From Cultural Silos to Cultural Systems

Municipal Cultural Planning Forums – Lessons and Implications

"When every place looks the same, there is no such thing as place anymore. Municipal cultural planning is about combating the 'geography of nowhere.'"
Glen Murray

Contents

Summary

What Happened?

Ÿ Five Municipal Cultural Planning Forums (MCPF) took place over a two-week period in April 2005 in Orillia, Peterborough, Sudbury, Mississauga and Cambridge. Four forums were originally planned; a fifth was added in response to community demand.

> *"The idea of cultural planning is becoming more widely accepted. The idea of what constitutes culture is also expanding."* Ken Seiling, Regional Chair, Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Ÿ Forums were attended by over 700 people representing a cross section of:
- Elected officials - including 11 mayors and 42 councilors;
- Municipal staff - from Departments of Culture, Community Services, Economic Development, Parks and Recreation, Planning - including City Managers and Chief Administrative Officers;
- Local cultural leaders – from across arts, heritage, libraries and cultural industries activity;
- Business and community leaders.

Ÿ Former Winnipeg Mayor Glen Murray gave an inspiring keynote address at each forum – a highlight of the day for many.

Ÿ MCPF explored the expanding significance of culture and local economic development, and the more integrated municipal cultural planning (MCP) approaches to which municipalities are turning to exploit these connections.

Ÿ MCP, as explored at the Forums, is not simply a new name for old practices but a significantly different approach to local cultural development. It rejects discipline or silo-driven approaches (e.g., separate policies for museums, performing arts, libraries, cultural industries) in favour of whole system thinking.

Ÿ It is a form of asset-based community development that begins with mapping broadly defined local cultural resources and then leverages these resources for economic development and community building.

Ÿ MCPF documented and profiled examples of good practice, and disseminated a range of relevant resource materials.

Ÿ The primary goal of the Forums was to raise awareness, generate energy, and profile leading work already happening in municipalities across the province. Feedback received at the events and through a follow-up survey confirms participants found the sessions enormously valuable learning and networking opportunities.

What Was Learned?

- That a growing – though still limited – number of leading municipalities in Ontario are moving to embrace more systematic and integrated approaches to MCP and to local cultural development.
- That there is growing awareness of MCP approaches and a hunger for new mindsets and a new shared vocabulary to help break down silos, create opportunities for new partnerships, and mobilize public-, private- and voluntary sector resources.
- That culture and heritage are essential ingredients in authenticity, quality of place and creativity – all drivers in emerging municipal economies.
- That the *barriers to progress* in advancing MCP in Ontario municipalities include (in order of priority):
  - Ÿ Insufficient dedicated resources to support municipal cultural planning;
  - Ÿ Lack of understanding and support on the part of elected officials and senior municipal staff;
  - Ÿ No convening body or agency to draw community stakeholders together;
  - Ÿ Lack of consensus (or division) within the local cultural sector;

Ÿ   Lack of access to tools, information and expertise.

Ÿ While resources are needed, the issues are not only money. Many pointed to the need for a clearly articulated policy framework or legislative foundation for MCP as a powerful lever for change.

Conclusions and Next Steps

> *Beauty is necessary and the necessary can be beautiful* – Glen Murray

- Forum participants also identified priorities for MCPF in terms of their capacity to leverage change and advance MCP in their communities. Based on these priorities and additional discussion by the MCPF Steering Committee, the following priorities have been identified to guide future work and funding proposals.

Communication and Advocacy

- *Communicate Forum Findings* – sustain the network created by the Forums through the dissemination of findings and relevant information.
- *Brief Relevant Ministries and Agencies on the Results of the Forums* – communicate with the many important networks represented on the MCPF Steering Committee inside and outside government.

Local Capacity Building

- *Deliver Additional Forums* – to parts of the province and specific constituencies not reached. Specific priorities to include small towns and rural areas, the Francophone community, north-western Ontario.
- *Develop Hands-On Tools and Resource Materials* – identify and make accessible existing tools and handbooks supporting MCP; define gaps; develop needed tools as required.
- *Continue Collecting and Disseminating Good Practices* – make use of the good practice template to collect and disseminate additional examples of leading practice in MCP.
- *Offer Professional Development Opportunities in Municipal Cultural Planning* – examine options including stand-alone workshops or retreats, events piggy-backed on existing meetings and conferences, use of web-conferencing, etc.

Research

- *Define Strategic Research Priorities* – identify and seek support to undertake strategically important research needs. Possibilities include: new municipal cultural governance systems; developing a 'cultural lens' to bring a culture-based perspective across all municipal planning and development; performance measures and indicators to support municipal cultural planning; leading practice in cultural mapping.
- *Community Cultural Councils* – undertake research to examine the feasibility and desirability of adapting the model of Community Sports Councils in Ontario as a convening body or agency representing the full spectrum of local cultural activity.

Policy

- *Establish an AMO Taskforce on Municipal Cultural Planning* – request that AMO strike a Taskforce to bring forward recommendations to the Province on coherent policy and program support for MCP.
- *Explore Potential for Provincial and/or Federal Government Support for MCP* – begin discussion with relevant ministries and agencies about possible adaptation and use of existing funding programs to support MCP.

- Many participants urged that no time be wasted and every effort be made to capitalize on the momentum and energy generated by the Forums.

1. Background and Forum Objectives

Beginnings

Planning for MCPF began in late 2003. The impetus was two-fold. First, rising interest in Ontario and across Canada in new perspectives and approaches to municipal cultural development. Second, the identification of municipal cultural planning as a priority by the Government of Ontario.

> *My ministry recognizes that arts and culture are essential for building prosperous communities across Ontario. We are encouraging municipalities to integrate cultural planning into their daily business, and emphasize local arts, culture and heritage as they plan the future of their communities.*
>
> Hon. Madeleine Meilleur, Ontario Minister of Culture

The Forums were organized by a Steering Committee representing an impressive range of partnerships:

Ø *All program areas of the Ontario Ministry of Culture* - arts, heritage, libraries and cultural industries;
Ø *Six provincial ministries* – Culture (lead), Municipal Affairs and Housing, Economic Development and Trade, Tourism and Recreation, Citizenship and Immigration, Northern Development and Mines;
Ø *The Association of Municipalities of Ontario*;
Ø *Key cultural service organizations* – including the Ontario Presenting Network;
Ø *Business groups* – Council for Business and the Arts in Ontario, Economic Development Council of Ontario;
Ø *A respected university centre* – the Centre for Cultural Management at the University of Waterloo.
Ø *Host cities* – Orillia, Peterborough, Sudbury, Mississauga and Oakville, Cambridge.

Objectives and Target Audience

Early on, the Forum Steering Committee confirmed the following objectives to guide planning.

1. To build a new, shared vision of integrated municipal cultural planning.
2. To build and strengthen local and regional networks.
3. To share experience and good practice
4. To identify needs and opportunities to advance municipal cultural planning in Ontario.

The Forums sought above all to reach key municipal decision-makers - elected officials, planners and municipal staff (across all departments), as well as cultural, community and business leaders.

Municipal Cultural Planning

One useful and widely accepted definition of cultural planning approaches is "*the strategic and integrated planning and use of cultural resources in urban and community development.*"[1]

---

[1] Grogan, David; Mercer, Colin; Engwicht, David. (1995). *Cultural Planning Handbook.* Allen & Unwin.
.

MCP is not simply a new name for old practices. Rather it is a new paradigm of local cultural development that varies in fundamental ways with past thinking. MCP is a form of asset-based community development that begins with the mapping of a community's broadly defined cultural resources and then draws together the partnerships and commitments needed to develop these resources for economic development and community building.

MCP, as interpreted and explored at the Forums is:

Ÿ *Horizontal* – cutting across silos of arts, heritage, libraries and cultural industries; for-profit & not-for-profit; professional & 'amateur';
Ÿ *Integrated* – integrated in terms of incorporating all of the above, and integra<u>tive</u> – bringing cultural considerations (a 'cultural lens') across all municipal planning;
Ÿ *Inclusive* – embracing a broad definition of a community's cultural resources and engaging the community directly in planning and decision-making.
Ÿ *Ongoing* – less about developing plans and more about ongoing planning and capacity building.

In this context, MCPF focused attention on three types of municipal cultural plans.

1. *Comprehensive and integrated cultural plans* (incorporating the full spectrum of arts, heritage, libraries, commercial cultural activity and other aspects of local cultural development.
2. Culture integrated with larger municipal *Strategic Plans or Official Plans*
3. Culture integrated with larger *Economic Development Plans/Strategies.*

2. Why Municipal Cultural Planning? Why Now?

Strong response to the Forums demonstrates growing interest in more integrated approaches to municipal cultural planning and development. Several developments are driving this interest.

Culture and Economic Development

Culture is becoming an increasingly important driver in local economic development for several reasons. First, because of growing recognition of the central place of culture and heritage in *quality of place* and *place competitiveness.* Research by Richard Florida and Meric Gertler confirms that quality of place has become a key competitive advantage for cities in attracting and retaining people – people who in turn attract investment and new business. Florida and Gertler found that key factors determining quality of place are:

Ÿ *uniqueness and authenticity* – a product of a distinctive local history, built heritage and natural landscapes;
Ÿ *a creative milieu* – reflected in a *lively and diverse arts and cultural scene.*

Municipalities are also turning increasingly to culture and heritage as part of economic renewal and restructuring brought on by the decline of traditional industries. Culture and heritage are key drivers in *downtown revitalization* and *cultural tourism strategies* in many communities. In the longer term, leading municipalities recognize that greater attention to culture and cultural development is part of the larger global shift from an economy based on the production of goods and services to a knowledge-based economy focused on *creativity and innovation.*

Rising Municipal Expectations

Beyond its role in leveraging local economic development goals, what else explains increased interest in MCP? Municipalities, like all levels of government, are under pressure to re-examine traditional ways of doing business and delivering services. Devolution of responsibility from federal and provincial to municipal government over the past decade (across all policy domains) means that local government has been required to assume more responsibility without in most cases the commensurate transfer of resources or taxing powers. This is nowhere truer than in the arts, culture and heritage were municipalities have been forced to rethink approaches, develop policies and plans that support local organizations becoming more self-sustaining, and finding new sources of revenue for cultural development.

With rising expectations, municipalities in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada, find themselves limited by traditional discipline-based policies and frameworks (i.e., distinct policies for museums, performing arts, libraries, cultural industries, etc.) most inherited from senior levels of government. MCP approaches offer a new vision and vocabulary to reframe local cultural issues, and new practices such as cultural mapping to implement these visions.

Benchmarking Current Practice in Ontario

In 2004 the Ontario Ministry of Culture commissioned research to benchmark current practice in MCP in Ontario.[2] While too extensive to summarize here, the results point to growing interest but still limited practice or application of MCP. While 61% of respondents indicated they had cultural elements as part of larger municipal planning documents, the majority of these are built heritage elements of Official Plans governing land use decisions.

A growing, though still limited number (10%) reported having integrated/horizontal cultural plans dealing with all aspects of local cultural life.

Many of the factors governing success as well as the barriers to progress identified through the Inventory parallel findings from the MCPF survey (below).

3. What Was Learned?

Start With Quality of Place

One of Glen Murray's most powerful messages was the need to move municipal priorities past the "three-P's" of "police, pavement and pipes" to ensuring *authenticity and quality of place*. Before cities and communities can become the creative places of the future, they must build from an authentic sense of place and identity. One participant observed: "the whole day should have been called 'how to make an authentic place?'"

This echoes the work of Florida and Gertler, but elaborates it in powerful ways. Murray drew particular attention to the quality of urban landscapes – of built heritage, urban planning and design, and civic aesthetics. This last point – the need to ensure our communities are beautiful places to live and work – struck a chord with many participants. His vision of "public works as public art" was an inspiration for many (as evidenced by survey results).

> *"We should be 'weavers of place.'"* Ann Pappert, Manager, Cultural Services, City of Kingston

---

[2] Carrie Brooks-Joiner & Associates and Victoria Stasiuk Associates (2004). *Municipal Cultural Planning Inventory.* Ontario Ministry of Culture.

A second powerful voice on quality of place was Ann Pappert, Director of Culture for the City of Kingston. Ann challenged participants to think about the concept of "placemaking" – a set of ideas and practices that have emerged over the past decade and play a prominent part in cultural strategies in many American cities. Placemaking is about revitalizing and animating authentic and beautiful public spaces in communities.

The idea of placemaking, according to Pappert, held the promise of connecting the "two solitudes" of heritage/history/memory and arts/creativity/ innovation in many communities. Placemaking, in this view, is the intersection of authenticity and creativity

> *"It's about time we got cultural policy to the local level where it belongs."* Survey response.

Embrace New Mindsets and New Vocabulary

MCPF demonstrated the receptivity – indeed the hunger – for new ways of thinking and new ways of framing problems. There was a collective sense that working harder in old frameworks no longer works; new perspectives and approaches are needed.

Michael Jones, the eloquent rapporteur at the Orillia forum put it this way: "We're creating a new vocabulary. The boundaries of our language are the boundaries of our world. We need words that conjure up something in our imaginations. We can't get there from here with the old language."

One characteristic of the change in mindset is a shift from thinking about planning for culture as only about planning for cultural facilities and cultural programming, to planning for the *lived culture* of a community and integrating culture into all aspects of planning and development.

One valuable role that could be played by the Province (see below) is to articulate the new mindset in an MCP policy framework that would map the territory for municipalities.

> *"What I learned was to look at the whole picture from a different perspective and begin to ask different questions."* Survey response.

Begin With Cultural Mapping

Cultural mapping is about identifying those cultural resources or assets that define a community's unique sense of place and identity. This includes all of the important organizations and activity in the arts, heritage, libraries and commercial cultural industries. But it also embraces such things as urban landscapes, local traditions, landmarks, unique or specialized products and crafts, new media industries, the diversity and quality of leisure activity, including recreation and entertainment, etc.

Cultural mapping is the essential first step in MCP and, if done effectively, sets the stage in quite a different way for the planning issues and process that follow. It begins with the premise that all culture is locally created and valued – it can't be imported. Each community must define its own culture and identity. Many communities find that it is through the mapping process that they become aware of that culture and identity in ways that they hadn't perceived or recognized before. The cultural mapping process encourages citizens to: "Be a tourist in your own town."

There was a desire expressed for more information and perhaps greater precision and consistency in how municipalities define the general categories or types of 'cultural resources' that are the focus of the mapping process.

There was strong interest expressed in practical tools and workshops to enable and support communities to get started on the mapping process at low expense.

One challenge identified related to the mapping process was the difficulty municipalities face in identifying and engaging small-scale cultural industries and independent cultural producers. These are essential elements of the cultural life of all communities, but are a greater challenge to locate and engage than traditional not-for-profit groups or more formally constituted cultural industries.

Build Common Knowledge

> *"We need to re-introduce beauty into our planning. The price of form may be higher than that of function, but the return is greater."* Glen Murray

Ann Pappert of Kingston described the cultural framework strategy that is forming the foundation for MCP in that city. It begins from the premise that planning is ultimately a process of building the shared knowledge and understanding needed for action. Prior to beginning any public consultation or engagement, Kingston went back to document and map all of the knowledge and recommendations made in previous reports related to culture completed over the past ten years.

There are three phases to the cultural framework strategy:

i. Build Common Knowledge (what do we know together?)
- Consolidate, Map & Share Information

ii. Build Common Ground (where are there information gaps and agreement?)
- Identify Information Gaps & Shared Opportunities

iii. Build Community Capacity (where do we want to be and how do we get there?)
- Map our Cultural Context and Strategic Action Plan

Adopt a Cultural Lens

The Ottawa *Arts and Heritage Plan* was one of the MCPF good practices. It was one of five plans that comprised Ottawa 20/20, a twenty-year growth management strategy for the City. Debbie Bourne, Manager of Recreation and Culture for the City of Ottawa described how in Ottawa they were seeking to bring a "cultural lens" to bear on virtually all municipal planning issues.

Interest was expressed in follow-up research and work on what a cultural lens might look like, how it would work, and how measures and indicators might be developed to operationalize its use in municipalities.

The full integration of culture with urban planning and development is consistent with the growing acceptance of culture as one of "four pillars" (along with social, economic and environmental considerations) of sustainable cities and communities. This perspective forms the basis of policy at the Federal Department of Infrastructure and Communities and is at the heart of the vision of Canadian cities of the future being developed by the External Advisory Committee on Cities and Communities (chaired by the Hon. Mike Harcourt).

Establish New Governance Systems

A characteristic shared by many good practices profiled at MCPF is the existence of structures that enable a wide cross-section of local stakeholders and constituencies to come together to develop shared vision, identify opportunities, pool resources, and take collective action. These municipalities, in short, are implementing new collective planning and decision-making (governance) systems.

Some of these took the form of multi-sectoral advisory committees to Council – such as the Peterborough Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Board. Others took less conventional forms – the Prince Edward County Cultural Roundtable, for example.

A frequently noted barrier to progress is the absence in most municipalities of a convening body or agency representing the entirety of the local cultural sectors. While community arts councils exist in many municipalities and often represent a range of important arts groups and activity, few include in their constituency heritage groups, libraries, commercial cultural industries, etc.

In this context it is worth noting a recent examination of collaborative planning and decision-making structures in another (related) sector in Ontario. A study undertaken by the Sports Alliance of Ontario (and funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation) examined the potential of Community Sport Councils (CSC) as mechanisms for mobilizing local resources and capacities in recreation and sport.[3] Councils exist in a number of Ontario municipalities. They serve as forums for information exchange and coordination among sport clubs and associations and undertake independent, collective projects to support their community. Although sport organizations and clubs dominate memberships, other stakeholder groups include: local schools and school boards, local business, health agencies, social service agencies, service clubs, tourism associations, colleges and universities.

A study on the usefulness and application of a comparable mechanism or structure (a 'Cultural Council') in the cultural field could prove a powerful step.

Bust Silos

Another defining characteristic of the new mindset provided by MCP is its insistence on breaking down barriers that separate different types of local cultural resources. The point is not abandoning disciplinary distinctions but looking for opportunities to build partnerships, link resources, and generate larger impacts than any single activity could achieve on its own.

> *"We need to get all the silos on the same farm."* Dan Taylor, Economic Development Officer, Prince Edward County

'Silo busting' is a trend across Canada and abroad. A major recent study in the United States concludes that the challenge for the cultural sector in the US is overcoming past fragmentation and mobilizing a new cultural *movement* uniting the arts, heritage and folk life, historic preservation, libraries and archives, museums, and the humanities. Without these alliances the report concludes the sector will never achieve the critical mass necessary to advance its interests.[4]

In this context, one of the most promising and hopeful developments seen at MCPF is the interest of the library community in examining how it can participate in meaningful ways in MCP. This receptivity is part of a larger shift in libraries across Canada toward thinking of themselves not only as book repositories and information centres, but also as community development agencies.

---

[3] In the words of the Sport Alliance: CSCs are the "missing link" in sport development at the local level and that "tremendous benefits can come from connecting sport leaders at the community level, including improved quality of sport programs, reduced duplication of effort and waste of volunteer and financial resources, and increased opportunity for sport participation within the community."

[4] *Policy Partners: Making the Case for State Investments in Culture* (2004). Funded by the Pew Charitable Trust and undertaken by the Centre for Arts and Culture, Washington, D.C.

4. Advancing the Agenda

Implications for Policy

A frequently raised issue was the absence of explicit legislative or policy frameworks for municipalities in cultural development. While legislation governing municipal responsibilities in specific areas (built heritage, libraries) exists, municipalities lack any overarching policy or legislative framework to guide activity and investments. A number of municipal officials argued that until MCP had some legislative basis or foundation, culture would remain vulnerable. When "push comes to shove" at budget time it is the "must do" items (legislated requirements) that take precedence over the "nice to do" (non-legislated activity).

Ontario's situation stands in contrast to some other provinces, notably Quebec, where a clear policy framework for municipal cultural development has been in place since the early 1990s.[5]

One step forward in Ontario was taken in the *Municipal Act, 2002* with the creation of 10 "spheres of jurisdiction" where municipalities can govern their affairs. One of these is *culture, parks, recreation and heritage.* Under the previous act, municipalities could only pass by-laws for those matters where provincial legislation had given them the authority to do so. The argument is that now the onus is reversed; municipalities establishing by-laws within these spheres of jurisdiction can assume they have the authority, unless restricted by some other provincial or federal legislation.

> *"This is our moment – if we don't capitalize on the attention to these issues now, we'll have failed our generation. And we have a new professional discipline (municipal cultural planning) to work with."* Erina Harris, Arts and Culture Coordinator, City of Kitchener

While this arguably provides the flexibility for municipalities to act, it doesn't provide any guidance or direction regarding how these areas of responsibility should be addressed – nor even any rationale for their combination. The Act does not replace or override existing legislation addressing specific types of heritage or cultural activity (such as the Ontario Library Act or the Ontario Heritage Act) but it does provide an *enabling legislative context* within which the Province and municipalities could explore opportunities for strengthening municipal cultural development through such tools as:

- Interpretive policy statements and guidelines;
- Benchmarking of best practices;
- Information and knowledge building programs.

This and other potential follow-up policy initiatives are set out in the next section of this report.

Implications for Building Capacity in Municipalities

The following barriers to progress were identified in survey responses, in order of priority:

   i.   Limited financial resources to support planning;
  ii.   Weak support from Council and senior municipal administration;
 iii.   No convening body/agency to draw community stakeholders together;

---

[5] The 1992 Quebec Cultural Policy made municipal cultural development a cornerstone of that policy. Based on the 1992 Policy the Government of Quebec negotiates formal partnership agreements with individual municipalities as the basis of multi-year funding commitments. A pre-requisite of these agreements is completion of an integrated municipal cultural policy.

iv.   Lack of consensus or division within the local cultural sector;
v.   Lack of access to relevant information and/or professional expertise.

Many municipalities in Ontario face capacity challenges across the full spectrum of local planning and development issues. Tools and strategies developed to support capacity building in MCP may also be of use and assistance in other areas in engaging the communities and mobilizing collective resources.

Forum participants were also asked to identify priorities for MCPF next steps, in terms of their capacity to leverage change in their community. In order of priority the responses were:

i.   Provincial and/or federal support for MCP;
ii.   Developing MCP tools and resources;
iii. Targeted research (e.g., on cultural mapping, social, economic and other cultural impact indicators, what else?);
iv.   Developing provincial policy statements or guidelines;
v.   Increased engagement and support from the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and/or the Federation of Canadian Municipalities;
vi.   Additional forums on more focused themes (e.g., the needs of small towns and rural areas, Francophone and Aboriginal needs, etc.)

This feedback, combined with discussion at the Forums and deliberations by the MCPF Steering Committee have generated a series of potential follow-up capacity building initiatives set out in the next section of this report.

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

The MCPF Steering Committee recognized early that it was impossible to satisfy all needs through one round of Forums. The primary goal was to raise awareness and generate energy, and to profile leading work already happening around the province.

This same awareness raising is needed in other parts of the province – for example in, north-western Ontario, and with specific constituencies with focused needs (e.g., small towns and rural areas, and Francophone communities). But the clear message at the Forums and in survey responses is that MCPF must now move to support concrete action – in municipalities and at the provincial level.

The survey asked people asked to rank needed next steps in terms of their capacity to leverage change in their municipality. Dedicated resources to support planning are clearly a need. But the issues are not only money. A strong message was the need for a clearly articulated policy framework or legislative foundation for MCP. On-line access to tools and good practices, community-specific workshops, professional development opportunities in municipal cultural planning – all were cited as practical steps to support action and build momentum in municipalities.

On the basis of the input of participants and the deliberations of the MCPF Steering Committee, the following priorities have been defined to guide next steps.

Communication and Advocacy
- *Communicate Forum Findings* – sustain the network created by the Forums through the dissemination of findings and relevant information.

- *Brief Relevant Ministries and Agencies on the Results of the Forums* – communicate with the many important networks represented on the MCPF Steering Committee inside and outside government.

Local Capacity Building

- *Deliver Additional Forums* – to parts of the province and specific constituencies not reached. Specific priorities to include small towns and rural areas, the Francophone community, north-western Ontario.
- *Develop Hands-On Tools and Resource Materials* – identify and make accessible existing tools and handbooks supporting MCP; define gaps; develop needed tools as required.
- *Continue Collecting and Disseminating Good Practices* – make use of the good practice template to collect and disseminate additional examples of leading practice in MCP.
- *Offer Professional Development Opportunities in Municipal Cultural Planning* – examine options including stand-alone workshops or retreats, events piggy-backed on existing meetings and conferences, use of web-conferencing, etc.

Research

- *Define Strategic Research Priorities* – identify and seek support to undertake strategically important research needs. Possibilities include: new municipal cultural governance systems; developing a 'cultural lens' to bring a culture-based perspective across all municipal planning and development; performance measures and indicators to support municipal cultural planning; leading practice in cultural mapping.
- *Community Cultural Councils* – undertake research to examine the feasibility and desirability of adapting the model of Community Sports Councils in Ontario as a convening body or agency representing the full spectrum of local cultural activity.

Policy

- *Establish an AMO Taskforce on Municipal Cultural Planning* – request that AMO strike a Taskforce to bring forward recommendations to the Province on coherent policy and program support for MCP.
- *Explore Potential for Provincial and/or Federal Government Support for MCP* – begin discussion with relevant ministries and agencies about possible adaptation and use of existing funding programs to support MCP.

These priorities will guide planning by the MCPF Steering Committee in seeking the resources necessary to continue the work. Many participants urged that no time be wasted and every effort be made to capitalize on the momentum and energy generated by the Forums.

Appendix A: Participant Survey Results

Survey Overview	No.	Percent	Notes
Total number of forum attendees	722	100%	
Total number of delegates surveyed	545	75.5%	1
Responses from those surveyed	196	36.0%	

Response breakdown by forum	No.	Percent	
Orillia	50	25.5%	
Peterborough	59	30.1%	
Sudbury	25	12.8%	
Mississauga	5	2.6%	
Cambridge	78	39.8%	
Total	217	110.7%	2

Breakdown by type	No.	Percent	
Elected officials	15	7.7%	
Government employees	100	51.0%	
Arts groups	47	24.0%	
Heritage groups	39	19.9%	
Libraries	31	15.8%	
Commercial culture	3	1.5%	
Business community	23	11.7%	
Community group	13	6.6%	
Academic	8	4.1%	
Total	279	142.3%	3

Ranking of resource material	Index	Percent	
Resource CD	4.59		
Documented good practices	4.45		
Hard copies of Power Point presentations	4.40		
CCN Special Edition	4.33		
Glossary	4.25		
Municipal World	3.99		
Total responding	186	94.9%	

Other resource material	No.		
Those suggesting more	112	(View comments online)	4
Those suggesting less	48	(View comments online)	4

Ranking of barriers to MCPF	Index	Percent	
Other (41 responses)	4.96	(View comments)	5
Financial resources	4.80		
Municipal support	4.24		
Convening body	4.12		
Cultural sector consensus	3.86		
Access to info / expertise	3.25		
Total responding	187	95.4%	

Next Steps	Index	Percent	Notes
Gov't funding support	5.92		
MCP tools	5.59		
Impact indicator research	5.55		
AMO / FCM support	5.27		
Provincial policy guidelines	5.26		
Additional forums	4.92		
Other (37)	4.76	(View comments)	5
Total responding	186	94.9%	

Additional comments & suggestions	No.	Source	
Themes	58	(View comments online)	4
MCP Resources	43	(View comments online)	4
Research	32	(View comments online)	4
Value of forums	145	(View comments online)	4
Action will take	107	(View comments online)	4

Notes:

1. Mississauga forum delegates not surveyed

2. Total number of responses exceeds number of those who responded because some attendees attended more than one forum.

3. Some attendees indicated multiple affiliations.

4. Comments can be viewed online by clicking on:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=106352120382

5. Comments attached.

Appendix B: MCPF Steering Committee and Local Arrangements Committees

Steering Committee

Linda Albright, Executive Director, Arts Network for Children and Youth
Greg Baeker, Vice President-Cultural Planning, The Corporate Research Group
Anita Brunet-Lamarche, Regional Service Branch, Ministry of Culture
Steven Campbell, Director of Community Partnerships, Ontario Arts Council
Ray Chisholm, Town of Oakville
Craig Curtis, City Manager, City of Owen Sound
Ken Doherty, Director, Community Services, City of Peterborough (Chair till June 2005)
Warren Garrett, Executive Director, Community Cultural Impresarios
Beth Gignac, Manager, Arts, Recreation and Parks, City of Mississauga
David Goode, Community Revitalisation Specialist, Community Economic Development, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Tim Hanna, Director, Recreation and Leisure Services, Township of Strathroy-Caradoc
John Harrison, President, Tempo Foundation
Julia Howell, Program Manager, Province Wide Grants, Ontario Trillium Foundation
Sarah Iley, CEO and President, Council for Business Arts in Canada
Bob Jeffery, Northern Development Advisor, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
John Parsons, Policy Advisor, Arts and Cultural Industries Unit, Ministry of Culture
William D. Poole, Director, {tc \l1 "}Centre for Cultural Management, University of Waterloo (Chair since June 2005)
Alan Rimmington, Senior Consultant, Product Development and Investment Services, Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
Suzanne Rowe-Knight, Manager, Libraries, Heritage and Libraries Unit, Ministry of Culture
Eva Salter, Consultant, Ministries of Citizenship and Immigration, Culture, Tourism and Recreation
Stephen Stein, Senior Policy Advisor, Municipal Governance and Structural Branch, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Alida Stevenson, Policy Advisor, Arts and Cultural Industries, Ministry of Culture
Heather Thomson, Municipal Heritage Committee Advisor, Ministry of Culture
Gartly Wagner, Library Policy and Program Advisor, Heritage and Libraries Branch, Ministry of Culture
{tc \l4 "}Robert Williams, Department of Political Science{tc \l4 "}, University of Waterloo
Petra Wolfbeiss, Senior Policy Advisor, Association of Municipalities of Ontario

Local Advisory Committees (LAC)

Cambridge

Sam Coghlan, Chief Executive Officer, Stratford Public Library
Margaret Dryden, Manager, Heritage and Culture, Planning and Economic Development Services, Norfolk County
David Goode, Community Revitalization Specialist{tc \l4 "}, Rural Programs Branch, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Martin de Groot{tc \l3 "}, Executive Director, Waterloo Regional Arts Council
Erina Harris, {tc \l1 "}Arts and Culture Coordinator, {tc \l4 "}City of Kitchener
April James, Manager of Libraries, Museums and Cultural Services, Lambton County Library Headquarters
Bob McFarland, Director of Community Services, City of Woodstock Community Complex
William D. Poole, Director, {tc \l1 "}Centre for Cultural Management, University of Waterloo (Chair)

Betty Recchia, Organizational Leader, Cultural Services, {tc \l1 "}City of Waterloo, Waterloo City Centre
Thomas A. Reitz, Manager/Curator, Doon Heritage Crossroads
Tracey Robertson, Regional Program Manager, Ontario Trillium Foundation
Helen Scutt-Wallis{tc \l3 "}, Regional Consultant, Ministry of Culture
Anne Unyi, Acting Manager, Culture and Heritage, Haldimand County
Reg Weber, Director of Community Recreation Services and Partnership Development, Corporation of the City of Cambridge
{tc \l4 "}Robert Williams, Department of Political Science{tc \l4 "}, University of Waterloo
Sally Wismer, Executive Director, Guelph Arts Council

Orillia

Judy Adams, Consultant, Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
Fred Addis, Curator, Leacock Museum National Historic Site
Maggie Buchanan, President, Orillia and District Arts Council
Larry Curly, Consultant, Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
Ron Douglas, Cultural Manager, Mnjikaning First Nation
Mandy Duncan, Recreation Manager, Township of Ramara
David Fanstone, Artistic Director, Sunshine Festival
Warren Garrett, Executive Director, Community Cultural Impresarios
Bill Gibson, Chair, Southern Georgian Bay Arts Circle (Midland\Penetanguishene)
Mark Hurst, Manager, Orillia Opera House
Michael Jones, Rapporteur
Craig Metcalf, Director, Culture and Heritage, City of Orillia (Chair)
Mike Saddy, CEO, Orillia Public Library
Eva Salter, Consultant, Ministries of Citizenship and Immigration, Culture, Tourism and Recreation
Greig Stewart, Consultant, Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Tourism and Recreation

Peterborough

Allison Bain, Geography Professor, Trent University
Phil Basicano, Manager, Peterborough and Kawarthas Tourism
Leah Bayley, MCPFP Project Coordinator
Liz Bierk, Centennial Celebrations Committee; Art Studio Manager
Su Ditta, Independent Curator, Chair: Arts, Culture and Heritage Board
Ken Doherty, Director of Community Services, City of Peterborough (Chair)
Terry Guiel, Councillor, City of Peterborough
Erik Hanson, Heritage Preservation Officer, City of Peterborough
Walter Johnston, Manager, Downtown B.I.A.
Iain Mudd, Planner, Peterborough County
Bjorn Nielsen, Regional Services, Ministry of Culture
Cathy Owens, on behalf of Peterborough Chamber of Commerce
Jackie Powell, Ontario Trillium Foundation
Mary Smith, Councillor, Township of Smith Ennismore Lakefield
Sylvia Sutherland, Mayor, City of Peterborough
Rob Swales, Visual artist, Chair, Peterborough Arts Umbrella

Sudbury

Paul Bradette, Ministry of Northern Development & Mines
Anita Brunet-Lamarche, Regional Service Branch, Ministry of Culture
Dennis Castellan, Art Gallery of Sudbury
Doug Craig, Councillor, City of Greater Sudbury
Stephanie Harris, City of Greater Sudbury
Sherry Moreau, Gezhtoojig Employment and Training
Geneviève Pinealt, Théâtre du Nouvel-Ontario
Rob Skelly, City of Greater Sudbury (Chair)