

British Columbia Arts Council and
British Columbia Touring Council

Final Report

September, 2003

Review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program

Table of Contents

Introduction and Approach..... 2
Program Overview 3
Review Findings 4
General Conclusion and Observations 9
The Way Forward 10

Appendix A : Summary of Review of Community Presenter Assistance Applications and Final Reports 1999 – 2002
Appendix B : Summary of Internet Survey Results
Appendix C: Interview Guides
Appendix D : Review Framework
Appendix E : Table of Survey and Interview Respondents
Appendix F : Program Guidelines and Application Package

Introduction and Approach

Background

The landscape for arts presenters has been marked by increasing competition for scarce funds and audiences, particularly in smaller and more remote communities. There are also tensions between promoting diversity in programming and maintaining a core customer base.

To help ensure that the needs of touring artists and presenters are being addressed, the British Columbia Arts Council (“BCAC”), in partnership with the British Columbia Touring Council (“BCTC”), sought a review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program (“Program”).

Scope and Objectives for the Review

The intent of this review was to provide an independent and objective assessment of the rationale for the Program, the extent to which current objectives remain relevant and are being met, and to a lesser degree, its administration.

In so doing, the specific expectations were that Grant Thornton LLP would evaluate:

- ❑ The degree to which the Program is achieving its objectives.

- ❑ Whether current objectives reflect the needs of touring artists and presenters.
- ❑ Program structure, eligibility criteria, the level of financial support, and methods of delivery.

Summary of Approach

The approach consisted of the following:

- ❑ Consolidation and an analysis of available Program statistics coupled with a review of documentation.
- ❑ An Internet-based survey of past and current clients of the Program.
- ❑ In-person and telephone interviews with management and senior staff of the BCTC, BCAC, and the Department of Canadian Heritage (refer to Appendix F).
- ❑ Interviews with non-clients of the Program as well as a focus group and seminar at the Pacific Contact 2003 conference with presenters.

Overall, what the BCAC sought was a general conclusion on the continued effectiveness and need for the Program.

Program Overview

The guiding principles for the Program are:

- ❑ **Access:** making the performing arts accessible throughout the province.
- ❑ **Community leadership:** providing for community-based decision-making.
- ❑ **Local support:** acknowledgment of community financial and service contributions.
- ❑ **Merit:** encouragement of artistic quality in all programming.

Funded by the BCAC and administered by the BCTC in its current form for the past four-years, the primary objectives for the Program are:

- ❑ Building markets and audiences for touring British Columbia artists outside of metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria.
- ❑ Access for non-profit presenters to sponsor touring Canadian professional performing arts events.

At its core, the Program provides financial support to community and key presenters. Community presenters tend to be smaller, volunteer-run organizations such as concert or recital associations. Key presenters, in turn, are generally organizations that have paid professionals that run facilities and that can act as the “anchor point” or catalyst for touring in a given region.

The level of financial support varies from upwards of \$5,000 on an annual basis for key presenters, and \$3,000 (an increase from \$2,500 in earlier years) annually for community presenters. The funding for key presenters is intended to support programming and marketing activities, whereas for community presenters the expectation is that it will be used to engage professional artists and to enhance performing arts programs.

In both cases, the following criteria are to be met in order to receive support of this nature under the Program:

- ❑ Present primarily recognized and professional Canadian artists.
- ❑ Present a range of artistic disciplines.
- ❑ Encourage cooperation amongst presenters in the same geographic area.
- ❑ Present primarily arts events intended for an adult audience.

On an annual average basis, upwards of ten applications are received from key presenters and over 40 applications for assistance is received from community presenters.

Review Findings

This section summarizes the key findings from the telephone and in-person interviews, focus group, client survey and document review. These findings were evaluated in terms of the:

- ❑ State of program objectives.
- ❑ Application processes and criteria.
- ❑ Information and reporting systems.
- ❑ Program impacts.

To better allow the reader to determine the importance of the findings, the primary observations have been highlighted in blue. Our primary observations can be summarized as follows:

- ❑ The Program can demonstrate a strong rationale.
- ❑ The Program can demonstrate substantial economic and social impacts in the province.
- ❑ Current funding levels are not sufficient to promote a range in artistic disciplines and programming.
- ❑ The limit of one application from each community is creating a competitive situation.
- ❑ Geographic exclusions under the Program should be limited to metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria.
- ❑ Criteria for eligibility under the Program need to be updated.

- ❑ The application process is well supported and relatively streamlined.
- ❑ The manner in which the Arts Presentation Canada Initiative and the Program complement each other should be reflected in stated objectives and principles.
- ❑ A broad range of information is being collected on Program performance, but it is not apparent how this is being used to meet the decision-making needs of diverse stakeholders (e.g., general public, client groups, Boards, management, etc).
- ❑ An emphasis is being witnessed on the engagement of British Columbia based artists

The Program can demonstrate a strong rationale

It is apparent that there is a strong rationale for the Program. This is evidenced by seventy percent (70%) of those surveyed reporting that the Program is responding to demonstrated needs and almost ninety percent (90%) indicating that without it, there would be fewer presentations and, in some instances, no events. For many of the organizations surveyed, the Program is considered to be critical to maintaining annual operations.

The Program can demonstrate substantial economic and social impacts in the province

The Program has had a tremendous impact on the level of artistic activity in British Columbia. Since 1999, the Program has directly contributed towards the success of over 1,029 presentations covering musical, theatrical, dance and variety artist disciplines, attended by over

277,000 individuals, and which resulted in fees paid to artists of over \$3.2 million. Total expenses generated by the presenters over this period of time resulted in over \$6.25 million in economic activity for rural British Columbia.¹ This impact is made more salient when it is noted that 90% of survey respondents indicated that without the Program their first course of action would be to present fewer professional productions.

Current funding levels are not sufficient to promote a range in artistic disciplines and programming

It was commonly reported that the level of funding is currently not adequate to enable clients to fully embrace and realize the current objectives of the Program. Based on available data, key presenters annually spend in excess of \$55,000 on artists' fees. Community presenters, in turn, annually spend an average of \$11,890 on such fees. When this is compared to annual, approximate operating budgets (2002) of \$111,000 and \$21,000 respectively, over 50% of expenses are attributable to artists' fees. However, Program funding is limited to \$5,000 and \$3,000 respectively.²

As a result, the Program is at best enabling clients to maintain more of a "status quo" operating position. There is also a tendency in programming away from larger productions (including theatre, classical music and dance)

¹ *It should be noted, that these expenses exclude the economic impact of the associated volunteer activity. For the study period, presenters indicated that for every one paid employee of an organization, on average in excess of 21 individuals were involved in a volunteer capacity.*

² *A complete analysis of each region, as summarized from Program reports for the years 1999 to 2002, is provided in Appendix B.*

towards smaller productions so as to stay within the limited budgets of the organizations.

Interviews with the agents of artists, who actively work at offering a diverse range of talents, confirmed that presenters are not always encouraged by funding programs to expand their offerings away from mainstream presentations. In reviewing the final reports on a region-by-region basis, this was further corroborated in that three of the seven regions demonstrated a trend towards less program diversity as part of their annual presentations.

Taken as a whole, these findings are indicative of an operating environment where constrained funding results in smaller shows being staged that likely present less financial risk, but which come at the expense of variety and scale in artistic offerings and artists.

Addressing these findings may not be as patently obvious though, as increasing the grant amount for general application. While a majority of respondents expressed a desire to see the annual contributions increased, it is less clear whether these increases would be used to enhance professional artist programming and marketing, or to simply support existing operations.

The limit of one application from a community is creating a competitive situation.

For the fiscal years 1999 to 2002, the number of applicants has been fairly stable at approximately fifty (50) per year. Of this total, the Island region consistently accounts for almost one-third of total applications, followed by the South East region at approximately 23% (refer to Appendix A for a detailed map of the regions). Of the remaining 50%, the applications are received fairly

evenly from the other regions. As such, the geographic reach of the Program has not really changed over time.

The limitation of a single application from a community has resulted though, in the practice of joint submissions. In certain cases this has served to increase competition to the extent that not all presenters can collaborate on an application. As a result of joint submissions there is also a secondary risk of distributed accountability that can complicate accounting for the proper use of funding. However, this risk is greatly mitigated by the required final reporting of the Program.

Geographic exclusions under the Program should be limited to metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria

With respect to inherent structural and population-based advantages that presenters in larger cities have, Victoria and metropolitan Vancouver undoubtedly enjoy this to some extent and in comparison to other regions of the Province. Extending this argument beyond these two centers though, is a more difficult proposition. Neighboring communities to Victoria and metropolitan Vancouver are unlikely to realize any significant competitive advantages strictly resulting from their close proximity. Rather, the primary issue is probably the same as in the interior and more remote regions of the province, namely, access to and competition for, limited financial and non-financial resources.

When considering the increased cost of artists and productions in general, it is reasonable to expect that available funding is the paramount concern for presenters across the majority of the province. As such, any exclusion in terms of eligibility under the Program based on geography should be limited to Victoria and metropolitan Vancouver (i.e., in place of the current

exclusion of the Greater Vancouver Regional District and Capital Regional District). The advantage to maintaining such exclusions is that it would somewhat increase the level of investment that can be made in other areas of the province.

Criteria for eligibility under the Program need to be updated

Criteria relating to venue size, and diversity of programming through professional touring artists, may serve to discourage presenters from applying. In many of the province's rural communities, a venue with 300 or more seats may not exist, nor be appropriate for the size of the community. In addition, the economic risk of offering diverse and innovative events in a small community further discourages presenters from applying for assistance.

While the minimum venue size is intended to ensure that the key presenter's category includes facilities with a credible mass, we noted that throughout the four-year period the average percent utilization (i.e., actual attendance divided by available seats) was in the range of 50% to 65%. Similarly, in the community presenter category, the average attendance per event was approximately 178 seats, with an average total capacity of 305 seats, which equates to a ratio of approximately 58%.

The application process is well supported and relatively streamlined

With respect to the application process, it was generally reported (i.e., over 70% of survey respondents) that although the requirements may appear onerous at first given the level of funding that is provided, the forms are in reality easier to access and complete when compared to

other programs. All (100%) of the respondents indicated that sufficient guidance and assistance is available to properly complete the applications.

The significant strides that Program staff has made in making the application process easier for the proponent is further evidenced by a decrease in the number of incomplete applications from approximately sixteen (16) in fiscal 1999 to just six (6) in fiscal 2001. When put into the context that the number of applications over that same period remained constant, this represents an approximate 63% improvement in performance.

The ways in which the Program complements the Arts Presentation Canada Initiative needs to be clearly reflected in objectives and principles

It was reported that few Federal or Provincial granting programs are available to address the need for funding and to address such challenges as the increased costs of artists and productions. The majority of respondents further pointed out that the Program is considered complementary to local government funding sources and the ability to source revenues from ticket sales.

The Arts Presentation Canada initiative does offer, however, significant funding opportunities for presenters. This Federal offering is apparently focused on ensuring access to diverse and quality artistic events for all Canadians. This complements the Program's efforts in enabling the engagement of artists and enhancing the marketing efforts of presenters. The distinction becomes less clear though, in terms of funding support for diverse programming (i.e., this represents a potential overlap between the Program and Arts Presentation Canada). As such, an opportunity currently exists for the Program to refine its objectives, criteria and funding requirements to

make it even more evident how both initiatives complement each other in working towards their shared priorities.

A broad range of information is being collected on Program performance, but it is not apparent how this is being used to meet the decision-making needs of various stakeholders

Each applicant is required to submit detailed plans and information and, in addition, final reports are to be filed indicating the success in achieving the intended outcomes. The information that is collected broadly encompasses venue size, budget information, artist fees, and programming details. From the filed annual reports, trends and benchmarks can be tracked in terms of:

- Number of applicants by category;
- Number of events by category and region;
- Actual versus capacity for attendance;
- Revenues and expenses by category and type of facility by region;
- Artists fees paid by region and by year; and
- Diversity of programming by category.

However, while the annual report serves a definite role, it is unable to fully address the range of information needs of different stakeholders such as the general public, client groups, Boards, and executive.

An emphasis is being witnessed on the engagement of British Columbia based artists

In considering the emphasis on sponsoring touring British Columbia and Canadian artists, an analysis of the origin of hires by key presenters was carried out. Overall, there has

been an increase in the number of British Columbia based artists relative to other locations from roughly 36% in 1999-2000 to slightly more than 47% in 2001-2002. Artists from the Prairies and the Eastern regions have narrowly fluctuated within year-to-year variations of 3% to 4%, 8% to 11%, and 28% to 31% respectively. In contrast, the representation of international artists has diminished from 23% in 1999-2000 to just over 3% in 2001-2002. This indicates that Canadian artists are indeed being engaged, and that there is a growing prominence of artists from Western Canada and in particular, British Columbia.

General Conclusion and Observations

Overall, the Program can demonstrate a solid rationale for its existence. Furthermore, significant improvements have been made to the efficiency of processes, and positive impacts can be demonstrated as a result of the Program's existence.

There is a need, however, to re-evaluate the level of financial assistance that is provided, along with the purpose to be served by the Program and the requirements underlying eligibility for funding.

The results from this review demonstrate that there:

- ❑ Is a solid rationale for the continued existence of the Program in terms of demonstrated need.
- ❑ Are demonstrable economic and social impacts attributable to the Program including access to over 1,000 presentations in a variety of disciplines and the generation of more than \$6.25 million in economic activity across the province.
- ❑ Are currently few alternatives in terms of Federal or Provincial granting programs.
- ❑ Have been significant improvements made to the application processes and criteria, including the forms and available guidance.
- ❑ Are appropriate monitoring and reporting practices in the sense that applicants must provide detailed plans and information on results, and that this information is comprehensive.

A number of associated issues must be accounted for though, to ensure that the Program is both effective and sustainable over the longer term.

- ❑ The level of funding that is available is not sufficient to enable presenters to fully realize the objectives of the Program. Rather, there is a demonstrated tendency for programming to become more

conservative and smaller in scale as a means of guaranteeing a higher audience turnout.

- ❑ The limitation of a single application from a community has not increased the geographic reach of the Program or promoted cooperation.
- ❑ The manner in which the Program complements the Arts Presentation Canada initiative needs to be clear and reflected in the objectives, criteria and funding requirements.
- ❑ Eligibility criteria relating to venue size and variety of programming for key presenters should be updated to allow for greater flexibility.
- ❑ Current exclusions under the Program based on geography should be limited to Victoria and metropolitan Vancouver.
- ❑ The annual report cannot meet, by itself, all of the information needs for the range of Program stakeholders.

Overall, there is a need to re-evaluate the level of financial assistance that is provided, along with the purpose to be served by the Program and the requirements underlying eligibility for funding.

The Way Forward

After conducting the review, we arrived at a number of recommendations for action by the BCTC and BCAC in relation to the Program. These are profiled below.

Augment the level of financial support for the Program

The Program is viewed as a critical initiative that directly contributes towards the ongoing viability of presenters across the province, and in a manner that is generally complementary of other government programs. Coupled with other findings, there is a solid rationale for increasing the overall budget of the Program.

Update the objectives and criteria for the Program

The Program objectives and application criteria need to be updated by:

- ❑ Modifying the criteria on venue size and in the demonstration of variety in programming for key presenters to allow for greater flexibility.
- ❑ Allowing for multiple applications from communities, and at the same time, identifying potential changes to the approval process that recognize the existence of “niche” organizations with a well-defined audience and presentations.

- ❑ Ensuring more of an emphasis on enabling the engagement of artists, particularly from British Columbia, and enhancing promotional efforts in areas outside of Victoria and metropolitan Vancouver.
- ❑ Clarifying how the Arts Presentation Canada Initiative and the Program complement each other in encouraging access to, and offering of, diverse programming.

Be strategic in the reporting of Program performance

There is an opportunity to use collected information on Program performance to strategically meet the needs of various stakeholders, such as the public, client groups, Boards, funding agencies, partners and executive. As such, a reporting strategy should be prepared that clearly identifies and provides direction on:

- ❑ The primary external and internal decision-makers and users for information on the Program.
- ❑ The type of information that would be relevant based on the judgments that these stakeholders will make (e.g., overall effectiveness of the Program, “value for money”, equitability in access to funding, etc.).
- ❑ The avenues for reporting (e.g., local media, BCTC website, e-mail reports, etc.).

By adopting changes in keeping with these recommendations, it can be anticipated that the Program, through the BCTC, as well as the BCAC, will continue to play a valued role in British Columbia’s art community and be able to demonstrate its effectiveness to stakeholders.

Appendix A

Summary of Review of Community Presenter Assistance Applications and Final Reports 1999 – 2002

General Comments

Data was compiled from the various binders provided by the BCTC for the fiscal years 1999 to 2002 and entered into spreadsheets based on the year to which the data related. There were several categories for which the data was arranged for each applicant, such as number of events, capacity, revenue, expenses, artist fees, and previous grants received. The level of detail provided by the applications and final reports is sufficient to provide ample data for the analysis of results. From the information provided, the following general observations were made:

Observations:

1. The total number of applicants has been fairly consistent over the last four years at around 50.
2. Further insight into the total number of applicants each year revealed that there has been very slight increase in Assistance for Key Presenters applicants combined with a very slight decrease in Community Presentation Assistance applicants, even though the total number has been fairly constant.
3. Through the fiscal years 1999 and 2000 there were a fair number of incomplete applicants each year, which could not be included in the analysis. This might be attributed to new applicants not having kept the proper records that BCTC required. We noted that in the past two fiscal years the number of incomplete applications has decreased considerably.
4. The total number of confirmed AKP presentations has increased from 39 to 92 from 99-00 to 01-02.
5. The origin of the artists has seen an increase in the number of British Columbia based artists from 35.90% in 99-00 to 47.38% in 01-02 and the number of artists from the Maritimes, going from 2.56% in 99-00 to 9.78% in 01-02. This jump seems mainly to be at the expense of the international artists, whose representation has gone from 23.08% in 99-00 to 3.26% in 01-02. The artists from the Prairies and the Eastern regions have fluctuated within yearly variations of around 3-4%, 7.5-11% for the Prairies and 27.5-31% for the East.
6. There has not been much change in the distribution of the disciplines for the AKP applicants. However, within the Musical discipline there has been a major decline in the percentage of Classical artists, going from 50% in 99-00 to 24.07% in 01-02. This decrease has been mainly due to a rising percentage of Folk artists, going from 16.67% in 99-00 to 24.07% in 01-02, and an increase in the Other artists, which includes opera, a cappella, country, and pop music, going from 12.5% in 99-00 to 27.78% in 01-02. The other categories had no real patterns to analyze.

Assistance for Key Presenters

There are less than ten applicants for this type of grant each year. Therefore, they were grouped together and analyzed as one cohort. For each data category an average, maximum, and minimum value was calculated and arranged in a summary in order to make year-to-year comparisons and observations. For the purpose of this analysis only the average values were reviewed. The following general observations were made:

Observations:

1. The total number of applicants has been increasing from fiscal 1999 to 2000, going from five to eight over this period.
2. The average percent capacity has been staying fairly consistent between the 50 to 65% range. The average attendance in 2002 was 331 patrons per event.
3. The total number of events has increased slightly from fiscal 1999 to 2001, going from 12 events per year to 13.
4. Except for fiscal 2000, the actual revenues and expenses have been closely in line with budgeted amounts. However, total revenues and expenses have been declining since fiscal 1999.
5. Average annual artist fees have been on the decline since fiscal 1999, going from approx. \$78,000 to approx. \$55,000 in fiscal 2001.
6. Considering the number of events has increased, it is somewhat unusual that revenues, expenses and artist fees have all declined significantly since fiscal 1999. Further insight shows that one applicant, Nanaimo, is the reason for the decline. They were one of a few applicants a few years back and because their revenues and expenses were so much greater than the others, they caused the average to increase. The increasing number of applicants has caused the averages to decline because their amounts are a lot lower than Nanaimo.
7. Generally, the applicants offer a diverse range of events.

Community Presentation Assistance

These applicants were broken up into their respective regions within British Columbia and evaluated as such. For each data category an average, maximum, and minimum value was calculated and arranged in a summary in order to make year-to-year comparisons and observations, both within and across regions. For the purpose of this analysis only the average values were reviewed. Further, there was only one applicant in the North region fiscal 2001, so they have been excluded from this analysis. The following general observations for each region were made:

Island Region

1. The total number of applicants has been consistent at 11-12 per year.
2. The average number of events has been increasing from 99-00 to 01-02, going from 5.22 to 7.0.
3. The percent of attendance to facility capacity has increased dramatically from 00-01 to 01-02, going from 58.5% to 72.85%.
4. Actual revenues and expenses have been consistent with budgeted amounts over the last four years, and have both increased slightly each year starting in 99-00.
5. Artist fees have also increased slightly from year-to-year starting in 98-99. The average annual artists' fees in 2002 was approximately \$10,000.
6. The diversity of events is very sporadic for the applicants, ranging from only one type of discipline to many.
7. The total number of confirmed presentations has increased from 43 to 54 from 99-00 to 01-02.
8. The origin of the artists has seen an increase in the number of British Columbia based artists from 46.51% in 99-00 to 72.22% in 01-02. This jump seems mainly to be at the expense of the Eastern and International artists, whose representation has gone from 18.60% in 99-00 to 12.96% in 01-02, and 23.26% in 99-00 to 3.70% in 01-02, respectively. The artists from the Prairies and the Maritime regions have maintained their levels at around 9% and 2%, respectively.
9. There has been a shift in the distribution of the discipline of the artists. Musical artists have increased in representation from 67.44% in 99-00 to 87.04% in 01-02. This at the expense of the Dance artists, who have gone from 13.95% in 99-00 to 1.85% in 01-02. And the Variety artists, which include mimes, comedians and puppeteer's, who have gone from 6.98% in 99-00 to 1.85% in 01-02.
10. Within the Musical discipline there has been an increase in the number of Blues and Folk artists, going from 10.34% in 99-00 to 29.79% in 01-02 and 6.90% in 99-00 to 34.04% in 01-02, respectively. This at the expense of the Classical artists, who have dropped from 75.86% in 99-00 to 34.04% in 01-02.

South West Region

1. The total number of applicants has been consistent at 5 per year over the last three years.
2. The average number of events has been slightly increasing from 99-00 to 01-02, going from 4.5 to 5.8.
3. In contrast to the Island region the percent of attendance to facility capacity has decreased dramatically from 00-01 to 01-02, going from 79% to 56.4%.
4. Actual revenues and expenses were under budget for the 99-00 and 01-02. However, actual revenues and expenses have been increasing between \$4,000 and \$6,000 each year for the past 3 years.
5. Artist fees have been increasing from year-to-year starting in 99-00. Average annual fees paid to artists in 2002 was approximately \$14,500.
6. The diversity of events is very sporadic for the applicants, ranging from only one to few types of disciplines to many.
7. The total number of confirmed presentations has increased slightly from 17 to 24 from 99-00 to 01-02.
8. The origin of the artists has seen a decrease in the number of British Columbia based artists from 58.82% in 99-00 to 50% in 01-02. There has also been a decrease in the number of International and Maritime artists, from 11.76% in 99-00 to 4.17% in 01-02 and 5.88% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02, respectively. These declines have meant that the Prairie and Eastern artists have increased. The Prairie artists from 5.88% in 99-00 to 12.50% in 01-02, and the Eastern artists from 17.65% in 99-00 to 33.33% in 01-02.
9. There has been a bit of shift in the distribution of the discipline of the artists with Musical artists declining from 82.35% in 99-00 to 62.50% in 01-02 combined with an increase in the Variety type artists going from 0% in 99-00 to 16.67% in 01-02. There has also been an increase in Theatrical artists, going from 0% in 99-00 to 8.33% in 01-02.
10. Within the Musical discipline there has been a slight change in distribution between a few categories. The Blues artists have declined from 28.57% in 99-00 to 20% in 01-02, while the Folk artists have increased from 14.29% in 99-00 to 26.67% in 01-02.

South Central Region

1. The total number of applicants has been consistent over the last four years, at 6-7 each year.
2. The average number of events is up slightly from 00-01 to 01-02, going from 3.75 to 4.33.

3. The percent of attendance to facility capacity has increased from 00-01 to 01-02, going from 56% to 66%.
4. Actual revenues and expenses have generally been in line with budgeted amounts, and have generally experienced an upward trend since 98-99. Although, actual expenses leveled off from 00-01 to 01-02.
5. Artist fees have been increasing from year-to-year starting in 99-00. Average annual fees paid to artists in 2002 was approximately \$11,100.
6. When compared to the average number of events put on each year, the diversity of events has been fairly good.
7. The total number of confirmed presentations has increased slightly from 8 to 12 from 99-00 to 01-02.
8. The origin of the artists has seen an increase in the number of British Columbia based artists from 25% in 99-00 to 50% in 01-02 and the number of artists from the Prairies, going from 0% in 99-00 to 33.33% in 01-02. This jump has been at the expense of the artists from the East, the Maritimes, and the International artists. The Eastern artists have gone from 25% in 99-00 to 8.33% in 01-02. The artists from the Maritimes have gone from 25% in 99-00 to 8.33% in 01-02. And, the International artists have gone from 25% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02.
9. There has been a bit of shift in the distribution of the discipline of the artists with Musical artists increasing from 62.50% in 99-00 to 75% in 01-02 combined with an increase in the Variety type artists going from 0% in 99-00 to 8.33% in 01-02. Except for Theatrical artists who haven't been above 0% except in 00-01 where representation was 20%, all other disciplines have decreased. Dance artists have gone from 12.50% in 99-00 to 8.33% in 01-02. And, Other artists have gone from 25% in 99-00 to 8.33% in 01-02.
10. Within the Musical discipline there has been an increase in the number of Classical and Other artists, going from 40% in 99-00 to 66.67% in 01-02 and 0% in 99-00 to 11% in 01-02, respectively. This at the expense of the Blues, Folk and Celtic artists. Blues have dropped from 20% in 99-00 to 11.11% in 01-02. Folk have dropped from 20% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02. And, Celtic artists who have dropped from 20% in 99-00 to 11.11% in 01-02.

South East Region

1. The total number of applicants has been consistent over the last four years, at 10 each year.
2. The average number of events has been consistent over the last three years, at between 6.5 and 7.
3. The percent of attendance to facility capacity has decreased from 00-01 to 01-02, going from 52% to 44%.

4. Actual revenues and expenses have generally been in line with budgeted amounts, except for the 00-01 period, which saw actual revenues around \$10,000 under budget. On the other hand, actual revenues and expenses have declined by around \$9,000 and \$7,000, respectively.
5. Artist fees have been relatively consistent each year, for the past 4 years. Average annual fees paid to artists in 2002 was approximately \$10,900.
6. The diversity of events is very sporadic for the applicants, ranging from only one to few types of disciplines to many.
7. The total number of confirmed presentations has increased from 27 to 42 from 99-00 to 01-02.
8. The origin of the artists has not changed much from 99-00 to 01-02, except for 00-01, when artists from the Prairies and Maritimes increased at the expense of artists from the East.
9. The distribution of the artists discipline has also not change significantly. The majority of events are musical, staying between 82% and 90% from 99-00 to 01-02. The rest of the disciplines have only varied slightly over the same time frame.
10. Within the Musical discipline there has been a decrease in the number of Classical and Blues artists, going from 66.37% in 99-00 to 60% in 01-02 and 16.67% in 99-00 to 11.43% in 01-02, respectively. The Folk and Celtic artists have been the beneficiaries of the decline in representation for the aforementioned disciplines. Folk has increased from 12.50% in 99-00 to 17.14% in 01-02. And, Celtic has increased from 0% in 99-00 to 8.57% in 01-02.

North Central Region

1. The total number of applicants has experienced an increasing trend over the last four years, going from 4 in 98-98 to 8 in 01-02.
2. The average number of events has been between the 4 and 6 range over the last four years, with the number dropping from 5.67 in 00-01 to 4.5 in 01-02.
3. The percent of attendance to facility capacity has decreased from 65% in 99-00, with it being 43% in 00-01 and 44% in 01-02.
4. Actual revenues and expenses have generally been in line with budgeted amounts over the last four years. However, actual revenues and expenses in 01-02 have declined over the prior year.
5. Artist fees have varied over the last four years, going up or down by approx. \$2,000. The 01-02 period, saw a drop of about \$2,000. Average annual fees paid to artists in 2002 was approximately \$11,000.

6. When compared to the average number of events put on each year, the diversity of events has been fairly good.
7. The total number of confirmed presentations has decreased slightly from 10 to 7 from 99-00 to 01-02.
8. The origin of the artists has seen a decrease in the number of British Columbia based artists from 60% in 99-00 to 42.86% in 01-02, and the number of International artists, going from 20% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02. This jump has been to the benefit of the artists from the East and the Prairies. The Eastern artists have gone from 10% in 99-00 to 42.86% in 01-02. And, the artists from the Prairies have gone from 10% in 99-00 to 14.29% in 01-02.
9. There has been a bit of shift in the distribution of the discipline of the artists with Musical artists increasing from 50% in 99-00 to 57.14% in 01-02 combined with an increase in the Other type artists going from 10% in 99-00 to 28.57% in 01-02. All other disciplines have decreased as a result. Theatrical artists have gone from 10% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02. Dance artists have gone from 10% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02. And, Variety artists have gone from 20% in 99-00 to 14.29% in 01-02.
10. Within the Musical discipline there has been an increase in the number of Classical, Folk and Celtic artists. Classical artists going from 20% in 99-00 to 25% in 01-02. Folk artists going from 20% in 99-00 to 25% in 01-02. And, Celtic artists going from 0% in 99-00 to 25% in 01-02. This at the expense of the Blues and Other artists. Blues have dropped from 40% in 99-00 to 25% in 01-02. And Other artists have dropped from 20% in 99-00 to 0% in 01-02.

North West Region

1. The total number of applicants has been declining since 98-99, from 5 applicants in that year to 3 in 01-02.
2. The average number of events has varied over the last four years, alternating between a decrease and an increase. The 01-02 period, saw a drop over the prior year, from 8.75 in 00-01 to 4.5 in 01-02.
3. The percent of attendance to facility capacity has been declining over the past three years, going from 55% in 99-00 to 37.6% in 01-02.
4. Actual revenues and expenses have generally been in line with budgeted amounts over the last four years, except for the 01-02 revenues and the 00-01 expenses. On the other hand, actual revenues and expenses have decreased by over \$10,000 from 00-01 to 01-02.
5. Artist fees had been increasing each year from 98-99 to 00-01, but they dropped by just over \$6,000 between 00-01 and 01-02. Average annual fees paid to artists in 2002 were approximately \$11,200.
6. When compared to the average number of events put on each year, the diversity of events has been fairly good.

7. The total number of confirmed presentations has decreased slightly from 19 to 16 from 99-00 to 01-02.
8. The origin of the artists has seen an increase in the number of British Columbia based artists from 31.58% in 99-00 to 50% in 01-02. This jump has been mainly at the expense of the artists from the East and the Maritimes. The Eastern artists have gone from 36.84% in 99-00 to 31.25% in 01-02. And, the artists from the Maritimes have gone from 21.05% in 99-00 to 6.25% in 01-02.
9. There has been a bit of shift in the distribution of the discipline of the artists with Musical artists decreasing from 78.95% in 99-00 to 62.50% in 01-02 combined with an increase in the Other type artists going from 10.53% in 99-00 to 31.25% in 01-02. All other disciplines have not changed significantly.
10. Within the Musical discipline there has been an increase in the number of Classical and Celtic artists. Classical artists going from 13.33% in 99-00 to 40% in 01-02. And, Celtic artists going from 6.67% in 99-00 to 20% in 01-02. This at the expense of the Blues and Folk artists. Blues have dropped from 53.33% in 99-00 to 20% in 01-02. And Folk artists have dropped from 26.67% in 99-00 to 20% in 01-02.

CPA Vancouver Island Region*Mean (Average) Values:*

| Year | # of | | Attend. | % Capacity | | Revenue | | Expenses | | Artists | BCAC | Grant |
|-------|--------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|
| | Events | Capacity | | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Fees | Contribution | Requested | | |
| 98-99 | 5.63 | 1,771.25 | 872.13 | 56.73% | 14,535.13 | 17,104.38 | 14,328.38 | 14,328.38 | 7,923.63 | 1,712.50 | 2,406.25 | |
| 99-00 | 5.22 | 1,588.00 | 757.44 | 55.08% | 16,875.67 | 15,837.33 | 16,836.00 | 16,230.56 | 9,468.78 | 2,350.33 | 2,444.44 | |
| 00-01 | 6.33 | 1,809.11 | 871.11 | 58.51% | 18,526.22 | 18,508.00 | 18,498.33 | 20,156.44 | 11,005.00 | 2,416.67 | 2,816.67 | |
| 01-02 | 7.00 | 1,398.33 | 1,012.11 | 72.85% | 17,458.11 | 20,843.11 | 18,325.11 | 20,497.22 | 10,020.33 | 2,815.67 | 2,769.78 | |

CPA - South West Region*Mean (Average) Values:*

| Year | # of | | Attend. | % Capacity | | Revenue | | Expenses | | Artists | BCAC | Grant |
|-------|--------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|
| | Events | Capacity | | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Fees | Contribution | Requested | | |
| 98-99 | 11.50 | 2,334.50 | 1,550.00 | 66.28% | 26,641.00 | 39,851.50 | 39,179.00 | 39,179.00 | 20,338.50 | 1,250.00 | 2,500.00 | |
| 99-00 | 4.50 | 1,351.00 | 812.00 | 50.41% | 19,362.50 | 14,278.75 | 20,499.00 | 16,679.75 | 7,782.50 | 1,687.50 | 2,500.00 | |
| 00-01 | 5.25 | 1,307.75 | 1,045.50 | 79.08% | 19,768.50 | 20,461.25 | 21,245.50 | 21,188.25 | 12,572.75 | 2,350.00 | 2,875.00 | |
| 01-02 | 5.80 | 1,613.20 | 935.00 | 56.40% | 30,447.60 | 26,084.35 | 31,125.80 | 25,708.90 | 14,462.20 | 2,640.00 | 2,868.00 | |

CPA - South Central Region*Mean (Average) Values:*

| Year | # of Events | Capacity | Attend. | % Capacity | Revenue | | Expenses | | Artists Fees | BCAC Contribution | Grant Requested |
|-------|----------------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | | | |
| 98-99 | 4.50 | 1,426.00 | 1,121.75 | 78.37% | 16,061.75 | 14,343.00 | 12,695.25 | 12,695.25 | 8,291.00 | 1,879.50 | 2,487.50 |
| 99-00 | 4.00 | 1,116.00 | 748.33 | 67.75% | 14,306.67 | 13,128.33 | 15,774.67 | 13,139.67 | 8,229.33 | 1,666.67 | 2,286.67 |
| 00-01 | 3.75 | 1,235.25 | 691.50 | 55.85% | 18,555.00 | 18,052.00 | 16,551.25 | 18,642.50 | 10,050.00 | 1,562.50 | 2,250.00 |
| 01-02 | 4.33 | 1,369.33 | 874.00 | 66.24% | 20,783.33 | 20,418.00 | 20,183.00 | 18,164.00 | 11,102.67 | 2,200.00 | 3,000.00 |

CPA - South East Region*Mean (Average) Values:*

| Year | # of Events | Capacity | Attend. | % Capacity | Revenue | | Expenses | | Artists Fees | BCAC Contribution | Grant Requested |
|-------|----------------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | | | |
| 98-99 | 4.57 | 1,982.57 | 1,008.43 | 49.83% | 16,908.71 | 16,961.14 | 14,298.57 | 14,298.57 | 11,630.14 | 2,835.71 | 2,500.00 |
| 99-00 | 6.83 | 1,625.83 | 717.00 | 46.04% | 25,004.83 | 23,286.00 | 24,413.50 | 24,565.33 | 9,898.17 | 4,212.33 | 2,500.00 |
| 00-01 | 6.56 | 1,993.89 | 1,182.78 | 52.09% | 35,538.00 | 25,873.44 | 24,702.00 | 24,203.11 | 10,757.00 | 4,242.67 | 3,000.00 |
| 01-02 | 6.89 | 1,566.56 | 698.56 | 44.13% | 15,803.22 | 16,971.00 | 15,397.00 | 16,868.11 | 10,884.00 | 3,880.11 | 2,495.67 |

CPA - North Central Region*Mean (Average) Values:*

| Year | # of Events | Capacity | Attend. | % Capacity | Revenue | | Expenses | | Artists Fees | BCAC Contribution | Grant Requested |
|-------|----------------|----------|---------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | | | |
| 98-99 | 5.20 | 1,405.00 | 754.60 | 54.95% | 11,325.80 | 10,781.00 | 11,498.80 | 11,498.80 | 8,170.80 | 2,100.00 | 2,038.00 |
| 99-00 | 4.00 | 1,145.00 | 773.33 | 64.69% | 10,588.33 | 11,004.67 | 11,472.00 | 10,590.00 | 6,965.67 | 2,113.33 | 1,950.00 |
| 00-01 | 5.67 | 1,720.00 | 783.33 | 42.96% | 17,988.00 | 17,423.67 | 17,877.00 | 17,490.33 | 12,623.33 | 3,200.00 | 2,796.67 |
| 01-02 | 4.50 | 1,487.50 | 711.50 | 43.75% | 15,894.50 | 14,747.50 | 17,962.50 | 16,579.50 | 10,960.50 | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 |

CPA - North West Region*Mean (Average) Values:*

| Year | # of Events | Capacity | Attend. | % Capacity | Revenue | | Expenses | | Artists Fees | BCAC Contribution | Grant Requested |
|-------|----------------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | | | |
| 98-99 | 6.00 | 2,833.33 | 1,293.67 | 52.10% | 22,273.33 | 24,852.33 | 22,403.00 | 22,403.00 | 14,482.00 | 2,166.67 | 2,500.00 |
| 99-00 | 5.33 | 2,178.67 | 1,231.33 | 54.81% | 25,084.33 | 25,838.67 | 24,364.67 | 24,661.67 | 16,503.33 | 2,500.00 | 2,500.00 |
| 00-01 | 8.75 | 2,838.75 | 1,393.25 | 47.90% | 25,813.75 | 27,989.25 | 37,785.00 | 28,770.25 | 17,578.00 | 3,132.75 | 3,000.00 |
| 01-02 | 4.50 | 1,450.00 | 554.50 | 37.61% | 18,170.00 | 13,464.00 | 16,628.50 | 16,612.00 | 11,175.50 | 3,000.00 | 2,900.00 |

Appendix B

Summary of Internet Survey Results

1. Based on the principles and objectives of the program, is CPAP meeting or exceeding your expectations of the program?

Yes – 70%

Why – 30% No’s indicated that funding is insufficient.

2. Could you please tell us a bit about your organization:

| | <u>2001</u> | <u>2000</u> | <u>1999</u> |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Number of paid staff | Avg. 4.20 | 3.15 | 2.93 |
| Number of Volunteers | Avg. 92 | 83.50 | 57.86 |
| Annual operating budget | Avg. 272,000 | 239,000 | 188,000 |
| CPAP funding received | Avg. 3,056 | 2,689 | 2,178 |
| Annual number of presentations | Avg. 11.73 | 10.05 | 8.05 |
| Total attendance at all events | Avg. 88,497 | 64,600 | 52,926 |

3. How many years has your organization been operating? - Avg. 21.83

4. On a scale of 1 to 5, to what extent do the following items challenge your operations: (1 – No impact; 3 moderate impact, 5 severe impact).

| | Average |
|--|--|
| 1. Available level of, and competition for, core funding | 4.4 |
| 2. Increased production/artist costs | 4.1 |
| 3. Recruitment and retention of staff and volunteers | 2.9 |
| 4. Audience and/or market development | 3.7 |
| 5. Remoteness of location relative to other communities | 3.3 |
| 6. Competition for entertainment dollars in your community | 3.5 |
| 7. Other | 0 – Marketing and advertising seen as impediments. |

5. Please tell us how you first became aware of this program?

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| ▪ B.C. Arts Council | 14 |
| ▪ B.C. Touring Council | 6 |
| ▪ Web site | - |
| ▪ Referral | - |
| ▪ Other | - |
| ▪ Pacific Contact | 4 |

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, to what extent do the following represent opportunities for your operations:

| | |
|---|-----|
| ▪ Strong artistic pool of talent | 4.2 |
| ▪ Artistic consistency and high quality | 4.7 |
| ▪ Local cultural tourism initiatives | 3.3 |
| ▪ Demographics of your community | 3.5 |
| ▪ Other | - |

7. Do the CPAP objectives, as summarized in the cover to this survey, reflect the pressures being faced by, and the needs of, your organization? (1 – reflects needs of my organization, 5 – does not reflect our needs)

Avg. 2.7

- If you indicated that CPAP objectives are not reflective of the pressures and needs faced by your organization, how could they be changed to make them more relevant?

8. Does your organization receive other grants from government or other agencies?

Yes - 86%

9. Does the CPAP complement, rather than duplicate, other funding initiatives and sources? - Yes – 86%

- Can you provide an example of how you see it being complementary:
 - Program provides specific funding for artists and non-traditional purposes.

10. In comparison to other funding programs how does CPAP compare as concerns:

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| ▪ Accessing application forms | Easier – 77% |
| ▪ Ability to understand the application requirements | Easier – 72% |
| ▪ Time taken to render a decision and for receipt of the funds | Faster – 63% |
| ▪ Final reporting requirements | Easier – 63% |

In your opinion, was there sufficient guidance and assistance available?
to properly complete the application? Yes

If NO, what was lacking in terms of guidance and supporting material?

No comments

Is there any information that, in your opinion, is being requested for the
final report that is not relevant or useful for determining how funding
was used and the results? Yes

If YES, how could the final reporting requirements be changed to make them more useful?

No comments

11. How do you feel that the British Columbia Touring Council utilizes the information that you provide in the final report:

Not sure – 10/18
To assess future funding – 7/18

12. If CPAP did not exist, how would this impact or change your operations (Please check all that apply)

- No impact
 - Fewer presentations 90%
 - Lay-off staff
 - Would not access British Columbia professional touring artists
 - Would not access Canadian professional artists
 - Other – (describe) _____
-

13. If you had a magic wand how would you change CPAP?

Available funding – 55%

14. Do you have any other comments regarding the future of CPAP, or its importance to your operations?

20/20 indicated that they are very pleased with the program.

Appendix C

Interview Guides

Review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program

INTERVIEW GUIDE: BC ARTS COUNCIL (BC TOURING COUNCIL)

As you know, we are carrying out a review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program (“Program”), with the primary focus being a determination of the degree to which it is meeting its objectives, and whether these objectives reflect the needs of touring artists and presenters. To make the most out of the time available, we have prepared some questions beforehand.

1. Looking at the objectives and principles for the Program, and in your opinion, do these **adequately describe its mandate and priorities** as it relates to providing assistance to community-based presenters?

The objectives of the Program are:

- Building markets and audiences for touring British Columbia artists outside metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria; and,
- Assisting not-for-profit presenters that sponsor touring Canadian professional performing arts events.

The guiding principles of the Program are:

- Access – making the performing arts accessible throughout the province.
- Community leadership – recognition of the importance of community-based Program decisions.
- Local support – acknowledgment of community financial and service contributions.
- Merit – encouragement of artistic quality in all programming.

2. How do you see these objectives and principles for the Program:
 - Supporting the priorities of the BC Arts Council (BC Touring Council)?**
 - Reflecting the needs and pressures that are faced by community-based presenters** including greater competition for funding, high reliance on volunteers, and the diversity within and across communities?
3. How does this Program **relate to the Arts Presentation Canada and Cultural Initiatives programs** of the Department of Canadian Heritage?
4. What **feedback have you received, if any, on the application process** in terms of:
 - The ability to access and understand the application forms and requirements?
 - The time that it takes to render a decision and then receive the funding?
5. Do you feel that the **current criteria for eligibility under the Program remain appropriate**, or are there any that should be changed to reflect the needs of existing or potential clients?
 - Diversity of programming (note there seems to be more specialized and niche offerings).
 - Professional, full-time touring artists (which does not recognize emerging artists nor allow for choirs, ballet schools, and other types of offerings).
 - Minimum venue size (300 seats).
 - Geography (should the program expand to the Lower Mainland and Victoria?)
6. Do you feel that the **final reporting requirements remain appropriate** in terms of collecting information that is needed for determining how the funding was used, and the results?

Is there information that is being collected that is not critical for these purposes, and alternatively, information that should be collected but currently is not?

How **is this information being used** in terms of managing the Program?

What **assurances** are there that the reported information is accurate?

7. Based on your experiences with the Program, how would you **describe the impacts it has had on local communities and presenters?**
8. Is there anything else that we have not discussed, but that relates to the **Program, its performance and opportunities for improvement?**

Review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program

INTERVIEW GUIDE: DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

On behalf of the BC Arts Council and the British Columbia Touring Council, we are carrying out a review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program (“CPAP”). The primary focus for this review is on determining the degree to which it is meeting its objectives, and whether these objectives reflect the needs of touring artists and presenters. All information that is provided will be aggregated. To make the most out of the time available, we have prepared some questions beforehand.

1. To begin, please describe for me the **intent and nature of the assistance that is provided through the Arts Presentation Canada and Cultural Initiatives programs.**
2. Looking at the objectives for the CPAP, and the type of assistance that is provided, do these **complement the assistance and services that are provided for through Canadian Heritage?**

The objectives of CPAP are:

- Building markets and audiences for touring British Columbia artists outside metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria; and,
- Assisting not-for-profit presenters that sponsor touring Canadian professional performing arts events.

Assistance is available in two categories:

- Key presenters – awards up to \$5,000 annually to enhance the programming or marketing activities of major community-based performing arts presenters.
- Community Presenters Assistance – awards up to \$3,000 annually to enable the engagement of professional artists and enhance performing arts programs.

3. Are there any potential areas of overlap or duplication, and if so, what are they?

Reference was made to partnership negotiations, and to the extent that this is accurate, can you tell me the status of these negotiations?

4. Is there anything else that we have not discussed, but that relates to CPAP, **its administration and opportunities for improvement**?

Review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program

INTERVIEW GUIDE: POTENTIAL APPLICANTS

On behalf of the BC Arts Council and the British Columbia Touring Council, we are carrying out a review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program (“Program”). The primary focus for this review is on determining the degree to which it is meeting its objectives, and whether these objectives reflect the needs of touring artists and presenters. All information that is provided will be aggregated. To make the most out of the time available, we have prepared some questions beforehand.

1. To begin, please describe for me the **nature of your organization and its history**.
2. Have you **heard about the Program before**, or is this interview the first time that you were made aware of its existence?
3. Looking at the objectives for the Program, and the type of assistance that is provided, do these **adequately reflect the needs of organizations such as yours, and the pressures facing community presenters?**

The objectives of the Program are:

- Building markets and audiences for touring British Columbia artists outside metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria; and,
- Assisting not-for-profit presenters that sponsor touring Canadian professional performing arts events.

Assistance is available in two categories:

- Key presenters – awards up to \$5,000 annually to enhance the programming or marketing activities of major community-based performing arts presenters.
- Community Presenters Assistance – awards up to \$3,000 annually to enable the engagement of professional artists and enhance performing arts programs.

4. Recognizing your level of familiarity with the Program, do you feel that the **current criteria for determining eligibility for assistance are appropriate**, or are there any that should be changed to reflect the needs of potential clients such as yourself?
- Diversity of programming (note there seems to be more specialized and niche offerings).
 - Professional, full-time touring artists (which does not recognize emerging artists nor allow for choirs, ballet schools, and other types of offerings).
 - Minimum venue size (300 seats).
 - Geography (should the program expand to the Lower Mainland and Victoria?)

5. If you were to become a client of the Program, how would you describe your **expectations with respect to the level and type of assistance that is provided?**

What about any **expectations in terms of how the program is administered**, such as the timing for making funds available, distribution of awards within and across communities, and reporting requirements?

6. Is there anything else that we have not discussed, but that relates to the **Program, its administration and opportunities for improvement?**

Appendix D

Review Framework

| CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS | REVIEW QUESTIONS | REVIEW METRICS | DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION STRATEGIES |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>I. Program goals and objectives should be clearly defined and relevant in relation to the needs of clients and the operating context.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Have goals, objectives and principles for the program been formalized and documented?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If so, are these goals, objectives and principles clear and aligned with those of the BC Arts Council? 2. How consistent are these program goals, objectives and principles with the pressures being faced by, and needs of, community and key presenters? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What financial (funding, artist fees, etc.) and other pressures are key and community presenters facing? • Why have prior clients not submitted subsequent applications? 3. Does the program complement or duplicate other initiatives, particularly those of the Department of Canadian Heritage (Arts Presentation Canada, Cultural Initiatives Program)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the status of partnership negotiations? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of program profile or plan with defined goals, objectives and principles • Reported trends in audience size and artist fees by fiscal year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person and telephone interviews with BCAC and BCAC representatives • Historic and current client survey • Client focus group • Telephone interview with DCH representative • Summary of application questionnaires • Program documentation |
| <p>II. Application processes and criteria should support the achievement of program goals, objectives and principles in a manner that is efficient and appropriate.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is access to the program a concern among prospective and past applicants? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did clients first become aware of the existence of the program? • Is the manner in which applications are being distributed and made available (electronic, hardcopy) to historic and prospective clients appropriate? 2. Are program application forms and supporting materials clear and useful? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are program application forms relatively easy to complete? • Are the Excel budget and statistical worksheets helpful? • Are summaries of prior budgets and statistics helpful? 3. Are appraisal criteria and processes clearly defined and appropriate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the criterion relating to professional touring artists seen to be a significant limitation, and if so, in what manner? • Why is the average number of performances for applications seven (7), when the criterion is ten (10) performances for key presenters? • Is the criterion limiting geographic access to program awards seen to be a significant limitation, and if so, in what manner? • Is the criterion for a minimum venue size (300 seats) seen to be a significant limitation, and if so, in what manner? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of incomplete applications received by fiscal year • Number of applicant inquiries regarding completion of applications by fiscal year • Number of staff contacts with applicants prior to adjudication by fiscal year • Number of application forms downloaded from program website by fiscal year • Number and type of complaints or appeals following adjudication by fiscal year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person and telephone interviews with BCAC and BCAC representatives • Historic and current client survey • Client focus group • Program documentation |

| CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS | REVIEW QUESTIONS | REVIEW METRICS | DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION STRATEGIES |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>III. The allocation of funding under the program should be consistent with stated goals, objectives and principles.</p> | <p>1. Is the distribution of funding under the program consistent with established goals, objectives and principles, particularly as they relate to access?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the geographic distribution of program awards, and how has this changed over time (if at all)? • Is the lag between notification of an award, and receipt of funding, a concern? Are direct deposits of awards feasible? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic distribution of program awards by percentage and total amount (\$) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person and telephone interviews with BCTC and BCAC representatives • Historic and current client survey • Client focus group • Program documentation |
| <p>IV. Information and reporting systems should provide needed facts and data to effectively gauge performance and demonstrate accountability.</p> | <p>1. What kind of information is being collected on the program and from clients?</p> <p>2. How is this available information being used in making management and future funding decisions?</p> <p>3. What additional information should be collected and maintained to support management decisions?</p> <p>4. How are results being reported to the BC Arts Council?</p> <p>5. Is the information being provided to the BC Arts Council considered sufficient for demonstrating accountability?</p> <p>6. Are there controls in place to ensure the integrity of results reported by clients?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency and type of program reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person and telephone interviews with BCTC and BCAC representatives • Client focus group • Program documentation |
| <p>V. Positive impacts of the program can be demonstrated in the meeting of client needs and expectations.</p> | <p>1. To what extent does the funding provided through the program support the viability and continued operations of community and key presenters?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How significant are program awards in relation the projected (actual) net financial positions of community and key presenters? • Why has the total amount awarded over the last three years been less than the total budget available to the program? • What are the implications, if any, of the growing reliance on volunteers as it relates to the program? <p>2. Are client expectations being met in relation to stated program goals, objectives and principles?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual percentage change in, and level (\$) of, total and average program awards • Percentage change in reported net financial position (revenues and expenditures) among applicants (CP, KP) • Ratio of program awards to reported net financial position (CP, KP) • Ratio of total program budget to total awards (CP, KP) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person and telephone interviews with BCTC and BCAC representatives • Historic and current client survey • Client focus group • Program documentation |

Appendix E

Review of the Community Presenters Assistance Program

As noted in the main body of this report, the approach to the review included an Internet based survey of past and current clients of the program, in person and telephone interviews with current clients, non-clients, talent managers, production companies, and various governmental and quasi-governmental agency representatives. All names and addresses for those organizations contacted were provided by the steering committee for this program review. The following list represents the complete list of organizations and individuals that were provided the opportunity to provide input into the program review.

Organization

100 Mile & District Arts Council
Arrow Lakes Arts Council
ArtSpring (Island Arts Centre Society)
Arts Club Theatre Company
Bell Centre for the Performing Arts
Bella Coola Arts Council
Bulkley Valley Concert Association
British Columbia Arts Council
British Columbia Arts Council
British Columbia Touring Council
British Columbia Touring Council
Capilano College Performing Arts Theatre
Capilano College Performing Arts Theatre
Capitol Theatre Restoration Society

Centennial Theatre
Chamber Music Kelowna Society
Chan Centre for the Performing Arts
Chilliwack Arts Centre
Clarke Foundation Theatre
Coast Recital Society
Columbia Valley Arts Council
Community Arts Council of Ft. St. James
Community Arts Council of the Alberni Valley
Cowichan Theatre
Creekside Theatre
Creston Concert Society
Denman Island Arts & Crafts Society
Delta Symphony Society
Evergreen Cultural Centre
Evergreen Cultural Centre
Fernie & District Arts Council
Felix Culpa

Contact

Gary W. Brooks
Mary A. George
Paul Gravett
Stphanie Hargreaves
Liam Coughlan
Joan Cole
Jill Dunbar
Jeremy Long
Tracy Black
Joanna Maratta
Sheryl Daly
Des Price
Fiona Black
Lynn Bakken

Margo Gram
Christine Dendy
Joyce Hinton
Rod Hudson
Bronwen Sutherland
Allan Crane
Ken Mallett
Bev Playfaird
Gareth Flostrand
Tracy Hamilton
Hoarst Jazzman
Patricia Zialia
Avidgor Schulman
Stephen Robb
Gay Northey
Wilson Durward
Jenny Nichols
Linda Quible/David Bloom

Email

artsncnl@bcinternet.net
alacnak@columbiacable.net
artspring@saltspring.com
shargreaves@artsclub.com
coughlan_1@fc.sd36.bc.ca

LDMcIntosh@bulkley.net
Jeremy.Long@gems5.gov.bc.ca
Tracy.Black@gems1.gov.bc.ca
fyi@bctouring.org
sheryl_daly@telus.net
dprice@capcollege.bc.ca
fblack@capcollege.bc.ca
capitoltheatre@netidea.co

gramm@northvanrec.com
cdendy@telus.net
joyce.hinton@ubc.ca
chwkartscouncil@uniserive.com
bronwen.sutherland@sd75.mission.bc.ca
coastrecitalsociety@dccnet.com
ktm@rockies.net
bgrill@cnetdirect.com
admincac@alberni.net
thamilton@cvrdr.bc.ca
horstj@okanagan.net
chrismil@kootenay.com
avigdor@telus.net
srobb@dvo.bc.ca
gnorthey@telus.net
wilson@evergreenculturalcentre.ca
theartsstation@elkvalley.net

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| Festival Vancouver | George Lavarock | |
| Galiano Concerts Committee | Inessa Ormand | |
| Gary Cristall Artist Management | Gary Cristall | garycristall@telus.net |
| Gateway Theatre | Vivienne Stonier | events@gatewaytheatre.com |
| Golden & District Arts Council | Heidi Wurman | goldenarts@redshift.bc.ca |
| Grand Forks Area Arts Council | M. Jedlock | abilities@telus.net |
| Harrison Festival | Phyllis Stenson | harrfest@uniserve.com |
| Houston Concert Association | Shirley Higgins | swamis@bulkeley.net |
| Howe Sound Arts Association | Brian Marchand | rose@howesoundarts.org |
| Howe Sound Performing Arts Association | Rose-Marie Carreras | rose@howesoundarts.org |
| Howe Sound Performing Arts Association | Tamsin Miller | |
| Kaslo Concert Society | Gordon Portman | lgsport@netidea.com |
| Kay Meek Centre for the Performing Arts | Richard Walton | rwalton@attcanada.ca |
| Kelowna Community Theatre | Michael Utgaard | rentals@kelownacommunitytheatre.com |
| Key City Theatre | Paul Heywood | keycitytheatre@cyberlink.bc.ca |
| Kimberley Arts Centre | Tony Osten | |
| Kitimat Concert Association | Heather Lundstrom | hlundstrom@telus.net |
| Kitimat Concert Association | Gwendolyn Sewell | |
| Kiwanis Arts Centre | Calvin Kruk | ckruk@mail.sd59.bc.ca |
| Mary Winspeare Centre | Debora Johns | deborajohns@sansch.com |
| Massey Theatre Society | Lydia Marston-Blaauw | |
| Mayne Island Concerts Society | Lael Whitehead | lredale@gulfislands.com |
| Mission Concert & Recital Society | Jon Burrows | rpamplin@wteltech.net |
| Mission Folk Music Festival | Francis Xavier | mfmfs@look.ca |
| Mount Elizabeth Theatre | Brenda Feldhoff | brfeldhoff@cmsd.bc.ca |
| Nechako Valley Arts Council | Mia Moutray | jhallet@avison.bc.ca |
| Nicola Valley Arts Council | Margaret Carlson | nvcac316@uniserve.net |
| North Island Concert Society | Gwen Doi | nicsociety@excite.com |
| North Okanagan Community Concert Assoc. | Cecil Schmidt/Les Davis | lesdavis@shaw.ca |
| North Peace Cultural Centre | Gordon Grant | gordongrant@ocol.com |
| North Peace Cultural Centre | Morris Holmes | morrish@ocol.com |
| Old School House Arts Centre, The | Maria Perdick | tosh@macn.bc.ca |
| Oponimous Management | Jim Smith | jim@holybodytattoo.org |
| Osoyoos & District Arts Council | Ralph Englesby | englesby@vip.net |
| Osoyoos & District Arts Council | Robin Gubby | |
| Osoyoos & District Arts Council | Jean Gubby | |
| Pender Harbour Music Society | Monty Rolston | info@phjazz.ca |
| Penticton and District Arts Council | Diane Estabrook | arts_council@img.net |
| Phoenix Theatre Management Society | Doug Roper | theatre@northernrockies.org |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Port Theatre Society, The | Sandra Thomson | sthomson@porttheatre.nisa.com |
| Powell River Academy of Music | Terry Sabine | Info@powellriveracademy.org |
| Prince George Folk Music Society/Calico Concerts | Jo Beattie | jo@calicoconcerts.com |
| Prince Rupert Concert Society | Douglas Edward Moore | |
| Prince Rupert Performing Arts Centre | Michael Sawatzsky | pac@citytel.net |
| Quadra Island Recreation Society | Hilda Van Orden | hildavo@oberon.ark.com |
| Queen Charlotte Island Arts Councils | Fran Fowler | observer@qcislands.net |
| Quesnel Live Arts Society | Darcy Richardson | nancylilienweiss@shaw.ca |
| Revelstoke Arts Council | Margaret Pacaud | mpacaud@revelstoke.net |
| Ridge Meadows Arts Centre | Brenda Findlayson/Tom Walker | bfindlayson@mapleridge.org |
| Royal and McPherson Theatres Society | Mandy Dewey | mandy@rmts.bc.ca |
| Salmon Arm Folk Music Society | Linda Tanaka | folk@sunwave.net |
| Saturna Island Arts & Concerts Society | Raymond Lindsay | lindsay@gulfislands.com |
| Shadbolt Centre for the Arts | Ian Forsyth | ian.forsyth@city.burnaby.bc.ca |
| Shameless Hussy Productions | Deborah Pickman | shamelesshussy@telus.net |
| Sid Williams Theatre Society | Deb Renz | admin.@sidwilliamstheatre.com |
| Sooke Community Theatre | Lori Messer | lmesser@sd62.bc.ca |
| South Okanagan Concert Society | Ralph Englesby | englesby@vip.net |
| South Okanagan Concert Society | Vivienne Calder | vivienne@otvcablelan.net |
| Summerland Community Arts Council | Ruth Manning | slandarts@telus.net |
| Sunshine Coast Jazz and Entertainment Soc. | Linda Williams | barlin@sunshine.net |
| Sunshine Theatre | Teddy Forsyth | suntheatre@silk.net |
| Surrey Arts Centre Theatre | Barb Wolfe | bswolfe@city.surrey.bc.ca |
| Terrace Concert Society | Karen Birkedal | birkparr@monarch.net |
| Terrace Concert Society | Tim Keenan | tkeen@kermode.net |
| Terry Fox Theatre | Bill Greenland | bgreenland@sd43.bc.ca |
| The Port Theatre | Sandra Thomson | sthomson@porttheatre.nisa.com |
| Tidemark Theatre Society | General Manager | manager.tidemark@tidemark-theatre.com |
| Tidemark Theatre Society | Ron Martin | manager.tidemark@tidemark-theatre.com |
| Trail Society for the Performing Arts | Garth Thompson | michallik@direct.ca |
| Trail Society for the Performing Arts | Lillian Michallik | michallik@direct.ca |
| University College of the Cariboo | Ron Miles | miles@cariboo.bc.ca |
| Vernon & District Performing Arts Centre | Michael Cade | theatre@ticketseller.ca |
| Whistler Community Arts Council | Joan Richoz | wh-arts council@direct.ca |
| Williams Lake Community Arts Council | Debbie Tobin | snebs43@yahoo.com |