

Minutes

Friday, October 23, 2015

Burgoyne Woods Room, City Hall at 12:00 p.m.

Members in Attendance:

Jeff Burch, John Crawley, Councillor Mark Elliott, Vickie Fagan, Councillor Carlos Garcia, Councillor Bill Phillips, Jennifer Wallace, Peter Wing

Regrets: Councillor David Haywood

Staff Liaison:

Rebecca Cann, Phil Cristi, Ashley Judd-Rifkin

1. Call meeting to order (Coun. B. Phillips)

Coun. B. Phillips called the meeting to order at 12:05

Coun. M. Elliott arrived - 12:06

2. Additions / Deletions to the Agenda

None

3. Motion to approve the Agenda

Moved by: Coun. C. Garcia Carried

4. Motion to Approve the Minutes of October 19, 2015

Moved by: Coun. M. Elliott Carried

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

1.1. Complete Business from October 19 Meeting

5.1.1. Festival & Events Program

The purpose and goals of the City's Festival & Events (F&E) policy were reviewed. Unlike SCCIP, the F&E program prioritizes strong marketing plans and tourism outreach. Funds for F&E were \$28,900 in 2015. The program is only 3 years old so a formal review has not been undertaken.

J. Wallace arrives - 12:10

Some former SCCIP clients have “graduated” to the F&E Program once their events were large enough. R. Cann went through F&E clients to date, noting that there are also a number of additional anticipated clients, some new, some “graduates” from SCCIP and one that moved from Jordan.

5.1.2. Other

R. Cann presented a list of potential new SCCIP clients, noting that SCCIP can have as many as 6 new clients in one year.

5.1.3. Policy vs. Program

R. Cann explained the importance of the differences between the terms “policy” and “program”. The role of Policy is to provide: purpose and goals; definitions; program priorities/streams; eligibility and ineligibility criteria; evaluation criteria; and a framework for the review and approval process.

The role of the “program” is to execute the Policy efficiently and effectively – it is the “interface” between policy and client, and is managed by staff with ongoing consultation with the Arts & Culture Committee. The term “program” is also used to refer to the program “streams” within SCCIP, ie the Sustaining Program.

R. Cann described the three program streams of SCCIP, including the new Culture Builds Community Program which began in 2012 to support grassroots initiatives that embrace a community's self-identified definition of culture. This is a break from the arts/cultural/ethnocultural “organizational” based application and a way of deepening engagement between arts & community organizations.

Distinguishing between Policy and Program will serve our future efficiency.

There was discussion around the creation of hard copy resource materials. It was suggested that everyone should read the two policies but perhaps individuals could each take on a document and become the “expert” in that document (e.g. the culture plan expert).

6. Business

1.1. Why Now? – Municipal Influences on Cultural Funding Program

6.1.1. FirstOntario Performing Arts Centre

REASON #1 (to answer “why now?”) There were presentations from several arts organizations to City Council regarding concern about the set rates and fees for the FirstOntario PAC. As a result, Council gave the Executive Director of the PAC authority to be flexible on the rates and fees – although he still has to meet the PAC’s bottom line and 5-year plan. This could limit his flexibility.

6.1.1.1. Rates and Fees

The original PAC feasibility study evaluated the direct and indirect economic impact of the PAC as \$16 million per year, once it's operational. Essentially, the catalytic impact of the City's annual investment in the PAC will be a transformed downtown St. Catharines.

R. Cann summarized the overall affect that the unknown costs of the PAC could have on user groups. It will cost more to use than what groups have previously paid; all arts organizations are in a high risk situation at present due to the unknown return on investment. Traditionally, when new facilities open, audience attendance is high in the first year – they don't necessarily return the following years. It will take 5 years (industry standard) to build and retain the audiences at the PAC. No Sustaining SCCIP clients applied for multi-year funding this year – they all noted the uncertain future as the reason why.

Discussion around IATSE at the PAC took place, with Councillors noting that they didn't realize the financial ramifications of having the PAC become an IATSE house. Discussion took place on how the PAC will always require an investment from the City. The group noted that this facility does not serve all purposes and needs in the arts sector. Question: will only 10% of groups use PAC? Answer: staff have not analyzed this.

6.1.1.2. Feasibility Study expectations – Martin Vinik Study

R. Cann presented the recommendations of the Martin Vinik Study (2008): that a subsidy of local organizations was recommended, that the PAC reduce rental costs where possible for local arts groups, and that a separate fund be established to support prospective local arts renters, to be funded by the City and outside funders and administered by an independent review panel.

6.1.2. Culture Plan 2020

REASON #2 to evaluate the City's Cultural Funding: City Council has recently approved the Culture Plan 2020. The plan has 3 priorities and 6 initiatives that relate directly to cultural funding, including building the creative sector, fostering participation in cultural activity etc.

6.1.3. Council Direction – Motion by Coun. Elliott Sept 14, 2015

This motion set the stage for the CFTF's existence – it includes specific information related to the Task Force's work and references the cultural sector's value to St. Catharines in terms of job creation and economic impact. R. Cann did a quick review of the motion.

Some of the questions the CFTF should be asking are: There's a need, but what is the need? What is the shape that SCCIP should be? How is the need addressed and or resolved? If it can't be done in one year, what does that look like? How much money is needed?

1.2. SCCIP Review – Evaluating Success

1.1.1. 10-year review

An overview of SCCIP's 10-year review was presented by R. Cann, who explained that the process aimed to evaluate whether the five main goals of SCCIP were achieved. For future reference: at least some of the goals of the SCCIP program would ideally be measurable. The following five goals were evaluated as part of the 10-year review.

Goal 1: Provide access to cultural opportunities for all citizens. The sector has grown activities that offer diverse experiences for residents. There's a high level of volunteerism among arts organizations and it's grown. Financial access is a very important issue in the arts – ie. making performing arts and arts experiences accessible to the public at multiple price points, including low or no cost is what many organizations strive for. Local arts organizations do an excellent job of ensuring anyone who wants to experience the arts, can.

Goal #2: Stimulate economic development and tourism. Return on SCCIP Investments is \$16 for every \$1 invested. When SCCIP dollars increased, so did other revenue sources. However, SCCIP has not grown with the organizations – in fact, in 2015 it is down to 4% of total revenue from 6.2% of total revenue in 2012.

Goal #3: Enhance St. Catharines desirability – to live, work, play. St. Catharines has developed a reputation as the cultural centre of Niagara. SCCIP has created optimism, hope, excitement in the sector – and 24 arts groups (supported by SCCIP) have emerged over the past 12 years! Arts education is very specifically supported by SCCIP through organizations such as Carousel Players, the Niagara Symphony Orchestra, and the Niagara Youth Orchestra.

Goal #4: Celebrate and encourage cultural and artistic diversity. There is a good diversity of arts that are funded, including community arts and ethnocultural arts experiences. However, many professional arts organizations offer programming that promotes diversity, by hiring diverse artists, partnering with non-arts community organizations and fostering an environment of acceptance and openness.

Goal #5: Promote Civic Identity. SCCIP supports artists and organizations creating original, made-in-Niagara work which fosters pride in our community and reflection of our collective characteristics. The arts community often travels or exports work – through tours, sales etc. – they act as diplomats for St. Catharines, representing the city to outside audiences. Artists are an economic export: 75% of artists surveyed during the Culture Plan reported selling their work outside of St. Catharines! This generates income from outside the city, thereby functioning as an export industry. SCCIP funding helps to hire many local artists (380 to 450 contracts per year).

The purpose of SCCIP is to strengthen, build and invest in St. Catharines' cultural sector. Has it accomplished this? SCCIP has had no impact on local heritage and little effect on the ethnocultural sector. Emerging arts organizations have not been able to thrive. Can these situations be changed? Should they change? How does it happen?

Sustainability of our current situation is an issue. Job security is uncertain, pay levels are often below the poverty line and recent provincial and federal funding changes are going to have an effect on key players in the community. While very few local arts organizations have deficits (Symphony excepted), they also don't have sizeable reserves to offset a major setback.

Issue: the Local Festivals funding program at the Department of Canadian Heritage requires a festival to have a proven municipal investment before their application is considered.

1.1.2. Economic Impact Analysis

It is worth noting that the economic impact of Arts & Culture is often hidden. Recent federal statistics show that the total Culture GDP was \$49.9 billion in 2009 - the Sport GDP was provided as a comparator – it was \$4.8 billion.

1:30 p.m. Coun. B. Phillips has to leave

Notes from Coun. B. Phillips: changing SCCIP will take a lot of thought, so perhaps the Task Force should go around the table at the next meeting (or the one after that) to answer the question, how would each Task Force member change SCCIP? Does the Task Force member have thoughts about the SCCIP program?

1:30 - Coun. M. Elliott takes over as chair

Figures from the Niagara Region's Economic Impact Study (2011) were presented. They represent a very wide range of cultural activities, from performing arts and spectator sports to heritage institutions and internet publishing.

The SCCIP Value and Impact Analysis was done by Lord Cultural Resources as part of the Culture Plan 2020 research. It includes a comparison of SCCIP to other public investment programs, such as the Ontario Trillium Foundation. Juries at the Ontario Arts Council and the Canada Council look to see if the municipality gives funding to an applicant, as local support is an indicator to them and can influence whether they provide funding to the applicant as well. Organizations often leverage municipal funding to access provincial or federal funding, and occasionally private sector funding as well. Similarly, not getting municipal funding can harm an organization's chances at getting funding, or (in

the case of the Canadian Heritage's festivals and events program) make the organization ineligible for their funding program.

Discussion around public funding in general took place.

Should the Task Force think about: is the City under-granted, in terms of grants **to** the City of St. Catharines? Does increased funding have to come only from the City coffers? Or can a grant come from another source as a "flow-through" to the arts community?

R. Cann notes that the only "flow-through" programs she's ever known were the Cultural Capitals program (which the Region of Niagara successfully applied to) and artsVest -- flow-through grants are rare, especially in the public sector. The City has generated two grants in the past that have directly supported the arts sector:

- 1) Heritage funding for cNiagara & collective marketing was awarded to a partnership between the City, Carousel Players and the Centre for the Arts, Brock University – it was a lot of work and did not represent direct investment in the cultural sector, although it was very beneficial.
- 2) artsVest -- the City partnered with the Chamber of Commerce and applied to Business for the Arts, who run the program. artsVest is a matching-funds grant where arts & culture organizations partner with the business community to leverage sponsorships from businesses for matching artsVest funding.

These were both one-off opportunities that can't be done on an annual basis – the City won't be eligible for artsVest again for at least 5 years, and the Cultural Capitals of Canada program no longer exists.

1.3. Changing SCCIP

1.1.1. Why? How? What?

Discussion around the question: How do we effect "smart" change?

Currently, there is no mention of funding individual artists. SCCIP predominantly funds organizations. For example, the money given to the Niagara Artists Centre does not go directly to visual artists, although the organization provides many resources, opportunities and an exhibit space for local artists. Questions from the Task Force: Could the cultural community be enhanced by looking at how individuals could be funded? How do the arts and creativity grow without funding individual artists? Playwrights, poets, visual artists, choreographers, musiciansetc.

R. Cann noted that there was lots of discussion in 2004 about grants to individual artists and, at the time, the committee determined there would be no political appetite to fund individual artists. The idea was to focus investment on

organizational infrastructure, to strengthen the sector. Some SCCIP clients have noted there is little investment in creative development, the “R&D” of the sector. It comes back to the question: why is it important to invest directly into CREATORS of art? 12 years ago the SCCIP Committee couldn't make the case, how do we make it now? How do we measure the effectiveness of this investment? When does an investment in an individual artist work?

1:50 p.m. – Coun. C. Garcia has to leave

R. Cann noted it is always more work for staff, more time, to work with individual artists and community organizations than Sustaining Program clients.

Independent creators are a huge part of the community – but how do we accommodate individual artists with the resources we have?? Some discussion took place about individuals applying *through* an organization, similar to the Exhibit Assistance program and Creators Reserve that the OAC offers.

In some communities arts councils are the agency that manages grant programs, with dedicated staff to work with smaller organizations and individual artists. This was a vision for the St. Catharines and Area Arts Council, when it existed.

7. Date of next meeting

Wednesday, October 28, 2015: 4:30 – 6:00 p.m.

8. Motion to Adjourn

J. Wallace (meeting ended at 2:15pm)

Materials distributed prior to or at the meeting:

1. [FirstOntario Performing Arts Centre 2015/16 Rates and Fees Schedule](#) – Additional Information (Report: PRCS-158-2015)
2. [Culture Plan 2020 \(2015\)](#)
3. [Corporate Report from PRCS: Terms of Reference for a Cultural Funding Task Force](#) (Report: PRCS-272-2015)
4. [SCCIP 10-Year Review](#) (2014)
5. [The State of Culture in St. Catharines \(2012\)](#) – Section 2: Value and Impact of St. Catharines Cultural Investment Program (SCCIP), pp. 7 - 28.
6. Council Motion – Cultural Funding Recommendation – September 14th, 2015
7. Council and Vinik References to Rental Access
8. Municipal Spending – 2007 to 2010: Details
9. Artist/Arts Economic Spectrum