

## APPENDIX ONE:

This is a direct transcript of notes provided by each participant table regarding their concerns with regard to the purpose and structure of the Cultural Committee of the PPRC.

### Morning Workshop:

Table 1:

- Selection criteria (*for Committee*) – expertise – at large – advocates – cultural community;
- Performance measurement framework – accountability of both committee and staff;
- Terms of service;
- Jury system (eg: public art funding);
- Need experts in cultural administration (eg: contracts);
- (*What are the*) guiding principles;
- Two term maximum with overlapping appointments;
- (*Clarify*) staff versus Committee roles;
- Communications;
- Accountability;
- Cultural plan done by a cultural planner.

Table 2:

- Interaction with groups;
- Handing out money – should this group (*the Committee*) be independent, separate;
- Cohesive arts community – how can we accomplish this;
- Representation - arts administrators – know your champions and invite them in – it's part of their job;
- Need dedicated staff – culture division;
- Is the list (*terms of reference*) too long for volunteers;
- Prioritize (*terms of reference*);
- More opportunity for change on the Cultural Committee;
- Advisors from key organizations;
- Are we realizing the vision;
- Need selection criteria (*for Committee members*);
- Not enough people apply.

Table 3:

- Body that advises also makes granting decisions;
- Membership – criteria;
- Knowledgeable cultural expertise on the Committee;
- Tourism representatives for festivals;

- Cultural officer for City of Nanaimo with education and experience in the arts and culture field;
- Cultural Advisory Committee to work (*directly?*) with officer;
- Jury of knowledgeable arts professionals;
- Terms for Committee needed.

Table 4:

- Disconnect (of Committee) with arts and cultural organizations;
- Committee – arts community needs two way communication;
- Committee workload ----- too big;
- Appropriate allocations of responsibilities between Staff --- Cultural Committee -- -- Jury (for grants and community access);
- Responsibility to develop and drive the cultural strategy---- but who controls;

Committee member representation;

- Expertise and voice;
- Mandate to connect with arts groups;
- Mandate for accountability – measurable;
- Lack of term – define – succession;
- Final choice (*of Committee members*) – who does this;
- Public show of support for the value of the arts;
- Advocates at every level;
- Unification of the arts and culture (*community*).

### Afternoon Workshop:

Table 1:

- Scope (*of the terms of reference or mandate of the Committee*) too large / not realistic;
- Structure may deter valuable volunteers due to conflict of interest with grant applications;
- Lack of identified selection criteria (*for appointment to Committee*);
- Succession planning / terms (*of appointment*);
- Representation (*of the cultural community on the committee*);
- Lack of direct contact with the arts community outside of grant process;
- Clarity of role (advisory only);
- Lack of centralization and unification.

Table 2:

(Table 2 chose a slightly different approach to articulating concerns by also identifying what they thought was working well.)

What needs to improve:

- How people are actually chosen for the Committee (transparency for the six at large members);
- What happens if there are not enough (*applicants ?*) for membership to fill positions;
- No (*evident?*) strong conflict of interest guidelines;
- More professional artists on Committee;
- Information available on who Committee members are;
- Larger Committee;
- More communication;
- Accountability – results of their work for the year;
- Focus on artists in Nanaimo;
- Distribution of minutes of Committee meetings (*e-mail distribution list?*).

What works well:

- Good at describing the structure;
- Sympathetic to the people who present to them;
- Funding is linked to per capita growth;
- Well written vision statement.

Issues Committee has to (*should?*) deal with:

- Promotion – bringing in events – lack of accommodation;
- Cost sharing / saving expenses across committees or departments;
- Balance between supporting local artists / artisans and bringing in a broader cultural experience for the city.

Table 2 also identified a “lack of information” to be a primary concern in the following “need to know” areas:

- History of membership (*of the Committee*);
- Criteria for renewal of appointments and prioritization of new applicants;
- Time frame of the learning curve (*to be a productive member*);
- Complete list of sub-committees (*eg: awards & public art*);
- List of Committee activities;
- Are “experts” or those “with interests” allowed to participate;

- Percentage of funding for culture vis-à-vis (*relative to?*) funding for parks and Recreation;
- Frequency of meetings.

Table 3:

- Length of term (*of appointments*);
- Staggering (*of appointments*) while having continuity;
- Level of interest (*of members?*);
- Arms length / conflict of interests;
- Scope of mandate (*too broad*) should break it down;
- Review / rewrite of roles;
- Selection process (*for Committee members*);
- Committee self-evaluation;
- Community presence / awareness / outreach to artists, organizations and the public;
- Breakdown of sub-committees;
- Gaps in responsibilities;
- Diversity (*cultural*) of the group (*Committee*);
- Professions and backgrounds (*of Committee members*);
- Level of staff support (for the Committee);
- Percentage of culture advised by Committee.