

**ARTS COMMISSION**

Notice of Meeting on **Wednesday, October 28, 2020, at 4:00 p.m.**  
Electronic Participation & Room 488, 4th Floor, 625 Fisgard Street, Victoria, BC

J. Loveday (Chair)	M. Brame	S. Epp	W. Gardner	D. Lajeunesse
	G. Lemon	C. Plant	T. Ney	K. Roessingh

---

**AGENDA**

1. Territorial Acknowledgement

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Adoption of Minutes of September 23, 2020

Recommendation: That the September 23, 2020, minutes of the Arts Commission be adopted as read.

4. Chair's Remarks

5. Presentations/Delegations

6. Commission Business

6.1. Arts Advisory Council Update

6.1.1. Arts Advisory Council Chair's Report (Verbal)

6.1.2. Arts Advisory Council Minutes for Information – Sept. 8 and Oct. 7, 2020

6.1.3. Arts Advisory Council Activities by Council Summary, Sept. 8, 2020

Recommendation: That the Arts Advisory Council Chair's verbal report; the Sept. 8 and Oct. 7, 2020, Minutes, and the Sept. 8, 2020, Activities by Council Summary be received for information.

6.2. Outreach Update – Verbal

Recommendation: That the Arts Commission receive this verbal update for information.

6.3. Equity Grant Program Evaluation and Recommendations

Recommendation: That the Arts Commission adopt the following recommendations contained in the CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Equity Program Evaluation:

1. That the Equity Grant program be allocated \$25,000 in annual core project-based funding;
2. That staff be directed to draft terms of reference for an Equity Advisory Sub-Committee to explore grant adjudication, accessibility of information, data collection and the development of an equitable access policy for all arts funding programs.

.../2

To ensure quorum, please advise Nancy More ([nmore@crd.bc.ca](mailto:nmore@crd.bc.ca)) if you or your alternate cannot attend.

6.4. Incubator Grant Program Evaluation and Recommendations

Recommendation: That the Incubator Grant program be allocated \$15,000 in annual core project-based funding.

6.5. Bylaw Amendment 4367 – Request for Further Information

Recommendation: That the Arts Commission direct staff to revise draft bylaw 4367 with alternate language defining exclusions for appointment to the Arts Advisory Council for consideration at their next meeting.

7. Correspondence

Recommendation: That the following correspondence be received for information:

7.1. Greater Victoria Youth Orchestra, 11 September 2020, re: Operating Grant

8. New Business

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting: November 25, 2020



Making a difference...together

## Minutes of a Meeting of the ARTS COMMISSION

Held WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2020, in Room 488, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC

---

**Present: Members:** J. Loveday (Chair), W. Gardner (EP), D. Lajeunesse (EP), G. Lemon, C. Plant (EP), T. Ney (EP), K. Roessingh (EP)

**Staff:** James Lam, Manager, Arts & Culture Support Service; S. Closson, Committee Clerk (recorder)

**Arts Advisory Council:** C. Heiman (EP), Chair, M. Heinz (EP), Funding Chair

**Absent:** M. Brame, S. Epp

EP – Electronic Participation (Telephone)

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 pm.

### 1 Territorial Acknowledgement

Chair Loveday provided a Territorial Acknowledgement.

### 2 Approval of Agenda

**MOVED** by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Lemon,  
That the agenda be approved as circulated.

**CARRIED**

### 3 Electronic and In-Person Meetings of CRD Committees and Commissions

**MOVED** by Member Lemon, **SECONDED** by Member Roessingh,

1. That this resolution applies to the Arts Commission for the meetings being held between September 23 and December 31, 2020, and
2. That the attendance of the public at the place of the meeting cannot be accommodated in accordance with the applicable requirements or recommendations under the *Public Health Act*, despite the best efforts of the committee, because:
  - a. The available meeting facilities cannot accommodate more than eight people in person, including members of the committee and staff, and
  - b. There are no other facilities presently available that will allow physical attendance of the committee and the public in sufficient numbers; and
3. That the committee is ensuring opening, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the open meeting by the following means:
  - a. By providing notice of the meeting in newspaper or local notice Board, including the methods for providing written or electronic submissions,
  - b. By making the meeting agenda, as well as the other relevant documents, available on the CRD website, and directing interested persons to the website by means of the notices provided in respect of the meeting,
  - c. By strongly encouraging the provision of, and subsequently receiving and distributing to members, written correspondence from the public in advance of the meeting, and
  - d. By making the minutes of the meeting available on the CRD website following the meeting.

**CARRIED**

#### 4 Adoption of Minutes

**MOVED** by Member Lemon, **SECONDED** by Member Gardner,  
That the minutes of the June 24, 2020, Arts Commission meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

**CARRIED**

#### 5 Chair's Remarks

Chair Loveday informed the Commission that letters were sent to jurisdictions not currently participating in the regional service and that the result was a virtual presentation to Sidney, an upcoming presentation to Colwood and an acknowledgement of the receipt of the letter from Central Saanich.

#### 6 Presentations/Delegations: There were none.

#### 7 Commission Business

##### 7.1 Arts Advisory Council Update

##### 7.1.1 Arts Advisory Council Chair's Report (Verbal)

Chair Heiman reported on the work of the Arts Advisory Council and the status of the adjudicated grants.

**MOVED** by Member Lemon, **SECONDED** by Member Roessingh,  
That the verbal Arts Advisory Council Chair's Report be received for information.

**CARRIED**

##### 7.2 Outreach Update

J. Lam spoke to the status of outreach work due to a staff resignation. Arts & Culture social media presence and the website continue to be maintained while recruitment for the staff vacancy is carried out.

**MOVED** by W. Gardner, **SECONDED** by K. Roessingh,  
That the verbal Outreach Update be received for information.

**CARRIED**

##### 7.3 Bylaw No. 4367: CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020

J. Lam provided an overview of this bylaw amendment and the background for this request. Discussion ensued on the possible implications of excluding volunteers with involvement in funding matters to the Arts Advisory Council.

**MOVED** by Member Plant, **SECONDED** by Member Loveday,  
To refer back to staff for further investigation on the distinction between an unpaid staff member as per recommended Bylaw 4367, clause (g)(ii) and a volunteer, and if appropriate, ask the Arts Advisory Council to comment on the proposed revisions.

**CARRIED**

#### 7.4 2021 Arts & Culture Budget

J. Lam provided an overview of the 2021 Arts & Culture Service Plan and Budget.

Discussion ensued on:

- Administration costs and internal allocations
- Operating grants
- Support of other arts organizations
- Impact of COVID-19 on the arts community

**MOVED** by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Gardner,  
That the 2021 Arts & Culture Service Plan and Budget be approved as presented and advanced to the October 28, 2020, provisional budget review process.

**MOVED** by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Gardner,  
That the Arts Commission provide direction to the Arts Advisory Council for the 2020 operating grants that the increase to the operating grants be reserved for new applicants that merit funding in the operating category.

**CARRIED**

#### 8 Correspondence

**MOVED** by Member Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Member Gardner,  
That the following correspondence be received for information.

1. Victoria Women's Transition House Society, 2020-06-09, re: Thank you
2. Pacific Opera Victoria, 2020-08-06, re: Thank you
3. Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, 2020-08-10, re: Thank you

**CARRIED**

#### 9 New Business:

- 9.1 Member Plant noted the Greater Victoria Regional Arts Awards on October 3, 2020. Chair Loveday noted that he will represent the Arts Commission for their sponsorship of the CRD Arts Commission Regional Impact Award.

#### 10 Adjournment

**MOVED** by Member Lemon, **SECONDED** by Member Loveday,  
That the meeting be adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

**CARRIED**

---

CHAIR

---

RECORDER

## ARTS ADVISORY COUNCIL

### Minutes of a meeting of the Arts Advisory Council, Capital Regional District Held Tuesday, September 8, 2020 via video conference

---

**Present Electronically:**

**Members:** T. Craig, B. Crook, D. Etsten, C. Heiman (Chair), A. Hershberg, M. Heinz,  
B. McLean, P. Sullivan, J. Verano

**Arts & Culture Staff:** J. Lam, Manager, J. Nichols, Community Outreach Coordinator, H. Heywood,  
Admin Assistant (recorder)

**Regrets:** D. Thorpe

**Absent:** E. Beaton

Chair Heiman called the meeting to order at 5:00pm with a welcome to members and a territorial acknowledgement.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** by D. Etsten, **SECONDED** by M. Heinz, that the agenda be approved as circulated.  
**CARRIED**

**2. Minutes:**

**2.1 MOVED** by P. Sullivan, **SECONDED** by M. Heinz, that the minutes of the June 2, 2020 Arts Advisory Council meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

**CARRIED**

**2.2 MOVED** by B. Crook, **SECONDED** by P. Sullivan, that the minutes of the May 27 and June 24, 2020 Arts Commission meeting be received for information.

**CARRIED**

**3. ABC'S (Activity By Council Summary)**

A list of Council activities was received for information.

**MOVED** by P. Sullivan, that the ABCs be received for information.

**CARRIED**

**4. Chair's Report**

Chair Heiman advised members of S. Ives' resignation from the Arts Advisory Council (AAC). Any member who would like to contribute to a card for S. Ives should send their note to Chair Heiman.

There will be three vacancies in the spring 2021. Advertising for these positions will take place later in the year.

The minimum budget requirement for Operating Grant applicants was reviewed by the Arts

Commission. The Commission raised it to \$90,000 and in addition, the motion included a one-year phase out period for currently funded organizations that no longer meet the minimum threshold requirement.

**MOVED** by D. Etsten, **SECONDED** by J. Verano to receive the Chair's Report.

**CARRIED**

## **5. Business Arising**

### **5.1 Topics Arising from Operating Grant plenary Fall 2019 – for Discussion**

- Implementation of the Notice of Significant Concern (NOSC) Policy

Referring to the background information provided, J. Lam gave a brief overview of the operating grant process and NOSC policy.

Chair Heiman opened the topic for discussion. Members considered the current NOSC policy, past examples, and possible changes.

By consensus, it was decided to keep the current policy, as the wording provides some flexibility for decision-making.

## **6. Grant Assessment**

### **6.1 IDEA Grants** – revised to add application question and RANC assessment for Financial Statements

J. Lam noted that the IDEA grant application and assessment matrix had been revised to align with other grant programs as it relates to review of financial statements.

### **6.2 Operating Grants** – Discussion: request for assessment direction from Arts Commission

J. Lam reviewed the background information provided and the mandate of the AAC as the adjudication body for grant programs. In light of the pandemic, operating grant applicants were directed to clearly articulate the impacts of COVID 19 in their answers.

After discussion, it was decided the AAC will follow the current adjudication process and review the applications in the context of the current financial climate.

Members were advised the Plenary is scheduled for Saturday, November 21<sup>st</sup>. A schedule will be sent to members.

## **7. Arts Implementation Update**

J. Nichols, Community Outreach Coordinator, advised members the 2019 Progress Report was presented to the CRD Board in July by Arts Commission Chair, J. Loveday. A short video will be available on the CRD YouTube channel.

Evaluation of the two pilot grant programs, Equity and Incubator grants, included a review of three years of grant application data, literature review, and interviews with applicants and applicant sponsor organizations. J. Lam will present two reports to the Arts Commission.

Creative Mornings has been able to continue by relaunching as a virtual presentation series. The presentations are available on the Creative Mornings website.

J. Nichols advised members this is her last week at the CRD and thanked all the AAC members for their contributions and for the opportunity to work with them.

#### **8. Correspondence**

Chair Heiman read a letter from S. Ives to the Arts Advisory Council. Other correspondence was received for information.

#### **9. Adjournment**

**MOVED** by P. Sullivan that the meeting be adjourned at 6:03 pm

**CARRIED**



## ARTS ADVISORY COUNCIL

### Minutes of a meeting of the Arts Advisory Council, Capital Regional District Held Tuesday, October 6, 2020 via video conference

---

**Present Electronically:**

**Members:** B. Crook, C. Heiman (Chair), A. Hershberg, M. Heinz, D. Thorpe, J. Verano

**Arts & Culture Staff:** J. Lam, Manager, H. Heywood, Admin Assistant (recorder)

**Regrets:** T. Craig, D. Etsten, B. McLean, P. Sullivan

**Absent:** E. Beaton

Chair Heiman called the meeting to order at 5:06pm with a welcome to members and a territorial acknowledgement.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** by D. Thorpe, **SECONDED** by A. Hershberg, that the agenda be approved as circulated.

**CARRIED**

**2. Minutes:**

**2.1 MOVED** by B. Crook, **SECONDED** by J. Veranno, that the minutes of the September 8, 2020 Arts Advisory Council meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

**CARRIED**

**2.2 MOVED** by M. Heinz, that the minutes of the September 23, 2020 Arts Commission meeting be received for information.

**CARRIED**

**3. ABC'S (Activity By Council Summary)**

Council discussed recent online presentations, including the Greater Victoria Arts Awards on October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**4. Chair's Report**

Chair Heiman highlighted two items from the September 23<sup>rd</sup> Arts Commission meeting:

- J. Lam presented the 2021 budget which was approved and will be advanced to the provisional budget review process
- the amendment to Bylaw 4367, was referred back to staff

**MOVED** by M. Heinz, **SECONDED** by J. Verano to receive the Chair's Report.

**CARRIED**

**5. Operating Grants – discussion**

J. Lam noted 23 applications have been received, 21 previously funded and two new organizations. As directed by the Arts Commission, the operating grant funding envelope for

previously funded, returning applicants has not changed, remaining at \$580,500. The increase to the operating grant budget of \$32,000 is to be retained for consideration of new applicants. Any funding not allocated will be returned to the Reserve fund.

Members discussed the operating grant process and scoring system, in light of the current financial climate.

It was **MOVED** by B. Crook, **SECONDED** by M. Heinz,  
To convene a formal debriefing meeting post Plenary, to review the grant adjudication process including the current applications and RANC assessment criteria, in preparation for 2021.

**CARRIED**

In response to a question, J. Lam advised members that the evaluation reports for Incubator and Equity grants will go forward to the October Arts Commission meeting.

Funding Chair, M. Heinz, raised the issue of holding the Plenary in person or via video conference. It was decided staff will confidentially survey all members for input. In deference to private health concerns it was noted that unanimous agreement would be required to meet in person.

**6. Correspondence - none**

**7. New Business – none**

**8. Adjournment**

**MOVED** by M. Heinz that the meeting be adjourned at 6:00 pm.

**CARRIED**

**Arts Advisory Council Meeting – Tuesday, Sept 8, 2020**

**ABC'S (Activities by Council Summary)**

AAC members recently attended the following events in the region:

- Creative Mornings: Parker Johnson
- AGGV – The AGGV Collection
- Deluge – It Once Had a Face, now it wants one again
- Madrona: 10th Anniversary Exhibition
- Open Space - On Line & Indigenous Artist Collective Colouring Book
- Legacy Gallery: To Fish As Formerly: A Story of Straits Salish Resurgence;  
Caribou Crossing
- Pacific Opera: Online – Flight of the Hummingbird
- Skampede

**REPORT TO ARTS COMMISSION  
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020**

---

**SUBJECT**     **Equity Grant Program Evaluation and Recommendations**

**ISSUE SUMMARY**

The Equity Grant program was developed as result of the 2016 Building Our Arts Futures Together initiative. Following a three year pilot a staff evaluation was undertaken to determine the success of the program and make recommendations on its continuance.

**BACKGROUND**

The Equity Grant program was created to provide funding opportunities that would reflect increased representation of the community, focusing on Indigenous and equity seeking groups. The original logic model was based on a rationale to provide opportunities for Indigenous, diverse cultures and other equity groups to access Arts Service funding for self-defined arts practices not readily supported through existing CRD Arts Service programs.

The program was initiated with an annual budget of \$25,000 with one intake per year. The Equity Grant program referred to the goals of the Arts Strategic Plan, particularly addressing goal #3, which is “to make access equitable”. The initial year of the Equity Grant program had significantly more applications than the two subsequent years. Applications fell in years two and three, in part due to the reintroduction of the IDEA Grant program that effectively shifted a number of applicants to that stream.

The Executive Summary on page two of the attached evaluation report notes success in eliminating barriers to funding, not the least of which is the requirement to be a registered, not-for-profit society in order to receive funding. A workaround was achieved through the creation of a sponsor society option whereby a registered society would assume responsibility for administration of the grant by applying on behalf of non-conforming groups. The report notes a need to more clearly define the role of a sponsor society in the funding relationship.

Potential barriers related to defining representation were addressed by allowing applicants to self-identify. Indigenous and disability groups had the highest representation among applicants. The program resulted in arts activities that would not have been supported under existing programs. Nuances to the self-identification option arguably resulted in funding to groups that would not normally be the focus of an equity focused program. This can be seen in the shift of some organizations to the IDEA program upon its reintroduction in the second year of the pilot period. There may be benefits to focusing on specific equity-seeking groups that could be identified through community research.

The Equity Grant pilot program collected limited data that enabled the program to assess basic eligibility. Other Arts & Culture programs do not collect information on equity. The allocations for the Equity Grant program equaled approximately 1% of the overall grant investment in regional arts organizations. An issue raised, but beyond the scope of the report, is the potential for the implementation of an equity lens in the fuller suite of Arts & Culture funding programs. If broader

equity in funding outcomes is a goal of the Arts & Culture Support Service, then the evaluation suggests that an effort to apply an equity lens to all programs would help to achieve that goal. The conclusions noted on page eight of the evaluation report note sufficient successful outcomes to merit continuation of the program and to examine further development of equity policy.

The first recommendation is for an annual budget allocation of \$25,000 to continue the program at the current level of intake.

The second recommendation is to form an Equity Arts Advisory Sub-Committee to explore grant adjudication, accessibility of information, data collection and the development of an equitable access policy for all arts funding programs. Terms of reference would have to be developed to determine scope of work.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

### *Alternative 1*

That the Arts Commission adopt the following recommendations contained in the CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Equity Program Evaluation:

1. That the Equity Grant program be allocated \$25,000 in annual core project-based funding;
2. That staff be directed to draft terms of reference for an Equity Advisory Sub-Committee to explore grant adjudication, accessibility of information, data collection and the development of an equitable access policy for all arts funding programs.

### *Alternative 2*

That this report be referred back to staff for additional information.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

### *Alignment with Board & Corporate Priorities*

The recommendations align with and support CRD Board Initiative 12c-1 to evaluate the effectiveness of grant programs in “supporting organizational sustainability, creative innovation & equity”

### *Alignment with Existing Plans & Strategies*

The recommendations align with and support Arts & Culture Support Service Strategic Plan Goal #3 to Make Access Equitable, and initiatives 3a to “ensure support for new and emerging organizations” and 3b to “support equity, diversity and inclusion through grant programs”.

## **CONCLUSION**

The dedicated Equity Grant funding program with an expanded adjudication committee and outreach measures was a positive first step towards increasing access to services. Outcomes indicated that a diverse range of organizations were able to access services which in turn have fostered more diversity in arts production in the region. Outcomes aligned with the CRD Arts & Culture Strategic Plan goal of ‘Equitable Access’ to services (Goal #3).

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Arts Commission adopt the following recommendations contained in the CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Equity Program Evaluation:

1. That the Equity Grant program be allocated \$25,000 in annual core project-based funding;
2. That staff be directed to draft terms of reference for an Equity Advisory Sub-Committee to explore grant adjudication, accessibility of information, data collection and the development of an equitable access policy for all arts funding programs.



---

James Lam, Manager  
Arts & Culture Support Service

**ATTACHMENT(S)**

Appendix A: CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Equity Program Evaluation

# CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Equity Program Evaluation

Evaluation of implementation and community outcomes 2018-2020

August 26, 2020

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
Background .....	3
Summary of Findings.....	6
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	8
Appendices.....	10
Appendix A - Description of Expected Outcomes .....	10
Appendix B - Initial Program Logic Model .....	11
Appendix C - List of Equity Grant Recipients 2018-2020 .....	12
Appendix D - Document Analysis .....	13
Appendix E - Interview Findings Compiled .....	14
Sources.....	16

## Executive Summary

In 2018, The Capital Regional District (CRD) Arts & Culture launched a pilot Equity Grant program to address systemic barriers to regional arts funding. The program implemented the approved Action #3 from the CRD Building our Arts Future Implementation plan. The dedicated Equity program, with an expanded adjudication committee and outreach measures, aligned with the CRD Arts & Culture Strategic Plan goal of 'Equitable Access' to services (Goal #3).

This report evaluates the three years of the pilot Equity Grant program administered by CRD Arts & Culture. This evaluation aligns with the CRD Corporate initiative 12c-1 to 'Evaluate effectiveness of grant programs in supporting organizational sustainability'. The evaluation consisted of a document analysis and qualitative interviews to determine if the expected outcomes of the program were achieved.

### Summary of key findings and recommendations

The CRD Arts & Culture Equity program successfully removed some systemic barriers for getting information, applying for public sector arts funding, and in adjudication processes. The program distributed \$74,945 over three years. Funds allocated through the program are equivalent to 1% of total Arts & Culture funding. Outcomes indicated that a diversity of organizations were able to gain access to services. 100% of funded projects increased access to arts activities benefitting under-represented arts, artist groups, and audiences in the region.

Funding a diversity of organizations has in turn fostered an overall greater diversity of artistic practices. Ten organizations (83%) reported production of a completely new event, one organization launched a re-occurring event, and one organization created new work. Collaborations between not-for-profit "sponsor societies" and unincorporated "artist leads" was a key success factor in reaching communities of artists facing systemic barriers (see Section 2 Background). The level of involvement with sponsor societies varied across collaborations - some participants requested clarity on CRD expectations for the role of sponsor organizations. About half of the respondents felt the grant was enough to fulfill program needs.

Administrative procedures and processes were considered straightforward and simple. There were additional requests for refinements around self-identification language, timing of deadlines and options for digital intake/online accessibility. Initial stakeholder input and expanded adjudication committees were considered beneficial. Increased outreach and promotion improved uptake and showed indications that an increase in targeted outreach would be beneficial. Further public engagement with stakeholders of the intended population groups at the collaboration level is critical if the program is maintained.

For CRD Arts & Culture to continue to making progress on strategic Goal #3 'Provide Equitable Access' it is recommended that:

1. The Equity Grant program be allocated \$25,000 in core project grant funding per year;
2. The Arts & Culture Support Service form an Equity Advisory Sub-Committee to explore grant adjudication, accessibility of information, data collection and the development of an equitable access policy for all arts funding programs.



## Background

Arts funding provided by the Capital Regional District (CRD) Arts & Culture is intended to benefit all citizens and visitors in contributing jurisdictions. For every \$1 dollar invested in CRD Arts & Culture grants an additional \$11.55 is generated. According to Statistics Canada, the region has two of the highest concentrations of artists in the country (Greater Victoria and Southern Gulf Islands) and accounts for 8.6% of a total culture GDP of \$7.9 billion in British Columbia.

Statistics Canada indicates that racialized artists, Indigenous artists, women and those with intersectional profiles in Canada have significantly lower median income than men, non-racialized and non-Indigenous artists. Regional data for the CRD is not available however, the BC arts sector has a higher than average concentration of racialized groups (20% of 24,800 artists). Data related to artists identifying disability, deafness and sexual orientation are not available from the Canadian census.

The CRD invests in arts and culture to foster artistic, social and economic benefits in the region and to contribute to its overall regional identity and global profile. In 2019 the CRD investment of \$2.4 million in the arts enabled funded organizations to generate over \$27 million in revenues, drew well over 644,000 audience members, while supporting 3,564 arts and culture jobs in the region.

The CRD Arts & Culture Support Service is one of approximately nine Canadian local governments that have implemented equity programs within their arts funding programs. These programs are intended to address issues associated with discrimination against underrepresented people including but not limited to Indigenous, racialized, disability-identified artists, deaf, low income, and LGBTQ2+.

In 2016, the CRD Arts Commission approved the Building Our Arts Future Implementation Plan (the Plan). Action #3 in the Plan recommended the creation of a “Dedicated Indigenous and diversity (equity) funding pool”. This led to the three-year pilot Equity Grant program administered by CRD Arts & Culture. The expected outcomes of the Equity program were to forge closer, mutual relationships between arts organizations that were more broadly representative of diverse communities in the capital region. See Appendix A for further details of the expected outcomes.

The program was designed to reduce systemic barriers to public sector funding. Several barriers were identified by a panel of subject-matter experts through initial community outreach related to policies, adjudication, and outreach. A notable systemic barrier included the requirement for applicants to be a not-for-profit society. Program guidelines addressed this barrier by allowing a not-for-profit organization to act as a ‘sponsor society’ for equity-seeking project leads.

The creation of this relationship had the (unintended) consequence of encouraging collaboration between the sponsor societies and the equity-seeking project leads that had sought them out for purposes of application to the program. This relationship was distinct from equity-seeking applicants that were already not-for-profit organizations and therefore did not need a sponsor society.

A self-identification form created for the Equity program enabled applicants to explain and identify the equity-seeking group they reflected. Open to self-description, the program allowed

for an unlimited range of community affiliations for applicants. The assessment process for Equity grants initiated the inclusion of external community-based experts on adjudication panels normally comprised of members of the Arts Advisory Council. This deepened the understanding of applicants that represented a variety of cultures, social experiences, and provided a wider perspective of artistic practices that would not necessarily be supported under other CRD funding programs.

Expanded outreach methods were offered such as graphic videos, American Sign Language (ASL) overview, a variety of in-person events such as 'Arts Service Office Hours', info sessions at CRD Fiskard headquarters and off-site at community spaces around the region.

## **Uptake**

The Equity program was launched in 2018. The maximum grant available was \$5000 from an annual available budget of \$25,000 funded from the Arts Reserve Fund. See Appendix B for the initial program logic model. The program ran for three years with one intake per year in 2018, 2019 and 2020. The 2018 and 2019 grant cycles are complete, the 2020 round of grants have been allocated. Final reports for the third year are not expected until March 2021.

Year	Total Applications	Grants Awarded	% of applicants funded
2018	21	11	52%
2019	6	5	83%
2020	4	2	50%

Over three years a total of 18 grants with a combined investment of \$74,945 were distributed. The program funded many types of arts projects and reached multiple communities that identified as facing systemic barriers to public sector arts funding. See Appendix C for a list of grantees and amounts.

Uptake of the program diminished each year. Two external factors influenced uptake of the program: 1) reintroduction of the CRD IDEA grant program in 2019 moved three Equity grant clients into a new funding stream; and 2) the global COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 created barriers to planning and implementing arts projects. Evidence suggests that marginalized communities already facing barriers and those with intersectional identities are disproportionately affected by the global pandemic.

Another internal factor that affected uptake was increased promotions of Project, Series and Extended Programming grants. This may have increased awareness of the ability for groups that were eligible for the Equity program to choose to apply for another CRD Arts grant program with higher funding thresholds. The significance of this factor is unknown as equity identification is not included in other program areas.

This evaluation specifically explored whether the projected outcomes of the Equity program were achieved or not. To this end the evaluation questions addressed were:

1. Do barriers exist for some segments of artist populations?
2. Does a self-identification form support equity-seeking groups in an inclusive way?
3. Does providing the sponsorship option remove barriers?
4. Did the funded project contribute to a greater diversity of artistic practices and/or benefit under-represented arts groups in the region?
5. Does the application, adjudication and reporting meet the needs of equity-seeking groups?
6. Does specialized outreach, communications, support groups appropriately?

The findings will help to assess the effectiveness of the Building our Arts Future plan and to determine the future of the Equity program. This evaluation will also fulfill, in part, strategic priority #3 'Equitable Access' of the CRD Arts & Culture Strategic Plan 2020-2023 as well as CRD Corporate initiative 12c-1 to 'Evaluate effectiveness of grant programs in supporting organizational sustainability, creative innovation & equity'.

### **Approach**

Between July 15 and August 22, 2020 CRD staff conducted a program evaluation through document analysis and qualitative interviews. The results were corroborated and compiled into summaries that address evaluation question found in Section 3 of this report.

Staff conducted a document analysis of 12 completed final reports from Equity Grant funded projects (67%). Six projects/final reports were not complete at the time of this evaluation.

Twenty-three participants were invited to participate in an interview. In order to avoid a conflict of interest with staff conducting the interviews, one participant was not invited. A total of 19 semi-structured, qualitative interviews through telephone and video conferencing were completed. The interviews were with the following participant groups:

- Participant Group A) Sponsor societies that were the recipients of grants for projects implemented by non-incorporated project leads; and
- Participant Group B) This group includes both incorporated project leads receiving grants as well as the non-incorporated project leads collaborating with the sponsor societies noted in Group A.

Of the 19 interviews, 6 represented Group A and 13 represented Group B. This meant 83% of all potential interviewees provided feedback, or 85% of Group A and 81% of Group B.

### **Weakness of this Evaluation**

A weakness of the evaluation is in its reliance on information provided by groups that may be cautious to criticize the CRD - a potential source of future funding. This was mitigated by explaining that the interviews were confidential and were not connected to grant adjudication.

## **Ethical Considerations**

The following ethical practices were used in the study:

- 1) Participants received an email with information about the study explaining how the data will be used and storage protocols. Names are included in the source research however final results are not attributable to a single individual unless permission is granted.
- 2) Participants received an email on September 9, 2020 describing the process for sharing the research publicly, the option to revoke consent and who to contact for more information.

## **Summary of Findings**

The following is a summary of findings with key highlights of input.

### **Need for a program with Equitable Access**

The CRD Arts & Culture Equity Program addresses systemic barriers to public sector funding. The program increased equitable access to grants. This benefitted communities through an increase in accessible and culturally relevant arts programming. This is a success that could be built on further as the Equity program represents 1% of the overall investment in regional arts.

Of the 19 sponsor societies and project leads interviewed:

- The majority of participants did not know of other funding options and felt the program was needed.

### **Self-identification**

The self-identification form was largely well-received and signaled the spirit of the program and the intentions of the CRD to work differently. Some refinements could be explored such as re-examining whether the terminology about who is eligible is clear. Further community consultation is recommended to determine how equity-seeking groups self-identify.

Of the 19 organizations and project leads interviewed who had also filled out self-identification form:

- The majority reported the self-identification form step as positive (ranging from 'fine', 'made sense', 'good', 'great', 'important', a 'milestone' and 'saving grace').
- Two participants felt their specific community affiliations were not represented in examples in the self-identification form.

### **Sponsor Societies**

The ability for non-incorporated project leads (i.e. prospective project leads that were not societies) to collaborate with a registered society that would act as a sponsor (a sponsor society), was intended as a solution to the barrier that requires applicants to be registered societies.

Although the intent was to provide a mechanism through which non-incorporated project leads could apply, an unintended result was to encourage deeper levels of collaboration. In those cases it was reported that the project lead received financial and administrative support, broadened the community they were affiliated with, and attracted larger audiences. Sponsor societies were able to collaborate with project leads at a variety of engagement levels while maintaining their society's mandate. If the sponsor society option is maintained it would be beneficial for the CRD to provide more communication on expectations, e.g. best practices (for sponsors) and the purpose of the sponsorship option (for equity seeking project leads).

Of the six sponsor societies interviewed:

- Six sponsor societies said they would agree to be a sponsor society again. Of those six, one would do so only if they had a strong existing relationship with the project lead.
- Some sponsor societies reported varying degrees of unanticipated administration tasks and capacity needed to support the collaboration.

### **Regional benefit to arts programming and Diversity of programming**

The projects contributed to an overall greater diversity of artistic practices. Interviewees reported that grants provided opportunities for artistic production of work that, while sometimes available elsewhere in the world, has not been available for audiences in the capital region or specifically in the Southern Gulf Islands e.g. performance art related to reconciliation; a podcast amplifying the stories, experiences and knowledge of local Indigenous, Black and People of Colour communities.

The funded projects also benefited under-represented artist groups and audiences in the region. Grantees reported an increased capacity to make diverse forms of art and provide access to artistic experiences that some communities of people would not otherwise participate in.

Examples of project benefits include: creating safe, accessible events; building relationships across generations; and fostering dialogue with groups facing a range of systemic barriers related to discrimination, disabilities and trauma.

Document analysis of 12 completed final reports found:

- Ten organizations (83%) reported production of a completely new event, one organization launched a re-occurring event and one organization created new work.
- The majority of projects enabled professional artists to contribute to their field and advance artistic practice.

### **Administrative Processes**

Multiple grantees thanked the CRD administrators and expressed appreciation for the simplified, sensible process. Greater accessibility was requested from some applicants.

Of the organizations and project leads interviewed:

- Several grantees appreciated and requested representation of target populations in Equity adjudication committees

- One grantee felt the timing of the grant application allowed for fewer scheduling options and was a barrier for small communities with less capacity.
- One project lead requested elimination of honourifics in follow-up communications.

Document analysis of 12 completed final reports found:

- Eleven organizations reported that the Guidelines were easy to understand, one reported that the Guidelines were 'not-bad' based on some confusion around financial statements.
- Eleven organizations reported that the application form was easy to understand, with one organization finding it 'cumbersome' with a suggestion for an oral intake, and an online application form.

Six organizations reported that the grant amount was enough. The other six reported the grant was not enough.

## **Outreach**

Grantees learned about the funding programs through a variety of the communication channels and outreach methods. Although efforts were made to increase online accessibility with an ASL video, audio grant descriptions, and multiple print pieces describing grants – more ways to access information was requested. Those interviewed provided feedback that greater website accessibility would be helpful as well as a request for more presence at community events.

The whiteboard video prepared for the Equity grant program received 1,124 views (combining the initial post with an updated version) and the ASL video received 331 views. Of the 39 videos posted in the past three years by the CRD, the median (middle of the range) number of views is 146. The Equity grant video is the fifth most watched video of CRD videos posted in the past three years and the ASL video is 13<sup>th</sup>.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The dedicated Equity Grant funding program with an expanded adjudication committee and outreach measures was a positive first step towards increasing access to services. Outcomes indicated that a diversity of organizations were able to access services which in turn have fostered more diversity in arts in the region. Outcomes aligned with the CRD Arts & Culture Strategic Plan goal of 'Equitable Access' to services (Goal #3).

### **Conclusions**

- The Equity pilot program met intended outcomes and provides enough positive outcomes to explore an ongoing Equity program and policy.
- The Equity pilot program attracted artists and arts organizations working with communities facing barriers to participating in arts and culture programming, or communities that did not have access to programming that was appropriate for their needs.
- Sponsor societies had more of a direct role than anticipated.

- The self-identification form was an important component and could be enhanced with more thorough prioritization.
- Further engagement with subject-matter experts and community leaders at the collaboration level of engagement is a critical component of further policy development.<sup>1</sup>

### **Recommendations**

1. The Equity Grant program be allocated \$25,000 in core project grant funding per year;
2. The Arts & Culture Support Service form an Equity Advisory Sub-Committee to explore grant adjudication, accessibility of information, data collection and the development of an equitable access policy for all arts funding programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the International Spectrum of Public Participation

## Appendices

### Appendix A - Description of Expected Outcomes

#### Expected outcome of Equity program

The Building our Arts Future Strategic Implementation Plan outlined the following expected outcomes of the Equity program based on the pilot program:

**The CRD Equity Program will forge closer, mutual relationships between arts organizations that are more broadly representative of the community in the capital region.**

The following list further clarifies the components of the expectations of the Equity program:

- **Not-for-profit art organizations** refer to registered societies with an arts mandate.
- **Closer, mutual relationships** refers to the CRD receiving a grant application through one of the program streams.
- **Arts organizations** refers to groups, collectives, or communities that share an artistic practice.
- **Broadly representative** refers to applicants that are at-risk of exclusion or have difficulty accessing support for systemic reasons. It is notable that although particular community groups were listed in the Plan (Indigenous and non-Indigenous arts organizations, multi-cultural people, people with disabilities, youth-at-risk and/or low-income groups) based on subsequent citizen input on draft guidelines it was determined that an open self-identification process would be piloted.
- **Community** refers to municipalities and electoral areas that participated in the CRD Arts & Culture Support Service between 2018 and 2020.



## Appendix B - Initial Program Logic Model

### Logic Model

The logic model below was drafted for the initial program design.

**Rationale:** Equity Grants provide opportunities for Indigenous, diverse cultures and other equity groups to access Arts Service funding for self-defined arts practices not readily supported through existing CRD Arts Service programs.

Investment	Program Activities	Outputs	Outcomes – Fulfillment of Arts Strategic Plan Goals [in ( )]	Measurement – Indicators [in ( )] Community Outreach Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$25,000 allocated from Arts Reserve</li> <li>CRD Arts Service staff</li> <li>AAC volunteer time</li> </ul>	Support for arts activities by not-for-profit (nfp) societies led by or serving Indigenous, diverse cultures, equity groups, or other communities self-identifying as being at risk of exclusion; or support for arts initiatives <u>led by</u> any of the intended target groups in partnership with a nfp organization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New and expanded support of activities by target groups</li> <li>arts programming leading to development of healthy communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizations representing Indigenous, diverse cultures and other groups at risk of exclusion are provided proactive access to CRD funding (Goal 1)</li> <li>Partnerships and collaborations with diverse communities created (Goal 2)</li> <li>New programs and events for CRD audiences (Goal 3)</li> <li>Expanded view of the arts and its role in various cultures and communities (Goal 3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in number of funded organizations (1)</li> <li>Number of new events produced (6)</li> <li>Audience numbers for new events (7)</li> <li>Reduction of barriers in education &amp; communication show through increased awareness and highly rated application process. (8)</li> <li>Year 1: number of CRD-based non-profit applicants to the fund (11)</li> <li>Number of attendees from participating municipalities. (5)</li> <li>Total number of events Arts Service provides outreach, information, education and data to, including annual summit. (15)</li> </ul>

\*Reference to a requirement for applicants to be an “arts” organization in the Implementation Plan has been omitted from the definition of eligibility in the draft guidelines. This is intended to avoid bias or assumptions of what constitutes an art practice within the applicant communities.

## Appendix C - List of Equity Grant Recipients 2018-2020

AIDS Vancouver Island	Storyboards -Lived Experiences of People Who Use Drugs	\$4,800	Year 2018
Downtown Blanchard Advisory Committee	Traditional Drum Making and Painting Workshop	\$3,500	Year 2018
Community Micro-Lending	Chronically Queer Embroidery Workshops	\$4,000	Year 2020
Ministry of Casual Living	Beau Dick Memorial Mural Cultural Activities	\$4,500	Year 2019
Oasis Society for the Spiritual Health of Victoria	Healing Drums	\$4,000	Year 2018
Old Dogwood Society for Arts & Ecology	Tiny Tiny Cozy Fest 2019	\$5,000	Year 2019
Ptarmigan Art Society	Washed Up (a component of SGI REDress Project)	\$5,000	Year 2019
Ptarmigan Art Society - ReDress project	ReDress project	\$5,000	Year 2020
The Cridge Centre for the Family	Concussion Dance	\$5,000	Year 2018
Tides Canada Initiatives	Existence Project - storytelling	\$5,000	Year 2018
University of Victoria Student Radio Society	Mediated Natures	\$5,000	Year 2019
University of Victoria Student Radio Society	Full Circle is a spoken word documentary podcast	\$3,200	Year 2018
Victoria Disability Resource Centre	Mixed-Abilities Dance Group	\$5,000	Year 2018
Victoria Disability Resource Centre	6th Annual Artists with Disabilities Showcase	\$4,000	Year 2018
Victoria Native Friendship Centre	Revitalizing Indigenous Arts and Culture Practitioners	\$4,000	Year 2018
Victoria Tool Library Society	Tender Textiles	\$1,445	Year 2019
Victoria Women's Transition House Society	Women's ceramics circle-Creativity for Healing	\$5,000	Year 2018
We Rage We Weep Alzheimer Foundation	Awkward Art Show (Arts & Alzheimer's)	\$1,500	Year 2018

## Appendix D - Document Analysis

Twelve final reports were available for analysis - that is 67% of projects. Document analysis of the reports found:

- Ten organizations (83%) reported production of a completely new event, one organization launched a re-occurring event and one organization created new work.
- Eleven organizations found the Guidelines easy to understand, one found them 'not-bad' based on some confusion around financial statements.
- Eleven organizations found the application form easy to understand, with one organization finding it 'cumbersome' with a suggestion for an oral intake, and an online application form.
- Seven organizations found the application process 'straightforward', three organizations found the application process 'easy'. One reported that the application process was 'very difficult' as relates to 'restrictions' of who can apply. This organization was in the process of organizational redevelopment and later did not meet eligibility criteria based on changes to their structure.
- Six organizations (50%) felt the grant amount was enough.
- All of the projects benefitted regional communities with themes emerging around creating safe, accessible events, building relationships across generations, and fostering dialogue.
- All of the projects reported removing barriers that enabled greater participation by more people.
- Most projects enabled professional artists to contribute to their field and advance artistic practice. However, the first year of the program included three projects with more of an impact in community development rather than artmaking.

The final reports included narratives that outlined the intrinsic impact of the program and community benefit in great detail. The CRD Arts & Culture Progress Reports from 2018 and 2019 provide evidence of impact. Quotes from eleven reports are as follows:

- "As numbers of overdoes rise, it's important to show the stories behind those numbers."
- "Not only did the youth get to learn about the culture of the Coast Salish People, how to make and paint a drum but also they were invited to join the Unity Drummers on Friday night at the Victoria Native Friendship Centre."
- "I have found the Equity Fund to be the most accessible and supportive funding program of the few which are available to members of marginalized communities."
- "Partnering with [removed for anonymity] allowed me to connect with an audience I wouldn't otherwise know how to find."
- "With the support of the Equity grant funding, to have a designated space for only queer and trans folks - these types of challenges didn't come up."

- "For some participants it was their first-time getting to be part of a dance class and build skills in integrated dance. For many people it was their first time having ASL and informal describing integrated into dance sessions."
- "These artists inspire not because of their disabilities, but because of their ability to create something beautiful that rivets its audience, that challenges their beliefs of what it is to live with a disability. While their disabilities are significant the artistry is greater."
- "The youth cultivated a new creative means that contributes to their wellness, gained new connections and strengthened their self-confidence."
- "Among the participants in our Arts & Alzheimer's program was a gentleman who had one time been a guitar player and singer. He had difficulty with his speech but became very positively animated by the music. One day when he arrived at the program he brought his guitar. Over time his playing and singing improved and he occasionally serenaded the group. His spouse later confided that her husband had not picked up his guitar in over three years since the progression of his condition."

## Appendix E - Interview Findings Compiled

The following findings were generated from a series of 18 semi-structured interviews with Equity program participants. The interviews were with the following participant groups:

**Participant Group A)** Sponsor societies that received grants for projects implemented by non-incorporated project leads; and

**Participant Group B)** Those that led funded projects – this group represents organizations receiving grants as well as the individual project leads collaborating with the sponsor societies noted in group A.

### Group A

- 5 out of 6 sponsor societies verbally confirmed the sponsored project aligned with their mandate. The only sponsor society that did not participate in an interview appears to have supported a project that provided arts education related to their mandate. This was determined through document analysis.
- 6 out of 6 sponsor organizations said they would agree to be a sponsor society again. Of those six one would only sponsor the lead if they had a strong existing relationship. One organization found that the only challenge was accounting for it in the context of the wage subsidy as it is technically revenue.
- Some sponsor societies reported unanticipated administration tasks and capacity needed to support the collaboration, for example one sponsor society faced a challenge with how to report the income while receiving COVID support funding (as noted in the point above).
- Sponsor societies felt there was a gap in communications to support their role.

## Group B

- Communications and outreach sessions reached some new potential applicants at promotions stage.
- Requests were made for more outreach activities that reached those with unique needs. For example, an Indigenous organization requested communications and engagement methods that went beyond using social media and introductory info sessions, with the intent to engaging and growing communities not only to increase program uptake.
- Suggestion for engaging Indigenous artisans in outreach efforts to build trust.
- Some requested more ongoing grant-writing support and education for organizations with less capacity.
- The grant program increased access to funding for under-served groups. Most participants did not know of many or any other funding options and felt the program was needed.
- Targeted funding with amounts set aside for Indigenous groups is needed.
- Requested consideration of moving towards allowing access [by cultural organizations] to the other grant programs that are administered because culturally mandated organizations may not necessarily have 'art' in their bylaws but deliver arts programming as a 'cultural tool'.
- The majority of grantees interviewed reflected on an enhanced ability and support for collaboration. Further to this point one grantee described how Indigenous-based organizations may be clearly supporting arts programming but not using the term 'art' in constitutional bylaws making collaboration the only way to access arts funding.
- 13 of 13 participants that filled self-identification form saw this part of the application as positive or were neutral (ranging from 'fine', 'made sense', 'good', 'great', 'important', a 'milestone' and 'saving grace').
- Some applicants felt the language on self-identification form could be refined for applicants such as clarifying if applicant was 'urban Indigenous' or 'rural Indigenous' and one requested elimination of honourifics in follow-up communications.
- One grantee felt the timing of the grant application was a barrier for small communities with less scheduling options for putting on events due to capacity.
- Project leads with sponsor organizations that were involved at a deeper level of collaboration found the relationship beneficial to increasing audiences, accountability, and accessing resources.
- Some project leads described challenges with finding a sponsor organization due to lack of eligible not-for-profit organizations related to the work they were doing.
- Many applicants did not consider who would be on the adjudication sub-committee. This appeared to be due to a lack of experience with granting processes.

- Artists that were aware of adjudication procedures noted the importance of representation on the adjudication sub-committee, and one expressed concern over whether adjudicators understood the terms used to describe equity groups. One grantee explained the importance of including individuals of the population group being adjudicated on the committee as long as they are not connected to the groups being funded.
- 13 out of 13 participants observed benefits for the self-identified groups related to increased diversity of art forms and/or increased access to experiencing art.

The grants provided opportunities for artistic production of work that, while sometimes available elsewhere in the world, has not been available for audiences in the capital region or in some cases specifically the Southern Gulf Islands (diversity). Other grantees reported the ability to provide access to artistic experiences that marginalized groups would not otherwise participate in (access).

- Applicants encouraged maintaining flexibility and simplicity wherever possible.
- Several grantees thanked the CRD administrators and expressed appreciation for the simplified, sensible process.

## Sources

Capital Regional District (2016) Building our Arts Future Together Strategic Plan  
Retrieved from [https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/arts-pdf/building-our-artsfuture-together---implementationplan.pdf?sfvrsn=896f3bca\\_4](https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/arts-pdf/building-our-artsfuture-together---implementationplan.pdf?sfvrsn=896f3bca_4)

Creative City Network of Canada (2007). Snapshot: Arts Funding Programs. Retrieved from  
Inter municipal Comparative Framework Project  
[https://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/snapshot\\_arts\\_funding\\_programs.pdf](https://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/snapshot_arts_funding_programs.pdf)

Government of Canada. (2020). Canadian Heritage.  
Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage.html>

Hill, K. (2020). Demographic Diversity of Artists in Canada in 2016. Government of Canada.  
Retrieved from <https://hillstrategies.com/resource/demographic-diversity-of-artists-in-canada-in-2016/>

1. Hill, K. (2020) Artists in Canada's provinces and territories in 2016 (with Summary Information about Cultural Workers). Retrieved from <https://hillstrategies.com/resource/artists-in-canadas-provinces-and-territories-in-2016>

Province of BC (2020) The Local Government Act.  
Retrieved from [https://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/r15001\\_00](https://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/r15001_00)

Toronto Arts Council Equity Framework (2020) Retrieved from  
<https://torontoartscouncil.org/reports-and-resources/toronto-arts-council-equity-framework>

**REPORT TO ARTS COMMISSION  
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020**

---

**SUBJECT**     Incubator Grant Program Evaluation and Recommendations

**ISSUE SUMMARY**

The Incubator Grant program was developed as result of the 2016 Building Our Arts Futures Together initiative. Following a three year pilot a staff evaluation was undertaken to determine the success of the program and make recommendations on its continuance.

**BACKGROUND**

The Incubator program was created to provide support for new kinds of arts initiatives and organizations by helping to build skills and capacity more rapidly. The dedicated Incubator program aligns with the CRD Arts & Culture Strategic Plan Goal #4 of 'Sustaining Creativity'. The logic model was based on the rationale that the inability to hire staff and adequately remunerate professionals with expertise is an obstacle to arts development at the idea and start-up phase. In particular, emerging arts organizations as well as innovative, experimental or new arts practices, have particular difficulty accessing start-up funding.

The Incubator Grant program is distinguished from Projects, Series and Extended Programming funding in that it focuses on the support of organizations undertaking developmental initiatives rather than focusing on an end product that is generally accessible to the public. The report notes the use of funds were primarily for start-up activities or to enable the employment of expertise not embedded in the organization.

The evaluation report notes that the intake for the program over the three-year pilot period was lower than anticipated, a total of six organizations. It notes a potential reason for minimal intake in 2020 was that the deadline in the last week of March coincided with the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Organizations taking advantage of the program were, with one exception, newly created organizations that had not received CRD Arts & Culture support before. The primary needs of this cohort were focused on support for administration, development of internal capacity, and support for the development of nascent artistic practices. Feedback also suggested specific areas where Arts & Culture could provide support through either direct programming or through existing community resources.

The evaluation of the pilot phase indicates that the continuance of the program fills a small but necessary and appreciated need in the community. The recommendation is for an annual budget allocation of \$15,000 in the core budget to continue the program based on the pilot period level of intake. This represents about 0.6% of total funding.

**ALTERNATIVES**

*Alternative 1*

That the Incubator Grant program be allocated \$15,000 in annual core project-based funding.

*Alternative 2*

That this report be referred back to staff for additional information.

**IMPLICATIONS**

*Alignment with Board & Corporate Priorities*

The recommendation aligns with and supports CRD Board Initiative 12c-1 to evaluate the effectiveness of grant programs in “supporting organizational sustainability, creative innovation & equity”

*Alignment with Existing Plans & Strategies*

The recommendation supports Arts & Culture Support Service Strategic Plan Goal #3, initiative 3a to “ensure support for new and emerging organizations”.

**CONCLUSION**

The establishment of the Incubator Grant program is a relatively minor cost that would support the distinct needs of new and developing arts organizations in start-up and development phases and in preparing them for future growth.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Incubator Grant program be allocated \$15,000 in annual core project-based funding.



---

James Lam, Manager  
Arts & Culture Support Service

**ATTACHMENT(S)**

Appendix A: CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Incubator Program Evaluation



# **CRD Arts & Culture Support Service Incubator Program Evaluation**

Evaluation of implementation and outcomes 2018-2020

September 9, 2020

## **Contents**

Executive Summary .....	2
Background .....	2
Findings .....	4
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	6
Appendices.....	7

## Executive Summary

In 2018, Capital Regional District (CRD) Arts & Culture launched a pilot Incubator program as a result of the Building our Arts Future Implementation plan. The Incubator program was intended to provide support for new kinds of arts initiatives and organizations by helping to build skills and capacity more rapidly. The dedicated Incubator program aligned with the CRD Arts & Culture Strategic Plan Goal #4 of 'Sustaining Creativity'.

This summary evaluates the three years of the pilot Incubator Grant program administered by CRD Arts & Culture Support Services. This evaluation aligns with the CRD Corporate initiatives 12c-1 to 'Evaluate effectiveness of grant programs in supporting organizational sustainability.' The evaluation consisted of a document analysis of final reports and qualitative interviews.

### **Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations**

A total of \$29,000 was invested over three years to six organizations. Feedback consistently remarked on the importance of start-up funding to launch new artistic projects with additional requests for training on application procedures and financial management. The CRD Arts & Culture Incubator program provided significant development support for new arts initiatives and new arts organizations that did not have administrative capacity.

For CRD Arts & Culture to continue to make progress on strategic Goal #4 'Sustain Creativity' it is recommended that:

- The CRD Incubator program be included in core funding with \$15,000 allocated per year.
- Additional outreach support is offered through community partnerships such as grant-writing workshops and an organizational development resource toolkit.

## Background

The Building our Arts Future strategic engagement process documented significant obstacles to the development of organizations engaged in innovative, experimental or new arts practices, particularly at the start-up phase. Action 2 of the implementation plan recommended a structure for a dedicated funding program to support early artistic or administrative staffing and support access to senior-level mentoring. The CRD Arts Commission adopted this recommendation and launched the Incubator program in 2018. See Appendix A for the initial program logic model. The Incubator program was intended to provide:

- Support for staffing, mentoring, workspace, training or other resources to assist in the acceleration of organizational development or in the development of new arts projects.

The maximum grant available was \$5000 from an annual available budget of \$25,000 funded from the Arts Reserve Fund. The program ran for three years with one intake deadline per year in 2018, 2019 and 2020. The 2018 and 2019 grant cycles are complete, the 2020 round of grants have been allocated. Final reports for the third year are not expected until March 2021.

### **Uptake**

A total of six grants with a combined investment of \$29,000 were distributed over three years. The program funded arts organization of various disciplines at different stages of development. Five organizations were newly registered societies in a 'start-up' phase. One was an arts organization created in 1989 that had never created administrative protocols. See Appendix B for a list of grantees and amounts.

The program increased uptake in year two but did not grow significantly in year three. There appears to be a correlation between the significant effort of establishing an arts organization and the volume of applicants to the Incubator program. In addition, the deadline for the third intake of the Incubator grant program was March 26th, 2020 - one week after the British Columbia government declared a provincial state of emergency. On March 18<sup>th</sup>, in response to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19). At this time large gatherings were prohibited, preventing many arts organizations from launching initiatives. It is feasible that uptake of the Incubator program decreased due to the inability of the arts sector to convene audiences, plan events or have financial security.

### **Evaluation Approach Taken**

Between July 15 and August 22, 2020, CRD staff conducted a program evaluation through document analysis of final reports and qualitative interviews. Staff conducted a document analysis of four available Incubator-funded final reports (67%). Two reports were not yet complete at the time of this evaluation. In addition, staff conducted six semi-structured interviews with representatives from 100% of organizations that received Incubator grants. Each participant answered a set of questions related to the intended outcomes of the program. The qualitative data from this sample group was coded into themes by the interviewer. This

evaluation explored whether the expected outcomes of the Incubator program were achieved or not. The evaluation questions addressed were:

- a) Is lack of funding a barrier to building skills?
- b) Does start up funding promote innovative, experimental or new artistic practices and/or help with organizational development, accessing specialized expertise, or enable the hiring of staff?
- c) Does the application, adjudication and reporting meet the needs of emerging artist groups?

The resulting findings will be useful in determining the future of the pilot Incubator program.

## Findings

### **a) Lack of funding is a barrier for emerging organizations wanting to build skills**

The amount of work and commitment required for arts organizations to become established or launch new initiatives is significant. It is difficult to find grants for new arts societies. All interview participants expressed the need for the Incubator grant program. Interview participants said;

- “Start-ups...is maybe the most, hardest thing to do and to own the journey. Incubator grants are really needed.”
- “There are business things you need to set up. It’s all a part of putting a show that you can be proud of and put into the community...but if you don’t know what those stepping stones are to put it on...you’re not really sure what the next step is.”

### **b) Start up funding promotes organizational development, helps access specialized expertise, and enables short term staffing**

Of the arts organizations that successfully applied to the program, 100% were able to use the grant to build capacity in their organization, learn new skills for development and either establish new partnerships or remunerate professionals. The ability to apply as a newly formed organization was valued.

Interview participants expressed that the Incubator grant process:

- Gave organizations a chance to define and focus their mandate
- Was an opportunity to learn about not-for-profit administration
- Built capacity for successfully applying to other grant programs
- Sparked momentum in organizational development

- Supported organizational capacity-building
- Supported new artistic practices
- Supported partnership development.

Interview participants said;

- “It [the grant] meant we were able to take a really big risk for a company of our size, we wouldn’t have been able to have the same designers or actor.”

Most of the organizations produced new and experimental work. However, the Incubator grant was *not* seen as a direct vehicle for artistic development, rather as an opportunity to cultivate administrative skills and learn the grant-writing process. It appears that organizations are not necessarily accelerating their organizational activities, instead they are proceeding more confidently and knowledgeably. Several interview participants commented how COVID-19 has become a barrier to creating and/or maintaining the momentum that the Incubator grants sparked.

Interview participants said;

- “If COVID wasn’t happening it would have put us in a much better position.”

### **c) The application, adjudication and reporting met the needs of emerging artist groups.**

All interview participants expressed satisfaction with the CRD Arts & Culture service. Several organizations commented that the application forms were generally simple and CRD administrators were helpful or exceeded service expectations. They were able to easily find information about the grant. Several attended information sessions as well as found details online.

All interview participants said they needed help with financial statements and either sought out mentorship or were seeking more resources. Several interview participants suggested the CRD provide an additional resource package during the grant writing phase and requested more examples of what the Incubator grant would fund.

Document analysis of 4 completed final reports found:

- Guidelines were easy to understand (100%)
- Application was easy to understand (100%)

- The application process was considered 'Straightforward' to 'Somewhat easy'.
- Funding was enough for proposed project (100%)

Interview participants said;

- "Answering all the questions made the plan way more clear. I liked the information asked on the form and the simplicity of the form."
- "It was hard to do the financial section at this point - we don't have anything to go on."

Many expressed appreciation for the administrative support and mentioned being treated with respect. Interview participants said;

- "The CRD was helpful and conscientious and professional - more than you had to be, you helped so much...I am really grateful."
- "It really does feel like a community-supported granting agency. You can see that the office is really trying to support people through the granting process which is also important for a regional funder."

## Conclusions and Recommendations

A small percentage of total annual arts and culture support funding (0.6% or \$15,000) would likely meet the annual need for the Incubator grant program as indicated by current uptake. The program would be improved with the addition of educational resources and training tools for not-for-profit financial management and basic administrative skills. Promoting organizational capacity and skill building is an existing Arts & Culture strategic outreach item.

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the Incubator grant program is extended to core funding with \$15,000 allocated per year and dedicated staff time to facilitate skill-building workshops in partnership with local subject-matter experts.

## Appendices

### Appendix A - Description of Expected Outcomes

The Building our Arts Future Strategic Implementation plan outlined the following expected outcomes of the Incubator program based on the pilot program:

**The CRD Incubator Program will enhance sustainability and resiliency of the arts by funding staffing for new kinds of arts projects and arts organizations. This new funding is designed to access senior-level expertise in any area required to accelerate the organizations development.**

### Appendix B - Initial Program Logic Model

The Building Our Arts Future Strategic Implementation plan

**Rationale:** the inability to hire staff and adequately remunerate professionals with expertise is an obstacle to arts development at the idea and start-up phase. In particular, emerging arts organizations as well as innovative, experimental or new arts practices, have difficulty accessing start-up funding.

Investment	Program Activities	Outputs	Outcomes – Fulfillment of Arts Strategic Plan Goals [in ( )]	Measurement – Indicators [in ( )] Community Outreach Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$25,000, allocated in project grants budget</li><li>• CRD Arts Service staff</li><li>• AAC volunteer time</li></ul>	Support for staffing, mentoring, workspace, training or other resources that assist in the acceleration of organizational development or in the development of new arts projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Economies of scale through shared resources</li><li>• Sharing of resources</li><li>• Supports staff cost or staff training</li><li>• Funding of outside expertise</li><li>• Supports mentoring</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Creation of new organizations (Goal 1)</li><li>• New collaborations and partnerships (Goal 2)</li><li>• Development of organizational capacity within funder orgs (Goal 2)</li><li>• Skill development in staff (Goal 2)</li><li>• Creation of new arts projects (Goal 2)</li><li>• Development of audiences (Goal 3)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of funded organizations that are growing sustainably (1)</li><li>• Funded orgs provide jobs for artists &amp; cultural workers (2)</li><li>• Year 1: Establish baseline number of applicants.</li></ul>

**Appendix C - List of Incubator Grant Recipients 2018-2020**

2020	Saanich Space Blanket Society	\$5000
2020	Starry Starry Skies	\$5000
2019	Artemesia Institute - Critical Ecology Research Guild	\$5000
2019	Victoria Hapax Theatre Society	\$5000
2019	Yellowhouse Arts Centre Society	\$5000
2018	Ground Zero Printmaking Society	\$5000



**REPORT TO ARTS COMMISSION  
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020**

---

**SUBJECT**     **Bylaw Amendment 4367 – Request for Further Information**

**ISSUE SUMMARY**

The Arts Commission requested further information on the distinction between an “unpaid staff member” and a “volunteer” as it relates to draft Bylaw 4367.

**BACKGROUND**

At their meeting of September 23, 2020, the Arts Commission reviewed draft bylaw amendment 4367, the purpose of which is to broaden the potential pool of candidates eligible to sit on the Arts Advisory Council (Council). The draft bylaw states that a person is disqualified from being appointed to the Council in section 2:

2

- (g)     A person is disqualified from being appointed to, and serving on, the Council who:
  - (i)     is a member of the board of directors of any organization applying for funding through the Arts Commission; or
  - (ii)    is a paid or unpaid staff member of any organization applying for funding through the Arts Commission.
- (h)     A member who has, directly or indirectly, individually or through any other person, any material interest in a contract with or for an organization applying for funding, shall not adjudicate, influence the vote on a matter, or otherwise lobby for such applications, and must disclose such conflicts and recuse themselves in accordance with the Capital Regional District Board Procedures Bylaw No. 3828, 2012;

In the current bylaw, the aspect of 2(h) reading “Anyone who has, directly or indirectly, individually or through any other person, any material interest in a contract with or for an organization applying for funding” is a disqualification for serving on Council. This has resulted in a narrowing pool of candidates over time. In the proposed bylaw, these terms are part of a newly introduced conflict of interest and recusal mechanism.

Following a discussion on whether the proposed disqualifying terms in 2(g)(ii) were too proscriptive, the Commission made the following motion:

To refer back to staff for further investigation on the distinction between an unpaid staff member as per recommended Bylaw 4367, clause (g)(ii) and a volunteer, and if appropriate, ask the Arts Advisory Council to comment on the proposed revisions.

Broadly speaking, a fiduciary duty requires one party to look after the best interests of another party in an exemplary manner. For purposes of determining eligibility, board members and paid staff of funded organizations have a clear fiduciary duty and may be excluded on that basis.

In the past, the exclusion of “unpaid staff” of funded organizations, *aka* volunteers, was absolute in order to avoid potential conflict or the perception of conflict. CRD Legal Services has commented that “unpaid staff” may be interpreted so as to disqualify those volunteers who are responsible for managing or undertaking a significant aspect of an organization’s affairs; e.g., a volunteer development manager or volunteer production manager versus a volunteer with lower levels of responsibility; e.g., an usher or ticket taker.

Further discussions with Legal Services has resulted in suggested alternative language to describe those disqualified as someone who “is a board member or other individual having a fiduciary duty to any organization applying for funding.” Such language would replace 2(g)(i) and (ii).

Stating “fiduciary duty” as the principle for exclusion provides a point of reference to applicants to self-vet. Omitting the blanket exclusion of volunteers may also contribute to the goal of increasing the pool of potential candidates which is understood to be the main concern of Commission members. The judgement of whether an applicant, who is also a volunteer, has a fiduciary duty and should be disqualified, would likely become part of the selection process.

Legal Services note that consultation with Council on the language of this or any other bylaw would not be typical. The initiative to change the terms of disqualification and introduction of conflict of interest and recusal was based on discussions between Arts & Culture staff and chairs of the Advisory Council over a period of years but not discussed with the Council as a whole. The Commission can seek advice or comment from their advisory body if there are particular issues as they see fit.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

### *Alternative 1*

That the Arts Commission direct staff to revise draft bylaw 4367 with alternate language defining exclusions for appointment to the Arts Advisory Council for consideration at their next meeting.

### *Alternative 2*

That the Arts Commission, per staff report of September 23, 2020, recommends to Capital Regional District Board:

1. That Bylaw No. 4367, “CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020” be introduced and read a first, second, and third time; and
2. That Bylaw No. 4367 be adopted.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

Amending bylaw 4367 will increase the potential cohort of individuals eligible to serve on the Arts Advisory Council (AAC) and introduce generally accepted practices for dealing with conflict of interest and recusal. This initiative is in alignment with the CRD 2019-2022 Corporate Plan to enhance systems and policies to respond to evolving best practices and adhere to legislative requirements.

**CONCLUSION**

The current eligibility criteria are atypically exclusionary and limits the pool of potential candidates. Common legislative language that allows for the identification of conflicts of interest, the materiality of conflicts, and a recusal process are absent.

Bylaw 4367 establishes conflict of interest rules for the Arts Advisory Council in line with CRD standards and widens the pool of expertise available to the Council that will enable it to more effectively fulfil its mandate of grant assessment and providing advice on issues facing the arts sector.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Arts Commission direct staff to revise draft bylaw 4367 with alternate language defining exclusions for appointment to the Arts Advisory Council for consideration at their next meeting.



---

James Lam, Manager  
Arts & Culture Support Service

**ATTACHMENT(S)**

Appendix A: Staff Report, Sept. 23, 2020: Bylaw No. 4367: CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020

Appendix B: Bylaw No. 4367

**REPORT TO THE ARTS COMMISSION  
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2020**

---

**SUBJECT**            **Bylaw No. 4367: CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020**

**ISSUE SUMMARY**

Bylaw 4367 amends Arts Advisory Council Establishing Bylaw 2973 to introduce conflict of interest and recusal processes with a purpose to increase accountability in the grant assessment process and increase the pool of candidates with desirable skills and experience.

**BACKGROUND**

Bylaw 2973, established in 2001, established the community-based Arts Advisory Council (AAC) to provide advice to the Arts Commission on the needs of the arts sector and to act as an adjudicative body for funding programs.

Bylaw 2973 disqualifies any individual who:

2(h)(iii) has, directly or indirectly, by himself or through any other person, any interest in a contract with or for an organization applying for funding.

The outcome of this clause has been a narrowing pool of candidates and the exclusion of many individuals whose experience could be a valuable addition to the AAC. As an extension of the exclusions resulting from this clause, the bylaw did not provide a conflict of interest or recusal process for members of the Council.

At their meeting of November 17, 2019, the Arts Commission directed staff to draft an amendment to the bylaw that would provide access to AAC membership from a broader pool of individuals from the community, provide a conflict of interest mechanism and provide for an appropriate recusal process in the event that a conflict of interest occurs.

The proposed revisions in draft bylaw 4367 accomplish this, pointing to the CRD Procedure Bylaw and the Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Commissions that outline the means for identifying conflicts and appropriate recusal processes.

**ALTERNATIVES**

*Alternative 1*

The Arts Commission recommends to Capital Regional District Board:

1. That Bylaw No. 4367, "CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020" be introduced and read a first, second, and third time; and
2. That Bylaw No. 4367 be adopted.

*Alternative 2*

That this report be referred back to staff for additional information.

### **IMPLICATIONS**

Amending bylaw 4367 will increase the potential cohort of individuals eligible to serve on the Arts Advisory Council (AAC) and introduce generally accepted practices for dealing with conflict of interest and recusal. This initiative is in alignment with the CRD 2019-2022 Corporate Plan to enhance systems and policies to respond to evolving best practices and adhere to legislative requirements.

### **CONCLUSION**

The current eligibility criteria are atypically exclusionary and limits the pool of potential candidates. Common legislative language that allows for the identification of conflicts of interest, the materiality of conflicts, and a recusal process are absent.

Bylaw 4367 establishes conflict of interest rules for the AAC in line with CRD standards and widens the pool of expertise available to the AAC that will enable it to more effectively fulfil its mandate of grant assessment and providing advice on issues facing the arts sector.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Arts Commission recommends to Capital Regional District Board:

1. That Bylaw No. 4367, "CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020" be introduced and read a first, second, and third time; and
2. That Bylaw No. 4367 be adopted.

Submitted by:	James Lam, Manager, Arts & Culture Support Service
Concurrence:	Nelson Chan, MBA, CPA, CMA, Chief Financial Officer
Concurrence:	Kristen Morley, J.D., General Manager, Corporate Services & Corporate Officer
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

### **ATTACHMENT**

Appendix A: Bylaw No. 4367

**CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT  
BYLAW NO. 4367**

\*\*\*\*\*

**A BYLAW TO AMEND BYLAW 2973, BEING CRD ARTS ADVISORY COUNCIL BYLAW, 2002**

\*\*\*\*\*

**WHEREAS:**

- A. Under Bylaw No. 2973, CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, the Regional Board established the Arts and Cultural Support Service for the purpose of benefiting the arts community; and
- B. The Board wishes to amend Bylaw No. 2973, to ensure broad participation, and clarify conflict of interest language for members serving on the Arts Advisory Council to avoid disqualifications within the Arts and Cultural Support Service.

**NOW THEREFORE**, the Capital Regional District Board in open meeting assembled hereby enacts as follows:

- 1. Bylaw No. 2973, "CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002", is hereby amended by:
  - (a) replacing all references to "Arts Committee" or "CRD Arts Committee" with "Arts Commission".
  - (b) replacing section 2 in its entirety with:
    - 2. The Council is hereby established as an advisory body to the CRD Arts Commission and shall consist initially of those twelve (12) persons appointed as members until December 31, 2002 and thereafter shall consist of twelve (12) persons appointed by the CRD Arts Commission.
      - (a) The Chair of the Arts Commission, the Chair of the Council and the Manager of the Arts and Cultural Support Service will together review and make recommendations to the Arts Commission for appointments to the Arts Council.
      - (b) Terms of appointment shall be to a maximum of eight (8) years with
        - (i) The first term to be for one (1) year;
        - (ii) The second term to be for three (3) years; and
        - (iii) Subsequent terms to be for two (2) years
      - (c) All vacancies arising from an expiration of a term must be advertised or posted publicly for at least thirty (30) days.
      - (d) Before the 1st of January every year, the Arts Commission shall appoint or reappoint members to the Council to fill the terms of office of the members whose term expire as of the 31st of December each year.
      - (e) A vacancy arising from any cause other than the expiration of the term for which the member was appointed, shall be filled for the unexpired portion of the term only, by an appointment of the member municipalities on recommendation of the Arts Commission. Such recommendation shall not be binding on the Board, but shall be considered.

(f) A member who fails to attend three successive meetings of the Council, except because of illness or with leave of the Council, shall be deemed to have vacated membership, and the Chair of the Council shall forthwith inform the Arts Commission of the vacancy.

(g) A person is disqualified from being appointed to, and serving on, the Council who:  
(i) is a member of the board of directors of any organization applying for funding through the Arts Commission; or

(ii) is a paid or unpaid staff member of any organization applying for funding through the Arts Commission.

(h) A member who has, directly or indirectly, individually or through any other person, any material interest in a contract with or for an organization applying for funding, shall not adjudicate, influence the vote on a matter, or otherwise lobby for such applications, and must disclose such conflicts and recuse themselves in accordance with the Capital Regional District Board Procedures Bylaw No. 3828, 2012; and

(i) Members of the Council shall serve without remuneration.

2. This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "CRD Arts Advisory Council Bylaw, 2002, Amendment Bylaw No. 3, 2020".

READ A FIRST TIME THIS	th	day of	20__
READ A SECOND TIME THIS	th	day of	20__
READ A THIRD TIME THIS	th	day of	20__
ADOPTED THIS	th	day of	20__

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER



Greater  
Victoria  
**Youth  
Orchestra**

Yariv Aloni MUSIC DIRECTOR

September 11, 2020

James Lam, Manager  
CRD Arts & Culture Support Service  
625 Fisgard Street, PO Box 1000  
Victoria, BC V8W 2S6

Dear James,

On behalf of Music Director Yariv Aloni, the players and board of the GVYO, I write to thank the CRD Arts Development Service and the members of the CRD Arts Commission and Arts Advisory Council for the support of the Capital Regional District to the Greater Victoria Youth Orchestra.

We have received the direct deposit payment of \$8,000 representing payment of the 2020/21 CRD Arts & Culture Operating Grant. Enclosed is a receipt for your records.

We are proud to be recognized as a valued contributor to our region's vibrant culture. The endorsement and financial assistance that the CRD has provided us over the course of three decades has made it possible for us to fulfil our mission to provide the highest standard of orchestral training and to be a musical resource to our community.

The GVYO has of course been impacted by the coronavirus pandemic, which led to the cancellation of our April 26, 2020 concert and this season's Summer String Camp. We are making every effort to continue to provide orchestral training to our young musicians; however our plans must remain flexible. We are following all safety protocols for instrumental ensembles to ensure that every precaution is taken. Our hope is to provide musical leadership for smaller ensembles with the aim of presenting three recorded concerts, streamed to an at-home audience. While we will all miss the excitement of live performance, participating in live-stream/recorded events will provide our musicians with first-hand experience in an aspect of professional performance. For safety reasons, we plan to start rehearsals with two strings-only chamber orchestras in October, with the hope of incorporating wind and brass players in January.

You and the CRD Arts Commission and Arts Advisory Council members will receive email updates and Society Newsletters as the season progresses. We thank you for your continuing support.

With gratitude from us all,

Sheila Redhead  
Manager, Greater Victoria Youth Orchestra

Encl: Receipt #6907