

# **RESEARCH REPORT**

## **Provincial Arts Funding in New Brunswick: A Provincial and Comparative Assessment**

**Prepared for:**

**ArtsNB**

**Prepared by:**

**Dr. Monica Gattinger**

**February 2016**

## **Table of Contents**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary  | 4  |
| 1.0 Introduction   | 7  |
| 1.1 Study Background   | 7  |
| 1.2 Research Objectives  | 7  |
| 1.3 Methodology  | 8  |
| 2.0 Arts Funding in Canada: The Context  | 9  |
| 2.1 The Massey-Lévesque Commission and the Origins of the Arts Council Model                                       | 9  |
| 2.2 Coordinating Arts Funding in Canada: Canadian Public Arts Funders and Tri-levels                               | 11 |
| 3.0 Arts Funding in New Brunswick  | 13 |
| 3.1 Historical Context   | 13 |
| 3.2 Funding Programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage & Culture and ArtsNB                                   | 14 |
| 3.2.1 Program Guidelines   | 14 |
| 3.2.2 Evaluation Processes   | 15 |
| 3.2.3 Reporting Structures   | 16 |
| 4.0 Arts Funding Models and Practices in Selected Canadian Comparator Jurisdictions                                | 18 |
| 4.1 The Federal Government, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Nova Scotia                  | 18 |
| 5.0 Opportunities to Strengthen Arts Funding in New Brunswick  | 20 |
| 5.1 Strengthen Program Guidelines and Administration at ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture | 20 |
| 5.2 Expand Collaboration Between ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture                        | 20 |
| 5.3 Consolidate Program Administration in Select Areas   | 21 |
| 6.0 Conclusion and Summary of Observations   | 22 |
| 7.0 Sources  | 26 |

Appendices (Appendices 2 and 3 are under separate cover)

|              |   |    |
|--------------|---|----|
| Appendix 1 - | Biography of Dr. Monica Gattinger   | 28 |
| Appendix 2 - | Table 1a: Analysis of Arts and Cultural Funding Programs<br>at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture<br>Table 1b: Analysis of Arts Funding Programs at ArtsNB |    |
| Appendix 3 - | Table 2: Public Arts Funding Administration in Selected Canadian Jurisdictions  |    |

## **Executive Summary**

Public funding for the arts and culture in New Brunswick is administered by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and by the New Brunswick Arts Board. In the context of a program review at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, ArtsNB arranged for an independent external assessment of the province's funding model to identify areas of strength and weakness, and opportunities for greater inter-organizational collaboration. The research study explored the substance and process of funding to the arts in New Brunswick, including what and who are funded by ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, and how funding decisions are made and reported on. The research also compared the province's funding approach to other Canadian jurisdictions to identify strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement. The study was undertaken via qualitative analysis of relevant documentation (websites, internal organizational documents, related studies, scholarly literature, etc.).

The research findings can be summarized as follows:

- The Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB offer a variety of funding programs to individual artists and arts organizations in the province. Programs at both organizations support creation, presentation, arts education and capacity building / career development, with ArtsNB focused predominantly on support to individual artists for creation and career development in the arts, and the Department focused mainly on operational funding to arts organizations for presentation, arts education and capacity building in the arts, cultural industries and heritage. This delineation of primary areas of focus of the arts council vis-à-vis the culture department is in keeping with the main approaches prevailing in the comparator jurisdictions analyzed (the federal government, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia).
- Notwithstanding the above, there are a number of particularities of the New Brunswick case:
  - Operational funding to organizations is delivered by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture. This stands in contrast to most of the comparator jurisdictions, where the arts council delivers operational funding to arts organizations.
  - There are a number of areas of overlap between the two organizations when it comes to funding to individual artists for creation and presentation.
  - New Brunswick Art Bank acquisitions are administered by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture. While some jurisdictions do position responsibility for provincial art bank acquisitions in the mandate of their culture departments, in New Brunswick, this practice appears to run counter to ArtsNB's enabling legislation.

- There is room for improvement in the clarity of program guidelines and the comprehensiveness of reporting of competition results. This is particularly the case for programs administered by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture.

While provincial governments adopt a variety of different approaches to arts funding administration, in the context of its program review, the Province of New Brunswick may wish to contemplate the following considerations when it comes to future administrative arrangements for arts funding in the province:

- Creative expression and fundamental values of democracy underpin the arts council model as it has been developed in Canada and elsewhere. The arm's length approach aims to avoid political interference in the creative process by placing individual funding decisions at a distance from politicians. In keeping with this, the use of peer assessment committees (juries) is intended to ensure funding proposals are evaluated on their artistic merits by specialists in the field, rather than assessed against political or bureaucratic criteria.
- Arts funding is but one component of a rich artistic ecosystem within which individual artists and arts organizations function. Where there is overlap, duplication or lack of clarity in program guidelines or in who is responsible for what, it increases the burden on funding applicants, most of whom are poorly resourced. Not only does this reduce applicants' capacity to be aware of programs for which they are eligible, but it increases the time and effort they need to invest in 'figuring out the system' – time which could otherwise be spent pursuing their artistic and organizational mandates.
- Overlap, duplication and lack of clarity in funding programs and guidelines also challenge efficient and effective program administration, not only for ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture in their own right, but for the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall system of provincial arts funding in New Brunswick. In addition, lack of clarity and transparency in the functioning of the peer review process may leave the system vulnerable to critiques of favouritism and bias.
- Likewise, where public reporting on competition results is in summary form or is provided in a way that does not readily enable readers to assess the distribution of funding allocations in regional, linguistic, disciplinary, ethnocultural, gender or other terms, it also renders the system vulnerable to critiques of unfairness, partiality and preferential treatment.

In light of the above, there are a number of opportunities to strengthen arts funding in the Province of New Brunswick:

- Program guidelines and administration can be strengthened at ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture:
  - guidelines could be made clearer when it comes to which linguistic or ethnocultural groups, disciplines and artistic practices are eligible (or not) for funding.
  - the appointment, composition and role of juries could be made clearer at the Department, as could the rationale for the use of juries versus program officers when it comes to individual programs. The role of program officers in juried processes could also be clarified.
  - public reporting on competition results could be strengthened with more fulsome analysis of results (e.g., success rates for individual programs, regions, linguistic communities, disciplines, along with distribution of funding across key categories like language, region, discipline, gender, etc.).
- Collaboration between the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB could be expanded to provide better and more efficient services to the New Brunswick arts community:
  - At a minimum, this could include more frequent exchanges of information on funding programs and strategic priorities, drawing on the unique expertise of each organization to assist the other. This could be undertaken alongside or in addition to forums like the provincial tri-level.
  - More extensive collaboration could include coordination of funding programs in similar areas, e.g., coordinating deadlines, aligning application forms and processes, comparing competition results with a view to better understanding who/what is (or is not) being supported by provincial funding, etc. A systematic mapping exercise of the various programs offered by each organization would be an important first step towards identifying precise opportunities for collaboration of this sort. The province may also wish to examine the co-management structure in place in Nova Scotia's Support4Culture program, which comprises a number of programs managed jointly by Arts Nova Scotia and the provincial Department of Communities, Culture and Heritage.
- Program administration could be consolidated in a number of areas with a view to improving service delivery and arts outcomes in New Brunswick. This could include consideration of the following:

- Currently, ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture both deliver creation-based funding to individual artists and arts organizations. These activities could be consolidated under one administrative roof to achieve efficiencies and maximize understanding of the provincial arts community and impact of program funding in the sector. Given the arts council model's articulation around creation-based funding, ArtsNB would likely be the best positioned to deliver these programs.
- The province may also wish to consider delivering operational funding to arts organizations alongside creation-based funding to arts organizations. Not only would this be in keeping with prevailing arts funding practices in Canada, it could also permit for the consolidation of information on funding provided to and the organizational practices of arts organizations in New Brunswick, thereby strengthening the government's understanding of the support it provides to the sector, along with the sector's current and future needs.

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Study Background**

In the Province of New Brunswick, funding for the arts and culture is administered partly by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture (organizational funding, festival funding, New Brunswick Art Bank acquisitions) and partly by the New Brunswick Arts Board (funding to individual artists and a program for organizations). The Province is currently conducting a program review at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture. In the context of this review, ArtsNB contracted Dr. Monica Gattinger (Dr. Gattinger's biography appears in Appendix 1) to undertake an external assessment of the province's funding model to identify areas of strength and weakness, and opportunities for greater inter-organizational collaboration.

### **1.2 Research Objectives**

The research study pursued two primary aims:

- 1) It explored the substance and process of funding to the arts in New Brunswick:
  - On substance:
    - It identified what is funded (creation, presentation, capacity building, etc.) and who is funded (individual artists, organizations, established/emerging artists, Francophone/Aboriginal/Anglophone arts, etc.).
    - It assessed whether there are gaps in funding or areas of duplication.
  - On process:
    - It identified which organization delivers the funding (the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture or ArtsNB).
    - It analyzing how funding is administered (by juries, program officers, other) and whether there is an 'off-ramp' in place to discontinue funding to particular projects, individuals or organizations.
    - It ascertained how funding is reported on.
- 2) It analyzed where the province's funding approach sits in relation to other Canadian jurisdictions in order to identify areas of strength, weakness and opportunities for improvement. The following comparator jurisdictions were analyzed: Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and the federal government.

The above research informed the identification of areas of strength, weakness, and opportunities for improvement and inter-organizational collaboration in New Brunswick.



### 1.3 Research Methodology

The study was undertaken via qualitative analysis of relevant documentation. For the first research objective analyzing the substance and process of funding to the arts in New Brunswick, the study focused on documentation provided by ArtsNB (annual reports and policy documents, internal documents provided by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture in response to a RIPPA request, and recent reports of similar exercises in other jurisdictions).

Based on available information, each program was analyzed using the following categories:

- Program guidelines
  - Eligibility criteria:
    - What is funded: creation, presentation, education or capacity building; disciplinary, multidisciplinary or inter-arts; traditional or emerging arts/artists
    - Who is funded: individual artists, arts organizations or both; Francophone, Anglophone or Aboriginal artists/organizations
  - Funding available: operating or project; annual or multiyear
  - Application deadlines: frequency; fixed or flexible
  - Reporting requirements for funding recipients
  - Presence (or not) of an off-ramp to discontinue funding to particular projects, individuals or organizations
- Evaluation process
  - Appointment, composition and role of peer assessment committees (including whether conflict of interest guidelines are in place)
  - Scoring guidelines
  - Role of program officers in evaluation
- Funders' practices for program reporting: competition results, total funding allocated and its distribution (regional, linguistic, cultural, etc.)
- Major changes or evolution in any of the above in recent years

The analysis of funding models and practices in comparator jurisdictions (Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and the federal government) was undertaken by reviewing relevant scholarly sources and publicly accessible documentation (websites, annual reports, etc.).

## **2.0 Arts Funding in Canada: The Context**

Canadian governments have funded the arts since the time of Confederation (and before), establishing public organizations like the National Archives of Canada (1872), the National Gallery of Canada (1880) and the National Film Board (1939) at the federal level, along with a variety of small funding programs for arts organizations like symphonies, ballets and theatre companies at federal, provincial, and in some instances, municipal levels. Prior to the 1950s, however, these approaches were largely ad hoc, responding to particular needs, public demands and issues of the day, rather than coordinated, concerted efforts to support the arts in a systematic holistic fashion.<sup>1</sup> It wasn't until the early postwar period that governments and the people they served saw a need to take a comprehensive look at government support for the arts. At the federal level, this culminated with the establishment of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (the Massey-Lévesque Commission) in 1949.

The Commission's final report constituted a watershed in Canadian arts policy and funding history: it included a comprehensive analysis of the state of the arts and scholarship in the country, along with detailed recommendations for federal government policy and administration in the field. In the decades that followed, both federal and provincial governments established a large range and number of arts and cultural institutions, including, notably, arts councils and government departments dedicated to artistic and cultural programming. Municipalities also became progressively more engaged in the arts over the years, creating arts councils and programming to varying degrees throughout the country. As described below, in contemporary times, this rich arts ecosystem of federal, provincial and municipal arts funders coordinates its activities through mechanisms like the Canadian Public Arts Funders network and Tri-levels in each province.

### **2.1 The Massey-Lévesque Commission and the Origins of the Arts Council Model**

Canada emerged from the second world war with a strong sense of pride and nationhood given its important contribution to the victory of the Allied forces. In the early postwar years, concerns grew that the country did not have the cultural, artistic or scholarly infrastructure befitting its newfound stature in the world. Notably, there was mounting unease over the extent to which the country's cultural and intellectual life were supported and developed by American foundations, in particular, Carnegie for public libraries, and Ford and Rockefeller for universities and the arts. There were broader concerns as well over the influence of American culture in Canada through print and broadcast media (books, magazines, television, radio, movies, etc.). In addition, the use of artistic and cultural infrastructure for the purposes of propaganda by the Nazi and Soviet regimes underscored the important role that the arts and culture play in

---

<sup>1</sup> For an excellent overview of the early history of arts funding in Canada, see Foote (2011). See also Jeannotte (2006) for a detailed historical chronology of federal cultural policy measures. Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (2008) also trace the history of federal arts and cultural policy and administration in Canada.

a healthy democracy. The artistic community in Canada advocated increasingly for federal support for the arts and culture in this context.

The early postwar government of Louis St. Laurent struck a royal commission in 1949 to examine this state of affairs and to make recommendations as to what should be done about it. Vincent Massey, who had recently returned to Canada following his time as High Commissioner to Great Britain, was appointed Commission Chair, and Father Louis Lévesque, the founding dean of the University of Laval's Faculty of Social Sciences, was appointed Vice-Chair. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (often referred to as the Massey Commission or the Massey-Lévesque Commission) undertook numerous studies and held public hearings across the country, issuing its final report in 1951.

The Commission's studies documented the relative paucity of artistic and cultural development across Canada, along with the considerable extent to which cultural and intellectual activity and infrastructure were supported and influenced by the United States. The report underscored the importance of artistic, cultural and intellectual production and infrastructure to civilization: 'If we as a nation are concerned with the problem of defence, what, we may ask ourselves, are we defending? We are defending civilization, our share of it, our contribution to it. The things with which our inquiry deals are the elements that give civilization its character and its meaning. It would be paradoxical to defend something which we are unwilling to strengthen and enrich, and which we even allow to decline.'<sup>2</sup> The Commissioners very clearly had the role of the arts in a *democratic* civilization in mind. Looking to Britain, they stated, '...state intervention in Great Britain [...] has left the artist and the writer free and unhampered. British Governments have paid heed to Lord Melbourne's dictum, "God help the minister who meddles in art".'<sup>3</sup>

The Commission's most important recommendations centred on the need for federal funding to support the arts, culture and scholarship in Canada, including, of greatest significance to this report, the creation of a federal arts council. The Commission paid special attention to the administrative arrangements that would underpin federal funding to the arts, and looked in particular to Great Britain, which placed funding decisions at arm's length from politicians in an independent arts council, the Arts Council of Great Britain.<sup>4</sup> The Commissioners wrote, 'In studying the work and the activities of the Arts Council of Great Britain we have noticed with particular interest the Council's awareness of the dangers inherent in any system of subvention by the central government to the arts.'<sup>5</sup> The Commission cited the Chair of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Canada 1951. *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences. Report*. Ottawa: King's Printer, Part II: Introduction. Available online at <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/massey/h5-439-e.html>

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Arts council funding in the United Kingdom has subsequently been devolved to Wales, Scotland, England and Northern Ireland, with the creation of arts councils for each of these jurisdictions.

<sup>5</sup> Canada 1951. *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences. Report*. Ottawa: King's Printer, Chapter 25. Available online at <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/massey/h5-452-e.html>

ACBG, who stated on this point, ‘... We administer a Treasury grant; but we act independently. [...] State support for the Arts without State control.’<sup>6</sup>

The Canada Council for the Arts was established in the years following the Commission’s report, and in the decades to come, arts councils were created in all provinces. Ministries and departments of culture were also established at both the federal and provincial levels across the country, with various funding programs housed under their aegis. In general, though, as documented in Section 4.0 of this report, the ‘division of arts funding labour’ between arts councils and cultural departments has retained the Massey-Lévesque approach, with funding for artistic creation (notably to individual artists) at arm’s length from politicians. Cultural departments tend towards funding for promotion, dissemination, and the like, and generally do not provide funding to individual artists.

## 2.2 Coordinating Arts Funding in Canada: Canadian Public Arts Funders and Tri-levels

As Canada has developed a more robust arts funding ecosystem over the years, a number of coordination mechanisms have been developed. Chief among these are the Canadian Public Arts Funders (CPAF) network, comprised of federal, provincial and territorial arts councils, and Tri-levels, which bring together public and foundation funders within each province.

CPAF was established by the Canada Council for the Arts in 2004. It brings together the chairs and executive directors of the federal, provincial and territorial (FPT) arts councils for the purposes of exchanging information, joint capacity building and collaborating in areas of mutual interest. Meetings are held several times yearly in various locations throughout the country, and include an annual meeting of chairs and executive directors, an annual strategic development meeting of executive directors, and professional development meetings of program staff. CPAF enables FPT arts councils to share best practices, identify trends or new developments in funding levels, purposes and approaches, and work collaboratively to identify and address key challenges and opportunities in the short, medium and long terms.

Tri-levels, fostered by the Canada Council in the western provinces as early as the 1970s, bring together public and foundation arts funders at the federal, provincial and municipal levels for collaboration, coordination and exchange of information on topics of mutual concern. In New Brunswick, the tri-level is comprised of the Canada Council for the Arts, the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, ArtsNB, the New Brunswick Foundation for the Arts, the Sheila Hugh McKay Foundation, and a number of municipalities (principally Saint John, Moncton, Dieppe, Riverview, Sackville and Caraquet). Meetings are held several times per year and provide a valuable opportunity for information exchange on key arts developments, and challenges/opportunities facing funders individually

---

<sup>6</sup> *The Arts Council of Great Britain, 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Report, 1948-49, Appendix A, p.24, as cited in Ibid.*

or collectively in the province. Tri-levels have given rise to important partnerships and projects, including Canadian Arts Data/Données sur les arts au Canada (CADAC) and the Equity initiative in Nova Scotia.

### **3.0 Arts Funding in New Brunswick**

#### 3.1 Historical Context

Arts funding in New Brunswick can be traced back to the 1950s and before, but systematic provincial government attention to the arts was only to begin to get underway in the late 1960s. In 1968, the government established a cultural affairs branch in the Department of Youth and Welfare and it created the New Brunswick Art Bank<sup>7</sup> (Barrieau et Bourgeois 2011). This was followed in 1969 by an agreement to foster cultural exchange between New Brunswick and Québec (*Accord de coopération entre le Nouveau-Brunswick et le Québec en matière d'éducation, de culture et de communication*).

It wasn't until the 1990s that New Brunswick created an arts council, and the province has never had a department dedicated exclusively to the arts and culture. As is the case in many provinces, arts and culture have tended to be one component of departments with broader mandates (e.g., tourism, housing, sport, municipalities, etc.). There have been frequent calls from the artistic community for creation of a department dedicated solely to the arts and culture, however. These go as far back as the 1980s' recommendation of the Premier's Advisory Committee on the Arts. Established by the Hatfield government and charged with making recommendations on the province's cultural policy and cultural development, the Advisory Committee's final report called for the creation of a department or permanent secretariat dedicated to coordinating provincial support to the arts and culture, along with the establishment of a provincial arts council to provide peer reviewed grants to the arts and to advise the department/secretariat on cultural policy (Ibid).

The Hatfield government was replaced by the McKenna government. The latter did not follow through on the recommendation to create a separate department for culture, but a culture branch continued to operate, at that time in the then Department of Municipalities, Culture and Housing (Ibid). The McKenna government did act on the recommendation to create an arts council, however, establishing the New Brunswick Arts Board in 1990. In contrast to the creation of the Canada Council for the Arts (see Section 2.1 above), however, the Arts Board had very limited autonomy at its inception: it had no permanent staff and decisions on the attribution of individual grants were ultimately made by the minister. As Barrieau and Bourgeois note, 'Pendant ses premières années d'existence, le Conseil des arts du Nouveau-Brunswick fonctionnait essentiellement comme une unité administrative de la Direction du développement des arts' (Ibid, 93). In this administrative context, it was difficult for the arts council to serve as a consultative body representing the needs of artists to the government, and the arts community of the day was dissatisfied with this state of affairs.

---

<sup>7</sup> The cultural affairs branch reported directly to the premier, had a single employee and an annual budget of roughly \$60,000. The initial budget of the New Brunswick Art Bank was \$1,000.

At a forum in 1995 on the future of provincial cultural policy organized jointly by the Department of Municipalities, Culture and Housing and the New Brunswick Arts Board, the artistic community called (again) for the creation of a separate culture department, along with greater autonomy for the provincial arts council. The first of these recommendations was not acted upon, but the second was addressed. The government hired an external consultant (Professor François Colbert, HEC Montréal), to assess the mandate and administrative arrangements governing the New Brunswick Arts Board. His report recommended greater autonomy be accorded to the organization. These recommendations were acted upon by the government. Amendments to the New Brunswick Arts Board Act in 1999 increased the organization's independence, including, notably, that funding decisions no longer required approval of the minister and that the organization be able to hire its own permanent staff. The amendments also expanded the purview of the board's mandate, including responsibility for acquisitions for the New Brunswick Art Bank.

### 3.2 Funding Programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB

The Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB administer a variety of funding programs for the arts in New Brunswick. Grants support individual artists and arts organizations across a range of artistic activities/functions (creation, presentation, arts education, organizational capacity building) and sub-sectors (visual, performing, audiovisual, literary arts, etc.). This section provides a high level overview of program guidelines, evaluation processes and reporting structures for this funding. Tables 1a and 1b in Appendix 2 provide details for each program.

#### 3.2.1 Program Guidelines

Written program guidelines describe eligibility criteria, application procedures and deadlines for each program. These include whether funding is available to individuals and/or groups, whether particular individuals or groups are the target of funding (Francophone, Anglophone, Aboriginal) and whether extra consideration is given to particular kinds of individuals or groups (e.g., emerging artists, nontraditional art forms, etc.). Program guidelines also specify the focus of funding (creation, presentation, education or organizational development), the nature of funding available (operating versus project-based funding, single or multi-year funding) and application deadlines (yearly, multi-yearly or flexible). They also specify whether and when a final report must be submitted following conclusion of the grant, and whether the program includes an 'off-ramp' (e.g., ineligibility for a future grant if the current project does not attain a minimum standard).

A number of observations emerge from the review of program guidelines undertaken for this assessment:

- Both the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB administer funding programs to individual artists and to arts organizations for creation, presentation, education and organizational development. While a certain degree of overlap and duplication may be unavoidable and may even be desirable, the logic behind the current distribution of funding programs between the two organizations is not evident.
- Program guidelines do not always specify clearly what activities or individuals/groups are (or are not) eligible for funding. Guidelines are clear on whether individuals and/or groups are eligible to apply, what arts activities are eligible for funding, and whether the funding available is project, operating, annual or multiyear, but it is not always evident whether funding programs are destined for Anglophone, Francophone and/or Aboriginal individuals and groups, and whether funding is intended for disciplinary, multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary, traditional and/or emerging art forms. This is particularly the case for program guidelines at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture.
- Many programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture have flexible application deadlines. While it can be advantageous for applicants to have more flexibility in the timing of their applications, where flexible deadlines are employed, the program guidelines note that applications are received until all program funds are distributed. This could have the unintended consequence of conferring advantage on applicants applying early in the funding process and/or result in a de facto annual deadline at the beginning of the application period.
- Very few programs have ‘off-ramps’.
- New Brunswick Art Bank acquisitions are administered by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture. This runs counter to the New Brunswick Arts Board Act, which confers authority for Art Bank acquisitions to ArtsNB.

### 3.2.2 Evaluation Processes

A number of key findings emerge from the review of evaluation processes undertaken for this assessment:

- The evaluation of arts funding in New Brunswick comprises a mix of external peer reviewed jury processes and internal program officer evaluations. All funding proposals at ArtsNB are undertaken using peer review. Funding programs at the Department of



Tourism, Heritage and Culture are administered either by juries or by program officers. On the latter, it is not always clear on what basis the Department has opted for the use of peer review versus internal review.

- Approaches to peer reviewed jury evaluation processes vary between ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, and within the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture itself. ArtsNB jury processes are described in detail on the organization's website and in program guidelines, including member selection, jury size and representation, conflict of interest guidelines, deliberation processes (including the role of ArtsNB staff), and ultimate decision-making authority (juries recommend grants for approval to the Board). The appointment processes, size/composition and role of juries in funding decisions is not always clearly described for programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture. While conflict of interest guidelines apply uniformly across juries, the rationale for variations in the size and role of assessment committees is not always apparent, and program information does not always describe clearly how members are selected, whether and how considerations of representation are taken into account in the appointment process, and how departmental staff are involved in assessment processes.
- Scoring guidelines comprise a mix of numerical and qualitative assessments at both organizations. They are not provided on the ArtsNB website, although evaluation criteria are generally noted in program guidelines. Approaches to scoring tend to vary for programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, and for some programs, there do not appear to be scoring guidelines in place.

### 3.2.3 Reporting Structures

This review assessed the reporting structures related to program funding from two perspectives: reporting requirements of funding recipients following conclusion of their grant and reporting by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and by ArtsNB on funding provided through their respective programs.

The main observations regarding funding recipients' reporting requirements are as follows:

- Individuals and organizations receiving funding from the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and from ArtsNB are generally required to report on the use of the funds they receive. Reporting requirements range from relatively brief reports to more detailed documentation, usually in line with the size and scope of the grant awarded.

- A small number of programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture explicitly do not require funding recipients to submit a final report, but the Department reserves the right to contact grantees following conclusion of the project.
- Program guidelines for a number of programs at the Department Tourism, Heritage and Culture do not indicate whether a final report is to be filed.
- Some programs at ArtsNB also require grant recipients to submit interim reports (in addition to final reports).

The main observations regarding public reporting on program funding and competition results are as follows:

- The Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture reports on funding and competition results in its annual reports and on its website. In its annual report, it lists the total dollar value of project grants provided (no breakdowns per program are provided in the annual report). The Department's website includes a listing of grant recipients for each program, including the name of the individual or organization, and the dollar value of the grant received.
- ArtsNB provides detailed breakdowns of funding awarded in its annual reports. The organization breaks down funding distribution by program, discipline and region of the province, and lists the names of jury members, grant recipients for each program and the dollar value of the grant awarded to each individual or organization. The annual report also provides statistics on success rates for its overall funding, along with breakdowns by region of the province (i.e., the number of applications received versus the number awarded).

#### **4.0 Arts Funding Models and Practices in Selected Canadian Comparator Jurisdictions**

This section of the report analyzes funding arrangements in other Canadian jurisdictions with a view to identifying where New Brunswick's funding approach sits in relation to peer counterparts in the country. Six comparator jurisdictions are analyzed: Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and the federal government. This analysis is then drawn on in the following section of the report to identify areas of strength, weakness and opportunities for improvement in the province.

It is important to note at the outset of this analysis, that relatively little scholarly research has been undertaken on arts and cultural policy in Canada, and the research that has been undertaken, focuses predominantly on the federal level (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2010). There is only one comprehensive comparative study of provincial and territorial arts and cultural policy and administration in Canada (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2011). It revealed that like the federal government, provinces and territories became far more active on the arts and cultural front in the post-war period, but the nature of these early interventions varies significantly across the country: early conceptions of culture, the original rationale and objectives of cultural policies, as well as early administrative arrangements for culture can differ substantially from one province or territory to another. They can also vary within a single jurisdiction over time, as the historical overview of administrative arrangements in New Brunswick in Section 3.1 above attests.

When it comes to early administrative arrangements, jurisdictions tended to opt for either centralized (i.e., departmental) or decentralized (i.e., arts councils) approaches in the early postwar years. Over time, they all developed departmental and arts council structures and at present, some dominant trends can be observed. In the main, arts funding is administered by both departments of culture and arts councils at the federal and provincial levels. Jurisdictions tend to confer decision-making authority over funding for artistic creation (whether to individuals or organizations) to independent arm's length arts councils to avoid the perception or reality of political interference in the creative process. Cultural departments, meanwhile, tend to be the more central player the further one gets away from creative expression. Their funding programs often focus on questions of public access rather than creation, e.g., grants for festivals or community events. Responsibility for funding activities lying somewhere in between creation and access (e.g., arts promotion, public engagement, arts education and capacity building) tends to differ across jurisdictions, housed at either the cultural department or the arts council.

##### **4.1 The Federal Government, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Nova Scotia**

Table 2 in Appendix 3 of this report details administrative arrangements for arts funding by the federal government, and the governments of Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Nova Scotia. Arrangements for New Brunswick are also shown for comparison purposes.

As revealed in the table, in some jurisdictions, an arts council was the first main funding organization created (federal government, Manitoba and Ontario), while in others, an arts and culture department was created first (Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick). Over time, all jurisdictions created both an arts council and a cultural department, with programming for various facets of the arts and culture distributed between the two organizations.

As noted above, in the main, the key program responsibilities of arts councils relate to individual and organizational programs for creation and presentation (and sometimes training), operational funding for arts organizations and arts education. Culture departments, meanwhile, have responsibility for activities further removed from creation: festivals/events, infrastructure and organizational capacity building. Other activities like acquisitions for government art banks or art collections, and professional training, are sometimes housed with the arts council, and sometimes with the culture department.

When it comes to reporting structures, arts councils tend to be more detailed in their reporting of competition results than their departmental counterparts. They generally provide detailed breakdowns in their annual reports or on their websites of success rates in total and for various programs, regions, disciplines or equity groups, and distribution of funding across key metrics (region, discipline, ethnocultural group, linguistic group, gender, etc.). Departments frequently provide only high-level information, such as total funding awarded. Competition results are often available on their websites, but are rarely 'rolled up' into aggregate analyses the way arts councils do with their funding figures.

## **5.0 Opportunities to Strengthen Arts Funding in New Brunswick**

The preceding analysis suggests a number of fruitful opportunities to strengthen arts funding in the province in three areas, each noted below.

### 5.1 Strengthen Program Guidelines and Administration at ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture

Section 3 above revealed that program guidelines and administration at ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture suffer in some instances from a lack of clarity. Specifically:

- guidelines could be more clear on which linguistic or ethnocultural groups, disciplines or artistic practices are eligible (or not) for funding.
- more detail on scoring guidelines could be provided by ArtsNB.
- both organizations could give greater consideration to whether off-ramps should be in place for each program.
- the appointment, composition and role of juries could be made clearer at the Department, as could the rationale underpinning when juries are used (versus when program officers evaluate proposals) for individual program. The role of program officers in juried processes could also be clarified.
- Public reporting on competition results could be strengthened with more fulsome analysis of results. Ideally, this would include success rates for individual programs, regions, linguistic communities, and disciplines, along with distribution of funding across key categories like language, region, discipline and gender.

### 5.2 Expand Collaboration Between the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB

Section 3 of this report also revealed that there is some degree of overlap, duplication and lack of coherent ‘division of labour’ between the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB when it comes to creation-based funding programs. Collaboration could be expanded to provide better and more efficient services to the New Brunswick arts community:

- At a minimum, this could include more frequent exchanges of information on funding programs and strategic priorities, drawing on the unique expertise of each organization to assist the other. This could be undertaken alongside or in addition to forums like the provincial tri-level.
- More extensive collaboration could involve coordination of funding programs in similar areas, e.g., coordinating deadlines, aligning application forms and processes, comparing competition results with a view to better understanding who/what is (or is not) being

supported by provincial funding, etc. A systematic mapping exercise of the various programs offered by each organization would be an important first step towards identifying precise opportunities for collaboration of this sort. The province may also wish to examine the co-management structure in place in Nova Scotia's Support4Culture program, which comprises a number of programs managed jointly by Arts Nova Scotia and the provincial Department of Communities, Culture and Heritage.

### 5.3 Consolidate Program Administration in Select Areas

Sections 3 and 4 highlighted that there is some degree of overlap and duplication between the Department and ArtsNB, and that some programs currently administered by the Department are generally housed at arts councils in comparator jurisdictions in Canada. The government may wish to consider consolidating program administration in a number of areas to improve service delivery and arts outcomes in New Brunswick.

This could include the following:

- Currently, ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture both deliver creation-based funding to individual artists and arts organizations. These activities could be consolidated under one administrative roof to achieve efficiencies in service delivery and to maximize the government's understanding of the provincial arts community and the impact of program funding to the sector. Given the arts council model's articulation around creation-based funding, ArtsNB would be the best positioned to deliver these programs.
- The province may also wish to consider delivering operational funding to arts organizations alongside creation-based funding to arts organizations. Not only would this be in keeping with prevailing arts funding practices in Canada, it could also permit for the consolidation of information on funding provided to and the organizational practices of arts organizations in New Brunswick, thereby strengthening the government's understanding of the support it provides to the sector, along with its current and future needs.
- In light of the above, acquisitions for the New Brunswick Arts Bank could be administered by ArtsNB. This would also be in keeping with ArtsNB's legislated mandate.

## **6.0 Conclusion and Summary of Observations**

This research study has explored the substance and process of funding to the arts in New Brunswick, including what and who are funded by ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and how funding decisions are made and reported upon. The research also analyzed the province's funding approach in relation to that of other Canadian jurisdictions to identify strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement.

While governments can adopt a variety of approaches to arts funding administration, this research suggests there are fruitful opportunities for the Province of New Brunswick to strengthen its arts funding model in the context of its program review.

Prior to undertaking any change, however, the Province of New Brunswick may wish to contemplate the core rationales that underpin its choice of approach. This research study suggests that the Province may wish to place two core rationales at the heart of its administrative choices: maximizing freedom of expression and maximizing funding efficiency, effectiveness and impact.

Section 2.0's review of the origins of the arts council model in Canada underscored that freedom of creative expression is a fundamental tenet of democracy underpinning the model. The arm's length independence of arts councils aims to remove political interference from the creative process by ensuring individual funding decisions are made at a distance from politicians. Peer assessment committees (juries) seek to ensure that funding applications are assessed on their artistic merits by specialists in the field – not political or bureaucratic criteria. Section 3.1 described how the Province of New Brunswick has moved in the direction of greater autonomy over time for its arts council in response to concerns from the artistic community.

Section 4.0's survey of funding approaches in comparator jurisdictions underscored that arts funding approaches vary across jurisdictions, but that, in the main, there is an explicit or implicit division of labour between arts councils (focused on creative expression and support for artists and creation-based organizations) and cultural departments (focused more on presentation, access, arts infrastructure, etc.). Overlap, duplication and lack of clarity in program guidelines or in which organization is responsible for what aspect of arts funding, increases the burden on artists and arts organizations seeking funding. This can reduce applicants' awareness of the full range of funding programs available, and can increase the time and effort needed to navigate the system – time which could otherwise be spent pursuing artistic ventures.

Overlap, duplication and lack of clarity also challenge efficient and effective program administration, not only for funding organizations in their own right, but for the system of arts funding as a whole. Lack of clarity and transparency in the peer review process can also bear negative consequences, leaving the system vulnerable to suspicion of preferential treatment or inequity. Likewise, where public

reporting on competition results is less than fulsome, it opens the system up to the charge that it's unfair, biased or partial.

The Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB collectively offer a rich basket of funding programs to individual artists and arts organizations to support creation, presentation, arts education and capacity building. ArtsNB focuses mainly on support to individual artists for creation and career development, while the Department targets mainly operational funding to organizations for creation, presentation, arts education and capacity building in the arts, cultural industries and heritage. This implicit division of labour aligns *grosso modo* with prevailing approaches in the other jurisdictions analyzed in this research report: the federal government, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Nova Scotia.

That said, a number of characteristics of arts funding in New Brunswick stand out. First, operational funding to organizations is delivered by the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, rather than by the arts council, which is the dominant approach in the comparator jurisdictions analyzed in this study. Second, there is some degree of overlap between departmental and arts council funding when it comes to programs supporting individual artists for creation and presentation. Third, the Department administers acquisitions to the New Brunswick Art Bank. While some of the comparator jurisdictions function in a similar fashion, in New Brunswick, this seems to contradict ArtsNB's legislated mandate.

In light of the above, this research suggests that there are some fruitful opportunities for the Province of New Brunswick to strengthen arts funding in the province:

- Program guidelines and administration can be strengthened at ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture:
  - guidelines could be made clearer when it comes to which linguistic or ethnocultural groups, disciplines or artistic practices are eligible (or not) for funding.
  - more detail on scoring guidelines could be provided by ArtsNB.
  - both organizations could give greater consideration to whether off-ramps should be in place for each program.
  - the appointment, composition and role of juries could be made clearer at the Department, as could the rationale for the use of juries versus program officers when it comes to individual programs. The role of program officers in juried processes could also be clarified.
  - public reporting on competition results could be strengthened with more fulsome analysis of results (e.g., success rates for individual programs, regions, linguistic



communities, and disciplines, along with distribution of funding across key categories like language, region, discipline, gender, etc.).

- Collaboration between the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture and ArtsNB could be expanded to provide better and more efficient services to the New Brunswick arts community:
  - At a minimum, this could include more frequent exchanges of information on funding programs and strategic priorities, drawing on the unique expertise of each organization to assist the other. This could be undertaken alongside or in addition to forums like the provincial tri-level.
  - More extensive collaboration could include coordination of funding programs in similar areas, e.g., coordinating deadlines, aligning application forms and processes, comparing competition results with a view to better understanding who/what is (or is not) being supported by provincial funding, etc. A systematic mapping exercise of the various programs offered by each organization would be an important first step towards identifying precise opportunities for collaboration of this sort. The province may also wish to examine the co-management structure in place in Nova Scotia's Support4Culture program, which comprises a number of programs managed jointly by Arts Nova Scotia and the provincial Department of Communities, Culture and Heritage.
- Program administration could be consolidated in a number of areas with a view to improving service delivery and arts outcomes in New Brunswick. This could include consideration of the following:
  - Currently, ArtsNB and the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture both deliver creation-based funding to individual artists and arts organizations. These activities could be consolidated under one administrative roof to achieve efficiencies and maximize the government's understanding of the provincial arts community and impact of program funding to the sector. Given the arts council model's articulation around creation-based funding, ArtsNB would be the best positioned to deliver these programs.
  - The province may also wish to consider delivering operational funding to arts organizations alongside creation-based funding to arts organizations. Not only would this be in keeping with prevailing arts funding practices in Canada, it would also permit for the consolidation of information on funding provided to and the organizational practices of arts organizations in New Brunswick, thereby strengthening the government's understanding of the support it provides to the sector, along with its current and future needs.

New Brunswick has a long history of public support for the arts. The level, nature and administrative arrangements underpinning this support have been strengthened over time in response to the arts communities' needs and interests, and political and policy priorities. The current program review offers a critical juncture to continue to strengthen the system. This report suggests a number of opportunities to that end.

## 7.0 Sources

- Barrieau, Nicole, and Daniel Bourgeois (2011), 'Le Nouveau-Brunswick : dualité culturelle et institutionnelle', in Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (ed.), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada...*, *op.cit.*, p. 77-103.
- Canada 1951. *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences. Report*. Ottawa: King's Printer, Part II: Introduction. Available online at <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/massey/h5-439-e.html>
- Cohnstaedt, Joy, and Sharon Jeannotte (2011), 'Le centre et la périphérie : le conflit au coeur des politiques culturelles au Manitoba', in Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (ed.), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada...*, *op.cit.*, p. 305-354.
- Foote, John (2011), 'Canada/ 1. Historical perspective: Cultural Policies and Instruments', Council of Europe/ERICarts, *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*, 12th edition, [Online], <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/canada.php?aid=1>, Retrieved February 2016.
- Gattinger, Monica (2011), 'L'Ontario : d'une politique culturelle réactive à une politique proactive ?', in Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (ed.), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada...*, *op.cit.*, p. 247-304.
- Gattinger, Monica and Diane Saint-Pierre (ed.) (2011), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada: Origines, évolutions et mises en œuvre*. Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Gattinger, Monica and Diane Saint-Pierre (2010), 'Canada: The Origin, Evolution and Underpinnings of Federal Cultural Policy,' paper presented at the panel 'An International Collaboration to Advance Comparative Cultural Policy Research: France, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada,' organized by Monica Gattinger and Diane Saint-Pierre for the 6<sup>th</sup> *International Conference on Cultural Policy Research*, Jyväskylä, Finland, August 24-27. (2012)
- Jeannotte, Sharon (2006), *Timeline of Federal Cultural Policy Milestones - 1849-2005*. Prepared for Culturescope.ca, an online source of the Department of Canadian Heritage, October.
- Marontate, Jan (2011), 'La Nouvelle-Écosse: clientélisme, militantisme et soutien provincial aux arts et aux cultures fondatrices', in Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (ed.), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada...*, *op.cit.*, p. 105-152.
- Rompkey, Ronald (2011), 'Une politique culturelle pour une société postcoloniale: le cas de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador', in Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (ed.), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada...*, *op.cit.*, p. 43-75.

Saint-Pierre, Diane (2011), 'Le Québec et ses politiques culturelles: l'affirmation d'une identité nationale et d'une culture distincte, créative et ouverte sur le monde', in Gattinger and Saint-Pierre (ed.), *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada...*, *op.cit.*, p. 183-245.

## **Appendix 1 – Biography of Dr. Monica Gattinger**

Monica Gattinger is Director of the University of Ottawa’s Institute for Science, Society and Policy and Associate Professor at the School of Political Studies. Her research explores two primary fields: the origin and evolution of Canadian federal and provincial cultural policy in comparative perspective, and the influence of North American economic integration on domestic and cross-border public policy and administration, with a particular focus on the energy sector.

Dr. Gattinger is co-editor with Diane Saint-Pierre of *Les politiques culturelles provinciales et territoriales du Canada: Origines, évolutions et mises en oeuvre* (Presses de l’Université Laval, 2011; in translation with UTP), co-editor with Geoffrey Hale of *Borders and Bridges: Canada's Policy Relations in North America* (Oxford University Press, 2010) and co-author with G. Bruce Doern of *Power Switch: Energy Regulatory Governance in the Twenty-First Century* (University of Toronto Press, 2003).

Monica recently received a grant from the Canada Council for the Arts to research and write a history of the organization in the lead-up to its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2017. She also chairs Positive Energy, a three year action research project on the challenge of attaining social acceptance and support for energy development (oil, gas, renewables) in Canada.

Professor Gattinger was elected to the University of Ottawa’s Board of Governors in 2012 for a three year term. She sat on the University’s Executive Committee, her Faculty’s Teaching Personnel Committee, and currently sits on the the Editorial Boards of the University of Ottawa Press and the journal *Canadian Public Administration*.

Monica holds a Ph.D. in public policy from Carleton University.

ArtsNB Study Report – Appendices 2 and 3

Table 1a: Analysis of Arts and Cultural Funding Programs at the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture

| Program  | Eligibility Criteria |                 |      |                |      |     |                |              |        |       | Focus of Funding |        |      |           | Funding Available |      |                |                | Deadline Type |       |                | Final Report    | Off-ramp                              | Peer Assessment Committees                                   |  |                             | Proj Of-ficer Role     | Scoring  | Deptal Report       |  |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|------|-----|----------------|--------------|--------|-------|------------------|--------|------|-----------|-------------------|------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
|  | Who is Funded        |                 |      |                |      |     | What is Funded |              |        |       | Crea-tion        | Pres'n | Ed'n | Org. devt | Op'g              | Proj | Annual         | Multi          | Yrly          | Multi | Flex           |                 |                                       | Appt   | Comp   | Role                        |                        |  |                     |  |
|  | Ind'l                | Org             | Both | Franc.         | Angl | Abl | Disc-ipline    | Multi /Inter | Trad'l | Emerg |                  |        |      |           |                   |      |                |                |               |       |                |                 |                                       |  |  |                             |                        |  |                     |  |
| Artists in Schools Prog. (Residency Component)               | ✓                    |                 |      | ? <sup>1</sup> | ✓    | ?   | ✓              | ✓            |        |       |                  | ✓      | ✓    |           |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                | ✓             |       | ✓              |                 |                                       | NS <sup>2</sup>  | NS   | NS                          | Deptal eval'n          | ✓  | ✓                   |  |
| Artists in Schools Program (Perform. Component)              |                      | ✓<br>school     |      |                | ✓    |     | Not specified  |              |        |       |                  | ✓      | ✓    |           |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                |               |       | ✓ <sup>3</sup> | No <sup>4</sup> |                                       |  |  | Deptal eval'n               | NS                     | NS   |                     |  |
| Arts Festival Program  |                      | ✓<br>Non-profit |      | NS             | NS   | NS  | ✓              | ✓            | ✓      | ✓     |                  | ✓      |      |           |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                | ✓             |       |                | ✓               |                                       |  |  |                             | Deptal eval'n          | ✓  |                     |  |
| Arts Orgs and Assoc Profl Devt                               |                      | ✓               |      | NS             | NS   | NS  | NS             | NS           | NS     | NS    |                  |        |      | ✓         |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                |               |       | ✓ <sup>5</sup> | ✓               |                                       |  |  |                             | Deptal eval'n          | NS   |                     |  |
| Business & Profl Devt Prog for Publishers                    |                      | ✓               |      | NS             | NS   | NS  | NS             | NS           | NS     | NS    |                  |        |      | ✓         |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                |               |       | ✓ <sup>6</sup> | NS              |                                       |  |  |                             | Deptal eval'n          | NS   |                     |  |
| Literary Promotion Initiative                                |                      | ✓               |      | ?              | ?    | ✓   | ✓              |              | ✓      |       |                  | ✓      |      |           |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                |               |       | ✓ <sup>7</sup> | ✓               |                                       |  |  |                             | Deptal eval'n          | ✓  | No numerical scores |  |
| Music Industry Developmt Prog                                | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓    | NS             | NS   | NS  | ✓              |              | ✓      | ✓     | ✓                | ✓      |      | ✓         |                   | ✓    | ✓              | ✓ <sup>8</sup> | ✓             | ✓     | ✓ <sup>9</sup> | ✓               | ✓                                     | Max of 3 grants per applicant for Album Prodn and Mktg/Promo | Appt by prog officer; Must divulge conflicts of interest | 3-6 regl; representative    | Recom-mend to dept     | Deptal eval'n + MusicNB for Emerging Artist & Bus/Profl Devt | ✓                   |  |
| NB Sound Initiative (multiple components; precursor to MIDP) | ✓                    | ✓               | ✓    | NS             | NS   | NS  | ✓              |              | ✓      | ✓     | ✓                | ✓      |      | ✓         |                   | ✓    | ✓              |                | ✓             | ✓     |                | NS              |                                       | For Album Prodn and Mktg/Promo components                    | Profls   | Recom-mend to dept          | Deptal eval'n for some | NS   |                     |  |
| NB Art Bank  | ✓                    |                 |      | ✓              | ✓    | ✓   | ✓              |              |        |       | ✓                | ✓      | ✓    |           | ✓                 | ✓    |                | ✓              |               |       |                |                 | NS Must divulge conflicts of interest | 5 profl artists & arts profls <sup>10</sup>                  | Recom-mend works to Min                                  | No involvement in selection | ✓                      |  |                     |  |
| NB Multimedia Initiative                                     |                      | ✓               |      | NS             | NS   | NS  |                |              |        |       | ✓                | ✓      |      |           | ✓                 |      | NS presume yes |                | NS            |       | ✓              |                 |                                       |  |  |                             | Deptal & RDC eval'n    | ✓  | No numerical scores |  |

<sup>1</sup> Only Anglophone school boards mentioned in application materials provided through RIPPA.

<sup>2</sup> No mention of PACs in application materials provided through RIPPA.

<sup>3</sup> Applications received until all program funds distributed.

<sup>4</sup> The Department reserves the right to conduct random telephone follow-ups.

<sup>5</sup> Applications received between October and March until all program funds distributed.

<sup>6</sup> Applications received between October and March until all program funds distributed.

<sup>7</sup> Applications received between October and March until all program funds distributed.

<sup>8</sup> Funding is available for two consecutive years for applications to the Album Production and Marketing/Promotion components to support the production and marketing phases of a single project.

<sup>9</sup> Applications received until all program funds distributed for Emerging Artist component.

<sup>10</sup> In previous years, juries were comprised exclusively of professional artists.

ArtsNB Study Report – Appendices 2 and 3

|  |                                      |   |    |    |    |               |    |    |                        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |    |    |                 |   |  |  |                               |   |                                |   |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|----|----|----|---------------|----|----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|----|----|-----------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| NB-PQ Cultural Coop'n Grant Prog                           | Priority to professional non-profits | ✓ | NS | NS | NS | Not specified |    |    |                        | ✓ | ✓ |   |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓  |    |                 |   |  |  | PQ-NB cttee                   | NS  |                                |   |
| Operational Grant Program                                  | ✓<br>Prof'l non-profit               |   | NS | NS | NS | ✓             |    | ✓  | NS                     | ✓ | ✓ |   | ✓ | ✓ |   | ✓ |  | ✓  |    | ✓               | ✓ | Appt by prog officer; Must divulge conflicts of interest | 3-6 independent Cdn profls; representative | Recom-mend grants to dept/Min | Reviews apps for completeness/eligibility; chairs panel mtg | ✓                              |   |
| Partnership Prog for Commy Cultural Activities             | ✓<br>Non-profit                      |   | NS | NS | NS | NS            | NS | NS | ✓<br>Extra points      | ✓ | ✓ |   |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  |    | ✓  |                 |   |  |  |                               | Deptal eval'n   | ✓                              |   |
| Presentation by Invitation                                 | Non-professional                     | ✓ | NS | NS | NS | ✓             | NS | NS | NS                     |   | ✓ |   |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  |    |    | ✓ <sup>11</sup> | ✓ |  |  |                               | Deptal eval'n   | NS                             |   |
| Programme d'aide à la tournée et à la diffusion            | ✓<br>Non-profit prof'l               |   | ✓  |    |    | ✓             | NS | NS | ✓<br>Extra points risk |   | ✓ |   |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓  |    | ✓               |   |  |  |                               | Deptal eval'n   | ✓<br>Not numeric as of 2012-13 | ✓ |
| Promotional Travel Assistance                              | ✓                                    |   | NS | NS | NS | ✓             | NS | NS | NS                     |   | ✓ |   |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  | NS | NS | NS              |   |  |  |                               | Deptal eval'n   | NS                             |   |
| Publishers and Periodicals Operational Grant <sup>12</sup> | ✓                                    |   | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓             |    | ✓  |                        | ✓ | ✓ |   | ✓ | ✓ |   | ✓ |  | ✓  |    | ✓               | ✓ | Appt by prog officer; Must divulge conflicts of interest | 3-6 independent Cdn profls; representative | Recom-mend grants to dept/Min | Deptal eval'n for specific titles                           | ✓                              |   |
| Strategic Initiatives                                      | ✓                                    |   | ?  | ?  | ✓  |               |    |    |                        | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  |    |    | ✓ <sup>13</sup> | ✓ |  |  |                               | Deptal eval'n   | ✓<br>No numerical scores       |   |
| Touring and Presenting Grants Program                      | ✓<br>Non-profit prof'l               |   | NS | NS | NS | ✓             | NS | NS | ✓<br>Extra points risk |   | ✓ |   |   |   | ✓ | ✓ |  |    | ✓  |                 | ✓ |  |  |                               | Deptal eval'n   | ✓<br>No numerical scores       |   |

<sup>11</sup> Applications received between October and March until all program funds distributed.

<sup>12</sup> It is not clear if the following programs are still offered as the documentation dates from 2011/12: Aboriginal Books Funding Initiative, Independent Booksellers Technology Development Program and Literary Translation Grant Component.

<sup>13</sup> Applications received between October and March until all program funds distributed.

ArtsNB Study Report – Appendices 2 and 3

Table 1b: Analysis of Arts Funding Programs at ArtsNB

| Program   | Eligibility Criteria |     |      |        |      |     |                |             |        |       | Focus of Funding |        |           |       | Funding Available |      |        |       | Deadline Type |       |      | Final Report | Off-ramp | Prog Officer Role   | Scoring Criteria | ArtsNB Final Report |
|---|----------------------|-----|------|--------|------|-----|----------------|-------------|--------|-------|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|-------|---------------|-------|------|--------------|----------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|   | Who is Funded        |     |      |        |      |     | What is Funded |             |        |       | Creation         | Pres'n | Arts Ed'n | Dev't | Operating         | Proj | Annual | Multi | Yrly          | Multi | Flex |              |          |                     |                  |                     |
|   | Ind'l                | Org | Both | Franc. | Angl | Abl | Discipline     | Multi/Inter | Trad'l | Emerg |                  |        |           |       |                   |      |        |       |               |       |      |              |          |                     |                  |                     |
| Career Development                                    | ✓                    |     |      | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              | ✓           | ✓      | ✓     |                  | ✓      | ✓         | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       |               | ✓     |      | ✓            | NS       | Confirm eligibility | NS               | ✓                   |
| Creation  | ✓                    |     |      | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              | NS          | ✓      | ✓     | ✓                |        |           |       |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       |               | ✓     |      | ✓            | ✓        | Confirm eligibility | NS               | ✓                   |
| Documentation   | ✓                    |     |      | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              | ✓           | ✓      | ✓     |                  |        |           | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       |               | ✓     |      | ✓            | NS       | Confirm eligibility | NS               | ✓                   |
| Artist in Residence                                   | ✓                    | ✓   | ✓    | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              | ✓           | NS     | NS    | ✓                | ✓      | ✓         | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       | ✓             |       |      | ✓            | NS       | Confirm eligibility | NS               | ✓                   |
| Arts Scholarships                                     | ✓                    |     |      | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              |             |        |       |                  |        |           | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       | ✓             |       |      | ✓            | ✓        | Confirm eligibility | NS               | ✓                   |
| Creative Residencies                                  | ✓                    |     |      | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              | ✓           |        |       | ✓                |        |           | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       | ✓             |       |      | ✓            | NS       | Confirm eligibility | ✓                | ✓                   |
| Arts Infrastructure Grants for New & Emerging Artists | ✓                    |     |      | NS     | NS   | NS  | ✓              | ✓           |        | ✓     | ✓                |        |           | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       | ✓             |       |      | ✓            | ✓        | Confirm eligibility | NS               | ✓                   |
| Aboriginal Arts Capacity Building Program             | ✓                    | ✓   | ✓    |        | ✓    |     | ✓              | ✓           | ✓      | ✓     |                  | ✓      |           | ✓     |                   | ✓    | ✓      |       | ✓             |       |      | ✓            | NS       | Confirm eligibility | ✓                | ✓                   |



**Table 2: Public Arts Funding Administration in Selected Canadian Jurisdictions**

|   | Federal Government   | Manitoba   | Ontario  | Quebec   | Newfoundland and Labrador  | Nova Scotia   | New Brunswick  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Main arts funding organizations (date of creation <sup>14</sup> ) | Canada Council for the Arts (1957)<br><br>Department of Canadian Heritage (1969)   | Manitoba Arts Council (1965)<br><br>Manitoba Culture, Heritage, Sport and Consumer Protection (1970)   | Ontario Arts Council (1963)<br><br>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (1974)   | Ministère de la culture et des communications (1961)<br><br>Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec (1992)   | Dept of Business, Tourism, Culture and Rural Devt (1975)<br><br>Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council - ArtsNL (1980)                                     | Communities Culture and Heritage (c. 1975)<br><br>Arts Nova Scotia (1995) <sup>15</sup>   | Department of Tourism, Culture and Heritage (1968)<br><br>ArtsNB (1990)  |
| Arts council: key program responsibilities                        | Individual/organization grants for creation and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to arts and arts service organizations<br><br>Art bank | Individual/organization grants for creation and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Arts education                     | Individual/organization grants for creation and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Arts education     | Individual/organization grants for creation, training and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Arts education                   | Individual/organization grants for creation and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Professional festivals<br><br>Arts education | Individual/organization grants for creation and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Arts education<br><br>Art bank<br><br>Support4Culture: individual/org'l grants co-managed with dept | Individual/organization grants for creation, professional development and capacity building  |
| Cultural department: key program responsibilities                 | Festivals<br><br>Arts infrastructure<br><br>Organizational capacity building<br><br>Professional artists' training                           | Festivals<br><br>Individual/organization grants for creation and presentation<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>MB art collection | Festivals/events<br><br>Organizational capacity building<br><br>Art collection (at Ministry of Government and Consumer Services) | Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Org'l capacity building<br><br>Professional artists' training<br><br>Arts education<br><br>Arts infrastructure | Festivals/events<br><br>Cultural economic devt   | Support4Culture: individual/org'l grants co-managed with Arts NS  | Some individual grants for creation, presentation, touring<br><br>Operating funding to organizations<br><br>Organizational capacity building<br><br>Art bank |

<sup>14</sup> Dates refer to original founding of a cultural department or arts council (organizational names may have changed over the years).

<sup>15</sup> The Nova Scotia Arts Council was disbanded in 2002, but reestablished in 2011.

ArtsNB Study Report – Appendices 2 and 3

|   |  |  |   |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|   |  |  |   |   |  |   | Art education   |
| Reporting structures for funding programs and competition results | Canada Council: detailed breakdowns in annual reports<br><br>Dept: totals in annual reports and competition results on website | Manitoba Arts Council: detailed breakdowns in annual reports<br><br>Dept: totals and some competition results in annual report | Ontario Arts Council: detailed breakdowns in annual reports<br><br>Dept: totals in annual report; some results on website | Dept: detailed breakdowns in annual reports<br><br>Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec: detailed breakdowns in annual reports | Dept: totals in annual report<br><br>Arts NL: competition results on website | Dept: limited reporting on website <sup>16</sup><br><br>Arts NS: limited reporting on website <sup>17</sup> | Dept: totals in annual report; results on website<br><br>ArtsNB: breakdowns in annual reports |

Sources: Barrieau and Bourgeois 2011, Cohnstaedt and Jeannotte 2011, Gattinger 2011, Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2010, Marontate 2011, Rompkey 2011, Saint-Pierre 2011, websites and annual reports of the organizations listed above.

<sup>16</sup> An annual report could not be located on the Department's website.

<sup>17</sup> An annual report could not be located on Arts Nova Scotia's website.