
FLEXIBLE MANAGEMENT MODELS

FINAL REPORT

Presented to the
Canada Council for the Arts

By Jane Marsland
March 30, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
DETAILED REPORT	
INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT	
Introduction and Purpose of Review.....	7
Context and Current Environment	
Theoretical Context.....	8
Environmental Context and Historical Overview.....	10
Critical Issues.....	11
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE PRODUCING FORMATS	
Features of Alternative or Non-Formal Arts Producing Entities.....	13
Flexible Frameworks of Arts Producing Entities.....	14
NEED FOR FLEXIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORKS	
Analysis of Current Canada Council Programs	16
How to Best Support Flexible Management Models.....	16
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
CONCLUSION.....	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of its new Strategic Plan, the Canada Council for the Arts commissioned this review to investigate flexible management models for artists, collectives and small arts organizations as well as evaluating existing programs at the Council to establish strengths and weaknesses of the current programs as well as gaps within and between disciplines.

Theoretical Context:

- The theory and foundation on how arts organizations are structured and managed that was developed in the 1960's and 70' no longer works for every artist or arts organization especially in an environment of rapid change and instability and a lack of financial and human resources. New arts entities are being hampered by the need to apply these structures and methods with insufficient resources to make them work.
- There has been an upsurge in the expansion, range, diversity, and productivity of artists working in non-formal, non-institutional formats, including crossing the boundaries between not-for-profit and for profit. Hybridity is emerging as a major theme as artists of many different cultural traditions start to make work on contemporary themes/issues using their cultural/artistic practices and performance theories. Artists working in new media and new practices see themselves on a spectrum or continuum of arts practice and not necessarily as part of a single discipline area.
- Discipline silos are starting to merge; in fact rigid boundaries between disciplines are becoming a major barrier to many artists.
- These artists are working in new formats by choice, they are not just waiting until they can grow into traditional organizations.

Environmental Context:

- Ambiguity, complexity, and rapid change now dominate the environment – arts entities must remain flexible and responsive to what is happening around them.
- There is a need for the arts community to move from the old vision of one model, one best way of doing things to new approaches – it's not enough to keep 'sharpening the saw' anymore – it's acknowledging that new models will be required to ensure the arts continue to thrive.
- Need to expand the primary focus on organizations and institutions – no longer the resources to build them – the focus for many artists and arts entities will be on developing networks and the need to build an ecology of shared resources.
- Increasingly, artists and arts entities want to retain their entrepreneurial spirit and roots.

Critical Issues:

- Artists are hampered in their development by lack of key human resources in critical supporting roles – independent producers, managers, agents, tour bookers, technicians, etc.
- Lack of continuity of key staff within arts entities.
- Huge attitudinal shifts in the values of the next generation about to enter the workforce – and the values of the young arts managers who have just entered the field are very different from the ‘pioneering managers’ who were willing to ‘subsidize’ the sector – the new managers are already saying they won’t work 80 hour weeks for low salaries and no benefits - they are seeking a healthier work/life balance.
- Not all younger managers are interested in supporting one artist’s vision- they tend to be more entrepreneurial and less interested in joining an established company.
- Artists expressed a tremendous need for flexibility in funding programs:
 - flexibility in definition and scope of programs as well as program criteria and expected outcomes;
 - ability to apply to one program instead of several in order to complete one artistic project which crosses multiple disciplines;
 - need for more frequent deadlines – much momentum lost having to wait months for next deadline.

ALTERNATIVE PRODUCING FORMATS

Producing Frameworks for Arts Entities:

Non institutional organizing frameworks developed by artists to produce their work:

- **Single Production Project Entity:** Primary purpose of the entity is to create and produce projects – no resources are spent on an ongoing operational structure.
- **Multi-Production Project Company:** Multi-disciplinary, numerous projects underway at the same time – what is in common with all the projects is the artists and what separates each project is the distinct need for particular resources or expertise to develop the project.
- **Multi-function/Production Centres:** A single entity serves as the centre for a number of artistic activities – usually has a resource such as a space that requires minimum amount of activity or need for more activity than can be generated by the centre itself in order to cover the operating costs.
- **Collaborative Ventures:**
 - Integrated – collaborations where two or more entities come together to achieve a specific project that one working alone could not – creates a virtual company – exists only to achieve production
 - Non-integrated – collaborations that involve sharing resources, such as a space or joint marketing initiatives, etc. Non-integrated collaborations can exist for one production or can be ongoing.

FLEXIBLE MANAGEMENT MODELS

This report examines:

- **The need to address:** What do artists require to create, produce, and connect their work to audiences in current environment?
- **Why:** Growth of arts sector outstripping available resources – new frameworks required – most arts entities will never have all the resources they require inside – they will have to engage their collaborators – administrative, artistic and technical – on an ‘as needed’ basis
- **How:** Support Flexible Management/Administrative Models and new organizing frameworks for management, administrative, and production entities, such as:
 - Cluster management entities
 - Umbrella management organizations
 - Independent agents – artist managers, booking agents, tour manager, dealers, etc.
 - Collaborative and co-operative ventures
 - Multi-function centres

(These organizing frameworks are defined on page 7)

To find, develop and support the key individuals to undertake this work, the Council will need to invest in these individuals who support the artists and small arts entities on the administrative and management side in the same way that the Council supports creative artists that emerge with compelling ideas.

Three critical aspects emerged from the review:

1. Non-formal or alternative producing entities require new supporting administrative and management structures.
2. The increasing deficit of trained administrators, managers, producers, agents must have training/development/mentoring programs in place to alleviate the impending crisis.
3. Changing the ‘institutional lens’ as the primary way of seeing arts organizations – for both the funders and artists, will take time and the building of trust.

What Council Can Do:

1. Acknowledge and support flexible management/administrative models that better reflect the operating/producing formats of artists working in non-institutional or non-formal alternative structures.
2. Find, develop, and support the key individuals who will provide the full range of management, administrative and career/market support to these artists working in non-formal/alternative production formats.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on initial findings from the review of the sector and meetings with Council staff:

- Acknowledge, recognize and support multi-year production projects.
- Amplify, highlight or introduce programs in appropriate discipline sections of the Council that will support flexible and new conceptual management models.
- Support collaborative administrative ventures and shared initiative projects in all sections of the Council.
- Recognize the need for a centralized program to respond to the need for a wider pool of shared services and free agents; producers, dealers, administrators, agents, project managers working across disciplines.

Recommendation 1: Multi-year project production programs should be explored in all disciplines for individuals (e.g. in Visual Arts) and organizations (e.g. in Media and Performing Arts and Spoken Word Artists).

Recommendation 2:

a) In the same way the Council is beginning to provide long-term project grants for the artistic production of non-traditional arts entities, Council should also support the introduction of long-term project grants to the administrative development of the artistic sector in order to provide increased stability through the creation and/or development of management structures such as Cluster Management, Umbrella Management to support artists working in non-traditional formats.

b) Invest in the Individual - find, develop and support key individuals who will provide the full range of management, administrative and career/market support to artists working in non-traditional production formats.

Recommendation 3: Acknowledge and accept the eligibility of individual artistic producers in the creation and production programs of the Canada Council for the Arts for their support required by artists working in non-traditional formats.

Recommendation 4: NASO's play an important role in the professional development of their members. It will be important for the development and sustainability of the non-institutional arts entities that the NASO's find ways to reflect these arts entities in their memberships and tailor some of their professional development opportunities for these entities. Currently, NASO's do not reflect the entire range of producing formats in their memberships.

Recommendation 5: Ensure the access and eligibility of arts entities working in non-formal formats that are not currently operating clients of the Canada Council to the Flying Squad Program.

Recommendation 6: Support administrative collaborative ventures and shared initiative projects in all sections of the Council. Multi-disciplinary ventures could be addressed through the Inter-arts Office

Recommendation 7: Acknowledge and support flexible management models that better reflect the operating/producing formats of the non-formal arts entities.

Recommendation 8:

- (a) Respond to the need for a wider pool of shared services and individuals skilled in specific roles: producers, dealers, agents, project managers working across disciplines; and
- (b) Create broader access for these types of individual and entities and greater flexibility in programs that already exist within specific disciplines at Council.
- (c) This could be a centralized program.

FLEXIBLE MANAGEMENT MODELS

Purpose of the Review:

As part of its new Strategic Plan, the Canada Council for the Arts commissioned this review to investigate flexible management models for artists, collectives and small arts organizations as well as evaluating existing programs at the Council to establish strengths and weaknesses of the current programs as well as gaps within and between disciplines.

The proposal defined three administrative support models as a framework for the review:

- Cluster management – an individual or group of individuals provide a range of administrative, management, technical support services to selected arts entities. Cluster management services can be provided by experienced arts managers or administrators who offer management services to a small group of artists they select, or a group of artists can find and share an experienced arts manager they couldn't afford individually. Momentum Arts Management is an example of a group of small dance entities came together to apply for funding for a manager to provide management services that they couldn't afford on their own.
- Umbrella management – a not-for-profit entity that provides administrative services such as grant writing, bookkeeping, planning to artists on a per service fee basis as well as providing a few of their clients a fuller range of management services. The Dance Umbrella of Ontario, the Small Theatre Administrative Facility and Diagramme are examples. These organizations receive funding to provide the administrative services at a subsidized rate.
- Agents, producers, managers and dealers – these are individuals who support artists to develop their careers, to get their work in front of an audience or into the marketplace. Increasingly artists require the services of independent administrators such as publicists, bookkeepers, grant writers because not all disciplines have access to Umbrella Management Organizations.

This review was required to investigate the changing management and administrative support requirements of increasing numbers of artists working outside the usual institutional formats. The review was also required to provide a rationale to better sustain the supporting structures themselves – administrative, management, collaborations – and to find a balance to the usual funding focus that is primarily on the artistic and producing aspects of the field.

Three critical aspects emerged from the review:

1. Artists who produce their work in non-institutional or alternative production structures require flexible or new supporting administrative and management models.
2. The increasing deficit of trained managers, administrators, producers, agents must have training/development/mentoring programs in place to alleviate any impending crisis.
3. Changing the 'institutional lens' as the primary way of seeing arts organizations – for both the funders and artists, will take time and the building of trust.

Methodology:

The consultant reviewed all the applicable programs offered by the Canada Council as well as examining numerous reports prepared by or for the Canada Council, other funding agencies, foundations, etc. The following observations and recommendations are based on several conversations with Canada Council staff, other government funders such as the Ontario Arts Council, foundations interested in the health and sustainability of the arts, as well as numerous artists, arts organizations, agents and producers. The consultant has also worked for nearly 60 organizations across Canada, many of which are interested in or currently use some form of these flexible management models.

As a result of this preliminary research, it became apparent that it would be necessary to look outside the arts sector to see how other sectors were dealing with similar issues. Many of the ideas put forward in this report are based on new conceptual frameworks developed by Brenda Zimmerman of York University in her work on complexity theory and its applications to the health care sector, *Edgware*; Gareth Morgan, York University, in his work on new mindsets, *Images of Organization*; Ralph D. Stacey, *Managing the Unknowable*; Margaret Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science* and *A Simpler Way*. Grounding these theoretical concepts in the arts is the work of George Thom and Nello McDaniel of Arts Action Research, especially their framework of using the artistic/creative process as the operating paradigm for arts organizations.

CONTEXT AND CURRENT ENVIRONMENT

Theoretical Context:

One of the challenges facing the arts today is the fact that much of the theory and foundation for how the arts are structured and managed was developed in the 1960's and '70s, a time of much greater environmental stability. Many of the conditions that allowed organizations to develop, flourish, and grow into institutions have disappeared and the new conditions are not favourable to the development of new institutions. Arts funders throughout North America and Europe are increasingly aware of how these changes are affecting the organizational infrastructure that artists require.

Alternative management models have been in existence and funded by the Canada Council since the 60's, but in a very limited way. In '*The Evolution of Arts Administration in Canadian Theatre 1945-2002*' by André Courchesne and Roger Gaudet, five principal management

models are detailed: the actor-manager model, the producer model, the external two-headed model, the internal two-headed model, and the self-management model. In theatre, the two-headed models have become the standard models, i.e. where there are two principal managers: an artistic director and an administrative director.

I'm not advocating that all of Council's clients require alternative management models, indeed, most will continue to work within the not for profit institutional model and whose management issues are addressed in the report by Louise Poulin,

However, there have always been artists who have determined to work outside the traditional institutional frameworks. The Council also responded to these needs by supporting artist run centres and collectives as early as the 1970's. Since the 1980's, when governments first started to cut their support to the arts, a larger proportion of the arts sector found it difficult to develop the resources to continue to build institutional structures. It has increasingly become apparent that many arts organizations will not be able to acquire all the resources they need independently. There is now a much greater understanding by certain arts organizations that they must work within a culture of shared resources.

The Council's commitment and flexibility to respond to the unique needs of artists and certain sectors of the arts community should be continued and expanded. At the same time, the Council needs to broaden the scope of support to allow individuals who have unique and essential leadership, management or administrative skills access to funding to ensure these sectors of the arts community to continue to flourish. An assessment of their organizational health will also require some adjustments from the model of organizational health proposed in the *Organizational Health Assessment and Implementation Process Final Report*, by Productions Louise Poulin.

Because the arts community often looks at itself through institution-coloured glasses, the new, emerging, and culturally diverse segments of the community have remained somewhat undefined and almost invisible. However, in sheer numbers alone, the expansion, range, depth, diversity, vitality and productivity of artists and artistic groups working in non-formal, non-institutional formats is undeniable. It is important to note that these entities are not necessarily small because of current conditions alone or their inability to develop resources. Many have determined that they are not interested in becoming traditional organizations or institutions. It is also important to recognize that in some arts disciplines – music for example – it is completely inappropriate to impose this model on ensembles, groups and bands, but these groups, which comprise a large component of the Music Section still require a certain amount of administrative and other support services.

In looking at the Ternary model of arts organizations in the Interim Report of the Organizational Health Committee, these entities would seem to form 'satellite' clusters to the model. These entities are highly diverse, including individuals, partnerships, ensembles and small 'companies', and the wide array of support services and/or structures they require are different from the traditional arts organization or institution. Growth is not necessarily a key indicator of success for them nor is acquiring the resources required to have a sizeable internal infrastructure. They are much more a reflection of and a response to the highly volatile environment of today. It cannot be overstated that this sector of the arts is where the most explosive growth is occurring, in the number of arts professionals working, the amount of work produced, and the number of companies/entities emerging.

Over the course of the research and investigation into the state of these arts entities and how they work, and in particular, when examining what was working well for them, it became clear that trying to fit the traditional not-for-profit framework on them wasn't entirely successful. Additional research into other organizational frameworks needed to be undertaken. That research revealed that new mental models and a paradigm shift would be necessary if these arts entities were to thrive in the current environment.

We all work within a certain paradigm, conscious or not. Our paradigm focuses the whole of our mental and emotional reality, it determines our expectations, frames the questions that we ask, and structures our approach to what we do. A paradigm is a whole conceptual framework embracing our most deeply held, unconscious assumptions and values – the things we take for granted in any situation – like a pair of glasses that we wear to focus our visual world. We need our paradigms to make sense of the world, yet because of them we become trapped or locked into one way of seeing things.

In the arts, our paradigm developed in the 60's and 70's and was based on the assumptions that the arts should work within the not-for-profit model, which worked quite well in a more stable environment and which still does work for many operational and institutional arts organizations. The not-for-profit model was chosen largely because of its governance function that would provide arts funders with an accountable structure to enable them to give grants.

Beginning in the early 1990's, there has been an increasing awareness that this paradigm is no longer working well, particularly not for the new and emerging artists and art forms. Within this sector, there is an increasing blurring of the boundaries between not-for-profit and for profit – many of these entities are hybrid models embracing elements of both. We need to take the opportunity change our lens and look at these arts entities from a new paradigm.

Environmental Context and Historical Overview:

Ambiguity, complexity and rapid change now dominate the environment. The speed of change is constantly increasing with the development of faster technologies. Arts entities must remain flexible and responsive to what is happening around them. Many arts entities described as one of their strengths their 'nimbleness'. Many of them also expressed a desire to retain their entrepreneurial spirit and roots. Others simply stated that the entire government granting process was too onerous and time consuming for the amounts of funding for which they were eligible. Many artists have also indicated that they are incurring substantial costs to secure grant writing services to try to be competitive in the funding process and while a well-written grant proposal increases their likelihood of receiving a grant, many times they do not receive a grant simply because of the enormous demand on Council's funding resources.

Because arts entities must become ever more adaptive to the changes in their environment, the idea that there is one model that fits everyone, one best way of doing things, no longer works. With the extraordinary advances in technology new possibilities and ways of working are opening up and becoming more affordable for the arts sector.

The arts sector needs to move beyond primary focus on traditional institutional model for many reasons, but two remain paramount:

- 1) the current environment no longer has the resources to build them and the allocation of resources from the existing funding base is stretched too thin to meet even the needs of existing clients;
- 2) a growing constituent of the arts sector increasingly does not reflect this way of working.

The new era we are moving towards will focus much more on networks and relationships. Many artists are realizing that they must develop new organizational frameworks in which to create, produce and disseminate their art. They also realize that they will not be able to build or sustain their organizational capacity through increased internal infrastructure. They will require access to a variety of critical support structures – in a variety of relationships (on a one-time as needed basis, on-going, or intermittent) - and that will be external to their organization. In fact, in some instances, the organizational structure that has been built is now an enormous burden on the artist. Arts funders will also have to recognize and support alternative producing and administrative structures. Many of the existing funding programs of the Canada Council for the Arts are too inflexible in their funding criteria, very discipline-specific and not responsive to a rapidly changing environment.

The extraordinary advances in technology have made alternative ways of working much more possible. People are much more comfortable working with e-mail, Websites, arts management blogs, and phone conferences through the internet. Information exchange is much more rapid and can bring perspectives and points of view from arts managers working around the world. These changes have not only made it possible to work from a distance, establish networks, and respond quickly but it is also a much less expensive way of working. It is no longer necessary to set up an office and have everyone working in one physical location.

Because the process of changing the 'institutional lens' will take time and require trust, the Council needs to signal to the arts community that it is prepared to consider flexible management structures and collaborative ventures to assist artists who are working in non institutional or alternative producing formats. While the Council has supported many flexible producing formats, such as artist run centres and a commitment to project funding over many years, the artists themselves believe that they need to build the not for profit infrastructure in order to move to their next stage of development. For some, this will be the appropriate way to move forward, but for others, it can lead to them becoming overextended by driving their artistic goals beyond the human and financial resources they can realistically achieve.

Critical Issues:

A recent examination of the environment in which the arts are currently working revealed the following issues that are having a major impact on the health and sustainability of arts organizations.

- many artists, particularly the newly emerging, are completely hampered in their development by lack of key, targeted support to take them to their next evolution – mostly an inability to find key players in the field - independent producers, administrators, agents, tour bookers/managers, etc.

- complete lack of continuity of key staff within arts organizations (with the exception of a few very rare examples). Many of the remaining senior managers spent their entire career supporting the vision of artists they believed in. The new generation of arts managers do not seem to be as interested in working this way, many indicate that three years is their preferred length of tenure, but most leave a few months into the job.
- increasingly difficult for arts organizations to find required staff, particularly in development – marketing and fundraising – the arts have done a superb job of training very effective development staff for universities and hospitals.
- arts organizations that have a number of ‘capacity’ building grants are unable to sustain the infrastructure they developed with the grants once they’re gone – definitely a problem in Ontario and Quebec
- the recent National Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating revealed that less than 2% of the population made financial donations to the arts. While the value of donations increased 20%, the number of donors actually decreased from 1997 to 2000. This is explained by the fact that in the arts nearly 80% of the total financial donations are made to large budget arts institutions (budgets over \$4million) rather than to small or mid-sized arts organizations.
- arts organizations are having great difficulty finding and keeping board members. People’s lives have become so overextended with increasing job expectations, family commitments, etc. that they have become highly resistant to serving on boards. This is more problematic for small and mid-sized arts organizations that don’t provide the ‘cultural/social capital’ provided by the large, well-known arts institutions
- many of the new and emerging arts producing entities will require greater scope in their producing and administrative formats to be able to compete for annual operating funding – the institutional not-for-profit model will not work for all of them.
- Artists expressed a tremendous need for flexibility in production funding programs:
 - flexibility in definition and scope of programs as well as program criteria and expected outcomes;
 - ability to apply to one program instead of several in order to complete one artistic project which crosses multiple disciplines;
 - need for more frequent deadlines – much momentum lost having to wait months for next deadline.
- Two-thirds to three-quarters of the young arts managers entering the field from university and college arts management programs as well as specialized programs such the income managers leave the sector within two to three years. This is already having a profound negative impact on the arts sector and it will soon become the paramount crisis facing the arts. The comment young managers most often make is that they are not prepared to work under the traditional expectations – they are not going to work 80 hours/week for low pay and no benefits. This issue has been clearly documented in Jocelyn Harvey’s report, *Creative Management in the Arts and Heritage: Sustaining and Renewing Professional Management for the 21st Century.*

- Audience behaviours are changing. In fact the only thing consistent about audience behaviours is inconsistency and unpredictability. Interpretations of this situation range from the impact of the economy to SARS to the lack of resources for marketing but is probably a convergence of evolving influences over many years that have achieved critical mass only recently, such as the devaluing of arts education; lack of time and multiplicity of choices; an aging population, and a general increase in more conservative worldview and taste – more audiences wanting to see works that support their values, a growing aversion to being challenged.
- Total audience participation rates for the arts are slowly increasing, but the audience for each arts organization or entity is either decreasing, static, or growing very slowly and erratically.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE PRODUCING FORMATS

Features of Alternative or Non-formal Arts Producing Entities:

Greater integration of artistic and administrative roles:

In the not for profit institutional arts model, there is a clear line dividing the functions and responsibilities of the artistic and administrative staffs. In the smaller arts entities, no such clear separation exists not only because of the lack of resources, but also because the arts professionals function much more as entrepreneurs. They also realize that their organizations are driven more by human capital, than by financial capital and they are prepared to do what is necessary to create the work, program it, as well as administer and do what is necessary to connect the work to an audience. This means that these entities are more open to alternative administrative support structures because they are not trying to set up the traditional arts model. There is, however, confusion regarding the objectives of their funders. Many of these artists believe that if they don't have the not for profit institutional model, they won't be as eligible for support from their funders. Continuum, a new music presenter, realized that this model was not working and has recently established an ongoing working relationship with a small group of experienced freelance arts managers/ consultants to provide management, marketing, development and touring expertise to the Artistic Director who orchestrates it all. It should be noted that the Council has been able to respond positively to this change.

Expectations:

While some new arts entities aspire to greater organizational or institutional scope (Soulpepper may be an example), many artists have expressed that they just want the resources they need to make their work and present it to an audience without all the extra work and resources, as well as loss of control over their work that institutionalization may bring.

Generally there has been the belief that an artist must build an institution to support and sustain the work. But with fewer resources to go around, many artists now see this as an imbalance: that more time and resources go into developing the organization than go into developing the work. They also realize that there just is not the funding available from funders such as the Canada Council to support an increasing number of institutions.

Furthermore, some artists commented that the inflexibility of current operating funding programs, with the timing, onerous application and reporting processes, are inappropriate to the way they work – i.e. the rhythm of the creation and production cycles. Multi-year production project funding should be explored in all disciplines.

Multiplicity of Structures:

While most of these organizations are small, some define their budgets by annual operating activity, others operate project to project. At the moment, most appear to be incorporated, but increasingly many cluster as needed under another incorporated entity's not-for-profit umbrella. The increasing complexity of these modes of working will require a willingness on the part of arts funders to recognize and support alternative producing and administrative structures.

Diversity:

While many traditional arts organizations are struggling to be more diverse, these arts entities working in alternative structures simply are diverse, representing the entire make-up of the Canadian population. Most of these arts entities are committed to new work that ranges from very traditional/classical to highly experimental. While some of these entities will want to be able to work in the not for profit institutional model, many are multi-disciplinary and are having a difficult time finding a 'home' in the Council's discipline-specific structure.

Flexible Frameworks of Arts Producing Entities:

Described below are the most common flexible organizing frameworks or formats developed by artists to produce their work. These frameworks usually align with the artistic leadership's artistic or creative processes. Artists have been working in these alternative, flexible producing formats/frameworks for many years which have been supported by the Canada Council.

Single Production Project Entity – Working project to project means the primary purpose of the entity is to create, develop and produce projects. The core of the entity is the artist and the base level of human and financial resources required to plan and develop projects which then grow out of this core. When the project is complete the entity returns to the base level and so no resources are spent on an on-going operational structure. Beyond the first presentation of a work, many subsequent artistic activities such as tours and recordings of that work can be thought of as separate/single projects.

The key is creating a structure that allows the artist to develop projects they want and which takes advantage of resources available for these projects; but which minimizes the amount of resources, time and energy needed to maintain the structure. These organizations would seem to benefit most from Cluster Management models and/or agents, bringing in artistic, administrative and technical collaborators on an as needed basis.

Multi-Production Project Company – Multi-disciplinary, numerous projects underway at the same time. For example, an artist may be interested in developing new dance projects, touring, film and video projects, and collaborations with other arts entities. Kaeja d'Dance or Robert Lepage are good examples of this type of organization. What is in common with all the projects is the artist. What separates each project is the distinct need for particular resources or expertise to develop the project. While these organizations will have a small

ongoing operational structure and some key ongoing support staff, they would still require specific expertise on an 'as-needed' basis from time to time for specific projects.

Multi-Function/Production Centres – A single entity serves as the centre for a number of artistic and/or administrative activities. The centre usually has a resource such as a space that requires a minimum amount of activity (in order to develop the resources required to cover the overhead of the centre) or has the need for more artistic activity than can be generated by the centre itself. L'Agora de Danse might be a good example. These centres can also be shared spaces for both production entities and administrative entities. For artists working in new media/new practices – artistic work is often much more about process, experimentation and collaborations outside arts sector, e.g. science/environmental sectors. Need for laboratories or experimental spaces to undertake this research and development. These artists also require space for dissemination as well as production.

Collaborative Ventures

Integrated artistic collaborations occur when two or more entities come together to achieve a specific project that one working alone could not. It creates something like a virtual company, since it exists only to achieve the production.

Non-integrated collaborations most often involve resources such as the sharing of space or collaboration around marketing or touring efforts. For Dance & Opera was an example of this. While the primary basis of collaboration is the need for a particular resource, the collaboration only works through effective relationships within the collaboration. Developing understanding and respect among the collaborating partners is the basis of trust necessary to carry out the activity.

There are increasing examples of artists who are beginning to realize that the only way they can have a career that has some chance that they will be able to earn a living wage is to come together to create an entity that allows them to provide their services on a consistent enough basis. For example, in Calgary there are a group of dancers who have just received a SSHRC grant as a pilot project to provide their services to a group of choreographers in an environment where there are not the resources for each choreographer to have a company structure. *Dances That Extend Themselves* is a creation-research project that will assemble a company of 11 dancers and one apprentice to work with three established University of Calgary choreographers over a three-year period to create six new concert dance works for performance in theatres and schools in Calgary and in selected places in Alberta and Saskatchewan. It will support the work of three Canadian artist/researchers in the only dance degree program between Toronto and Vancouver. These dancers will be able to secure up to 30 weeks employment. The critical issues here are the need to help these artists with their management needs and also to develop their ability to be able to work together with a sense of shared purpose and good relationships. The Department of Canadian Heritage could be a potential partner to provide some of these 'soft skills' and attributes into their training initiatives.

THE NEED FOR FLEXIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORKS SUPPORTING ARTISTS WHO WORK IN NON-INSTITUTIONAL OR ALTERNATIVE PRODUCING STRUCTURES

Analysis of current Canada Council Programs that support administrative/ management individuals or entities that provide administrative services to the alternative producing entities (non-institutional formats):

There is no consistency across the disciplines in how non-formal arts entities are supported for their administrative and/or management needs. Programs are either non-existent or in most cases have too many barriers for entry. Many of the programs are too exclusive, too discipline-specific and not responsive enough to such a fast changing environment.

My recommendations are based on an examination of relevant programs in dance and new music. The reason I have focused on these two programs is as a result of an examination of all the programs described on the Canada Council's Website. While the Council does wish to be responsive to the varied needs of the arts sector, it was not immediately apparent from the program descriptions where one could apply if you were coming with a proposal that was somewhat outside the traditional framework and more to the point, was for administrative services rather than artistic programs. It was only after meeting with the working group that I realized that the Council was prepared to support applications from independent arts managers/administrators/producers who may want to set up a flexible management models. Some additional work needs to be done not only to indicate on the Website that the Council would welcome applications from individuals interested in developing flexible management models, but also a more active communication strategy needs to be developed.

The current Council programs that seem to have major benefits and could possibly serve as an initial Council-wide framework for this sector are the Dance Flying Squad, and the recently completed Targeted Initiative Program in New Music as well as the Music Section's Career Development Program. The recommendations for a harmonized and enhanced Flying Squad program will also assist in the development of key individuals required to support the non-formal arts entities.

How to Best Support Flexible Management Models:

One of the important findings coming out of organizational change research is the fact that an individual's, and an organization's, ability to control the detailed results of their work is limited to "the 15% sphere of direct influence. They can only act effectively on problems falling within this domain". (Research conducted by Edwards Deming and others.) Individuals and organizations are increasingly hemmed in by rapidly changing environmental forces and internal problems over which they have limited control. The basic challenge is to level positive change through their spheres of limited influence. This knowledge, rather than being a energy dampener, in fact opens up an attitude of possibility to achieve success. Problems are often defined in ways that overwhelm people's sense of an ability to do anything about them. Changing the scale of the way problems are perceived can reduce resistance and encourage innovation. Individuals and organizations are then able to realize major changes when the challenges are transformed into opportunities for 15% successes that can gather momentum through visible results. In the field of corporate strategy, Henry Mintzberg and others, have demonstrated how the pattern of successful change is often emergent and incremental rather than comprehensive and planned.

All the above is to say that a significant strategy the Council might examine to strengthen certain sectors of the arts community would be to build on the experiences gained from existing projects and programs within various discipline offices as well as undertaking the initiatives outlined in the recommendations below that address the issues of a growing sector of the arts community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Multi-year project production programs should be explored in all disciplines for individuals (e.g. in Visual Arts) and organizations (e.g. in Media and Performing Arts and Spoken Word Artists).

Recommendation 2:

a) In the same way the Council is beginning to provide long-term project grants for the artistic production of non-traditional arts entities, Council should also support the introduction of long-term project grants to the administrative development of the artistic sector in order to provide increased stability through the creation and/or development of management structures such as Cluster Management, Umbrella Management to support artists working in non-traditional formats.

b) Invest in the Individual - find, develop and support key individuals who will provide the full range of management, administrative and career/market support to artists working in non-traditional production formats.

Because non-institutional arts entities exhibit emergent processes to such a degree, it would be impractical to impose management theories from another era or models on them. In the same way that the Council funds artists that emerge on the scene with compelling ideas and

artistry to move the art forms forward, the Council should support individuals who clearly see the administrative, management, technical, or other needs artists have to assist them to realize their artistic goals and connect their work to audiences at home and on tour.

In examining most of the current umbrella or cluster management organizations in operation, it became very clear that all of them were dependent on the vision and leadership of an individual. That was true across Canada as well as in the US. Even an organization such as DUO which has undergone a couple of management transitions, each time it has oriented around an individual, whether it was Cathy Levy in the beginning, recently Myles Warren and now Christine Moynihan. It is also very clear that there can be no 'cookie-cutter' approach to developing these management structures across the country. They have to evolve out of the unique needs of each locality and art form. Increasingly this may also mean working across disciplines such as Eponymous in Vancouver.

As these management models are initially dependent on individuals and not so much on structures, the impact of the findings in Jocelyn Harvey's report, *Creative Management in the Arts and Heritage: Sustaining and Renewing Professional Management for the 21st Century* are critical. There are numerous examples from the past of individuals who saw the management needs and set up Cluster Management organizations but who were not able to sustain them without some funding from arts agencies. Currently, agents and artist managers who have been so important to the development of many artists careers are being forced to either take on too many clients to really do the development work required or take on more commercial work in order to make a sustainable living. Even where the Council does provide some support, such as classical music managers and agents, they are leaving the field as they feel stretched beyond capacity and unfortunately, they see no one replacing them. As a result there has been a serious loss of key individuals to the sector.

At the same time that there is an explosion in the artistic activities in non-traditional arts entities, there are fewer and fewer capable managers to be found. There are lots who enter the field, but very few are staying. People have always understood the amount of work required in the field, but values have changed and young managers place a much higher value on their time – they are not going to work excessive hours and they do expect a living wage.

Recommendation 3: Acknowledge and accept the eligibility of individual artistic producers in the creation and production programs of the Canada Council for the Arts for their support required by artists working in non-traditional formats.

The single most important need expressed by the small theatre entities is the need for more producers and by dance entities, tour bookers and managers. They are almost impossible to find and the few that are still working are very overstretched. For new music artists and organizations, as indicated by the recent report on the Targeted Initiatives program that has just come to a close, producers, publicists who know anything about new music, as well as artists managers, administrators – in fact just about any role that assists in putting new music in front of an audience – is specified as a much-needed resource right across the country. In music, the managerial gap is huge: many world class artists in any genre from classical to new music, folk, jazz or world, cannot find management.

Recently, Community Cultural Impresarios (CCI) raised the issue of artist management replacement and training at a recent meeting of CAPACOA and five other regional presenting networks from English Canada in Ottawa in December. This issue has also been consistently and recently raised at both CAPACOA and CCI board meetings by each organization's industry (business) members who foresee a crisis in artist management if remedial steps are not taken immediately to replace and train professionals who are leaving or retiring. There was also universal agreement that training is required in all aspects of artist management including tour management.

The Council's Outreach Office/Audience and Market Development Unit could play an important role here to assist in the development of strategies to meet these critical training needs. The Unit is currently developing important programs to address many of the critical issues in the areas of tour management, presenting, marketing, and promotion. The Unit could provide individual project grants to arts administrators, producers, presenters, and curators to develop skills in these areas.

The Unit could also provide annual and multi-year project grants to agents, dealers, international agents and artist representatives to establish specific market development strategies for producing entities as well as supporting cluster management models in key sectors where there is a lack of artist support.

Recommendation 4: NASO's play an important role in the professional development of their members. It will be important for the development and sustainability of the non-institutional arts entities that the NASO's find ways to reflect these arts entities in their memberships and tailor some of their professional development opportunities for these entities. Currently, NASO's do not reflect the entire range of producing formats in their memberships.

Where NASO's have had an important role in the professional development of many of the required skill sets, an examination of the types of professional development and training offered to members seemed aligned more to the older institutional models than the needs of the emerging artists and art forms, with the exception of some technical courses. Where is the investment in research and the development of new conceptual approaches to declining audiences, new management models and the perpetual Board problems? The reports from the Flying Squad programs could be a tremendous resource if they were put in a format that could reveal systemic problems and/or patterns of behaviour that have been changed by an intervention.

An interest approach that one American foundation took – the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation – was to provide a three-year grant of \$225,000 to A.R.T./New York to provide technical assistance for theatres with annual budgets below \$75,000. In order to access the grants, the theatres must undertake a process of work with the program's technical assistance consultants to address fundamental organizational issues rather than taking a series of workshops. The purpose of the work process was to help them appreciate their strengths and abilities, and help them to avoid management models that were no longer suitable. The Flying Squad could provide this kind of intervention.

Recommendation 5: Ensure the access and eligibility of arts entities working in non-formal formats that are not currently operating clients of the Canada Council to the Flying Squad Program.

The Flying Squad Program will be an important tool for the development, health and sustainability of the non-traditional arts entities and the sector. It will also be critical for the development of a pool of effective producers, agents, tour bookers and managers, etc. The exchange of knowledge from the few remaining individuals with these skills must be supported and encouraged through mentoring processes and activities supported by the Flying Squad.

One of the problems identified through the research phase of this report is the impending crisis of a lack of skilled and experienced people to undertake the management, touring, producing, administrative, income development and technical needs of this vast range of artists and arts entities. In the 'Policy in Action Report on National Service Organizations', professional development and training was mentioned as a key activity of the NASO's. However, in my brief survey of what was being offered by these organizations, much of it was rooted in traditional practices and knowledge and delivered in workshop formats. I now have a strong belief that the kind of professional and leadership development that is required in these times needs to be provided within the context of the organization, format or framework that the person is working. It can be supported by workshops, primarily for the purposes of networking and sharing information, but the key development of the professional leadership needs to be a facilitated process shaped around their specific individual needs.

The Flying Squad Programs could be a more effective way of providing this kind of professional development.

Recommendation 6: Support administrative collaborative ventures and shared initiative projects in all sections of the Council. Multi-disciplinary ventures could be addressed through the Inter-arts Office

Both the integrated and the non-integrated collaborations are important to the health of the non-formal arts entities.

Shared initiative projects are important ways for arts entities that have insufficient resources to do everything themselves and can establish a culture of shared resources which will have tremendous benefits for each participating entity.

Some of the discipline offices had shared initiatives projects, but not all. Of those, most seemed to offer support in the non-integrated format, i.e. shared marketing initiatives.

A significant illustration of the impact of shared initiatives projects is the recently completed three-year investment in the New Music community. The Targeted Initiatives complement to core support program sought to explore and intervene in the very areas of infrastructure and development thought most prohibitive for these small to medium-size organizations. It provided flexible, new ways of looking at issues of capacity building that recognized the diversity of this milieu. administrators, that were best suited to them.

In the three years of the program, organizations broadened the scope of outreach activity, developed new marketing tactics, reached out to uninitiated audiences, improved the general awareness of new music, learned to work together and developed new skills in a variety of areas.

These shared initiatives made it possible for resource-scarce organizations to significantly extend the amount of audience development activity they were undertaking and enhance the potential impact of their artistic programs within their communities. They spurred focused and thoughtful discussions about their relationships to each other and to the community at large and revitalized the community's collective spirit. And they have shown that very ideologically and structurally different organizations can successfully share resources for specialized areas of activity.

Recommendation 7: Acknowledge and support flexible management models that better reflect the operating/producing formats of the non-formal arts entities.

Recommendation 8:

- (a) **Respond to the need for a wider pool of shared services and individuals skilled in specific roles: producers, dealers, agents, project managers working across disciplines; and**
- (b) **Create broader access for these types of individual and entities and greater flexibility in programs that already exist within specific disciplines at Council.**
- (c) **This could be a centralized program.**

Attention must be placed on an examination of what artists need to be able to create and produce works of art and connect the work to audiences/viewers.

Artistic and organizational sustainability (or growth) needs to be planned on the basis of emerging conditions rather than on past practices. All too often these artists and arts entities are being hampered by the need to apply structures and methods that were appropriate to another era or the more traditional not-for-profit arts organization. Both the artists and the managers, administrators, agents, producers, touring agents, shared management, cluster managements, etc. have to be able to work in a spectrum from the highly entrepreneurial (even for profit) mode to a format similar to the traditional not-for-profit format, such as an umbrella management provider (DUO).

Conclusion

As the growth of the arts sector is outstripping the available resources – human, time, financial, material and space – new administrative and technical frameworks will be required. Most arts entities, both now and increasingly in the future, will be unable to secure all the resources they require on their own. They will have to engage their collaborators – administrative and technical – on an ‘as needed’ basis, in much the same way as they have always engaged certain members of the creative team.

In some important ways, attention needs to be paid to developing the infrastructure of the sector **(being able to provide infrastructure resources that are external to the arts entity)** as well as to the internal infrastructure needs of each entity. This will allow the development of ‘networks’ and foster culture of shared resources.

There are always going to be unique needs for each discipline, which is why a focus on investing in individuals is important. Many of the current programs within the discipline offices could be adjusted/refined to provide more meaningful or significant support to artists. For instance, in the case of agents, support that would allow them to take on a smaller roster and provide the artists better career development.