

Minutes – Meeting #8

Wednesday, December 02, 2015

Burgoyne Woods Room, City Hall at 4:00 p.m.

Members in Attendance: Jeff Burch, John Crawley, Vickie Fagan, Councillor Carlos Garcia, Councillor David Haywood, Councillor Mat Siscoe, Jennifer Wallace, Peter Wing

Regrets: Councillor Bill Phillips

Staff Liaison: Rebecca Cann, Phil Cristi, Ashley Judd-Rifkin

1. Call meeting to order (C. Garcia)

4:00 p.m.

2. Additions / Deletions to the Agenda

None

3. Motion to Approve the Agenda for December 2, 2015

Moved by: J. Crawley Carried

4. Motion to Approve the Minutes of the Three Previous Meetings:

4.1. Motion to Approve the Minutes of November 11, 2015

Moved by: P. Wing Carried

4.2. Motion to Approve the Minutes of November 17, 2015

Moved by: J. Wallace Carried

4.3. Motion to Approve the Minutes of November 18, 2015

Moved by: Coun. D. Haywood Carried

5. Business

5.1. Review of Discussion Paper

R. Cann re-capped the discussion paper. Coun. C. Garcia suggested that the Task Force should begin with looking at the recommendations in the report. He also noted that that they should be focused and there should perhaps be fewer when the report is presented to Council.

5.2. Discuss Recommendations

Recommendation #1 – The Task Force agreed that this is a good recommendation and suggested some re-wording.

J. Burch arrived at 4:15 p.m.

Recommendation #2 – A discussion took place around per capita cultural investment. It included:

- A bigger conversation with the Region is required but it's not the purview of this Task Force.
- What is the appropriate per capita investment and how does the Task Force recommend getting to that target amount?
- To provide better data, comparisons of cultural funding support should be made with cities of similar size across Canada.
- The CFTF shouldn't make recommendations that are politically palatable; it should make recommendations that address the need.
- \$3.28 per capita should be the start, since it is a target that compares St. Catharines with the other lower-tier municipal comparators – there is a rational justification for this number.

Recommendation #3: The CFTF agreed this is a good recommendation, and that it means that ethnoculture and heritage should be removed from SCCIP's core purpose and goals.

Recommendation #4: The CFTF agreed that this recommendation looks good.

Recommendation #5: The CFTF agreed that this recommendation looks good.

Recommendation #6: The CFTF agreed that this recommendation should be removed as a recommendation to Council, but stay in the report as part of the larger Cultural Funding discussion. Staff would like to simplify the application process so they're not getting organizations to do a lot of work for very little return. This applies specifically to the Festival & Events grant program.

There was a discussion around how to define a core arts organization and when to classify a core organization as such. Budget level, activity level and audience numbers are all indicators. What would prioritizing funding to core organizations mean for emerging organizations? The total amount of cultural funding allocated to SCCIP will influence what the "pots" are and how much they have in them. Core organizations can also provide mentorship and leadership to emerging artists.

Recommendation #7 was replaced with Recommendation #9.

Recommendation #8: The CFTF agreed that the wording should be reworded.

A discussion took place about whether the CFTF should recommend to Council where the funds are to come from. For example, it is not the CFTF's job to recommend that funds come out of the Civic Project Fund for SCCIP. However, providing revenue options that don't just go to the tax base are important.

Discussion took place about whether the Task Force sets a target funding level for each year, up to 2018. The group agreed they should recommend a target – how the City gets to that target is not part of what was asked of this process.

Recommendation #10: There was a discussion around whether the Festival & Event program should become a stream of SCCIP. It was noted that festivals have begun to partner and support each other and there is further work to be done in collaboration. For 2016: staff needs to vastly simplify the application process, since the current draft budget is so low.

The CFTF agreed that: \$13,900 should be moved into the SCCIP budget for 2016; \$28,900 should be recommended for the 2016 festival season; and, a minimum match (i.e. \$28,900) should be approved for the 2017 festival season in the 2016 budget. Another note is that the CFTF should make core arts organizations ineligible for F&E funding as of the 2017 season, and manage festival support in their SCCIP program stream instead. This means less grant applications for these organizations – ultimately a more efficient approach.

Recommendation #11: The CFTF agreed that this recommendation should be removed as a recommendation to Council, but stay in the report as part of the larger Cultural Funding discussion.

Recommendation #12: The CFTF agreed that this recommendation needs to clarify the intention to develop an individual artist grants program by 2017.

A discussion took place around the Culture Builds Community program of SCCIP. It was agreed that the program should be reviewed, with a clearer understanding (for the review panel) of what/who the program is to serve and what its success indicators should be. It was noted that different evaluation tools could be employed for different programs – numbers are one way to get feedback, and success stories are another. While it's current practice to gather both types of information, capacity in the sector served by this program is often very limited, making it more labour intensive for staff. The SCCIP committee needs to sit down and discuss this program further.

Recommendation #13: The CFTF agreed that this recommendation should be removed as a recommendation to Council, but stay in the report as part of the larger Cultural Funding discussion.

Recommendation #14: is to be cut – it's an observation.

Recommendation #15: It was noted that the CFTF can't assume that SCCIP will just continue to exist. The CFTF needs to request a stable, multi-year fund, tied to the terms of council. The CFTF agreed that this recommendation should clarify this.

It was suggested that the need for an Arts Council be included in this report, since arts councils are often the distribution mechanism for cultural funding programs. There is an initiative within the Culture Plan that notes this, and it could be added to the report.

5.3. Arts Community Feedback Session

It was decided that no other feedback from the arts community is required at this time, as there have been two sessions of consultations. Staff needs to distill the recommendations at this point and prepare for the final presentation.

5.4. Council Presentation – Who and What

J. Wallace and J. Crawley will make the presentation to Council.

6. Date of next meeting

Tuesday, December 8, 2015

Burgoyne Woods Room, 3rd floor City Hall

4 – 6 p.m.

7. Motion to Adjourn

Made by: J. Burch

Carried

Materials distributed prior to or at the meeting:

1. Summary of Evaluation and Discussion Paper, Nov 28, 2015