

Creative City Network of Canada

INTERMUNICIPAL
COMPARATIVE
FRAMEWORK
PROJECT

Phase One Pilot
REPORT

The municipalities who responded to the pilot survey are:

Banff, AB
Brantford, ON
Camrose, AB
Edmonton, AB
Fredericton, NB
Grande Prairie, AB
Hamilton, ON
Kingston, ON
Mississauga, ON
Moncton, NB
Nanaimo, BC
New Westminster, BC
North Vancouver (City & District), BC
Ottawa, ON
Port Coquitlam, BC
Port Moody, BC
Portage la Prairie, MB
Prince George, BC
Red Deer, AB
Regina, SK
Richmond, BC
Saskatoon, SK
Sooke, BC
St. Catharines, ON
St. John's, NL
Strathcona County, AB
Toronto, ON
Vancouver, BC
West Vancouver, BC

© 2006 Creative City Network of Canada

Data years: 2002 – 2004

Analysis/Writing: 2005

Analysis/Writing: Nancy Duxbury and Anne Russo

Editing: Kaija Pepper

Outreach: Sheryl McGraw and Anne Russo

Design: Gliss Media

Creative City Network of Canada

408 – 402 West Pender Street

Vancouver, BC V6B 1T6

www.creativecity.ca

604-688-2489

Project contact: Nancy Duxbury

nancy@creativecity.ca

This project was supported through a contribution from the Department of Canadian Heritage.



Patrimoine Canadian
canadien Heritage

Contents

List of Tables	5
Preface	6
Introduction	7
Phase One Pilot Survey Responses	9
1. Participating Communities	9
2. General Administration of Culture.....	11
Legislation, policies, and plans	
Other plans or strategies	
Chapter in Official Community Plan	
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, and advisory groups	
Arm’s-length agencies	
Intermunicipal or regional shared-cost programs	
Organizational structures, cultural departments, and staffing	
Volunteer policies	
3. Special Initiatives for Cultural Organizations	22
Stabilization programs	
Other special initiatives	
4. Assistance to Major Institutions	23
5. Arts Funding Programs	24
Types of funding programs	
Types of organizations or activities funded	
Adjudication of arts funding	
6. Festivals and Special Events Support	28
By-laws, policies, and advisory groups	
Administrative structures	
Funding support to festivals and special events	
Non-funding support to festivals and special events	
Adjudication of funding requests	
7. Public Art	33
Legislation, policies, and advisory groups	
Acquisition of public art	
Selection process	
Grant programs for public art	
Percent for Art Programs	
Maintenance and de-accessioning policies	
Public art staff	
Registries/inventories	

8. Civic Art Collections.....	37
Legislation, policies, and advisory groups	
Acquisition of civic art	
9. Cultural Facilities Assistance.....	39
Legislation, policies, and plans	
Cultural facility development	
Direct operation and programming	
Support to cultural organizations for facilities	
10. Local Government-Owned Cultural Facilities Inventory.....	42
11. Heritage.....	44
Legislation, policies, and advisory groups	
Heritage incentives and registry	
Types of heritage funding programs	
Types of heritage organizations and activities funded	
Decision-making processes for municipal heritage funds	
12. Civic Awards.....	49
Legislation and policies	
Selection process	
Types of civic awards	
13. Public Libraries.....	51
14. Cultural Industries.....	53
15. Other.....	54
Appendix A: Respondent Municipalities.....	56
Appendix B: Glossary of Terms.....	57

List of Tables

Table 1	List of pilot survey respondents	10
Table 2-1	Legislation, policies, and plans by subject area	12
Table 2-2	Official Community Plans including specific goals and objectives for cultural development	13
Table 2-3	Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, and advisory groups mandated to address cultural issues on behalf of the municipality	14
Table 2-4	Arm’s-length agencies and non-profit organizations	14
Table 2-5	Organizational structures, cultural departments, and staffing levels	17
Table 2-6	Staffing levels of cultural workers in municipalities and areas of responsibility	20
Table 3	Special initiatives for cultural organizations	22
Table 4	Assistance to major institutions	23
Table 5-1	Types of arts funding programs	25
Table 5-2	Types of arts organizations and activities funded by arts grant programs	26
Table 5-3	Decision-making and adjudication processes for municipal arts funding programs	27
Table 6-1	Festivals and special events legislation, policy, plans, or strategies, and Council-appointed committees	28
Table 6-2	Direct organizing/programming and support of festivals and special events	31
Table 6-3	Adjudication of festivals/special events funding	32
Table 7-1	Public art legislation, policies, plans, and Council-appointed committees	33
Table 7-2	Public art selection/commissioning processes	35
Table 7-3	Public art programs	36
Table 8-1	Civic art collection legislation, policies, plans, and Council-appointed committees	37
Table 8-2	Civic art collection selection/commissioning processes	38
Table 9-1	Cultural facilities legislation, policies, plans, and mechanisms	40
Table 9-2	Facility support to cultural organizations	41
Table 10	Local government-owned cultural facilities	43
Table 11-1	Heritage legislation, policies, plans, strategies, committees, and agencies	45
Table 11-2	Types of heritage funding programs	46
Table 11-3	Types of heritage organizations and activities funded	47
Table 11-4	Decision-making and adjudication processes for municipal heritage funding programs	48
Table 12-1	Civic awards legislation, policies, and plans/strategies	49
Table 12-2	Local government civic awards in the arts, heritage, and other cultural areas	50
Table 13	Municipal libraries	52
Table 14-1	Cultural industries legislation, policy, plans, or strategies, and Council-appointed committees	53
Table 14-2	Municipal support to commercial cultural industries	53
Table 15	What resources for culture (arts or heritage) are most difficult to account for in your local government?	55
Table A1	General characteristics of respondents to Phase One Pilot Survey	56

Preface

A few years ago, a consultant with a 30-year career in community-level planning remarked on the uneven playing field on which he found himself when hired to develop a strategic plan for the arts in a particular municipality. “Where is your historical data?” he remembered asking. “Where are the comparative figures and municipal funding trends by province, across Canada?” If, he claimed, he had been developing a strategic plan for recreation tourism, or if he were a politician creating new public policy, the information needed to analyse the local potential and to make recommendations would be readily available.

His despair was understandable, although there was certainly some information available at that time. Many overworked cultural staff in major Canadian cities were regularly asked to help colleagues in other cities prepare reports on comparative per capita arts funding in selected municipalities. In this way, the data for this developing sector was slowly being collected, analysed, and reported. Yet requests to determine per capita support generally lacked consistency, and the resulting reports measured indicators that differed considerably. For example, some recorded cash grants only, while others included the value of using civic-owned facilities at no charge. Within the latter category, some municipalities included facility maintenance costs of civic-owned buildings; others did not. While there was a clear indication of the wide range of municipal involvement in, and support for, culture, the reports as a whole measured apples with oranges.

A response to the need for consistency in reporting was found in the 1996 Municipal Cultural Investment Survey, designed by Nancy Duxbury for the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) Cultural Plan Committee and completed by 17 of the region’s 21 municipalities. Here was a comprehensive survey of municipal arts support that in its survey form alone gave a valuable overview of the arts sector and of connections to municipal infrastructure.

For the Creative City Network of Canada, we decided to expand the scope of the GVRD survey in terms of both content and geography, and so we created the Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project. Questions on heritage and libraries were added and, through the Creative City Network’s Culture-L listserv, we “went national” with coast-to-coast input and respondents.

The long-term goal of the Framework Project is to have an accessible source of baseline information about municipal planning, policy, programming, and support in municipalities across Canada. Phase One is about designing the structure – the framework – for storing and retrieving this multifaceted body of information. This report summarizes, in tables and commentary, what we learned about municipal involvement in arts, heritage, and culture in 30 municipalities across Canada through a survey initially distributed in 2003.

From the beginning, we relied upon colleagues who found the time in crowded schedules to consider our information requests thoughtfully. Special thanks go to Keith McPhail in Halifax, Debbie Hill in Ottawa, Sue Stewart in Saskatoon, Ken Doherty in Peterborough, and Christine Picard in Moncton, as well as to every single busy staffer who provided input on the survey design and/or completed our 95-question survey. Thank you also for so patiently awaiting this report.

Introduction

The Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project is a means to inventory and understand the infrastructure, scope, and nature of local government involvement in cultural development across Canada. It creates the structure to capture the nature of local government involvement and investment in cultural development nationally. “Cultural development” is used here in an inclusive sense, and topics addressed in the project include arts, heritage, facilities, civic art collections, public art, funding, non-monetary support, and more.

A comprehensive inventory of this nature, which is national in scope, has not been attempted before in Canada, and at each stage of its iterative development we have been aware of the complexity and subtlety of this sector that we need to learn more about.

In developing the concept of a comparative framework, we reviewed two kinds of documents. First, there were the limited number of existing inventories of municipal cultural investment and involvement covering diverse municipalities operating independently within a geographic and political region: Greater Vancouver Regional District (1996), the Capital Regional District on Vancouver Island (2002), and l’Observatoire de la culture et des communications du Québec (OCCQ, 2003). We also reviewed intermunicipal comparative surveys produced by municipal staff in cities across Canada (e.g., Halifax, Ottawa, and Toronto). We used information from this research as a basis for further information gathering, and a resulting discussion on the Creative City Network listserv, Culture-L, provided detailed feedback from staff in 12 variously sized municipalities that informed the design and process of the project. Our colleagues recommended:

- The framework needs to be user-friendly in design, flexible enough to accommodate a variety of structures and models, and useful to a range of municipalities with diverse characteristics and structure.
- The process of completing an inventory of local activity has, in itself, the capacity and potential to be a learning tool, a characteristic that needs to be developed to its full potential.
- Wherever possible, the framework needs to use terminology, categories, and components for qualitative and financial reporting that respects and incorporates existing understanding, parameters, and definitions, rather than creating new terminology.
- Definitions and examples should be included throughout the document, and also as a stand-alone glossary at the end.
- Responses should be standardized with a balance of check-off boxes for ease in tabulation as well as opportunities for open-ended responses.
- A comprehensive inventory of civic-owned facilities needs to be a separate document.
- Web references to access documents should be requested where available.
- The survey should be designed to be completed by municipal staff, with no need for an outside “interviewer,” and to be self-tabulating.

The research, responses, and recommendations resulted in a three-phased approach for the Pilot Project:

Phase One: Qualitative Survey – Policies, Plans, Programs and Practices (first distributed in 2003)

This phase is aimed at understanding the general framework, scope, and nature of local government involvement in cultural development across Canada.

Phase Two: Quantitative Survey – The Numbers

This phase will capture the value of local government investment in cultural development across Canada. It will expand the information gathered in Phase One to include the value of direct and indirect support through funding programs, administrative costs, operational expenses, and other mechanisms.

Phase Three: More Details in Selected Topic Areas

Every category included in the framework could be explored in more detail. Topics to be selected for further study will reflect growing areas of practice and priority needs for information. Topics and issues will be compiled on an ongoing basis for consideration, and methodologies will reflect the nature of the subjects being examined. A few areas of growing interest that have already been identified for consideration include the interrelated roles and models of regional and municipal government support for cultural development, details of heritage support strategies, and the role of libraries in local cultural development.

The long-term goal of the Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project is to have an accessible source of baseline information about municipal planning, policy, programming, and support in municipalities across Canada. Phase One is about designing the framework for storing and retrieving this multi-faceted body of information. The Phase One Pilot Report summarizes, in tables and commentary, what we learned about municipal involvement in arts, heritage, and culture in 30 municipalities across Canada through a survey initially distributed in 2003.

Phase One Pilot Survey Responses

To appreciate the full extent of government involvement in cultural development, it is necessary to understand the broad context and comprehensive nature of this support, including the non-monetary aspects, before defining the portion that can be quantified with monetary values. Phase One inventories the qualitative involvement – the policies, plans, programs, and practices. Additionally, the Phase One Pilot is an iterative process itself, and a test of the next stage. Limiting information-gathering to qualitative categories helped identify the potential for reporting inconsistencies and duplications before introducing quantitative information – the dollar values – into the survey in Phase Two.

1. Participating Communities

Thirty municipalities completed the survey in the pilot. Two of the municipalities are administered jointly and are counted here as one. The total number of respondents is therefore referred to as 29. Participating municipalities range in size from major urban centres such as Toronto to communities such as Banff with populations under 10,000. Participating municipalities bookend the nation, from the recently incorporated town of Sooke on the southwest coast of Vancouver Island to the heritage-steeped hills of St. John's, Newfoundland. We believe these communities are a fair representation of the scope and diversity of Canadian municipalities for this pilot (see Table 1).

Each municipality is unique and to a greater or lesser extent each is structured differently. Municipal departments serve communities with varying resources, needs, and expectations. Each community responded to the survey questions as its own timeframe and circumstances allowed. Functions and roles are defined in different ways (e.g., program instructors are defined in some departments and municipalities as contractors; in others, as part-time staff), creating challenges to a balanced inventory.

The use of the word inventory throughout the project is indicative of the intent to be non-judgmental in the assembly of the information. Many municipalities do not have key community, organizational, or service data easily available within their existing departments or information systems, so the foundation of a consistent, systematic data collection and reporting system will need time, patience, networking, and communication.

There are the obvious distinctions between large and small municipalities, due often to the availability in larger centres of staff in greater numbers who are therefore able to specialize. But there are no clearly definitive trends that distinguish commitment to the arts, culture, and heritage according to population size alone.

Appendix A presents further details about the respondents to the pilot survey.

Municipality	Province	Population	Pop. Date	Data date
Banff	AB	8,282	1998	2003
Brantford	ON	86,417	2001	2003
Camrose	AB	15,669	2003	2003
Edmonton	AB	666,104	2002	2003
Fredericton	NB	47,560	2001	2003
Grande Prairie	AB	40,226	2003	2003
Hamilton	ON	490,270	2001	2002
Kingston	ON	116,000	2004	2004
Mississauga	ON	695,000	2002	2003
Moncton	NB	61,055	2001	2003
Nanaimo	BC	74,500	2001	2003
New Westminster	BC	58,000	2003	2003
North Vancouver (City & District)	BC	132,730	2002	2002
Ottawa	ON	774,072	2001	2003
Port Coquitlam	BC	53,223	2003	2003
Port Moody	BC	25,000	2003	2003
Portage la Prairie	MB	12,976	2001	2003
Prince George	BC	72,406	2001	2003
Red Deer	AB	71,000	2003	2002
Regina	SK	187,441	2002	2002
Richmond	BC	168,138	2003	2003
Saskatoon	SK	213,607	2002	2003
Sooke	BC	8,735	2001	2003
St. Catharines	ON	129,170	2001	2002
St. John's	NL	100,000	2001	2004
Strathcona County	AB	75,949	2003	2003
Toronto	ON	2,481,494	2001	2003
Vancouver	BC	545,671	2001	2003
West Vancouver	BC	43,660	2001	2002
29 respondents covering 30 municipalities Data dates: 2002 – 6; 2003 – 21; 2004 – 2				

2. General Administration of Culture

Legislation, policies, and plans

Municipalities create a range of different instruments to guide and support the cultural development of their community, ranging from legislation, policies, chapters in general community plans, and specific cultural plans and strategies (as well as programs and other initiatives, examined later in this report). Some of these documents are general in nature, encompassing a range of possible activities within articulated strategic directions, while others are very precise instruments that enable particular actions.

This section aimed to determine the extent to which municipalities have legislation, policies, and plans relevant to cultural development, and to further determine the topic areas they addressed. In the process of analyzing responses, the multidimensional nature of many municipal documents, which may serve as both policy and plan, was confirmed. We have carefully reviewed the responses, and have used a flexible approach that recognizes and respects this reality and the diversity of approaches used by individual municipalities.

A Glossary of Terms relevant to this project was included with the survey (presented in Appendix B). In it, policy is defined as “a consolidated statement of vision, purpose, goals, and objectives for the description and development of activity, production, services, and related resources. It may include details of scope and roles, with attendant analysis and recommended actions and implementation strategies.”

Legislation or by-laws at the municipal level are resolutions describing intent, approved by a majority vote of council.

In the survey and in this analysis, culture is used as an inclusive concept, and refers to the total of the various categories, types, or descriptions in a given section or question. Municipality and community are used somewhat interchangeably.

There may have been confusion on the survey instrument when multiple choices included the terms heritage, arts, and culture (arts and heritage). The phrase “culture (arts and heritage)” was intended to capture information from those communities that have, from the outset, included both arts and heritage as one in their legislation, policy, and planning.

All responding municipalities report having policy and legislation related to culture (see Table 2-1).

Heritage is in the vanguard of cultural policy and legislation, with 23 municipalities indicating a variety of by-laws and legislation in place. One of the earlier pieces of legislation noted in the returns is the 1965 St. Catharines, Ontario By-law to Operate a Museum. In the 1970s there was a flurry of heritage-related legislation and policy, from Brantford’s Master Plan of Archaeological Resources (1977) and Heritage Committee By-law (1978) to the again archaeology-related City of Vancouver policy in 1979, resulting from a new Provincial Heritage Conservation Act. Throughout the 1980s, heritage-related legislation continued to build at a steady but sedate rate. The very few reported arts-related documents of this period include Moncton’s Council Resolution with Respect to Initiating a Collection of Fine Arts (1985), North Vancouver’s Establishment Agreement with Arts & Culture Commission (1989), and Vancouver’s Advance Grant Installment Policy (1989). These are the first arts-related legislation and policy to be reported.

Policy: A consolidated statement of vision, purpose, goals, and objectives for the description and development of activity, production, services, and related resources. It may include details of scope and roles, with attendant analysis and recommended actions and implementation strategies.

Legislation or by-laws (at the municipal level): Resolutions describing intent, approved by a majority vote of Council.

Culture: Includes the performing, visual, literary, and media arts; library, archives, and heritage resources; and socio-cultural activities as practiced and preserved in a community. These practices are multicultural and reflect the beliefs, experiences, and creative aspirations of a people in a specific geographic and political area.

The breadth of the responses indicates that cultural policy and legislation is not the purview of large municipalities alone. For example, Banff, Alberta and Sooke, BC, both with populations under 10,000, report various pieces of legislation and policy, although two different approaches are in evidence. Banff's completed work is primarily in heritage, and they report more recent work in progress on a variety of arts and festival-related policy and legislation. Sooke, a recently incorporated municipality, has a full range of both arts and heritage policy and legislation, including policy related to the film industry. Sooke's first Official Community Plan, completed in 1999, includes substantive sections on both arts and heritage.

Other plans or strategies

Nineteen respondents reported they have already developed plans or strategies focused on culture (arts and heritage), or have them in development. Twenty-nine heritage-related plans are complete, with an additional eight in process. Only nine plans are focused on the arts alone.

Seven municipalities are working on a public art plan or strategy, more than doubling the number of such plans already in place.

TABLE 2-1
Legislation, policies, and plans by subject area

Subject	Legislation			Policy			Cultural Plan/Strategy		
	Yes	In proc.	Total	Yes	In proc.	Total	Yes	In proc.	Total
Culture (arts and heritage)	14	2	16	15	2	17	18	1	19
Arts	9	1	10	11	3	14	8	1	9
Heritage	23	0	23	19	2	21	13	5	18
Public Art	11	3	14	13	7	20	6	7	13
Civic Art Collection	8	3	11	12	7	19	3	4	7
Community Arts	4	1	5	5	3	8	2	1	3
Festivals & Special Events	8	3	11	14	5	19	4	0	4
Civic Awards	7	0	7	9	0	9	4	0	4
Cultural Facilities Development	3	2	5	5	1	6	7	4	11
Cultural Facilities Support/Use	7	2	9	8	3	11	5	4	9
Cultural Tourism	3	2	5	1	3	4	3	0	3
Heritage Tourism	1	2	3	3	2	5	5	0	5
Heritage Registry and/or Designation	19	3	22	17	2	19	12	3	15
Archaeology	5	0	5	6	0	6	2	2	4
Cultural Industries	6	0	6	8	0	8	2	0	2
Other *	5	6	11	2	0	2	1	0	1

* Other responses:

Legislation: Public libraries (3), Heritage Commission Bylaw/Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw, Affiliation

Policy: Community cultural development, Theatre operating policy

Cultural plan/strategy: Community cultural development

Overall, all 29 respondents indicated they had legislation, policies, and/or cultural plans/strategies in at least one of these subject areas.

Chapter in Official Community Plan

A total of 25 respondents report an Official Community Plan, City Plan, or equivalent that explicitly includes reference to culture, arts, heritage, or archaeology (see Table 2-2). Heritage is identified in an Official Community Plan in 17 municipalities and culture (arts and heritage) in 16. The arts, the more recent focus, appear in an Official Community Plan or its equivalent in 10 municipalities. Policies for archaeology appear in four. Although policies for cultural industries (generally the film industry) are reported in various municipalities, there is no indication that this topic is incorporated yet into any Official Community Plan.

Based on responses to date, municipal legislation is reported in documents as far back as 1965, but there is no indication of cultural topics appearing in an official Community Plan or its equivalent before 1990. Only Toronto reports that it has included public art in its recent Official Community Plan.

Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, and advisory groups

Local government often has a Council-appointed committee, commission, board, or advisory group mandated to address cultural issues, generally or specifically, on behalf of the municipality (see Table 2-3). Regarding multiple committees, if there is more than one body in a particular area, respondents were asked to list all of them. If Council members are included in some committees but not in others in the same topic area, respondents could add these to the end of the list.

TABLE 2-2

Official Community Plans including specific goals and objectives for cultural development

Subject	In Community Plan	In process	Total
Heritage	17	2	19
Culture (arts and heritage)	16	2	18
Arts	10	2	12
Archaeology	4	1	5
Public Art	1	0	1
Cultural Industries	0	0	0
Other *	2	4	6

* Other responses: Community development, strategic plan

Overall, 24 respondents indicated their municipality's Official Community Plan already included, or had in process, specific goals and objectives for cultural development.

Arm's-length agencies

In a limited number of municipalities, a non-profit organization or agency, often facility-specific, may be mandated by Council to manage all or some of the arts or heritage issues in the municipality (see Table 2-4). More frequently, there is a key community organization or agency (not mandated by Council) that may be formally or informally contracted by the municipality to provide a perspective on cultural issues, or to assist with particular programs. These umbrella organizations, representing a broad array of interests and citizen involvement, can be key to planning and implementation of broad cultural initiatives in a community.

TABLE 2-3

Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, and advisory groups mandated to address cultural issues on behalf of the municipality

Area of Mandate	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?	
Heritage	25		25	15	60%
Libraries	23		23	15	65%
Recreation, Parks, & Culture	17		17	10	59%
Arts	16	2	18	10	56%
Public Art	12	1	13	5	38%
Festivals/Special events	9	1	10	4	40%
Cultural affairs/arts and heritage (combined)	8	1	9	6	67%
Community Development (including culture)	8		8	5	63%
Civic-Owned Facilities	8	1	9	2	22%
Cultural Tourism	7		7	6	86%
Civic Art Collection	4	2	6	1	17%
Cultural Industries (e.g., Film Commission)	2		2	0	0%
Other *	8		8	5	63%

Note: In most cases, the "Other" response indicated a second committee in one of the above areas (most commonly Heritage) in which only some of the committees (not all) included Council members.

All respondents indicated they had Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, and/or advisory groups mandated to address cultural issues on behalf of the municipality.

TABLE 2-4

Arm's-length agencies and non-profit organizations

Area of Mandate	Organizations/agencies mandated by Council			Key orgns/ agencies not mandated
	Yes	In process	Total	
Arts	6	0	6	22
Heritage	7	0	7	15
Other *	6	1	7	5

Other responses: Six of the seven non-profit organizations or agencies mandated by Council are facility-specific. The other area was "cultural tourism and industries."

Overall, 14 respondents indicated an arm's-length agency or non-profit organization was mandated by Council, and 23 indicated a key organization or agency not mandated by Council.

Intermunicipal or regional shared-cost programs

Regional governments may be involved in policies and programs for culture. The programs are usually based on a cost-sharing arrangement with the regional municipalities. Contributions to multi-municipality or shared cost regional services are reported in a limited number of cases.

Regional systems warrant further investigation to better understand the various models established in different regional areas, the conditions under which they are established and operate, the strengths and limitations of the various systems, and the extent to which they adapt to changing regional situations.

A closer understanding of these situations will illuminate the various models at work, and the nature of intergovernmental cooperation for cultural development at a regional level. It will also assist in designing a survey instrument that captures difficult-to-identify dollar values in a consistent fashion. As an example, the City of Prince George funds approximately 60% of the Regional District of Fraser Fort George budget. The Regional District is responsible for funding the district and city's art gallery and two museums. Therefore, in essence the City funds these three facilities' operating budgets by approximately 60%. This operational funding is not reflected in this survey as it is currently structured.

Organizational structures, cultural departments, and staffing

In this evolving area of practice, the definition, roles, responsibilities, skills, and knowledge base of cultural staff is emerging and fluid. As well, because of the range of municipal models – reflecting geographic size, population, historical precedent, and incorporated status among other factors – cultural staffing is one of the more challenging areas to inventory.

Municipal cultural staff members are found within a wide variety of departments and may work from multiple departments depending on their areas of responsibility and the nature of their work. Many municipalities hire contract or seasonal employees for special projects or events.

A review of the pilot survey data identifies some of the structural options found in the participating municipalities, and provides a picture of the multidimensional nature of the work of municipal cultural staff. A “top-level” review of the data sheds light on the following questions:

1. Where in the municipal structure does cultural staff work?
2. To what extent do municipalities have a specified office or offices for culture?
3. What is the level of cultural staffing in municipalities?
4. What are their general areas of responsibility?

Arts: Includes the visual arts (painting, print-making, drawing, sculpture, crafts, photography, film, and video), theatre, music and song, literary arts, and dance. The arts encompass original, creative interpretation, and facsimile reproduction and distribution.

1. Where in the municipal structure does cultural staff work?

The survey provided space for reporting up to six different areas in which cultural staff may work. Just under 60% of the 29 respondents indicated that staff with cultural responsibilities worked in either one or two offices, which were identified generally as arts/cultural services or heritage/museum/archives (see Table 2-5). While two municipalities indicated that staff with cultural responsibilities worked across six different offices or groups, none mentioned that cultural staff in their municipality worked in more than six areas.

Arts, heritage, film, and tourism are included in the responsibilities reported by the 18 municipalities with an arts and cultural services type of office. In 17 municipalities, cultural staff works in heritage, museum, and archive areas. Staff with cultural responsibilities is also included in 12 planning departments and eight recreation departments.

2. To what extent do municipalities have a specified office (or offices) for culture?

Although the small population of volunteer pilot respondents prevents generalizing these pilot survey findings, they offer a glimpse into an evolving municipal field of practice. Twenty respondents (69%) indicated their municipality had at least one specifically cultural office, division, or group. When staff with cultural responsibilities was located in only one office or group, this was a cultural office or group only in 40% of the cases. When staff with cultural responsibilities was located in two offices or groups, it was a bit more likely (57%) that one of the two areas was a cultural office or group. Once cultural staff worked in three to six different areas, all respondents indicated that at least one of these areas was specifically a cultural office, division, or group. This indicates the breadth of this field of work and, in many situations, how it is embedded or integrated into broader municipal systems and structures.

Divisions or departments under which cultural offices are positioned include: Planning, Recreation, Community Services, Economic Development, and Tourism. Municipal cultural staff is also situated in civic-owned or managed arts facilities. In the next analysis of municipal support, the distribution of staff (i.e., regular full-time equivalents, or FTEs) among these departments will be examined.

Cultural offices were found in municipalities from just over 15,000 in population size. However, even when the name of the division includes culture (e.g., Parks, Recreation, and Culture), this does not necessarily mean there is a specific cultural office within the division.

3. What is the level of cultural staffing in municipalities?

Despite the number and range of responsibilities and departments reported, only three municipalities reported FTEs of over 20 staff (see Table 2-6). Fully 75% of the respondents reported a total of fewer than 10 FTEs performing a wide range of work, including running museums, theatres galleries, arts centres, and other facilities; programming and producing cultural festivals; administering programs; scouting and permitting for a local film industry; managing archives; developing policy and guidelines; administering public art selection processes; running summer arts activities in the parks; and much more.

(A possible future survey might compare staffing levels and citizen involvement for cultural programming with that of recreational programming to more fully capture the full import of this work and to more fully appreciate how this work leverages and enables community involvement.)

The data on seasonal and contract FTEs has been set aside at this time, awaiting further work, for two reasons. First, 15 of the 28 respondents indicated they hired contract or seasonal employees but could not estimate FTEs. Second, 103 of 122.35 seasonal or contract FTEs reported are attributable to one municipality. Thus, the data at present does not provide a good picture of this aspect of cultural staffing.

TABLE 2-5 (part 1/2)			
Organizational structures, cultural departments, and staffing levels			
<i>Number of offices or groups in which staff with cultural responsibilities work:</i>			
No. of different offices/groups	No. of respondents	At least one specifically cultural office, division, or group	% of municipalities in category with a cultural office, division, or group
1	10	4	40%
2	7	4	57%
3	4	4	100%
4	3	3	100%
5	3	3	100%
6	2	2	100%
	29	20	69%
<i>Office types where municipal cultural staff work:</i>			
General categories	No. of respondents	Office types	No. of respondents
Arts/cultural services	18	Arts/cultural services*	15
		Cultural services/heritage	2
		Cultural services/tourism/film	1
Heritage/museums/archives**	17	Heritage	7
		Heritage/museums	4
		Museums	3
		Museum/archives	1
		Archives	2
Planning	12	Planning	12
Recreation/parks	8	Recreation/parks (and culture)	7
		Recreation/social services	1
Community services/development	7	Community services/development	7
Facilities	6	Arts centre	4
		Theatre	1
		Facilities	1
Other – cultural	2	Special events	1
		Film	1
Economic development/tourism (and culture)	1	Economic development/tourism (and culture)	1
Other	4	Initiatives section	1
		City Clerk's	1
		Corporate communications	1
		Strategic services	1
	75		75

TABLE 2-5 (part 2/2)			
Organizational structures, cultural departments, and staffing levels			
<i>The larger departments in which these offices are located:</i>			
General department categories	No. of respondents	Department types	No. of respondents
Community services	25	Community services	23
		Community services/development/planning	1
		Community/economic services/development	1
Planning/development services	19	Planning or planning/development services	15
		Development services	1
		Properties division	1
		Urban development division	2
Parks/recreation/leisure services	18	Parks and recreation	10
		Recreation	3
		Recreation and community services	1
		Leisure services	3
		Engineering, public works, and parks & recreation	1
Economic devmt/tourism	7	Economic development and tourism (within community services)	1
		Economic development, culture, and tourism	6
Centralized corporate	7	CAO	1
		City Clerk's	4
		Commission of Council	1
		Corporate communications	1
Other	3	Strategic services	1
		Unknown	2
	79		79
* Includes an arts commission			
** This area seems under-reported, especially archives. This may be due to respondents' varying definitions of the scope of "cultural" staff.			
All respondents completed this section.			

4. What are their general areas of responsibility?

In this evolving sector, the definition, roles, responsibilities, skills, and knowledge base of cultural staff is emerging and fluid. The job is multidimensional. From the responses to a question on the primary nature of their work, it appears that municipal cultural staff is responsible for a broad spectrum of policy administration, programs, facilities, special events, and other functions in an equally broad array of departments or divisions. In addition to the basic skill sets of the job, cultural portfolios require individuals with considerable flexibility, creativity, and adaptability.

Whatever the department or position, in general the majority of time is taken up with administration (56%); 22% of work time is facility-related (operations and programming); 12% of work time involves direct cultural programming; and 10% involves “other” work. While these proportions are generally consistent across both arts and heritage positions, among “blended” (arts and heritage) positions, the administration share rises to 64% of work time. The wide range of examples given to explain other types of work and other types of positions provide insightful glimpses into the multidimensional nature of the work conducted by cultural staff in municipalities.

Volunteer policies

Many municipalities depend on volunteers in the operation of municipal facilities and municipality-organized festivals and special events. Ten respondents indicated that their municipality had a volunteer policy.

TABLE 2-6 Staffing levels of cultural workers in municipalities and areas of responsibility							
<i>Regular staff with cultural responsibilities (Full-Time Equivalents): *</i>							
No. of regular staff (FTEs)		No. of respondents					
< 1		2					
1 – 5		14					
1 – 1.75	5						
2 – 3.25	6						
4 – 5	3						
6 – 10		4					
11 – 15		2					
15.5 – 20		3					
21 – 25		1					
26 – 30		1					
Over 100		1					
		28					
<i>Regular employees – primary nature of work (% time):</i>							
	Administration	Facility operation and programming	Other (non-facility direct programming)	Other ***	Total	<i>No. of usable estimates</i>	<i>No. of respondents</i>
Arts	53	26	14	7	100	15	13
Heritage	54	23	15	8	100	18	14
Blended (arts and heritage)	64	14	12	10	100	15	14
Other **	54	26	7	13	100	18	10
Unknown						1	4
Overall total	56%	22%	12%	10%	100%		
* This table reports indicated levels of regular staff (FTEs). It does not include contractors or seasonal staff. Note: Accuracy/completeness of responses is an issue given multiple departments were often indicated.							
Additional notes to this table are on the next page.							
Overall, there were 28 respondents (missing City of Ottawa data due to amalgamation flux at time of response).							

Notes to Table 2-6 (continued)
<p>** “Other” job categorizations:</p> <p>Festivals Special events Management of amphitheatre Public art program and social planning issues Percent for Art coordinator Planning, policies, public art, and strategic partnerships Interpretive programming, park operations, and special events Community arts City archives</p> <p><i>Variety of task areas, e.g.:</i> Arts, heritage, sports, recreation, and entertainment Arts, heritage, culture, festivals, and special events Arts, heritage, cultural diversity, and natural history Recreation, culture, and heritage Film industry permitting and liaison Tourism, arts, culture, and film</p> <p><i>Other:</i> Heritage Commission liaison and land use planning 1/3 time allocated to ‘economic development’</p>
<p>*** Nature of “Other” areas of work:</p> <p><i>For Arts positions:</i> Special events Community development liaison Community liaison Liaison with NFP’s to facilitate community cultural development</p> <p><i>For Heritage positions:</i> Board governance of Museum Advisory Group Community liaison Heritage designation; heritage district development</p> <p><i>For Blended (arts and heritage) positions:</i> Special projects and policy/program development Community arts development Community development and resource Development (policies, studies, guidelines, community advisory, etc.) Non-archives related work Cleaners, chef, and dock co-ordinators</p> <p><i>For “Other” positions:</i> Council-directed items Special event planning Support to festival organizers Archival management Policy development; larger department and corporate planning and issues Anything that falls under ‘economic development’</p>

3. Special Initiatives for Cultural Organizations

Stabilization programs

Stabilization or sustainability programs are designed to build the organizational capacity of larger organizations by encouraging sound practices in governance, strategic planning, and organizational effectiveness. Very few municipalities report involvement in stabilization and deficit reduction initiatives, perhaps due to the general provincial or national scope of current programs (see Table 3).

Four municipalities, in BC, Alberta, and Manitoba, currently contribute to a stabilization program. Two more are developing a program.

Special initiatives

Examples of other special initiatives include New Westminster and Portage la Prairie, which contribute to a Deficit Reduction Program; Ottawa, which reports the availability of a line of credit or loans; and Toronto's Cultural Facilities Capital Grants.

Comments by respondents referred to flexible support mechanisms and programs that may exist outside of more formal cultural support programs. A few comments referred to forms of initiatives outside municipal support to arts organizations, such as a "partnership with provincial agencies for sustainability, inventory and planning," i.e., more planning-related initiatives and partnerships.

Other responses indicate that the question on special initiatives was confusing when positioned at this point of the survey instrument, and it will be appropriately repositioned for future use.

Stabilization or sustainability

projects: Refers to partnered projects with incentive funding to encourage sound practices in governance, strategic planning, and organizational effectiveness in order to strengthen individual organizations and build capacity within the sector.

Strategic plan: A clearly written document that describes an organization's mandate, as well as its near, mid and long-term goals or objectives, and the priority actions and implementation plans necessary to realize them.

Deficit reduction program: Refers to a generally time-limited, incentive funding program for the purpose of building organizational capacity through the elimination of deficits, usually administered in conjunction with other capacity-building initiatives, such as a stabilization program.

	Yes	In development	Total
Deficit reduction program	2	0	2
Stabilization or sustainability program	4	2	6
Other special initiatives	14	2	16
Total municipalities responding	14	3	16

Overall, 16 respondents indicated at least one of the three choices:
 Two indicated all three categories
 Three indicated "stabilization" and other
 Twelve indicated only "other ..."

4. Assistance to Major Institutions

Local government may contribute to major exhibition, heritage, museum, performing arts, or training institutions directly and/or indirectly, with support administered outside of the general adjudication process for cultural grants. For example, this may include facilities that are a line item within local government and part of the ongoing municipal budget process. Support may include annual operating, building maintenance, and/or other services. Examples of major institutions treated in this way include the Vancouver Art Gallery, Toronto Symphony, Victoria Maritime Museum, National Ballet School, and the London Regional Art and Historical Museum. However, as one respondent commented, a community’s major institutions may be considerably smaller than these examples.

Twenty municipalities indicate support to major institutions through the use of City-owned buildings, 16 report the use of City-owned land, and 20 report building maintenance and other services as support outside of the general adjudication process (see Table 4).

Other support provided ranges from consultative services on topics such as board development, business planning, grant funding, and financial accounting; to support for utilities, security, and grounds maintenance; to use of City-owned lands for cultural activities; to promotional support. Property tax exemptions and lease subsidies were also mentioned. Overall, 27 respondents indicated they offered assistance to major institutions in at least one of the categories indicated.

TABLE 4 Assistance to major institutions			
Types of support	Yes	In development	Total
Operating assistance outside of the general adjudication process for arts or heritage grants	23	1	24
<i>Other types of support:</i>			
Use of City-owned building	20	0	20
Use of City-owned land	16	0	16
Building maintenance and other services	20	0	20
Other *			13
<p><i>* Services provided include:</i> City support systems such as IT services, purchasing, training, input into city policy and city planning documents Consultative services for Board development, business planning, grant funding Financial accounting, and payroll services and expertise Other expertise Utilities, building maintenance, janitorial, security and grounds Access to City-owned lands for activities Core staffing, IT services, office equipment Some administrative support from City departments Web promotions</p> <p><i>Also:</i> Property tax exemption Lease subsidies</p> <p>Overall, 27 respondents indicated they offered assistance to major institutions in at least one of the categories above.</p>			

5. Arts Funding Programs

There are two ways of reporting municipal cultural support: by the type or nature of the program (e.g., operating grants or project grants) and by the discipline or activity that is supported (e.g., dance or theatre).

Phase One of the Comparative Framework Project concentrates on the types of programs and the nature of the support delivered through each. Phase Two will be designed as a companion framework for quantitatively reporting municipal grant support.

While municipal cultural grant programs are usually created and managed by municipal staff, some funding may be allocated or awarded to an independent non-profit organization in the community (e.g., a local arts council), which adjudicates and disburses the funds to local arts groups. Delegating the administration of program funds to these organizations has sometimes been a developmental stage for smaller communities, leading to a more formalized structure of local government arts programming supported by municipal staff. There are also examples of developing or using a sophisticated arm's-length agency when funding major professional organizations in large urban centres.

Types of funding programs

Sixteen local governments fund non-profit arts groups through a general grants program, but only two municipalities use this mechanism exclusively and in place of an arts-specific program. More commonly, a general grants program, usually open to non-profit groups of various sectors, is just one of a number of municipal programs or mechanisms through which arts organizations are supported.

Twenty-seven municipalities have funding programs designed specifically for non-profit arts groups (see Table 5-1). Nineteen municipalities in seven different provinces offer arts project funding and 17 offer annual operating grants. Nine municipalities support the work of individual artists. As there is a perception in some quarters that municipalities cannot fund individuals because of provincial legislation, this is something to investigate further.

In five municipalities, a portion of the municipal arts funding is allocated to an arm's-length non-profit organization to administer, adjudicate, and dispense as grants. Four of the five examples of arm's-length funding cited are in large urban centres.

Four municipalities in BC either already support or are planning to support organizational development or training through grant programs.

Seven municipalities report fee-for-service programs. Twelve report other non-grant support. These programs include downtown event grants, festival-related grants, equipment grants, and tax exemptions.

Local governments also provide non-grant support programs (varying from informal assistance to formalized programs). These support services range from the provision of office or performance space (for free or reduced cost), to promotional assistance, to event set-up support, partnerships, and tax relief. For example:

- Provision of facility use for offices at no rent
- Use of City facilities

Professional arts

organizations: Strive for excellence, and support, present, produce, distribute, and/or assist in the creation of the work of professional artists and professional arts educators.

Amateur arts:

Provides opportunities for local community members to participate in the arts. Amateur arts organizations are community-oriented, and generally exist for the enjoyment and self-actualization of their members.

Artists' collective:

A collaborative enterprise in which a minimum of three artists share equal responsibility in the creation and presentation of their work.

Arts service/representative

organizations: Organizations founded and directed by their members, who are creators, interpreters, producers, distributors/disseminators, and or conservers in the arts sector, to serve the collective interests of the membership, the constituency, and the public. They may be discipline-specific or multidisciplinary.

- Community Access Program to local theatre
- Promotional support: assistance with joint promotions and marketing
- Coordinated promotional initiatives
- Access to city promotions: website, calendars of events, media lists, and free editorial space in Leisure Guide
- Assistance with distribution of promotional materials
- Transit Shelter Advertising Program and outdoor Video Screen Program
- Partnerships for special events
- Tax free status or tax relief program

TABLE 5-1 Types of arts funding programs			
Types of programs	Yes	Program in development	Total
Support to not-for-profit organizations			
Through a general grants program	15	1	16
<i>Grant programs designed specifically for non-profit groups:</i>			
Funds delegated to community organization (e.g., local arts council) for disbursement	5	0	5
Annual operating grants	17	0	17
Multi-year operating grants	5	2	7
Project grants	19	1	20
Theatre rental assistance grants	3	0	3
Organizational development grants	2	1	3
Other *	12	0	12
Fee-for-service or purchase of services program	7	1	8
Other non-grant support programs	12	0	12
Support to individual artists			
Funding support directly provided to individual artists	7	1	8
<p>* Other responses: Events/festivals-related: Celebration Grants, Event/Festival Grants, Festival Funding, Downtown Event Grants Services: City Services donated Other programs: Equipment Grants, Training Grants, Opportunity Grants Heritage grant/loan programs: Heritage grant program (Planning Division), Community Heritage Fund (loans), Market Square Heritage District Fund Capital grants programs: Capital, Cultural Facilities Capital Grant Tax exemption</p> <p>Overall, 26 respondents indicated they funded the arts through one of these options.</p>			

Types of organizations or activities funded

All 22 of the municipalities responding to this question support community and/or non-professional arts organizations and 16 support professional arts organizations (see Table 5-2). Sixteen also support arts service or representative organizations. Only seven municipalities support artists' collectives or the equivalent, for which society status is not required. Professional arts organizations are supported by a range of municipalities, including mid-sized communities and cities with populations under 50,000 (e.g., West Vancouver and Fredericton).

Eleven municipalities also support non-arts organizations with arts-designated funds in various ways. Five municipalities support non-arts organizations where the funds are specified to provide artist fees for creation and presentation of their work. Five provide incentive grants for artistic development in distinct communities as defined by race, ethnicity, or disability. Four support leadership development and/or capacity building initiatives with an arts component and seven fund arts programs for children or youth.

Nine municipalities offer development or creation grants to individual artists; two offer scholarship or study grants. Four mid-sized communities sponsor artist-in-residence programs and three municipalities offer travel grants.

TABLE 5-2	
Types of arts organizations and activities funded by arts grant programs	
	Yes
<i>Arts organizations:</i>	
Community and/or non-professional arts organizations	21
Professional arts organizations	16
Arts service/representative organizations	16
Artists' collectives (society status not required; as defined by Canada Council)	7
<i>Non-arts organizations where the funds are specified for:</i>	
Artist fees for creation and/or presentation of their work	5
Artistic development in distinct communities as defined by race, ethnicity, or disability	5
Leadership development and/or capacity building initiatives with an arts component	4
Arts programs for children or youth	7
<i>Support to individual artists:</i>	
Development or Creation Grants	6
Scholarship or Study Grants	2
Artist-in-Residence Programs	4
Travel Grants	3
Other *	2
* Other responses: Artistic merit award, through Arts Development Program	
Overall, 21 respondents indicated one of these options.	

Adjudication of arts funding

Generally, funding for the arts is ultimately a decision of Council. Ten municipalities rely on staff assessments that are approved by Council (see Table 5-3). Nearly as many municipalities (nine) have a jury or advisory committee process, which includes community non-arts representatives as well as artist representatives. The context or process for selecting members of juries or selection committees was not explored in this survey. In general, staff supports these committees, and recommendations are sent to Council for approval.

In a limited number of municipalities, grant applications are adjudicated through a discipline-specific jury process and Council approval is not required, as a global budget for the responsible arm’s-length agency in each case has already been approved. An example of this model is the City of Ottawa. The Toronto Arts Council is responsible for a significant portion of that city’s arts grant programs and, as in Ottawa, grant applications are adjudicated through a discipline-specific jury process, and recommendations are made to the arm’s-length agency or board for final approval. The Edmonton Arts Council and the North Vancouver Arts Commission, both arm’s-length agencies but with differing mandates, make recommendations by discipline-specific peer review to Council for final approval.

TABLE 5-3 Decision-making and adjudication processes for municipal arts funding programs	
Decision-making process	Process used
Staff assessment, approved by Council	10
Jury or Advisory Committee process which includes community non-arts representatives and artist representatives. Recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	9
Direct submission by arts groups to Council, and decision by Council	4
Peer assessment/jury process by arts discipline (peer review). Recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	3
Advisory Committee (community based, no designated arts representative), recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	2
Peer assessment/jury process by arts discipline (peer review). Recommendations to arm’s-length agency for decision/final approval	1
Other *	6
<i>In the adjudication of arts grants:</i>	
All decisions are subject to approval by Council	17
Jury and/or peer assessment process is arm’s-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval	4
<p>* <i>Other</i> responses: Formula funding for major institutions, including festivals Only one group (operating major civic facility) is handled with direct submission to Council Jury process by community granting agency with input from cultural staff and final approval by Community Services Directorate; Council pre-approves a specific amount during budget process As part of revised Investment Program it is being recommended that a system of staff and advisory committee assessment with recommendation to Council be adopted Comment: Recommendations do not go to Council for approval Peer assessment/jury process by arts discipline (peer review). Does not require Council approval</p> <p>Overall, 21 respondents indicated they funded the arts through one of these options.</p>	

6. Festivals and Special Events Support

Municipal involvement in festivals or special events requires the co-operation of numerous municipal departments and programs if it is to succeed. Festivals and special events present a good opportunity to consider the broader context of local government involvement in the cultural life of a community.

By-laws, policies, and advisory groups

Twenty-six respondents cited policy, permit, and licence requirements from departments or agencies such as Liquor Control, Legal Liability, Engineering, and Health (see Table 6-1). Twenty-four respondents have noise by-laws to consider and 21 have by-laws that regulate the use of parks and public spaces. In addition, municipalities co-operate with police and fire departments for traffic management and road closures. Communities of all sizes report advisory, council, or staff committee structures to assist in the coordination of events and festivals. Forty percent of respondents report that Council members serve on a festival or special event advisory committee, commission, or board.

Administrative structures

Nearly three-quarters of municipalities responding have an administrative structure to assist in the coordination of services for festivals and special events. Municipalities under 100,000 are likely to report a single person with a title that gives some indication of municipal priorities – Special Event Co-ordinator, Festival Liaison Officer, Community Development Officer, and Film and Events Co-ordinator are among the range of structures in which one staff person co-ordinates the work of other committees and departments. Cities and larger municipalities are developing interdepartmental (staff) event support teams, such as Vancouver’s Festival Committee or Ottawa’s Event Central, a one-stop shop for event planning.

Festival: Refers to a special event designed to present and celebrate, through public access, productions or services of an arts discipline(s) or with a heritage focus. Festivals can be multifaceted, and occur during a brief period of time, often annually, and usually in a reasonably contained area, indoors and/or outdoors.

Special event: Similar to a festival, but often with a more specific purpose of celebrating or displaying a particular theme or focus, and including public involvement (e.g., a community art celebration for a centenary). Opening and closing dates and times are usually specified and the program may consist of separate activities in different venues.

TABLE 6-1

Festivals and special events legislation, policy, plans, or strategies, and Council-appointed committees

	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?	
Legislation	8	3	11		
Policy	14	5	19		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	4	0	4		
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups	9	1	10	4	40%
<i>Other local government legislation and policies governing festivals and special events: **</i>					
Permit requirements	26				
Noise by-laws	24				
Parks and public spaces use	21				
Other *	4				
<p>* <i>Other</i> responses: Festivals and Special Events procedure in development Liquor Control Board, Legal Liability, Engineering, Health Department Police, Fire, and Liquor Board Signage; Road closures</p>					
<p>** Overall, 26 respondents indicated <i>other</i> local government legislation and/or policies governing festivals and special events in the areas above.</p>					

Eighty-six percent of the 22 responding municipalities describe their direct involvement in the organization of annual festivals and special events (see Table 6-2). Rather than supporting, assisting, or funding community or non-profit organizations to create these events, municipal staff and other resources are directed to community events that may include Canada Day and First Night or New Year's Eve celebrations. Sixteen municipalities have organized one-time events. Examples of such special events include:

- Civic functions such as openings, dedications, and public art unveilings
- Centennial celebrations
- Millennium celebrations
- Royal visits
- RCMP musical ride
- New Year's Eve special event
- Winterlights Festival
- Hamilton Homecoming
- Tall Ships Festival
- 2010 Olympic Festival
- Trans Canada Trail Opening
- Windows on the World – International Sommet de la francophonie
- East Coast Music Awards
- 400TH Anniversary Celebrations of the Founding of Acadie (in 2003)
- Moose in the City public art event

Funding support to festivals and special events

As outlined in the previous section, municipalities often directly organize and program special events and festivals. When non-profit groups organize these events, municipalities may support the organizations through programs specifically designed for festivals and special events, or through more general support programs, such as project and operating grant programs. Some municipalities, such as the City of Vancouver, provide support to festivals and special events organized and run by non-profit organizations both through general cultural grant programs and through a targeted program (e.g., Celebration Grants). This section examines grant or support programs designed specifically for festivals and special events run by non-profit organizations, not all support given to festivals and special events by a municipality.

Twenty-seven municipalities provide support designed specifically for festivals and special events run by non-profit organizations. Sixty-two percent of the responding municipalities offer start-up or project grants and 52% offer annual operating grants. Three municipalities offer incentive funding but only one offers organizational development grants.

Seventy-seven percent of funding is for annual community celebrations (e.g., First Night or Canada Day) and approximately 64% of the programs reported fund the arts, heritage, or multicultural components of community festivals. Respondents were invited to select all that apply to their situation. It is important to note that classifying specific multi-dimensional events into these categories differs by community. In other words, different communities may classify an event differently. The social dimensions of the types of events supported (or criteria for support) were not explicitly examined in this survey. For instance, an important dimension of the festival and special events support program of the City of Saskatoon is the participation of target groups, such as Aboriginal, youth at risk, low-income, and women. This aspect of municipal support programs (arts, heritage, festivals, and others) could be examined further in a follow-up survey focussed specifically on support program criteria and priorities.

The “free to the public” component of festivals is considered an important element of the service provided (and of the rationale for support) whether a festival is supported through a festival-specific program or a more general project or operating support program. Over half of the programs described fund the free element of public festivals.

Non-funding support to festivals and special events

Municipalities report a wide array of non-grant support that includes:

- Facility access, meeting rooms, staff support with logistics, promotional assistance and coordinated promotion on a case-by-case “partnership” basis, assistance with contacts, and hosting of receptions
- Consultative services, equipment loan, volunteer assistance, and assistance with festival grant applications to other levels of government
- Provision of mobile facilities including toilets, lighting, bleachers, garbage containers, tables, water, fencing, canopies, staging, and sound systems
- City services including garbage pick-up, grounds set-up, equipment delivery, road closures, and clean-up
- Assistance from Events Coordinator, online/print events list, and planning guidelines
- Offsets for up to \$1,000 for cost of civic services, use of city parks and streets, transit shelter advertising space, barricades, and some staff time

TABLE 6-2 Direct organizing/programming and support of festivals and special events			
	Yes	In process	Total
Direct organizing/programming			
Direct programming: Annual events	19		
Direct programming: One-time events	16		
Funding and other support			
<i>Type of program:</i>			
Project or start-up grants	15	2	17
Annual operating grants	12	2	14
Incentive grants	3	0	3
Organizational development grants	1	0	1
In-kind facility or site assistance	15	0	15
In-kind provision of municipal services (traffic control, policing, electrical hook-ups etc.)	14	1	15
Other *	5	1	6
Other non-grant support	18	1	19
<i>What is supported by these festivals and special events programs:</i>			
Annual community celebrations (e.g., First Night)	21		
Community festivals with an arts component	18		
Heritage or multicultural festivals	18		
Arts festivals	17		
Community festivals with a heritage component	17		
“Free to the public” component of festivals	15		
Other **	2		
<i>* Other types of support responses:</i>			
No comments	3	1	4
Equipment, canopies, staging, sound systems	1	0	1
Special Council grants	1	0	1
Comments: Other – Community foundation city grants Marketing and promotional support: a strategy is in process for a major festivals/events campaign with corporate sponsors, bill-boards and media advertising becoming the City’s main support Festivals can access funding from our cultural grants program Organizing group can apply for a Healthy Community Fund grant Event organizers may apply for special Council grants as part of annual grant program <i>outside</i> of City’s arts and heritage program			
<i>** Other responses:</i>			
Participation of target groups (e.g., Aboriginal, youth at risk, low-income, and women) Sport			
Overall, 22 respondents indicated direct organizing/programming; 28 respondents indicated funding and other support of festivals and special events.			

Adjudication of funding requests

In over half of the municipalities responding, the assessment of festival funding applications are made by staff and presented to Council for approval (see Table 6-3). Approximately one quarter of the responses indicate that groups may make a direct request to Council or the Mayor, on an ad hoc basis, and the resulting support may or may not be considered a grant. A further 25% report recommendations that come from a community-based committee to Council for approval. Overall, 20 municipalities report that all decisions regarding festival and event support require approval by Council. In three municipalities only, a jury or peer assessment process of festival funding is arm's-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval.

TABLE 6-3 Adjudication of festivals/special events funding	
Decision-making process	Process used
Staff assessment, approved by Council	14
Direct submission by arts groups to Council, and decision by Council	7
Jury or Advisory Committee process which includes community non-arts representatives and artist representatives. Recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	6
Peer assessment/jury process by arts discipline (peer review). Recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	2
Advisory Committee (community based, no designated arts representative), recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	1
Peer assessment/jury process by arts discipline (peer review). Does not require Council approval	1
Other *	4
<i>In the adjudication of festival/special event grants:</i>	
All decisions are subject to approval by Council	20
Jury and/or peer assessment process is arm's-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval	3
<p>* <i>Other</i> responses: Ad hoc case-by-case letters of request for assistance to Director of Parks and Recreation or Mayor, not grants Funding formula used Recommendations do not go to Council for approval Staff assessment and approval through a budgeted program</p> <p>Overall, 24 respondents indicated one of these options.</p>	

7. Public Art

All municipalities participating in the survey responded to some or all of the questions in this section on Public Art. The responses indicate that municipal staff and Councils are active in the development of legislation, policy, and plans regarding public art.

Public art programs present the opportunity to make art accessible and visible throughout a municipality. Public art serves as an expression of the community, and public sites provide an important venue for everyone to appreciate artwork outside the traditional museum or gallery setting.

In the context of this project, public art refers to a program to commission, acquire, install, and maintain works of art in any medium for temporary or permanent placement in a prominent indoor or outdoor setting. Community public art is produced by artists collaborating with communities. It responds to neighbourhood needs, aspirations, or other community issues and may be sponsored by non-arts organizations.

Legislation, policies, and advisory groups

Municipal staff and committees are active in the development of legislation, policies, and plans regarding public art (see Table 7-1). This is a highly visible aspect of municipal involvement in art-making that is often an initial step in a process of arts policy development for a municipality.

	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?	
Legislation	11	3	14		
Policy	13	7	20		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	6	7	13		
In Official Community Plan	1	0	1		
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups	12	1	13	5	38%
<i>Local government legislation and/or policies governing public art address: *</i>					
<i>Acquisition:</i>					
Public art donations/gifts	17				
Civic public art commissions	16				
Private sector public art commissions	13				
Community public art	11				
Public art maintenance	10				
Public art de-accessioning	9				
Local government has commissioned a public art work in last five years	21				
* Overall, 19 respondents indicated local government legislation and/or policies addressing the public art topics above.					

Acquisition of public art

Twenty-one municipalities report being actively involved in the public art process in the past five years. A municipality acquires public art through various means, and experience indicates that clearly articulated policy developed through a rational process helps to avoid contentious issues that sometimes arise from the acquisition of artistic work. Municipalities report a total of 16 policies regulating civic public art commissions, 17 regarding donations or gifts of public art, 13 for private sector art commissions, and 11 for community public art.

Selection process

A question about who selects or commissions public art elicited a wide range of responses, reflecting the lively activity surrounding issues about public art in many municipalities. In only one municipality do local politicians alone make decisions on the selection of public art.

In five municipalities, recommendations are forwarded directly to Council, or to a standing Council committee or commission (see Table 7-2). Five municipalities mandate a committee or other body to make the actual selection. Further details of the selection process from 18 respondents under “other” include various descriptions of independent panels, task forces, or juries made up of artists, project engineers, architects, and community members or “community representatives, the majority of whom are art experts.” For example, one municipality reports that for a publicly funded public art project, a committee makes a selection which must then be approved by Council. If Council rejects the committee’s recommendation, the project does not happen. In the case of a private commission of public art in the same municipality, the developer has a seat on the selection committee, and the committee’s decision is final. Municipal Council is not involved in the selection.

In 20 communities staff members are involved in the selection process in various capacities. Staff recommend community art projects to a Public Art Commission which then makes the recommendation to Council, or they serve on a task force with community representatives which make recommendations to Council or to a Council-appointed Advisory Committee.

The public art selection committee or commission is a standing body in only four of the 19 municipalities responding to this question. In the other municipalities, the selection bodies are ad hoc or project-specific, convened as needed. For example, North Vancouver selects public art by a five-to-eight person jury assembled for the project and comprised of one Public Art Program Steering Committee member, one member from the design community (an architect, landscape architect, interior designer, etc.), one internal municipal staff member (from Engineering, Parks, Streets, etc.), one community citizen (preferably one who has a relationship with the site), and one to three artists.

Only one municipality reports that public input, in the form of a public vote or opportunity for comment, is part of the usual selection procedure for public art. Depending on the size, scope, and/or location of the project, there may be an occasional opportunity for public input in about half of the reporting municipalities but there is generally no formal opportunity for public input prior to selection.

Public art program: A program to commission, acquire, install, and maintain works of art in any medium for temporary or permanent placement in a prominent indoor or outdoor setting.

Community art: Links people and communities with practicing, professional artists. Community art helps targeted communities to collectively express themselves and their unique circumstances, often aiming to create solutions for a community’s challenges and problems.

Community public art: Public artworks produced by artists collaborating with communities in response to neighbourhood needs, aspirations, or other community issues, and which may be sponsored by non-arts organizations.

TABLE 7-2 Public art selection/commissioning processes		
	Process used	
<i>Who makes the selection:</i>		
Council is responsible for selection	1	
Council is advised by committee. Council makes selection	5	
Committee is mandated by Council to be responsible for selection	5	*
Other	18	**
<i>The mandated composition of the selection committee:</i>		
Selection committee is a standing group	4	
Selection committee is project-specific	15	
<i>Other selection committee characteristics:</i>		
Selection committee includes artist(s)	17	
Selection committee includes neighbourhood representative(s)	11	
Selection committee includes staff	11	
Selection committee includes Mayor or Councillor(s)	4	
<i>Formal opportunity for public input on public art submission/proposals prior to selection:</i>		
No	9	
Occasionally, for certain projects	10	*
Usual selection procedure includes a public vote or comments	1	
Other	1	**
<p><i>Who makes the selection – Comments:</i></p> <p>* Civic Art Collection Committee (a sub-committee)</p> <p>** Other comments:</p> <p>“Art Advisory Committee” (now defunct)</p> <p>An independent jury made up of artists, project engineers and architects, and community members</p> <p>Community representatives, majority are art experts</p> <p>If public project: selection made by Committee, then must be approved by Council for approval of funds. If they reject, project does not happen. If private: developer has a seat on selection committee, committee chooses. Community art projects: staff recommend to Public Art Commission, they recommend to Council</p> <p>Juried Selection Committee forwards recommendations to Public Art Committee and Council</p> <p>Jury</p> <p>Jury, subject to approval by Council</p> <p>Project Specific Panels</p> <p>Public Art Advisory Committee and Staff</p> <p>Public Art Committees will be convened as needed</p> <p>Staff and community representative task forces created through the Council-appointed Advisory Committee</p> <p>Standing Committee engages an independent jury to select art, then recommends to Council</p>		
<p><i>Opportunity for public input – Comments:</i></p> <p>* Occasionally, for certain projects:</p> <p>Community Art Projects</p> <p>Yes, but not mandatory</p> <p>It depends on the size and scope of the project</p> <p>** Other:</p> <p>This depends on where the art is to be placed</p>		
All respondents indicated one or more of the options above.		

Grant programs for public art

Seven municipalities report an existing or upcoming grant program to support the creation of public art (see Table 7-3).

Percent for Art Programs

Seven municipalities report a mandatory Percent for Art Program based on municipal expenditures and an additional two report a voluntary program. Two municipalities report a mandatory private program based on private development costs, with five reporting a voluntary private program.

Percent for Art Programs generally require that a pre-determined percentage of the budget for eligible municipally-funded construction projects be spent on artwork for civic facilities. A Percent for Art Program offers municipal agencies the opportunity to acquire or commission works of art for municipally-owned buildings and public places. Artists can be brought into the design process, enriching civic and community buildings.

Maintenance and de-accessioning policies

Nine municipalities report policy and a fund dedicated to the maintenance of public art (see Table 7-1). Nine municipalities report having a de-accessioning policy for public art.

Public art staff

Twenty municipalities of the 29 responding report staff designated to develop and/or administer public art policies and/or programs.

Registries/inventories

Ten municipalities reported having a hard copy inventory of public art, and six have developed an online inventory or registry.

	Yes	In process/ considering	Total
Acquisition of public art			
Grant program directed to the creation of public art (e.g., a community art program)	5	2	7
<i>Percent for Art policy or program *</i>	<i>Mandatory</i>	<i>Voluntary</i>	
Yes, based on municipal capital expenditures	7	2	10
Yes, based on private development projects	2	5	7
Maintenance of public art			
Program or fund dedicated to the cost of maintenance for public art	9		9
* Percent for Art policy or program: 10 respondents indicated having such a program; nine responded to the mandatory/voluntary part of the question.			

8. Civic Art Collections

For the purpose of this project, civic art, as distinguished from public art, refers to a collection of artwork held in trust by a municipality for the citizens of the community. The collection may be displayed in rotation in galleries, civic offices, or interior public venues.

Civic art collection

(distinguished from public art collection): A collection of artwork held in trust by a municipality for its citizens, which may be displayed in rotation in galleries, civic offices, or interior public venues.

Museum collection

(civic owned): A collection owned in trust by a municipality for its residents, which may be managed by a City agency, or by an arm’s-length or independent non-profit organization.

Legislation, policies, and advisory groups

A total of 11 municipalities report legislation on civic art in place or in stages of preparation (see Table 8-1). A total of 19 have policy guiding civic art collections, including donations, gifts, purchases, de-accessioning, and maintenance policy, and a total of seven municipalities have included civic art in their planning process. Only one municipality reports a civic art committee with Council representation. Fourteen have acquired at least one work of art in the previous five years.

In five municipalities, the policy covers heritage and art museum collections. Ten municipalities report policies guiding the acquisition of art for the civic art collection. Seven have programs or funds dedicated to the cost of maintenance of the civic art collection. Eight municipalities have staff dedicated to manage the civic art collection. Ten of the municipalities have the collection inventoried and three of them have the collection online. In one case, the collection has been documented for insurance purposes, but it is not available to the public.

	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?
Legislation	8	3	11	
Policy	12	7	19	
Cultural Plan/Strategy	3	4	7	
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups	4	2	6	1
<i>Local government legislation and/or policies governing civic art address: *</i>				
Civic art acquisition	12			
Civic art donations/gifts	12			
Acquisition of heritage or art museum collections	5			
Maintenance for the civic art collection	10			
De-accessioning items in the civic art collection	7			
Local government has purchased or commissioned a work of art for a civic art collection in last five years	14			
* Overall, 16 respondents indicated local government legislation and/or policies addressing the civic art topics above.				

Acquisition of civic art

There is a wide range of responsibility for the selection of civic art. Of the 19 responses, just over half include staff and/or artists in the selection process (see Table 8-2). Three include the Mayor or Councillors and four include neighbourhood representatives. In large urban centres, individual institutions have their own acquisition committees, but staff responsibility for decision-making is not limited to large cities or urban centres alone. Twelve of 14 responses to the question indicate that there is little public input for acquisitions for a civic art collection: only two municipalities report such input.

TABLE 8-2
Civic art collection selection/commissioning processes

	Process used	
<i>Who makes the selection:</i>		
Council is responsible for selection	1	
Council is advised by committee. Council makes selection	5	*
Committee is mandated by Council to be responsible for selection	2	**
Other	21	***
<i>The mandated composition of the selection committee:</i>		
Selection committee is a standing group	5	
Selection committee is project-specific	9	
<i>Other selection committee characteristics:</i>		
Selection committee includes staff	10	
Selection committee includes artist(s)	9	
Selection committee includes neighbourhood representative(s)	4	
Selection committee includes Mayor or Councillor(s)	3	
<i>Formal opportunity for public input on public art submissions/proposals prior to selection:</i>		
No	12	*
Occasionally, for certain projects	2	**
<p>Who makes the selection – Comments:</p> <p>* Selection by jury, as per public art process</p> <p>** Committee engages independent jury, then recommends</p> <p>*** Other – comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administered by the Collections and Outreach Coordinator Individual departments Staff Staff and public art advisory committee Staff groups rotate annually to select fine art at an annual show for display in civic buildings Depends on where the art work is going Jury Committee: Proponent, councillor, artist, art expert Civic collecting institutions have acquisition committees A non-profit art gallery association is responsible for the civic art collection This is still in progress and undecided 		
<p>Opportunity for public input – Comments:</p> <p>* Public consultation is requested for commissions only</p> <p>** Expect there will be, once program established</p>		
All respondents indicated their municipality has a civic art collection.		

9. Cultural Facilities Assistance

Legislation, policies, and plans

Twenty-nine municipalities indicated that they offer some type of assistance to cultural facilities (see Table 9-1). Council-appointed committees or advisory groups are responsible for the overall direction of civic-owned facilities in 22% of the responses. All respondents have existing policy and legislation regulating facility support and public use. Possibly because it was not explicitly asked for in the survey, there were no reports of agreements or policies regulating the joint use of a facility, such as a joint-use agreement for a theatre on behalf of a municipality or recreation commission and a high school.

Cultural facility development

Twenty-one municipalities indicate policies or plans for the development of facilities. Local government encourages the development of cultural facilities by private developers in various ways: through the easing of development cost charges or through bonusing strategies (e.g., public amenity bonusing provisions) in three urban centres, through the provision of city-owned land in six municipalities and, in one case, through capital grants.

Direct operation and programming

Eighteen municipalities operate and manage programming for cultural facilities, rather than relying on non-profit cultural organizations and community groups being responsible for providing these community services.

Support to cultural organizations for facilities

Local government offers facility-related support to cultural organizations, and diverse and often unique agreements have developed in each community. Large urban cities, for example Toronto, Ottawa, and Vancouver, report a variety and combination of mechanisms for facility support.

a. Cultural organizations contracted to operate civic-owned public facilities

In the most prevalent model, 18 municipalities contract non-profit cultural organizations to operate a civic-owned public facility, such as a theatre, museum, or art gallery, for free, or for a nominal or reduced annual fee (see Table 9-2). These organizations may also be eligible for operating grants or other forms of non-monetary support (maintenance, security, etc.) in 12 municipalities. In 10 municipalities, capital support for these facilities is provided through the municipal budget process; in six of those municipalities, capital grants are also available.

b. Cultural organizations occupying civic-owned and managed properties

As a second model, eight municipalities support a wide range of cultural organizations by allowing them to use civic-owned buildings or land at no cost or at a reduced cost. In these circumstances, a municipal department manages the facility. Seven municipalities provide capital support for these facilities through the budget process and six provide capital grants.

c. Cultural organizations operating their own or leased facilities

In a third model, 13 municipalities provide operating grants to cultural organizations that own or lease their own facilities. Other operating support under these circumstances, in the form of maintenance, security, or utilities, is not common, and only one municipality reports covering water and sewer costs. Property tax permissive

exemptions or other property tax relief is reported in nine municipalities, although the reporting may not reflect that in Ontario all theatres with less than 1,000 seats are exempt. Three municipalities report fee-for-service agreements.

Eight municipalities provide capital grants to non-profit organizations that own and operate their own facilities. Without access to municipal budget allocations, these organizations rely in total on those grants for the municipal share of their building development plans, as municipal funds may lever both provincial and federal contributions.

Grants for facility planning or equipment acquisition are reported by approximately 10% of the municipalities responding, whether facilities are civic-owned or not.

When designing the quantitative survey, it would be interesting to distinguish planning grants from equipment acquisition grants. It will also be critical to design a reasonable accounting for the value of subsidized use of civic-owned facilities in comparison to the value of grants received by non-profit organizations for the operation of their owned facilities.

TABLE 9-1 Cultural facilities legislation, policies, plans, and mechanisms					
	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?	
Cultural facility development					
Legislation	3	2	5		
Policy	5	1	6		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	7	4	11		
Cultural facility support/use					
Legislation	7	2	9		
Policy	8	3	11		
Cultural Plan/ Strategy	5	4	9		
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups for civic-owned facilities	8	1	9	2	22%
Cultural facility development – private development					
Local government encourages development of cultural facilities by private developers through:					
Allocation of development cost charges or bonusing programs (e.g., public amenity bonusing provisions)	3	(Toronto*, Vancouver, North Vancouver)			
Provision of City-owned land	6				
Other	2	**			
Direct operation/programming					
Local government directly operates and programs a cultural facility(ies)	18				
Notes: * Toronto – Section 37 of the Planning Act ** Other comments: The City <i>may</i> provide land to two proposed museums [not counted in the Provision of City-owned land category] Capital contribution					
Legislation/policy/plans: All respondents. Private development support or direct operation: 19 respondents.					

TABLE 9-2 Facility support to cultural organizations			
Type of support available	Cultural organizations contracted to operate civic-owned facility	Other cultural organizations occupying civic-owned properties	Cultural organizations operating their own or leased non-civic facilities, which are not civic-owned
Operating support			
Use of civic-owned building for free	10	8	-
Use of civic-owned building for a nominal fee (e.g., \$1/year)	7	6	-
Use of civic-owned building with reduced rent	9	9	-
Use of civic-owned land	11	10	-
Operating grant	12	13	13
Other operating support (e.g., maintenance, security costs, utilities, etc.)	12	12	0
Support through a fee-for-service program	4	3	3
Property tax permissive exemption or other property tax relief	-	-	9
Other	3 *	1 **	5 ***
Capital support			
Capital budget allocation	10	7	0
Capital grants	6	6	8
Grants for facility planning or equipment acquisition	3	4	3
Other	0	0	0
Other (operating support) comments: <i>*Cultural organizations contracted to operate civic-owned facility:</i> The City took over operation of the community arts centre from a non-profit society, as requested by the society Only one organization/facility We are currently developing an arts centre and subject to Council approval it will be operated by the City with community involvement in the form of partners and an Advisory Committee <i>**Other cultural organizations occupying civic-owned properties:</i> Operating costs of civic-owned facility only <i>***Cultural organizations operating their own or leased non-civic facilities, which are not civic-owned:</i> Water and sewer paid by City Lease subsidy Service agreements Our proposed revised Investment Program recommends operating grants In Ontario, all theatres with less than 1000 seats are tax exempt Overall, 24 respondents indicated one or more of the operating support options above, and 14 respondents indicated one or more of the capital support options above.			

10. Local Government-Owned Cultural Facilities Inventory

This section aimed to create a preliminary inventory of local government-owned cultural facilities and to note whether these facilities are part of a community or recreation centre or a school partnership; whether they are part of a cultural centre; or whether they are a free-standing facility, purpose-built primarily for cultural use.

The library is the most common civic-owned facility, reflecting a century-old commitment by local government to ensuring access to the literary arts (see Table 10). Eighty percent of the municipalities own a library building. Nineteen of these are free-standing, purpose-built facilities. Nine are designed as part of a recreation or community centre and two are part of a cultural centre.

Seventy-three percent of the municipalities who responded own a museum. Seventeen are free-standing, purpose-built facilities, two are part of a recreation or community centre, and one is part of a cultural centre.

Seventy-three percent of the municipalities report the availability of multi-purpose rooms. They are found in recreation or community centres in 15 municipalities, and in cultural centres in five. Four are free-standing, purpose-built facilities primarily for cultural use.

Sixty-five percent of the municipalities report owning theatres with fixed seating. Twelve are free-standing, purpose-built facilities, three are part of cultural centres, and five are part of recreation or community centres or school partnerships.

Fifty percent of the respondents own and operate an art gallery, an outdoor performance space, or a purpose-built production space, such as a pottery studio.

TABLE 10
Local government-owned cultural facilities

Note: This table presents the number of municipalities reporting that they own the various types of cultural facilities, not the number of such facilities owned.

	Community Centre/ Recreation Centre/ School Partnership	Cultural Centre	Free-standing facility purpose- built for primary cultural use	Total number of municipalities indicating owning facility type
Library	9	2	19	21
Museum	2	1	17	19
Multi-purpose Meeting Rooms	15	5	4	19
Theatre (fixed seating)	5	3	12	17
Art Gallery	4	5	10	13
Performance Space (outdoor)	2	2	9	13
Purpose-built production space (e.g., pottery studio)	9	3	3	13
Archives	2	3	9	12
Auxiliary or Lobby Gallery	7	4	5	12
Multi-purpose Workshop space (with sinks, etc.)	8	3	3	12
Exhibition Space	3	6	2	9
Artist production studio(s)	2	4	3	8
Dance rehearsal studio (with dance floor)	5	3	2	8
Theatre (moveable seating)	1	2	2	5
Outdoor Exhibition Space	0	2	2	4

Overall, 25 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.

11. Heritage

Legislation, policies, and advisory groups

Heritage has been in the vanguard of cultural policy and legislation in municipalities across Canada since being given a welcome measure of credibility around the time of the country's centennial in 1967. As mentioned previously, one of the earlier pieces of legislation noted in the pilot survey is the 1965 St. Catharines, Ontario By-law to Operate a Museum; in the 1970s there was a flurry of heritage- and archaeology-related legislation and policy. At least 18 responding municipalities have legislation, policies, and/or plans to address heritage generally or specifically and to include heritage in community plans or their equivalent (see Table 11-1). A similar proportion of municipalities have legislation and policy regarding heritage and incentives for heritage preservation, registration, and designation. In a quarter of the municipalities responding, both cultural tourism and archaeology are the next most common areas for legislation and policy.

At least one Council-appointed committee, commission, or board with a heritage mandate is reported in all the municipalities responding. Sixty percent of these include a member of Council on their governing or decision-making body.

Heritage incentives and registry

Grants or other forms of incentives (e.g., relaxation of development cost charges and reduced fees) are available to heritage resources not owned by the local government in a total of 16 municipalities (see Table 11-2). Designation or another form of legal protection (e.g., conservation covenant, heritage revitalization, or easement agreement) is required before an incentive is approved in 11 municipalities. Four municipalities report limitations on this requirement: in Vancouver, if the incentive is minimal (e.g., one parking space waived), designation is not required; in Port Moody, before obtaining additional development rights, designation and a conservation covenant are required; in Toronto, a Heritage Easement Agreement is also required; and in St. John's, the City's designation of heritage buildings applies only to commercial buildings.

Types of heritage funding programs

Thirteen local governments fund non-profit heritage societies through a general grants program (see Table 11-2). This program is usually open to non-profit groups of various sectors, and is just one of a number of municipal programs or mechanisms through which heritage organizations are supported. A total of 10 municipalities offer annual operating grants and two have developed a multi-year operating grant process. Nine provide heritage project funding, two provide grants in lieu of taxes, and two provide organizational development grants. Twenty-two municipalities pay a fee-for-service to heritage organizations and eight report a range of other non-grant forms of support. In 12 municipalities, funding support is provided to the private sector and individuals who own heritage resources (e.g., for exterior upgrades). In only one municipality a portion of the municipal heritage budget is allocated to an arm's-length non-profit organization to administer, adjudicate, and dispense as grants.

Archaeology: The science that deals with past human life and activities as shown by fossil relics and by the monuments and artefacts left by ancient or pre-literate peoples.

Cultural tourism: The search for and participation in new cultural experiences. It incorporates a variety of cultural forms, including museums, galleries, festivals, architecture, historic sites, artistic performances, and heritage sites, as well as experiences that bring one culture in contact with another for the specific purpose of that contact.

Heritage resources: Includes artefacts and architecture, historic and prehistoric resources, and archival and interpretive material and activity. Significant objects and structures are protected by legislation which distinguishes that which is merely old from that which is deemed valuable according to notable public aesthetic, educational, or social consensus.

Heritage register: Significant objects, landscapes, resources, and structures are evaluated against an established set of heritage criteria, to determine whether they merit addition to a heritage register and to be listed as a heritage resource. Inclusion on a heritage register does not protect the resource but notes it as having historic value and as eligible for incentives that may be offered under a heritage program.

Historic site (park or building): Refers to a publicly owned and managed historic facility that is preserved according to standard principles and practices, and where there is some form of regular public access.

TABLE 11-1
Heritage legislation, policies, plans, strategies, committees, and agencies

	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?	
Heritage					
Legislation	23	0	23		
Policy	19	2	21		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	13	5	18		
Goals/objectives in community plan	17	2	19		
Heritage Tourism					
Legislation	1	2	3		
Policy	3	2	5		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	5	0	5		
Heritage Registry and/or Designation					
Legislation	19	3	22		
Policy	17	2	19		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	12	3	15		
Archaeology					
Legislation	5	0	5		
Policy	6	0	6		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	2	2	4		
Goals/objectives in community plan	4	1	5		
Committees and agencies					
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups with heritage mandate	25		25	15	60%
Mandated arm's-length agency	7				
Key (non-mandated) organization	15				

Types of heritage organizations and activities funded

Heritage grant programs fund community museums and historic societies which are substantially volunteer-run operations in 13 municipalities (see Table 11-3). Funding is provided to private sector organizations or individuals who own heritage resources in nine communities, with three additional respondents reporting that such a support program is under development.

In addition to programs supporting heritage archives, exterior upgrades on designated properties, and creation of historical pieces of work such as books, films, or photography, municipalities report examples of innovative heritage projects they have funded, including:

- A heritage building material recycling program
- An awning and signage grant program for heritage buildings in the downtown
- Community loans from a Heritage Fund
- Matching grants (e.g., for exterior restoration)
- A tax incentive program for downtown commercial buildings that convert to residential, offering a tax holiday of up to 10 years for conservation projects

TABLE 11-2
Types of heritage funding programs

Types of programs	Yes	Program in development	Total
Support to not-for-profit heritage organizations			
Through a general grants program	13	0	13
<i>Grant programs designed specifically for non-profit groups:</i>			
Funds delegated (mandated by Council) to community organization for disbursement	1	0	1
Annual operating grants	9	1	10
Multi-year operating grants	1	1	2
Project grants	9	0	9
Grants in lieu of taxes	2	0	2
Organizational development grants	2	0	2
Other *	2		2
Fee-for-service or purchase of services program	2	20	22
Other non-grant support program(s)	8	0	8
Support to private sector/individuals			
Funding support provided to private sector/ individuals who own heritage resources	9	3	12

* Other programs: Gifts in kind, Capital

Overall, 28 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.

TABLE 11-3 Types of heritage organizations and activities funded		
	Yes	
Heritage grant programs fund:		
Smaller community museums and historic societies (i.e., substantially volunteer-run organizations)	13	
Heritage program(s) and/or project(s)	11	*
Privately owned heritage buildings/sites	10	
Publicly owned historic sites	8	
Major heritage institutions and museums	7	
Heritage service organizations	6	
Archives	6	
Other	4	**
Archaeological program(s) and/or project(s)	2	
Type(s) of support offered to private sector/ individuals who own heritage resources:		
Project grants	6	
Grants in lieu of taxes	4	
Annual operating grants	2	
Multi-year operating grants	0	
Fee-for-service	0	
Other:	8	***
<p>* Heritage programs and/or projects funded by heritage grants programs: e.g., Tour Booklet; Plaque Program; Heritage Built Material Recycling Program</p> <p>** Heritage grant programs fund – Other: e.g., Exterior upgrades; Heritage weekend/week events; plaquing; tour brochures; photo/drawings of heritage properties; Annual funding to Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee for programs</p> <p>*** Types of support to private sector/individuals – Other: \$1,000 grant for exterior upgrades on designated properties Awning and Signage grant program for heritage bldgs in the downtown - up to \$10,000 per project Community Heritage Fund (loans) Individuals creating historical pieces of work i.e., books, films, photography etc. Market Square Heritage District Fund (grants) Matching grants for Built Heritage (exterior restoration) Tax exemptions Tax incentive program for downtown commercial buildings that convert to residential/tax holiday up to 10 yrs for conservation projects</p> <p>Overall, 20 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.</p>		

Decision-making processes for municipal heritage funds

The most common process for decision-making for heritage funds, reported in 10 municipalities, is a staff assessment and recommendation presented to Council for approval (see Table 11-4). An equal number of municipalities involve an advisory body, with or without a heritage specialist, to make a recommendation to Council. Of 12 municipalities, a jury and/or peer assessment process is arm's-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval in only two.

TABLE 11-4
Decision-making and adjudication processes for municipal heritage funding programs

Decision-making process	Process used
Staff assessment, approved by Council	10
Jury or Advisory Committee process which includes community non-heritage representatives and heritage representatives. Recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	6
Advisory Committee (community based, no designated heritage representative), recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	4
Direct submission by heritage groups to Council, and decision by Council	3
Other *	6
<i>In the adjudication of heritage grants:</i>	
All decisions are subject to approval by Council	10
Jury and/or peer assessment process is arm's-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval	2
Staff assessment process, not subject to Council approval	0
* Other responses: Both staff and MHAC are making recommendations to Council Comment: recommendations do not go to Council for approval Formula funding Heritage Foundation Staff assessment limited to historical societies Tax incentive program Overall, 16 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.	

12. Civic Awards

Legislation and policies

Civic awards appear to be quite common (22 responses), but formal legislation and policies to govern them are less so. Generally, persons are nominated for civic awards rather than making application to be awarded. The majority of the awards reported do not include a monetary award (see Table 12-1).

Selection process

Only one municipality of 20 responding reports staff involvement in the selection of civic award recipients in either the arts or heritage (see Table 12-2). In two municipalities, the Mayor and Council make the selection. In six municipalities, a community-based selection committee includes representation from Council, and in nine municipalities a community-based committee is responsible alone.

Types of civic awards

Twelve municipalities recognize Volunteerism and seven acknowledge Personal Achievement or Excellence in the Arts. In the heritage sector, 10 municipalities award Personal Achievement or Excellence and nine recognize Volunteerism. In both the arts and heritage categories, only one civic award includes a monetary element. Six municipalities make annual Book Awards, with monetary values ranging from \$0 to \$10,000. Five municipalities make Annual Urban Design Awards and three create a Poet Laureate annually. Examples of some of the awards give a sense of their scope:

- Arts Achievement Awards
- Excellence in Culture
- Mayor’s Awards for Business Support of Arts
- Business & The Arts Awards (Chamber of Commerce)
- Cultural Hall of Fame
- Artist Residency Award /Artist Studio Award (rental opportunity)
- Honour in Culture
- Cultural Volunteer Award
- Art/Cultural Person of the Year
- Recreation Award of Merit
- Heritage Achievement Awards for Exterior Restoration, Interior Restoration, Adaptive Re-use, New Design – Sensitive Infill, New Design – Sensitive Addition
- Heritage Open Space
- Architectural Conservation Awards
- Liveable City Design Awards
- Heritage Award for Public Service: Volunteer involvement and commitment to heritage
- Arts/Culture Award as part of Civic Tourism Awards
- Quill a Quatrain (Poet Laureate Award)
- Annual Urban Design Panel Awards / Design Excellence Award

TABLE 12-1
Civic awards legislation, policies, and plans/strategies

	Yes	In process	Total
Legislation	7	0	7
Policy	9	0	9
Cultural Plan or Strategy	4	0	4

TABLE 12-2
Local government civic awards in the arts, heritage, and other cultural areas

	Yes	Monetary	Who decides				No response
			Mayor/ Council	Community committee/ jury	Staff	Other	
Arts							
For volunteerism	12		1	7		1	3
For personal achievement or excellence*	7	1		6		1	
Achievement or excellence on a project basis	4		1	1		1	1
Lifetime Achievement Award	4			3		1	
For an organization's achievement or excellence	3			2		1	
For business support	3			1		2	
Totals - Civic arts awards	33	1	2	20	0	7	4
Heritage							
For personal achievement or excellence	10		2	4		1	2
For volunteerism**	9	1		5		2	2
For an organization's achievement or excellence	8		2	3		1	2
Achievement or excellence on a project basis	5		1	4			
Lifetime Achievement Award	5			4		1	
For business support	3			2		1	
Totals - Civic heritage awards	40	1	5	22	0	6	6
Other							
Book award***	6	4	1	4			
Urban design award	5			1	1		3
Other civic awards that include arts and heritage****	4	1		4			
Poet laureate award	3		1	1			1
Totals - Other awards	18	5	2	10	1	0	4

* Arts award monetary value: \$1,500

** Heritage award monetary value: not reported

*** Book award monetary values: \$10,000, \$2,500, \$2,000, \$2,000

**** The City of Ottawa has two awards, the Karsh Award and the Rich Little Endowment, valued at \$5,000 and \$2,500

Overall, 13 respondents indicated one or more civic *arts* awards; 16 respondents indicated one or more civic *heritage* awards; and 11 respondents indicated "*other*" civic awards (as listed above).

13. Public Libraries

Public libraries are lively centres for cultural activity in communities of all sizes. Their intrinsic role in the life of our communities and their history in ensuring the accessibility of both information and the literary arts may sometimes be taken for granted and yet, as reported in the survey, their activity level is high. Twenty-three municipalities reported that events, exhibitions, and other public programming take place within their library on a regular basis, with an average of 4.3 different event types reported by each municipality (see Table 13). The top six events or activities reported are:

- Author readings (21 municipalities)
- Visual art exhibitions (18 municipalities)
- Writing workshops (18 municipalities)
- Heritage or historical exhibitions (15 municipalities)
- Book fairs (eight municipalities)
- Theatre productions (six municipalities)

A wide array of additional programming in the libraries includes children's storytelling, arts and crafts programs, and vocal, drama, magic, and puppet performances. For all ages, programs include book clubs and related programming, reading incentive or literacy programs, school field trips, youth literacy programs, and films, including foreign films. Many programs relate to current topics and community interests and include seminars, lecture series, poetry readings, computer information, and workshops.

Eight municipalities report being part of a regionally delivered library service and 18 report a municipal library service governed by a board of trustees or directors. One municipality reports that library services are delivered through a municipal department.

The section on public libraries in the Phase One Pilot is nominal only, and will be expanded in later phases of the project.

TABLE 13	
Municipal libraries	
	No. of responses
Library service options	
Local government supports library services delivered through:	
Municipal department	1
Municipal library service	18
Regional library service	8
Total number of responding municipalities	27
Events, exhibitions, or other public programming that take place within the library facility	
Author(s) readings	21
Visual art exhibitions	18
Writing workshops	18
Heritage or historical exhibitions	15
Book fairs	8
Theatre productions	6
Other:	
<i>Children's programming:</i>	
Arts and crafts programs for children/children's performers - vocal, drama, magic, puppeteers	1
Children's Programming	1
Puppet shows	1
<i>Book clubs and related:</i>	
Book Club and programming; Reading incentive programs; School Field Trip programs	1
Craft workshops, literacy programs, book clubs, youth literacy programs, films	1
<i>Musical events:</i>	
Concerts	1
Musical performances	1
Music, dance, festivals (music, literary), many community partners (e.g., CBC)	1
<i>Film screenings:</i>	
Screening of foreign language films in the Film Theatre	1
<i>Other:</i>	
Storytelling	1
Many programs related to current topics and community interests	1
Seminars, lecture series, poetry readings, computer information under the CAPPS program, workshops, meetings, others	1
Total number of responses	98
Total number of responding municipalities	23
Average number of responses/municipality	4.3

14. Cultural Industries

While six municipalities have formulated legislation and eight report having developed formal policy on cultural industries, only two have a strategy or have included this sector in their cultural plan (see Tables 14-1 and 14-2). Two municipalities report the formation of a Council-appointed advisory group.

	Yes	In process	Total	Council members?	
Legislation	6	0	6		
Policy	8	0	8		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	2	0	2		
In community plan	0	0	0		
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups (e.g., Film Commission)	2		2	0	0%

Sector	Support – yes	Financial support	Logistical assistance
Broadcasting (radio or TV)	2	0	2
Film	12	2	12
Interactive media/Games	1	0	1
Publishing	1	1	0
Sound recording/Music industry	2	1	1
Totals	18	4	16

Overall, 12 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.

15. Other

Developing techniques and tools to identify the total of municipal funds allocated to arts, culture, and heritage was one of the driving forces for the development of this survey. In Phase One we were concerned with identifying the infrastructure (the policy, planning work, and programs) to use in Phase Two, in which we will create a quantitative survey instrument to inventory the basic accounting for arts, culture, and heritage in a municipality.

But not all resources for culture (arts or heritage) can be easily identified and inventoried. A final section gave staff who completed the survey the opportunity to describe areas that are particularly difficult to account for in local government (see Table 15). A summary of their comments includes the general lack of policy and procedure that results in minimal information sharing among departments that “share” responsibility for culture. Staff time providing liaison support for a cultural organization is difficult to account for because no one position is dedicated to arts and culture. Also difficult to track are:

Structural/intra-organizational contributions and challenges:

- Internal transfers of funds between departments
- Internal use of equipment
- Infrastructure initiatives that might integrate art features, such as development of a pedestrian overpass and a youth park, that are funded through non-cultural budgets such as park capital
- Contributions made by the City to parks with heritage and public art in them
- Parks work around heritage facilities
- Accounting (dollar value) for support through services in-kind
- Quantifying the arts/cultural portions of “general budgets” (maintenance, office administration, etc.)
- Time allocated by various employees for cultural matters, i.e. legal expertise, event set-up, translations, etc.
- Public Art Program – planning and implementation assistance; staff consultation/ time
- Donation or reduction in costs of City support services for festivals in public places

Staff involvement in community initiatives:

- Neighbourhood arts projects – partnerships between neighbourhood associations and arts organizations
- Staff involvement in community development work which is hard to measure and account for, but which is essential
- Volunteers
- Advisory support to organizations

<p>TABLE 15 What resources for culture (arts or heritage) are most difficult to account for in your local government?</p>
<p><i>(For example, things not captured by typical documents, such as internal transfers of funds between departments or services provided in other departmental budgets.)</i></p>
<p>Comments</p>
<p><i>Advisory support:</i></p> <p>Advisory support to organizations – networking, accounting for services in-kind support (dollar value), quantifying the arts/cultural portions of “general budgets” (maintenance, office administration, etc.), as well as the time allocated by various employees for cultural matters (legal expertise, event set-up, translations, etc.)</p> <p>Liaison support for cultural organizations – staff time is difficult to account for because one position is not dedicated to arts and culture</p> <p>Public art program – planning and implementation assistance; Staff consultation/time</p>
<p><i>Staff involved in community initiatives:</i></p> <p>Neighbourhood arts projects – partnerships between neighbourhood associations and arts organizations</p> <p>The City owns a number of heritage sites and buildings, some of which are being developed for cultural purposes, or could be, i.e., a historic carousel; a mill with miller’s house, barn, and sawmill on site; and a historic lighthouse. Some staff time and resources have gone into these sites, but only the carousel is a fully functioning site, with assigned staff. Also, the extent of community development work is hard to measure and account for, but has been essential</p>
<p><i>Other non-monetary support and services:</i></p> <p>Donation or reduction in costs of City support services for festivals in public places</p> <p>Services in the arts to the community, e.g., playground activity, class instruction, and workshops for children</p> <p>Tax exemption, maintenance, and repairs</p>
<p><i>Structural/intra-organizational contributions and challenges:</i></p> <p>Internal transfers of funds between departments; Internal use of equipment; Volunteers</p> <p>All of the above mentioned. Lack of policy and procedure results in minimal information sharing among departments that “share” responsibility for culture (civic art collection, heritage buildings, museums, theatre, etc.)</p> <p>Infrastructure initiatives that might integrate art features such as development of a pedestrian overpass and a youth park that are funded through non-cultural budgets such as park capital</p> <p>Parks work around facilities, primarily heritage</p> <p>Contributions made by City to parks with heritage and public art in them</p>
<p><i>Municipal share of regional funding:</i></p> <p>The City of Prince George funds approximately 60% of the Regional District of Fraser Fort George (RDFFG) budget. The District is responsible for funding our art gallery and two museums. Therefore, in essence, the City funds these three facilities’ operating budgets by approximately 60%. This operational funding is not reflected in this survey</p>
<p><i>Basic accounting:</i></p> <p>Total of municipal funds allocated to arts, culture, and heritage</p>
<p>Overall, 15 respondents provided comments for this question.</p>

Appendix A: Respondent Municipalities

TABLE A1	
General characteristics of respondents to Phase One Pilot Survey	
<i>Geographic distribution of pilot respondents:</i>	No. of respondents
Newfoundland and Labrador	1
Prince Edward Island	0
Nova Scotia	0
New Brunswick	2
Quebec	0
Ontario	7
Manitoba	1
Saskatchewan	2
Alberta	6
British Columbia	10
Territories	0
	29
<i>Pilot respondents by population size: *</i>	
Less than 20,000	4
20,000 – 49,999	4
50,000 – 99,999	8
100,000 – 249,999	7
250,000 – 1,000,000	5
Over 1,000,000	1
	29
<i>General characteristics of pilot respondents:</i>	
A “new city” through recent amalgamation (e.g., Toronto)	4
Part of a non-amalgamated urban region (e.g., Vancouver)	12
Located in a non-urban setting (e.g., Brandon)	9
Not sure/Other	4
	29
<i>Other characteristics of pilot respondents (not mutually exclusive):</i>	
Regional centre	13
Resort municipality	1
<i>Other:</i>	
Provincial capital	4
Primarily residential communities	2
Rural district municipality	1
Overshadowed by neighbouring tourism/resort destination	1
<i>Respondents in regional jurisdictions:</i>	
Municipalities included in a regional jurisdiction	13
Regional government takes responsibility for some or all of local municipal policies and programs for culture **	2
<p>* Population reference years are generally 2001–2003 (exceptions: one 1998 and one 2004). Key population data sources are the municipal planning department (10 respondents) and Statistics Canada (17 respondents).</p> <p>** Respondents within the Greater Vancouver Regional District did not indicate this regional body as taking responsibility for local cultural policies and programs. At the time of this survey, the GVRD held a minimal role in cultural development in the region, offering a small grants program to selected region-serving organizations, an endowment fund, and liaison to an intermunicipal cultural development committee.</p>	

Appendix B: Glossary of Terms

Archaeology: The science that deals with past human life and activities as shown by fossil relics and by the monuments and artefacts left by ancient or pre-literate peoples.

Amateur arts: Provides opportunities for local community members to participate in the arts. Amateur arts organizations are community-oriented, and generally exist for the enjoyment and self-actualization of their members.

Artists' collective: A collaborative enterprise in which a minimum of three artists share equal responsibility in the creation and presentation of their work.

Arts service/representative organizations: Organizations founded and directed by their members, who are creators, interpreters, producers, distributors/disseminators, and or conservers in the arts sector, to serve the collective interests of the membership, the constituency, and the public. They may be discipline-specific or multidisciplinary.

Arts: Includes the visual arts (painting, print-making, drawing, sculpture, crafts, photography, film, and video), theatre, music and song, literary arts, and dance. The arts encompass original, creative interpretation, and facsimile reproduction and distribution.

Civic art collection (distinguished from public art collection): A collection of artwork held in trust by a municipality for its citizens, which may be displayed in rotation in galleries, civic offices, or interior public venues.

Community art: Links people and communities with practicing, professional artists. Community art helps targeted communities to collectively express themselves and their unique circumstances, often aiming to create solutions for a community's challenges and problems.

Community public art: Public artworks produced by artists collaborating with communities in response to neighbourhood needs, aspirations, or other community issues, and which may be sponsored by non-arts organizations.

Culture: Includes the performing, visual, literary, and media arts; library, archives, and heritage resources; and socio-cultural activities as practiced and preserved in a community. These practices are multicultural and reflect the beliefs, experiences, and creative aspirations of a people in a specific geographic and political area.

Cultural tourism: The search for and participation in new cultural experiences. It incorporates a variety of cultural forms, including museums, galleries, festivals, architecture, historic sites, artistic performances, and heritage sites, as well as experiences that bring one culture in contact with another for the specific purpose of that contact.

Deficit reduction program: Refers to a generally time-limited, incentive funding program for the purpose of building organizational capacity through the elimination of deficits, usually administered in conjunction with other capacity-building initiatives, such as a stabilization program.

Festival: Refers to a special event designed to present and celebrate, through public access, productions or services of an arts discipline(s) or with a heritage focus. Festivals can be multifaceted, and occur during a brief period of time, often annually, and usually in a reasonably contained area, indoors and/or outdoors.

Heritage resources: Includes artefacts and architecture, historic and prehistoric resources, and archival and interpretive material and activity. Significant objects and structures are protected by legislation which distinguishes that which is merely old from that which is deemed valuable according to notable public aesthetic, educational, or social consensus.

Heritage register: Significant objects, landscapes, resources, and structures are evaluated against an established set of heritage criteria, to determine whether they merit addition to a heritage register and to be listed as a heritage resource. Inclusion on a heritage register does not protect the resource but notes it as having historic value and as eligible for incentives that may be offered under a heritage program.

Historic site (park or building): Refers to a publicly owned and managed historic facility that is preserved according to standard principles and practices, and where there is some form of regular public access.

Legislation or by-laws (at the municipal level): Resolutions describing intent, approved by a majority vote of Council.

Museum collection (civic owned): A collection owned in trust by a municipality for its residents, which may be managed by a City agency, or by an arm's-length or independent non-profit organization.

Memorials or memorial artwork: Artwork, statuary, landmarks, or urban features that memorialize events, personalities, or groups.

Policy: A consolidated statement of vision, purpose, goals, and objectives for the description and development of activity, production, services, and related resources. It may include details of scope and roles, with attendant analysis and recommended actions and implementation strategies.

Professional artists (emerging and established): Have completed professional training, studies, or apprenticeship in an arts discipline, and enjoy both peer recognition and public exposure. They are dedicated mainly to the practice of their art and are paid for their artistic work.

Professional arts organizations: Strive for excellence, and support, present, produce, distribute, and/or assist in the creation of the work of professional artists and professional arts educators.

Public art program: A program to commission, acquire, install, and maintain works of art in any medium for temporary or permanent placement in a prominent indoor or outdoor setting.

Special event: Similar to a festival, but often with a more specific purpose of celebrating or displaying a particular theme or focus, and including public involvement (e.g., a community art celebration for a centenary). Opening and closing dates and times are usually specified and the program may consist of separate activities in different venues.

Strategic plan: A clearly written document that describes an organization's mandate, as well as its near, mid and long-term goals or objectives, and the priority actions and implementation plans necessary to realize them.

Stabilization or sustainability projects: Refers to partnered projects with incentive funding to encourage sound practices in governance, strategic planning, and organizational effectiveness in order to strengthen individual organizations and build capacity within the sector.

Creative City Network of Canada

The Creative City Network of Canada is a national non-profit organization that operates as a knowledge-sharing, research, public education, and professional development hub in the municipal cultural planning field. Through its work, it builds the capacity of municipal cultural planning professionals – and by extension their municipalities – to take effective and proactive roles in the cultural development of their communities. Its members are municipalities across Canada.

More information is available at www.creativecity.ca