (17) 2. Content/Availability (8)	1. More Technology Tools (14) 2. More Digitization (4)
Service Organizations	1. Culture (8) 2. Outreach/Awareness (7)	1. Dance is More Popular (5) 2. Broader Access (3)
Presenters & Producers	1. Culture (10) 2. Resources/Tools (2) 3. Content/Availability (2)	1. Larger Audience for Dance (4) *2. No Response Above 1 Point*
Individual Artists	1. Content/Availability (5) 2. Culture (4)	1. Dance is More Popular (4) 2. More K-12 Dance Education (3)
Policy Makers & Funders	**No Response Above 1 Point**	**No Response Above 1 Point**
Others	Resources/Tools (8) Content/Availability (6)	1. Increased Awareness (4) 2. Diversity of Material (2) 3. Larger Audience for Dance (2) 4. Preserve Work of Sr. Artists (2)
Combined (all responses)**	1. Resources/Tools (73) 2. Content/Availability (36)	1. Technology Solutions (26) 2. Dance More Respected, Popular (23) 3. More Information (19) 4. Increased Awareness (18) 5. Broader Access (14)

*Excluding Funding
**Combined totals reflect all responses from all constituencies for each theme category and therefore do not equal the total of the individual constituent responses shown on the chart. For example, if responses from educators totaled 12 for Content/Availability, that category would not make the priority list for that constituency. The 16 points, however, are reflected in "combined responses."