

CITY OF HAMILTON

COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Culture Division

TO: Chair and Members Emergency & Community Services Committee	WARD(S) AFFECTED: CITY WIDE
COMMITTEE DATE: September 21, 2011	
SUBJECT/REPORT NO: The 2012 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program (CS10058(a)) (City Wide)	
SUBMITTED BY: Joe-Anne Priel General Manager, Community Services Department	PREPARED BY: Jennifer Kaye 905-546-2424 ext. 4807
SIGNATURE:	

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) That the “City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program - Recommended Changes to Format and Budget”, attached as Appendix A to Report CS10058 (a), be approved.
- (b) That one time funding in the amount of \$51,550 for the planning and delivery of the 2012 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program, to be funded from either (a) the Community Services Department’s existing operating budget; (b) Corporate Surplus, or (c) the Tax Stabilization Reserve, be approved.
- (c) That staff be directed to submit an enhancement request, for an additional \$51,550 annually for the City of Hamilton Arts Awards, to the 2012 budget process for consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides an overview of the 2011 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program (“The Program”). The 2011 Program implemented the recommendations of Report

SUBJECT: The 2012 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program (CS10058 (a)) (City Wide) - Page 2 of 16

CS10058 “City of Hamilton Arts Awards Review” that was received and approved by Council at their meeting on June 9, 2010. An “Overview of the Arts Awards Program” is attached as Appendix B to Report CS10058 (a).

This report also provides a recommendation and alternatives for implementation of the 2012 Program that responds to Council’s direction, provided during the 2011 budget deliberations. Staff were directed to find ways to reduce the overall tax-supported costs of the Program. Staff were able to reduce the overall program costs by \$8000 thereby reducing the 2011 budget of \$74,550 to \$66,550.

Based on stakeholder and participant feedback regarding the 2011 Program, “2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011” attached as Appendix C to Report CS10058(a), no significant change in the format of the Program is recommended in 2012. This means that:

- There will continue to be 11 categories¹, with cash awards provided to established and emerging artists in each category (with the exception of the Emerging Lifetime Achievement award, which will not be awarded in 2012, in keeping with stakeholder and participant feedback included as Appendix C to Report CS10058(a)).
- There will continue to be a nomination process that will invite broad participation from the arts community.
- There will continue to be a fair and transparent peer-based adjudication process.
- There will continue to be an event at which the awards will be announced and all participants celebrated.
- There will continue to be a third party contractor assist with the Program. The Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts was the successful proponent in response to the Arts Awards Request for Proposal for Contract C5-11-10. The program responsibilities for the third party are summarized in Appendix B to Report CS10058(a)

Changes to the Program, and the reduced budget enhancement request, are outlined in “City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program - Recommended Changes to Format and Budget” attached as Appendix A to Report CS10058 (a).

Of the \$66,550 recommended program budget for the 2012 Arts Awards Program, \$15,000 is identified in the current operating budget, leaving \$51,550 unfunded and required on an annual basis.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 10

¹ The 11 Arts Awards categories are for Arts Administration, Arts Education, Community Arts, Film and New Media, Fine Craft, Music, Performance, Theatre, Visual Arts, Writing and Lifetime Achievement. An established and an emerging artist award is available in each category.

FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial:

The recommended budget for the 2012 Arts Awards Program is outlined below showing an \$8,000 savings over the Council-approved budget for 2011.

Program Budget	2011 Arts Awards Program		2012 Recommended
	BUDGETED	ACTUAL	
Awards to artists			
• Established (\$2,500 for each artist awarded)	\$27,500	\$25,000	\$27,500
• Emerging (\$1,000 for each artist awarded)	\$11,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
• Medallions	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>\$4,520</u>	<u>\$1,500</u>
Sub-Total	\$41,500	\$39,520	\$39,000
Marketing of Nominations and Event			
• Paid advertising	\$3500	\$2929	\$3500
• Community outreach	\$1000	\$646	\$1000
• Nomination material Design & Printing	\$3300	\$3132	\$3200
• Event photography & videographer	\$1500	\$1500	\$1500
• Postage	<u>\$250</u>	<u>\$223</u>	<u>\$350</u>
Sub-Total	\$9,550	\$8,430	\$9,550
Third-party Contract Costs			
• Adjudication process	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
• Branding and marketing services	\$7,250	\$7,000	\$4,000
• Other services including sponsor development, event planning, volunteer management	<u>\$5,000</u>	<u>\$5,000</u>	<u>\$4,000</u>
Sub-Total	\$17,250	\$17,000	\$13,000
Event Delivery Costs			
• Venue & Catering	\$3000	\$4422	\$4500
• Entertainment	\$1500	\$1500	\$1500
• Event material printing and signage	\$2000	\$1919	\$1750

SUBJECT: The 2012 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program (CS10058 (a)) (City Wide) - Page 4 of 16

• Other	<u>\$250</u>	<u>\$191</u>	<u>\$250</u>
Sub-Total	\$6,750	\$8,032	\$8,000
Meeting costs, supplies	\$2,500	\$1,434	\$2,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$77,550	\$74,416	\$71,550
Sponsorship Revenue	(\$3,000)	(\$2,200)	(\$5,000)
TOTAL PROGRAM	\$74,550	\$72,216	\$66,550
Existing annual budget	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Required additional funding	\$59,550	\$57,216	\$51,550

The differences between the recommended 2012 budget and the 2011 budget are as follows:

- Reduction of \$1,000 expense in emerging artist cash awards, due to the elimination of the Emerging Lifetime Achievement award, based on the recommendations of both surveyed event stakeholders and the Arts Advisory Commission, which is a volunteer advisory committee of Council who monitor and assist with implementation of the Arts Awards program.
- Reduction of \$3,000 in medallion² costs, reflecting the bulk purchase of medallions that was made in 2010. The remaining \$1,500 is for costs related to the packaging of the medallions for presentation to award recipients.
- Reduction of \$4,250 expense in third-party contract costs, due to reduced need for branding and event planning services in the second year of the renewed Arts Awards Program.

The third-party contractor that was hired to provide services in 2011 – the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts – worked 750 hours (the equivalent of 21 weeks) at a total contract cost of \$17,000, which equates to approximately \$22.67 per hour. Services provided are summarized in Appendix B to Report CS10058 (a).

- Reduction of \$500 in meeting costs and supplies, which is \$500 more than the 2011 actual, reflecting anticipated price increases and a need to replenish depleted stores of supplies.

² The Arts Award medallion has been presented to each recipient of the Established Award since 1976. , The bronze medallion was designed by renowned artist Dora de Pédery-Hunt who also designed Queen Elizabeth II's image that appears on all Canadian coins. A maximum of 11 medallions are presented each year.

- Increase of \$1,250 in event delivery costs, based on actual 2011 costs which were higher than budgeted due to higher than anticipated attendance at the event.
- Increase of \$2,000 in sponsorship revenue.

Because expenditures related to planning for the 2012 Arts Awards Program need to be made in 2011, while expenditures for implementation are made from January to May 2012, the request for additional funds for the 2012 Program cannot be deferred to the 2012 budget process.

Staffing:

There are no staffing implications associated with the recommendations of Report CS10058 (a).

Legal:

There are no legal implications associated with the recommendations of Report CS10058 (a).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Pre-2010 background

The City of Hamilton Arts Awards has been presented annually since 1976 to practising artists in the Hamilton area. Artists are recognized for significant contributions in their chosen discipline (visual art, music, etc). From 1976 to 2000, one artist was recognized each year with a bronze medallion designed by artist Dora de Pédery-Hunt. In 2001, the award categories expanded to recognize artists in six different categories³. Each winner received a \$1,000 cash prize and a bronze medallion designed by artist Dora de Pédery-Hunt.

In 2008, the City of Hamilton Arts Awards event took place at the Hamilton Convention Centre. Culture Division staff and Arts Advisory Commission volunteer resources, as well as marketing resources, were stretched beyond capacity to promote and deliver the Program. As a result, the Program was not well supported (in terms of nominations or attendance) by the arts community.

³ From 2001 to 2008 Arts Awards were presented in six categories: Dance, Literature, Visual Arts, Theatre, Music and Lifetime Achievement.

In 2009, with the support of the Arts Advisory Commission, Council approved recommendations to suspend the Program, and to have staff report back with recommendations on how to improve the City of Hamilton Arts Awards.

2010 Review of Arts Awards Program

The review of the Program was completed and approved by Council in 2010. The review was guided by the Arts Advisory Commission and undertaken by the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts. Appendix B to Report CS10058 (a) provides an overview of the Program as determined through the 2010 Review process. The complete City of Hamilton Arts Awards Review and associated research was attached as Appendix A to Report CS10058.

2011 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program

The Arts Awards Event was held on May 9, 2011 at the Scottish Rite, and was a celebration of the strength of the Hamilton arts community, featuring local entertainment before, during, and after the ceremony. The Event was attended by approximately 550 people. The event was free, with reserved tickets which “sold out” well before the event date. Member of Parliament David Christopherson, Mayor Bratina, Councillors Farr, Jackson, McHattie, Powers, and City Manager Chris Murray all presented awards to the recipients.

Although the sponsorship campaign was not started until March 2011, five sponsors and one program partner were secured as follows:

- The Hamilton Spectator, providing free ad space for each of the established award recipients in fall 2011 at a total retail value of \$30,000.
- Arcelor Mittal, \$500
- Scotia Bank, \$500
- David Premi Architects, \$500
- Marsales Realty, \$500
- Carmen’s Inc., \$200.

Many volunteers contributed to the planning and delivery of the 2011 Program, most notably the members of the Arts Awards Steering Committee: Karen Logan (Arts Advisory Commission representative), and three members of the local arts community – Barbara Milne, Matt McInnes, and Lil Acevedo – who bring knowledge of different aspects of the arts community. The Steering Committee authorized all Program plans.

This chart compares the 2008 and 2011 Programs, demonstrating the improved community engagement of the 2011 Program:

SUBJECT: The 2012 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program (CS10058 (a)) (City Wide) - Page 7 of 16

	2008 Arts Awards	2011 Arts Awards
Number of nominations received	42 nominations received for 6 categories 7 nominations for Youth Awards in 5 categories	73 nominations received for 11 established categories 70 emerging artists selected for the program by established artists
Number of languages in which nomination information was made available	1 (English)	11 (Urdu, Somali, Hungarian, French, Chinese, Italian, Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese, Czechoslovakian, English)
Number of program volunteers	30	48
Number of event attendees	250	550
Number of program sponsors/partners	1	6
Value of sponsorships and partnerships (cash, in-kind)	\$150	\$32,200
Number of post-event survey respondents (see Appendix C to Report CS10058(a) for survey results)	No survey implemented	86

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There are no policy implications associated with the recommendations of Report CS10058 (a).

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The format of the 2011 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program is in direct response to the stakeholder and public comments received during the City of Hamilton Arts Awards Review approved by Council at their June 9, 2010 meeting. See Appendix B to Report CS10058 for a summary of key elements of the Arts Awards Program.

During and after completion of the 2011 Arts Awards Event in May 2011, staff sought and collated input regarding the 2011 Arts Awards Program from a variety of stakeholders and using various methodologies as identified below:

- The Arts Awards Steering Committee.
- The Arts Advisory Commission.
- Local artists and community members.
- Request for comments in the event program.
- A post-event on-line survey was sent by email to all 2011 award recipients, nominees, nominators, members of Council, the Arts Awards mailing list, individuals who reserved event tickets, local arts organizations, and was posted on the Arts Awards webpage and Facebook page. A total of 86 responses have been received to date.

The 2011 Arts Awards Survey Results are attached as Appendix C to Report CS10058 (a). This survey was intended to shape program development for 2012 based on the feedback that had already been received by direct program stakeholders and participants as listed above.

The recommendations provided in this Report have been approved by both the Arts Awards Steering Committee and the Arts Advisory Commission.

The Manager of Finance and Administration, Corporate Services (assigned to the Community Services Department) has reviewed the report and provided comments, which have been incorporated.

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Program provides civic recognition of artists who contribute to the growth and development of Hamilton, both through their artistic contributions and their demonstrated community commitment. By providing the Program, the City of Hamilton demonstrates its awareness of the important and growing role the arts play in the social and economic development of our community. Civic recognition also adds to the credentials of Hamilton's leading artists, helping them to further succeed in their careers.

The recommended budget for the Program provides \$37,500 in award money that goes directly to individual artists (\$2,500 to each established artist recipient and \$1,000 to each emerging artist recipient). Given that the average earnings of Hamilton artists are \$21,100 compared with an average of \$39,400 for all Ontario workers⁴, cash awards

⁴ Hill Strategies Research "Artists in Large Canadian Cities Based on the 2006 Census", September 2009

have the potential to strengthen artists' ability to support themselves and their art careers. The low income cut-offs for a single person is \$20,778 for cities, like Hamilton, of 500,000 people or more⁵. Direct funding to individual artists supports a low-wage sector that is contributing positively to Hamilton's image on a national scale⁶.

Recommended 2012 sponsorship approach

Staff is recommending a \$2,000 target increase in sponsorship for the 2012 Arts Awards Program for a total of \$5,000, recognizing that a fall start for the 2012 sponsorship campaign will likely yield stronger results than the March 2011 start of the 2011 campaign.

Although sponsorship is an obvious means to offset program costs, it is not a straightforward solution. There are both philosophical and practical issues to be considered:

- Private sector sponsorship funds are scarce. By seeking sponsorships for the Arts Awards Program, the City is competing with the arts sector for these scarce funds.
- The City does not currently have fundraising positions on staff, leaving a gap in expertise and workload capacity for fundraising.
- There is diminishing sponsorship capacity in the business community and increasing competition for sponsorship dollars in the arts community.

Given the sponsorship dollars secured in 2011 and the above considerations, it is anticipated that a modest increase in sponsorship revenue should be achievable using existing resources. The feasibility of a more significant increase would need to be ascertained by a fundraising professional.

Rationale for Use of Third-Party Contractor

The Request for Proposals that was issued in 2010 for a third-party contractor had a two-year timeframe, with the City having the option to continue the contract into the second year. The Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts was the successful proponent, with a fee of \$17,000 to provide the required services for the 2011 Arts Awards Program, and \$13,000 to provide the required services for 2012.

The use of a third-party contractor to assist in the delivery of the Arts Awards Program has a number of benefits:

⁵ Low Income Cut-offs for 2006 and Low Income Measures for 2005, Statistics Canada, 2007, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75f0002m/75f0002m2007004-eng.htm>.

⁶ Hamilton artists, arts community and the Art Crawl have been featured in articles by the Globe and Mail (February 18, 2011; July 24, 2010), Toronto Star (Feb 5, 2009; June 21, 2007), National Post (Aug 20, 2010) among others.

- Can provide more value for funds invested if the hourly rate of the contractor is less than that paid to City staff (the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts will complete approximately 750 hours (the equivalent of 21 weeks) of work at a contract cost of \$13,000 for the 2012 Program, which equates to approximately \$17.33 per hour);
- Spending fewer work hours on the Arts Awards Program enables City staff to work on a greater range of projects;
- Can provide better access to contacts for soliciting nominees, jurors and volunteers within the local and regional arts communities – especially at the grassroots level – if the contractor is a member of the arts community (as has been the case with the current third-party contractor);
- Can lend additional credibility to a program that needs to have buy-in from the local arts community in order to succeed, if the contractor is a member of the arts community (as has been the case with the current contractor).

Staff propose to continue the contractual relationship with the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts for the 2012 Program.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:
--

A range of options are provided below for Council's consideration and summarized in the following chart.

SUBJECT: The 2012 City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program (CS10058 (a)) (City Wide) - Page 11 of 16

	2011 Budget	2011 Actual	2012 Recommend Reduced contract costs	2012 Alternative #1 Reduced contract costs and stakeholder changes	2012 Alternative #2 Contract for adjudication only	2012 Alternative #3 AND Eliminate emerging cash awards and add admission	2012 Alternative #4 Change to community-led program	2012 Alternative #5 Retire program
REVENUES								
Sponsorships	3,000	2,200	5,000	5,000	5,000	3,000		0
Event admission @ \$10	0	0	0	0	0	2,000		0
TOTAL REVENUES	3,000	2,200	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		0
EXPENSES								
Cash awards to artists								
Established	27,500	25,000	27,500	27,500	27,500	27,500		0
Emerging	11,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0		0
Medallions	3,000	4,520	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500		0
SUB-TOTAL	41,500	39,520	39,000	39,000	39,000	29,000		0
Marketing of nominations and event	9,550	8,430	9,550	9,550	9,550	9,550		0
Third-party contract costs								
Adjudication process	5,000	5,000	5,000	8,000	5,000	5,000		0
Branding and mktng services	7,250	7,000	4,000	4,000	0	0		0
Other services, including sponsor development, event planning, vol. management	5,000	5,000	4,000	4,000	0	0		0
SUB-TOTAL	17,250	17,000	13,000	16,000	5,000	5,000		0
Adjudication honoraria	0	0	0	3,000	0	0		0
Event delivery costs	6,750	8,032	8,000	8,000	8,000	6,000		0
Meeting costs and supplies	2,500	1,434	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000		0
TOTAL EXPENSES	77,550	74,416	71,550	77,550	63,550	51,550	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	74,550	72,216	66,550	72,550	58,550	46,550	Not known	0
EXISTING CURRENT BUDGET	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
NET ADDITIONAL PROGRAM COSTS	59,550	57,216	51,550	57,550	43,550	31,550	Not known	(15,000)

Alternative #1 – Recommended Program format with two additional changes suggested by stakeholders and participants

Cost of Alternative #1 – Total program \$77,550 (\$15,000 current budget + \$5000 sponsorship + enhancement \$57,550)

Stakeholder and participant feedback favoured maintaining the 2011 Program format in 2012, with two exceptions:

- Jurors should be paid an honorarium in recognition of the time commitment required (estimated at 5-6 hours each). If each juror received a \$100 honorarium, that would add approximately \$3,000 to the budget. Paying a juror’s honorarium is the established best practice for arts-related juries, making it easier to secure jurors and recognizing the value of their time and expertise. Currently the City

does not utilize juror's honorariums for any of its adjudicated programs, such as the Public Art Program.

- Emerging Artist categories should be adjudicated. For the 2011 Program, established artist nominees were asked to select a deserving candidate for the emerging award. If the established nominee won, then his/her emerging candidate was automatically selected. This approach recognizes and builds connections between different generations of artists and encourages a climate of mentorship, which helps to build a cohesive arts sector within communities. Stakeholder and participant feedback has been split on this issue, with approximately half feeling it is important that the emerging awards be fairly and transparently adjudicated, and half preferring the existing approach. The Arts Awards Steering Committee supports the mentorship approach, and has suggested some minor Program changes that may increase overall support for this approach. Moving to an adjudicated emerging award would result in approximately \$3,000 in additional costs for a third-party adjudication contractor, and would add to Program administration.

In light of feedback from Council during the 2011 budget deliberations regarding the desire to reduce costs for the Arts Awards Program, staff is not recommending that these two changes be made at this time, but that both issues be evaluated during the 2012 Program.

Financial:

Funding of \$6,000 would be required to implement jurors' honorariums and adjudication of emerging artist awards. This would increase the overall additional funding required for the Program to \$57,550, which is \$6,000 more than the recommended option and \$334 more than the actual amount spent on the Program in 2011.

Staffing:

There are no staffing implications associated with Alternative 1 to Report CS10058 (a).

Alternative #2 – Contract for adjudication only

Cost of Alternative #2 – Total program \$63,500 (\$15,000 current budget + \$5000 sponsorship + enhancement \$43,500)

Although staff is recommending that a third-party contractor be retained to provide a range of specialized services, the adjudication component of the Arts Awards Program is the sole component that cannot be adequately completed by staff. City staff does not have the breadth of contacts in the regional arts community required to recruit over 30 volunteer jurors per year in a range of arts disciplines. It is also preferable to have a body that is arms-length from the City responsible for the assessment of nominations, to avoid any possible conflicts of interest. A third-party contractor is required with

experience in the development and implementation of adjudication processes and with specialized contacts in the arts field. The cost of such a contract is estimated at \$5,000.

Alternative #2 has been reviewed by both the Arts Awards Steering Committee and the Arts Advisory Commission and was determined to be a satisfactory alternative to the recommended Program.

Financial:

Additional funding of \$43,550 would be required to implement Alternative 2, which is \$8,000 less than the recommended option.

Staffing:

The remaining work that would have been done by the third-party contractor for the 2012 Arts Awards would then be transferred to existing staff. This is approximately 375 hours of work, which is roughly the equivalent of 0.2 FTE, or \$15,000 in salary costs. Details of what this work would be are included in Appendix B to Report CS10058 (a) as part of the recommended Program delivery model. This compares unfavourably with the \$8,000 that the contractor would charge. The impact on existing workloads would be considerable, and would result in a reduction in the capacity of existing staff in the Arts and Events Section of the Culture Division to complete existing work plan commitments.

Legal:

There are no legal implications associated with Alternative #2 to Report CS10058 (a).

Alternative #3 – Contract for adjudication only, eliminate Emerging Artist cash awards, and introduce an admission fee to the event

Cost of Alternative #3 – Total program \$51,500 (\$15,000 current budget + \$5000 sponsorship + enhancement \$31,500)

In addition to the reduced scope of work for the third party service provider identified in Alternative #1, the Emerging Artist cash awards could be eliminated, saving \$10,000. Recognition would still be provided to emerging artists at the Arts Awards event. This would make the Emerging Artist award less desirable, and could limit the ability of the Arts Awards Program to attract some sponsors, given the appeal to some sponsors of supporting younger generations. Attendance could be negatively affected, especially given the strong attendance of the younger generations of artists at the 2011 Arts Awards Event.

In addition to the elimination of the Emerging Artist cash awards could be the introduction of an admission fee for the Arts Awards Event. In the post-event survey, respondents were asked what they would be willing to pay as an admission fee to the

event; the majority of respondents said either nothing or up to \$10. The elimination of the Emerging Artist cash awards has the potential to make the attendance of emerging artists at the event less likely. The introduction of an admission fee may have less of a negative impact on attendance from that particular demographic.

Alternative #3 has been reviewed by both the Arts Awards Steering Committee and the Arts Advisory Commission. The elimination of the emerging artist cash awards is not preferred by either group, but is a potential means to reduce the overall budget of the Program.

Financial:

Additional funding of \$31,550 would be required to implement Alternative #3, which is \$20,000 less than the recommended option.

Staffing:

The remaining work that would have been done by the third-party contractor for the 2012 Arts Awards would then be transferred to existing staff. This is approximately 375 hours of work, which is roughly the equivalent of 0.2 FTE, or \$15,000 in salary costs. Details of what this work would be are included in Appendix B to Report CS10058(a) as part of the recommended Program delivery model. This compares unfavourably with the \$8,000 that the contractor would charge. The impact on existing staff workloads would be considerable, and would result in a reduction in the capacity of existing staff in the Arts and Events Section of the Culture Division to complete existing work plan commitments.

Legal:

There are no legal implications associated with Alternative #3 to Report CS10058 (a).

Alternative #4 – Change the Arts Awards Program from a civic-led to a community-led Program

This option would involve identifying individuals or agencies in the Hamilton community that would be interested in taking on the planning and implementation of an arts awards program to recognize Hamilton artists in a range of disciplines. The arts awards program would no longer be a civic program, bestowing civic recognition on Hamilton artists.

It is not known at this time if there is an individual or agency that would be interested in assuming responsibility for this program. In order to determine both interest and capacity for this alternative staff would need to initiate an Expression of Interest, Request for Quotes, or Request for Proposal process.

Financial:

The financial implications of this alternative are unknown at this time. It is anticipated that the overall costs to the City for this event would be either reduced or eliminated over time.

Staffing:

The staffing implications of this alternative are unknown at this time. In the short term, program staff would devote their time to seeking potential program delivery agencies, and would not undertake any planning for the 2012 Program.

Legal:

There are no legal implications associated with Alternative #4 to Report CS10058 (a).

Alternative #5 – Retire the Arts Awards Program

This option would save the greatest amount of money, but would result in the elimination of one of the City of Hamilton's primary means by which to support – both materially and symbolically – the arts in Hamilton. It is anticipated that the response from the arts community would be very negative.

The Arts Advisory Commission discussed other possible cost-saving options, such as eliminating the public event component of the Arts Awards Program or reducing the number of award categories, but felt that these options would weaken the Arts Awards Program sufficiently that it would be incapable of meeting the goals that were identified when the renewed program was approved in 2010.

Financial:

No additional funding would be required to implement Alternative #5, and the \$15,000 of annual funding in the current budget for the Arts Awards Program could be removed.

Staffing:

Approximately 0.4 FTEs are currently devoted to the Arts Awards Program in the Arts and Events Section of the Culture Division.

Legal:

There are no legal implications associated with Alternative #5 to Report CS10058 (a).

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN

Focus Areas: 1. Skilled, Innovative and Respectful Organization, 2. Financial Sustainability, 3. Intergovernmental Relationships, 4. Growing Our Economy, 5. Social Development, 6. Environmental Stewardship, 7. Healthy Community

Skilled, Innovative & Respectful Organization

- ◆ Council and SMT are recognized for their leadership and integrity

Financial Sustainability

- ◆ Delivery of municipal services and management capital assets/liabilities in a sustainable, innovative and cost effective manner

Growing Our Economy

- ◆ A skilled and creative labour pool that supports new employers
- ◆ A visitor and convention destination

Social Development

- ◆ People participate in all aspects of community life without barriers or stigma

Healthy Community

- ◆ An engaged Citizenry

APPENDICES / SCHEDULES

Appendix A to Report CS10058 (a) – City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program - Recommended Changes to Format and Budget

Appendix B to Report CS10058 (a) – Overview of the Arts Awards Program

Appendix C to Report CS10058 (a) – 2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program Recommended Changes to Format and Budget

The format of the 2011 Arts Awards Program was approved by Council as part of the City of Hamilton Arts Awards Review, Appendix A to Report CS10058, dated June 9, 2010. Now that the format has been implemented in 2011 and feedback has been received by stakeholders, there are format changes recommended that have service and budget implications as follows:

Recommended changes to the Arts Awards Program Format

- 1) The Arts Advisory Commission may select up to two members to join the Arts Awards Steering Committee.
- 2) The Lifetime Achievement category will have nomination requirements that differ from all other award categories and will change to a more narrative approach.
- 3) Eliminate the Emerging artist award in the Lifetime Achievement category.
- 4) Change the "Film and New Media" category title to "Media Arts".
- 5) Definitions for the Emerging and Established award categories will be introduced.
- 6) Artists will not be allowed to self-nominate for the Awards.

Recommended changes to the Arts Awards Program Budget

- 1) Increase of \$2,000 in sponsorship revenue (from a \$3000 target to \$5000 target)
- 2) Reduction of \$4,250 to budgeted third-party contract costs. The reduction incorporates the bid price from the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts who was the successful proponent of the Arts Awards Request for Proposal Contract C5-11-10. The reduced budget will be reflected in future Request for Proposals (anticipated to be released in 2012 in time for the 2013 program).
- 3) Reduce the Cash awards total by \$1000 to reflect the elimination of the Emerging Lifetime Achievement award.
- 4) Reduction of \$3,000 in medallion¹ costs, reflecting the bulk purchase of medallions that was made in 2010.
- 5) Reduction of \$500 in meeting costs and supplies.
- 6) Increase of \$1,250 in event delivery costs, based on actual 2011 costs which were higher than budgeted due to higher than anticipated attendance at the event.

¹ The Arts Award medallion has been presented to each recipient of the Established Award since 1976. , The bronze medallion was designed by renowned artist Dora de Pédery-Hunt who also designed Queen Elizabeth II's image that appears on all Canadian coins. A maximum of 11 medallions are presented each year.

Program Budget	2012 Recommended Budget
Awards to artists <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established (\$2,500 for each artist awarded) • Emerging (\$1,000 for each artist awarded) • Medallions <p style="text-align: right;">Sub-Total</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$27,500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$10,000</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>\$1,500</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$39,000</p>
Marketing of Nominations and Event <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid advertising • Community outreach • Nomination material Design & Printing • Event photography & videography • Postage <p style="text-align: right;">Sub-Total</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$3500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$1000</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$3200</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$1500</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>\$350</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$9,550</p>
Third-party Contract Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjudication process • Branding and marketing services • Other services including sponsor development, event planning, volunteer management <p style="text-align: right;">Sub-Total</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$5,000</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$4,000</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>\$4,000</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$13,000</p>
Event Delivery Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venue & Catering • Entertainment • Event material printing and signage • Other <p style="text-align: right;">Sub-Total</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$4500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$1500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$1750</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>\$250</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$8,000</p>
Meeting costs, supplies	\$2,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$71,550
Sponsorship Revenue	(\$5,000)
TOTAL PROGRAM	\$66,550
Existing annual budget	\$15,000
Required additional funding	\$51,550

Overview of the Arts Awards Program

The complete City of Hamilton Arts Awards Review was attached as Appendix A to Report CS10058 that was received and the program approved by Council at their meeting on June 9, 2010.

The review was guided by the Arts Advisory Commission and undertaken by the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts. Through a combination of best practice research, community consultation and stakeholder interviews, the review confirmed that the Arts Awards Program had limited profile in the arts community, and was seen as tired, under-resourced, and in need of renewal in order to be effective.

The review recommended a renewed program mission, vision, values, format, responsibilities and budget, as follows:

Vision Statement

The Awards will serve to promote the City of Hamilton's pride in its arts community, to inspire and enhance success, to foster growth in the sector, and develop the talent that drives this vital part of our city.

Mission Statement

The mission of the City of Hamilton Arts Awards Program is to recognize the full breadth of achievement that is generated by our local arts community, the individual artists and organizations who are its ambassadors, and the community members who support and engage in the work throughout our community.

Values Statement

The Arts Awards program will consistently promote the values of:

- inclusivity and diversity,
- a transparent and open process,
- community building and public engagement, and
- the core principle that the arts are central to our community's identity, economy, civic pride and sustainability.

Program Format

As a result of the review, the following format and delivery changes were made to the Program:

- An increase in the number of award categories from 6 to 11 to reflect changes in the Hamilton arts community.
- The introduction of an emerging artist category, to recognize and nurture the achievements of future leaders in the arts community.

- An increase in the value of cash awards from \$1,000 to \$2,500 for established artists, and the introduction of a \$1,000 award for emerging artists.
- Establishment of adjudication criteria that would consider the artists' work, the artists' career, and the artists' reception in the community, to ensure that community contributions would be considered in the adjudication process.
- Increase in marketing funds to promote the nominations process and deadlines.
- Funds to hire a third-party to assist with both program implementation and promotion.

Arts Awards Program Responsibilities

The third-party contractor (the Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts is on contract for 2012) is responsible for:

- Development and distribution of nomination materials;
- Production of nomination materials in multiple languages (11 languages were used in 2011);
- Conducting outreach to diverse communities to engage them in the Program;
- Planning and delivering nomination workshops;
- Development of the marketing and promotion plan with a focus on arts-relevant channels;
- Managing the Arts Awards Facebook page;
- Managing the adjudication process;
- Recruiting and scheduling volunteer jurors;
- Developing a sponsorship package and secure sponsors;
- Preparing event marketing plan;
- Event planning and coordination, including securing entertainers;
- Recruitment and management of volunteers for the event; and,
- Production of a post-event report.

The Arts Awards program components that City staff are responsible for are as follows:

- Respond to all public enquiries about the Arts Awards Program;
- Liaise with potential and actual nominees during the nomination process;
- Plan and implement marketing and promotion for the program, focusing on City-relevant channels;
- Manage the Arts Awards webpage on the City of Hamilton site;
- Conduct outreach to engage diverse communities in the Program;
- Manage the Steering Committee;
- Liaise with the Arts Advisory Commission;
- Manage the relationship with the third-party contractor;
- Event planning and coordination;
- Develop and distribute a post-event survey; and,
- Ensure program timelines are met;

- Manage the budget;
- Ensure City policies and procedures are being followed; and,
- Provide the majority of administrative support for the program.

In addition to City and contractual staff, arts community volunteers will participate as follows:

Arts Advisory Commission

- Monitor the Arts Awards Program;
- Monitor the adjudication process to ensure a fair and transparent process; and,
- Select members to participate on the Arts Awards Steering Committee.

Arts Awards Steering Committee

- Meets regularly and has representation from the Arts Advisory Commission, City staff, the third-party contractor and individuals from the local arts community who bring knowledge of different aspects of the arts community;
- Assists with the development of all program plans;
- Authorizes all program plans and assists with procedural components; and,
- Conducts a post-event evaluation of both process and outcomes.

Arts Awards event volunteers












- Assist with the implementation of the Arts Awards event including registration, crowd management, reception and entertainment management.

Program Budget

The recommended budget for the Program was increased as part of the Review and is outlined in the chart below:

	2008 Awards Program Budget	2011 Awards Program Budget
Awards	\$6,000	\$41,500
Marketing of nominations and event	\$3,000	\$9,550
Third-party Contract Costs	\$0	\$17,250
Event Delivery	\$6,000	\$6,750
Meeting costs, supplies	\$0 (previously funded through other budgets)	\$2,500
Revenues from sponsorships	\$0	(\$3,000)
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	\$15,000	\$74,550
Net costs in addition to existing \$15,000 annual budget)	\$0	\$59,950

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

1. How did you participate in the 2011 City of Hamilton Arts Awards program? Check all that apply.		 Create Chart	 Download
		Response Percent	Response Count
I was nominated as an Established Artist		18.2%	16
I was nominated as an Emerging Artist		9.1%	8
I nominated an artist		18.2%	16
I wrote a letter of reference for a nominated artist		17.0%	15
I was a jury member		8.0%	7
I was a volunteer at the Arts Awards event		2.3%	2
I attended the Arts Awards event on May 9 at the Scottish Rite		48.9%	43
I did not participate in the 2011 program		10.2%	9
Other (please specify) Show Responses		17.0%	15
		answered question	88
		skipped question	0

QUESTION #1 Summary of Answers for “Other (please specify)”

- email list of artists involved with the city
- My partner/friend/family member was nominated
- Member of AAC (3 answers)
- Me/my friend/family member wanted to be nominated
- Considered nominating (3 answers)
- Received special recognition
- Didn't attend event but wanted to attend. (2 answers)

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

2. Arts Awards Program - General Question Please rate the importance of the following Arts Awards components. Create Chart Download				
	not important	somewhat important	very important	Response Count
Recognition by the City of Hamilton of individual artists.	1.1% (1)	12.5% (11)	86.4% (76)	88
A public event to recognize Award recipients.	3.5% (3)	16.3% (14)	80.2% (69)	86
Cash awards to Arts Award recipients.	5.8% (5)	23.3% (20)	70.9% (61)	86
A nomination process that encourages involvement from a broad range of artists.	5.9% (5)	12.9% (11)	81.2% (69)	85
A fair and transparent adjudication process.	0.0% (0)	10.6% (9)	89.4% (76)	85
Marketing and promotion of Arts Awards event.	2.4% (2)	22.9% (19)	74.7% (62)	83
		Additional Comments Show Responses		13
		answered question		88
		skipped question		0













QUESTION #2 Summary of Answers for “Additional Comments”

- anyone should be able to submit their Art for award consideration
- cash award is the most important (2 answers)
- a process to make it possible to nominate people without the artist having to do it themselves
- All jurors in each category should be established and professionals in the medium they are adjudicating
- More information/profile for nominees (2 answers)

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

- tell the recipient that they have won before the event
- Great night out (2 answers)
- Surely all of the nomination material could have been submitted online.
- The city of Hamilton gave recognition verbally which resulted in a photo-op for them but often behind the scenes their actions speak louder. Case in point the two theatres the zoning dept. has harassed in the downtown area.
- I am still not a fan of the current nomination process. I chose "very important" to acknowledge the importance of participation by a broad range of artists.
- I appreciate the opportunity to be involved in this survey!

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

3. Reviewing the 2011 Arts Awards - Promotion How did you find out about the Arts Awards program? Check all the apply.		 Create Chart	 Download
		Response Percent	Response Count
City of Hamilton website		22.7%	20
Facebook		35.2%	31
E-blast from City of Hamilton's Culture Division		18.2%	16
E-newsletter (AKIMBO, The ZINE)		11.4%	10
Weekly papers (VIEW, Hamilton Community News)		14.8%	13
Arts community publications (HMag, MayDay)		15.9%	14
Diverse community publications (Women's Press, Presencia Latina, etc)		2.3%	2
Posters or postcards		9.1%	8
Information booth at arts event		6.8%	6
Word of Mouth		61.4%	54
	Other (please specify) Show Responses		17
		answered question	88
		skipped question	0

QUESTION #3 Summary of Answers for "Other (please specify)"

- other arts orgs (4 answers)
- Because I was nominated (3 answers)
- told/contacted by organizers (3 answers)
- Not sure
- Artist request to write a letter of reference
- I was invited to jury a category
- AAC member
- Twitter
- TV news

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

4. Reviewing the 2011 Arts Awards - Event If you attended the Arts Awards event on May 9, what did you think about the following event components? Create Chart Download						
	awful!	not the greatest	okay	good	fantastic!	Response Count
Venue	1.5% (1)	6.1% (4)	13.6% (9)	39.4% (26)	39.4% (26)	66
Pre-ceremony reception	3.2% (2)	16.1% (10)	21.0% (13)	53.2% (33)	6.5% (4)	62
Length of ceremony	6.1% (4)	9.1% (6)	47.0% (31)	31.8% (21)	6.1% (4)	66
Post-ceremony reception	1.7% (1)	18.6% (11)	28.8% (17)	39.0% (23)	11.9% (7)	59
Speeches by award recipients	4.8% (3)	7.9% (5)	33.3% (21)	42.9% (27)	11.1% (7)	63
Recognition of nominees	7.6% (5)	9.1% (6)	33.3% (22)	37.9% (25)	12.1% (8)	66
Performances	5.2% (3)	15.5% (9)	20.7% (12)	36.2% (21)	22.4% (13)	58
Emcee	25.8% (17)	22.7% (15)	21.2% (14)	24.2% (16)	6.1% (4)	66
Volunteers	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	15.6% (10)	50.0% (32)	34.4% (22)	64
Food and drink	4.6% (3)	12.3% (8)	30.8% (20)	40.0% (26)	12.3% (8)	65
If there had been a ticket price for the 2011 Arts Awards event, how much would you have been willing to pay?						58
						Show Responses
answered question						67
skipped question						21

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

QUESTION #4 Summary of Answers for “If there had been a ticket price for the 2011 Arts Awards event, how much would you have been willing to pay?”

Amount	# of responses	Percentage %
Free (to everyone or at least nominees)	12	20
Pay what you can	1	1.6
\$2	1	1.6
\$5	4	6.6
\$8	1	1.6
\$10	23*	38.3
\$15	5**	8.3
\$20	7	11.6
\$25	2	3.3
\$30-40	1	1.6
No answer	3	5

Note: Responses that included more than one answer were counted twice (ie free for nominees, cost for public) and therefore there are 60 comments incorporated from 58 respondents; *includes answer “10-15 for charity”; **includes answer “\$15-20”

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

5. Planning for the 2012 Arts Awards - Nomination Process There will be some changes made to the Arts Awards in time for the 2012 nomination process. Your feedback will be used to help determine the changes.				
	disagree	no preference	agree	Response Count
Artists should be allowed to self-nominate.	49.4% (44)	22.5% (20)	28.1% (25)	89
Nominations should be shortlisted in each award category.	12.8% (11)	26.7% (23)	60.5% (52)	86
The Lifetime Achievement category should have a different nomination process than the other award categories.	8.1% (7)	11.6% (10)	80.2% (69)	86
There should not be an "emerging" artist award in the Lifetime Achievement category.	25.0% (22)	10.2% (9)	64.8% (57)	88
		Additional Comments Show Responses		26
		answered question		89
		skipped question		0

QUESTION #5 Summary of Answers for "Additional Comments"

Nomination process

- nomination process too bureaucratic/tedious/confusing/inaccessible (4)
- should move to 2 stage nomination process (2)
- judge by merit of artists' work via support material, drop the letters of support (nomination letter should suffice)
- Showcase nominees more (4)

Emerging/Established

- Artists should be allowed to self nominate in the Emerging Artist category
- Emerging awards should be adjudicated and not selected by established award recipient (4)
- Should not be able to nominate each other as emerging/established or be nominated in both categories(2)

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

- emerging Lifetime just needs to be renamed

Lifetime

- should be a separate category if the award is to be given posthumously
- Lifetime is a stand alone achievement of senior proportions

Categories

- more subdivisions within categories like music, performance (3)
- one nominee/too many nominees in a category is problematic (2)

6. Planning for 2012 Arts Awards - Emerging Artist Definition A definition for the Emerging Artist category will be introduced in time for the 2012 nomination process. The definition needs to reflect Hamilton's diverse arts communities as it will be applied across all the Arts Award categories (theatre, fine craft, music, arts administration, community arts, etc). How important should the following factors be when developing a definition for an "emerging" artist?

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not important	somewhat important	very important	Response Count
Level of education	55.8% (48)	33.7% (29)	10.5% (9)	86
Exhibition/performance record	5.8% (5)	46.5% (40)	47.7% (41)	86
Level of public recognition	22.1% (19)	48.8% (42)	29.1% (25)	86
Minimum number of years practicing art	26.5% (22)	45.8% (38)	27.7% (23)	83
Maximum number of years practicing art	22.4% (19)	42.4% (36)	35.3% (30)	85
After how many years of artistic practice does a Hamilton artist stop being "emerging" and become "established"?				75
			Show Responses	
		answered question		86
		skipped question		2

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

QUESTION #6 Summary of Answers for “After how many years of artistic practice does a Hamilton artist stop being “emerging” and become “established”?”

# of years	# of responses	Percentage %
1-2	7	14.6
3-5	11	22.9
3-8	1	2.1
5	12	25.0
5-8	3	6.2
5-10	2	4.2
7-9	5	10.4
10	7	14.6

Note: Responses have been grouped. 48 of the 75 responses included specific years, all other responses were descriptive.

Other factors for consideration to differentiate between “emerging” and “established” are:

- Achievement and recognition by peers/grants/professional awards (7 answers)
- Exhibition/publishing/performance record and history (4 answers)
- History of work sold (2 answers)
- Too much variety between the Award categories (2 answers)
- Not measured in years (2 answers)
- Having established a body of work
- Frequency of work
- Self identify as emerging/established

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

7. Planning for the 2012 Arts Awards - Suggestions Do you have a suggestion for the 2012 Arts Awards event? Suggest a Hamilton based Emcee, performer(s) or a venue that can hold more than 500 people. Do you, or someone you know, want to get involved with the program? Suggest a jury member or potential sponsor. [Download](#)

QUESTION #7 Summary of all responses:

Venue suggestions:

- Scottish Rite (4 answers)
- theatre Aquarius (3 answers)
- Hamilton studio theatre (2 answers)
- Mohawk college auditorium
- The Tivoli Theatre
- Sir John A. Macdonald Secondary theatre
- Merritt Hall at the Ancaster fairgrounds
- The Warplane Heritage Museum.
- Warehouse space.
- I think the Awards should be in a larger venue.
- I believe the awards should always be accessible by transit.
- DOWNTOWN destinations

Emcee suggestions (specific names removed):

- Hip hop emm cees
- It would be great if the Emcee could be a former Award winner or an artist of high local profile
- mc representing Hamilton's cultural diversity would be an improvement
- An MC with known humour and quick wit (pro) would suit best. Someone with character, personality, perhaps even slightly updated in terms of edgy roots sophistication.
- The emcee should be an actor

Performer suggestions:

- nominees perform at the event.

Jury suggestions (specific names removed):

- Jury members should be free of conflicts (2 answers)
- More judges from central Hamilton

Sponsorship suggestions (specific names removed):

- well-known artists

2011 Arts Awards Survey results and summary as of July 15, 2011

Other

- Need to recognize nominees (3 answers)
- There should be a charge for the event, say \$10. Making it free gives the wrong message to the community about how our tax dollars are being spent!
- Event should be MUCH shorter in terms of the award part with many fewer awards - 30 minutes max for this part would be nice Then lots more time for networking and chatting which is the reason why we all go to these thing
- There should be a description of the each category
- disappointed that the AAC members were not recognized at event
- Nominations for arts organizations would be improvement
- There should of been certificates with a City of Hamilton seal printed out for all the nominees
- There should be some process where people can 'roll-over' their nominations into the next year (or two) to avoid having to get new letters, and go through the whole process (which might deter people from re-applying - due to embarrassment at having to ask again for letters, often from the same people).
- Perhaps only 2 letters of reference per nominee for now. It's a small cultural pool.
- Mark Rose made the wooden boxes the awards came in but there was no recognition that I saw.
- council needs to provide more support