

Cultural wellbeing indicators in programs and policy making

*Report on a workshop for cultural development
workers in government and the community*

Adj. Prof. Mike Salvaris
School of Global Studies, Social Sciences and Planning
RMIT University
Melbourne
salvaris@optusnet.com.au

*Cultural Development Network
March 2007*

PART 1: Introduction and context

Nature of the workshop
 Background and context: wellbeing indicators
 Cultural development and culture indicators
 Practical issues about indicators for cultural development workers

PART 2: Workshop report

Aim of the day
 The ZING process
 Workshop Findings:

1. Composition of workshop participants
2. Vision and long term goals for cultural policy.
3. Cultural policy in Victoria today: progress, critical issues, overall state.
4. Key practical outcomes needed to achieve the vision and goals.
5. The main problems and barriers to good cultural policy.
6. Integrating cultural policy into local and state government planning.
7. Measures and indicators of success in cultural policy:
 - a. What indicators are the best measures?
 - b. What are the most 'measurable' indicators?
 - c. What indicators will most influence people outside cultural policy?

PART 3: Conclusion and next steps

Appendices

- A. PowerPoint slides
 - A1: Victorian Community Wellbeing Framework
 - A2: Culturally rich and vibrant communities
 - A3: Defining culture (UNESCO 2002)
 - A4: VCIP Cultural wellbeing indicators
 - A5: Key outcome areas for cultural wellbeing indicators
- B. References and web-sites
- C. Detailed responses to questions (Tables C2 – C8.3)

***PART 1* Introduction and Context**

1. This paper reports on a workshop on ‘Cultural planning and cultural indicators’ sponsored by the Cultural Development Network and hosted by VicHealth, at Carlton on 16th February 2007. The workshop was attended by over 40 participants, most of whom worked at the local government level in arts and cultural programs and policy, or in community development and planning, with some also from state and federal government, non-government, community and philanthropic agencies and several arts practitioners.
2. The aim of the workshop was to
 - a. inform community cultural and arts workers about community planning and community indicators;
 - b. help give them tools and opportunities to have a stronger input into Council policies and planning;
 - c. work together to develop a better set of agreed cultural indicators, using a process similar to that used in the Victorian Community Indicators project;
 - d. start a process that local arts and culture workers can carry out themselves: i.e., by developing local cultural well-being indicators and planning processes with others in Council and their community, and with other arts/culture workers.

Background

3. In many countries over the past three decades, community based wellbeing indicators have become increasingly important as a tool for better and more accountable policy making, and a means for democratic engagement of local citizens and communities.
4. Criticisms of the inadequacy of Gross Domestic Product (total economic production) as a measure of the overall wellbeing of nations led over time to the search for a more holistic and integrated framework of wellbeing measures, which would give proper weighting not just to economic output but to other key dimensions of progress and wellbeing – social, environmental, cultural and democratic – and better reflect the values and priorities of citizens and communities, not just policymakers, statisticians or experts.

5. The movement to develop better progress and wellbeing measures has been a genuinely global and multi-level movement, embracing international agencies (such as the UN and the OECD) and national governments, down to local governments, towns and neighbourhoods. One of the most important national initiatives has been the ABS project 'Measures of Australia's Progress'.
6. Community indicators have become increasingly important to local governments, especially in Victoria. Over the past ten years, following extensive amalgamations, local governments have had to take on increasing responsibility for integrated long-term planning for the well-being of their municipality, going well beyond the traditional concerns of councils ('roads, rates and plan rubbish'). New legislation such as the Local Government (Democratic Reform) Act now requires local governments to develop long-term plans for the environmental, social and economic well-being of their municipalities; these plans must include specific measures of progress and well-being and ensure community participation in the process. This last requirement reflects recognition of the growing need for policies that strengthen communities and local democratic processes at a time when many people are increasingly disengaged from their community and communities themselves are fragmenting in consequence of inequalities, economic restructure and demographic change.
7. The Victorian Community Indicators Project (VCIP) was a major initiative funded by VicHealth and carried out in 2005 and 2006. It was designed to help local governments to develop and use community well-being indicators, to better measure health, well-being and sustainability in their communities and to improve citizen engagement, community planning and policy-making.
8. One of the core tasks of the VCIP was to develop a comprehensive framework of well-being indicators that could be used by all local governments and local citizens, and was based on reliable statistical data. The VCIP well-being framework consists of 70 different well-being indicators organised around five major wellbeing domains (or 'pillars'):
 - Healthy, safe and inclusive communities (the 'social wellbeing' pillar);
 - Dynamic, resilient local economies (economic);
 - Sustainable built and natural environments (environmental);
 - Culturally rich and vibrant communities (cultural);
 - Democratic and engaged communities (democratic).

Table A1 in Appendix A shows this framework and the major policy (or key outcome) areas in each wellbeing domain.

9. Cultural well-being indicators in the VCIP framework (Table A4) were not developed in detail, for reasons discussed below. They should be

regarded as a starting point only; the VCIP team recognised the importance of more informed debate and discussion amongst those actively involved with cultural well-being try to identify better and more useful indicators. This workshop was aimed to facilitate such discussion.

Cultural development and culture indicators

10. In the early development of well-being indicators, there was a tendency to focus on the more material aspects of social well-being – those which also corresponded with traditional government policy and statistical categories, such as education, health, housing and income. Less attention and less credibility were given to more intangible areas of personal development and subjective well-being (like cultural wellbeing and life satisfaction), as well as more complex and political dimensions, such as democracy and social cohesion. Today there is no longer any serious dispute that cultural issues in general deserve to be a critical dimension of progress in well-being, both at community and national levels. Table A2 (an extract from the VCIP report) summarises the value of culture to wellbeing and communities, and closely follows the broad arguments used in the ABS ‘Measures of Australia’s Progress’, and other international reports (see References, Appendix B).
11. More recently, the problem for cultural indicators has been less one of legitimacy (though this is still an issue with some governments), and more one of agreed definitions and clear policy outcomes, by which to define and measure cultural well-being, and the lack of suitable data that accurately reflects these key goals and outcomes. This itself is largely a consequence of the broad and different meanings and applications of ‘culture’ and ‘cultural policy’, which potentially embrace everything on a spectrum from neighbourhood art shows to national values (see, for example, UNESCO’s definition of culture, Table A3). The net result is that cultural indicators used in wellbeing frameworks and government planning are often undeveloped or inappropriate.
12. Both in Australia and overseas in the past decade, national policy organisations have begun to think more seriously about cultural indicators, and about the place of cultural policy in wider public policy objectives such as health, wellbeing and community development. Some examples of reports from such bodies are listed in Appendix B. However in Australia there has not yet been a broad process across the cultural development sector as a whole (including those who work in it) to identify the key indicators of cultural wellbeing.
13. In cultural policy, as in other areas of policy, the starting point for developing effective indicators and progress measures is to be clear about what are the most important values and goals and from these to identify

the key outcomes needed to achieve these values and goals across the different policy and operational areas. Table A5 suggests 13 possible ‘Key outcome areas’ as a starting point for cultural wellbeing indicators, and the basis for a more detailed indicator framework, drawing on the kind of values, goals and operational areas identified in reports such as those listed in Appendix B.

Practical issues for culture development workers

14. The discussion above has focussed on the underlying issues of cultural indicators, and their development in the larger context of the wellbeing measurement movement. But for people working in cultural policy and programs in Victoria today, whether in government or the community, there are some immediate and practical reasons why they need to be familiar with indicators.
15. Indicators are influential in government. They are used in policy making and planning, and especially in evaluating the success of programs. The indicators used will reflect the priorities of those who select them, and their view of the value and importance of cultural policy. As governments, especially local governments, increase their role in community planning, and become more committed to ‘evidence based policymaking’ there will be greater pressure for better progress and wellbeing indicators, which will in turn increasingly influence budget allocation and program development.
16. Most cultural development workers work for governments at one or other level, many in local government; others (artists, community workers etc) are directly affected by government programs, policies and values in the cultural area (Table C2 in Appendix C shows the background of participants in this workshop).
17. Many cultural development workers feel that culture and the arts are not given proper recognition in government policy, that they are seen as low priority programs or ‘fluffy’, and that cultural development workers are not involved in key policy and budget processes (see Table C6).
18. Cultural development workers need to know what cultural indicators are used by governments; they need to be able to use these indicators themselves, and where necessary, argue for new indicators which better reflect cultural policy goals and community priorities
19. As we have seen, a key problem with cultural indicators (as in some other areas) is a lack of good data, and a tendency to use whatever statistics are available as indicators rather than those that reflect the most important issues or goals of cultural policy. An example of this is the current

reliance on attendance at certain cultural events as a cultural wellbeing indicator. This may be a useful measure of some aspects of cultural programs (for example, the efficient use of facilities); but it often would be a poor measure of larger community participation in the arts, or of the actual impact of cultural programs; yet attendance figures are relatively easy to collect. Much less is known on a whole range of more complex questions about cultural participation, needs, the impact of arts and culture programs outside specific activities or 'events', the equitable distribution of cultural resources etc. – the kind of factors listed in Table A4, for example.

PART 2: Workshop report

Aims and process

20. As indicated, the workshop had four main focuses:
 - a. information about community planning and community indicators;
 - b. tools and skills for stronger input into Council policies and planning;
 - c. developing a better set of agreed cultural indicators;
 - d. starting a collaborative process for cultural workers to achieve this.
21. Facilitators for the workshop were: Adj. Professors Mike Salvaris and Hayden Raysmith of RMIT University (both former members of the VCIP research team) and Mr Bob Ayton (Director of Edutech Concepts, leading exponents of the ZING collective learning process, described below).
22. The workshop used a collective 'brainstorming' technique, working systematically from values and vision in cultural policy, to key outcomes and then identifying the most important indicators that might reflect these goals and outcomes, and how they might best be applied in local government policy.
23. The process used was the ZING system, an 'interactive group computer learning process'. ZING is essentially, an electronic focus group for brainstorming and ideas generation but with distinct advantages over more traditional methods. Sessions are built around a series of sequenced questions; people work in groups of three around an 'input' keyboard; there is a short group discussion before each question and then every one puts their individual response (in some cases, more than one) into the group keyboard. Everyone's response is equal and anonymous. All of the responses are then put up together on a screen and read out: this gives a good sense of both the general consensus, and the range of different ideas. The collective output of 40 people working together can be very powerful and surprisingly prolific. This process is not scientific or rigorous but it is an excellent qualitative research and learning tool. It enables a large volume of ideas and opinions to be gathered and compared in a very short time, and quickly converted into a useful report. This is a big improvement on the old 'butcher's paper' process for group discussions: more sophisticated, but also more fun.

24. The workshop was organised around seven questions, set out in Table 1 below. For most of these questions, participants were asked to provide two or three short responses after a brief discussion of the issues. For one question (Q. 3), they were asked to indicate their agreement (on a scale from 1 to 10) with each of nine statements on current issues and problems in cultural policy, and then to provide an overall 'health rating' of Victorian cultural policy (from 0 – 100). For another question (Q.7) they were asked to suggest possible cultural wellbeing indicators in three categories: the best indicators; the most easily measured indicators; and the most influential indicators.

TABLE 1: Workshop questions

Q.1	What is your interest, and current area of employment, in cultural policy?
Q.2	What is your vision or ideal for cultural policy?
Q.3	Here is a list of nine factors many might think important for good cultural policies in Victoria. For each one, do you agree or disagree that they are achieved in current policy? And lastly, how would you rate the overall health of cultural policy now (from 0 – 100)? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Broad agreement in cultural sector on key goals of cultural policy (2) Influence of and respect for cultural workers in government (3) Good standard of cultural facilities and programs (4) Equity and diversity of participation in cultural programs (5) Adequately funded local cultural programs (6) Community engagement in cultural programs and policy making (7) Good policy and planning skills in cultural development officers (8) Adequacy of cultural wellbeing indicators currently used by government (9) Cultural policy well integrated into government planning and policy making (10) Overall state of health of cultural policy in local or state government
Q.4	To achieve the key goals and values of cultural policy, what are the most important practical outcomes that need to be achieved in different fields?
Q.5	What are the main problems and barriers to good cultural policy?
Q.6	How can cultural policy be better integrated into local and state government planning?
Q.7	Thinking about indicators to measure cultural wellbeing and progress, what do you believe are <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the best indicators of successful cultural policies? (2) the most measurable indicators? (3) The indicators most likely to influence external decision makers?

25. The responses of workshop participants are summarised briefly below, and a detailed listing of the responses is set out in the relevant Table in Appendix C, as indicated.

1. Composition of participants (Q1)

Most of the 42 participants worked at the local government level in arts and cultural programs, policy and planning; some were employed in related fields like community development and planning. There were a small number of state and federal government workers; several academic/student representatives; some NGO cultural organisation representatives; and two artists/cultural outreach workers.

Details are set out in Table C2 (Appendix C) below.

2. Vision and long term goals for cultural policy (Q2)

The four main themes which came through were, in rough priority order;

- *Creativity*: vitality, adventure, diversity
- *Community*: community engagement and participation, culture as part of community
- *Integration*: Culture policy integrated into government, taken seriously, planned, embedded
- *Inclusiveness*: of marginalised and disadvantaged people and indigenous culture

Detailed responses are listed in Table C3 below.

3. The state of current cultural policy (Q3)

The overall state of culture policy in Victoria today identified at the workshop was 'just satisfactory' (average rating: 56 out of 100), and there is a lot of room for improvement. Some of the most critical issues, in order of the strength of views expressed, are:

1. Cultural policy workers have little influence or respect in broader state and local planning and budget processes.
2. Cultural policy itself is not well integrated into these broader processes
3. Culture programs are not well funded compared to other state or local programs
4. The indicators used by state and local government are a poor measure of the most important cultural policy goals

5. Currently there is a reasonable amount of community participation in cultural programs and policymaking but much more can and should be done in this area.
6. In particular, cultural programs and policies at local and state level are generally not well enough targeted to minority groups or diverse interest groups and not well participated in by such groups.
7. In general more should be done to promote shared visions and agreed goals among those working in cultural development.
8. The actual standard of cultural facilities and programs in Victoria at present is fair but could be significantly better.
9. The skill levels of cultural development workers in the area of policy and planning are reasonably good.

Table C4 sets out a detailed analysis of responses to this question.

4. Key outcomes needed to achieve vision and goals (Q4)

Key outcomes suggested here followed fairly closely from the visions and goals identified earlier. They were grouped around six main themes:

- Stronger community connection, participation and ownership
- Raising the status of the arts and culture in society and in government
- Improving skills and capacity, both of the community and culture workers
- More support from senior government officers
- Improved funding and resources
- Better inclusion of young people, disadvantaged and marginalised groups and minorities.

Some participants identified the need for ‘more cross fertilisation between arts/culture and other fields, including service and business’.

Detailed responses are listed in Table C5 below.

5. Main problems and barriers to good cultural policy (Q5)

Responses to this question were very diverse, with the main recurrent themes being:

- Lack of resources
- Low levels of knowledge in government and business
- Poor integration with other areas of government
- Undervaluation of arts and culture in the community and government, seen as ‘arty farty’

- Culture seen as ‘middle class’, opera and ballet etc; negative influence of mass culture
- Low policy skill levels of culture workers
- Lack of sufficiently strong multicultural and minority group engagement, dominance of English-US language and models
- Inward looking, ‘precious’ culture within arts community
- Failure to consult with community workers.

Detailed responses are listed in Table C6 below.

6. Integrating cultural policy into government (Q6)

In this question too, responses were enthusiastic and broad ranging: the main solutions offered were:

- Stronger advocacy, more rocking the boat, better marketing of culture
- developing a stronger case for culture, with better evidence and indicators, showing the power and benefits of good cultural policy.
- Integrating cultural policy more directly into government by requiring cultural impact statements, for all policies; placing cultural policy officers in all departments; and developing ‘cultural KPI’s’
- training cultural officers more strategically and increasing their policy skills.
- Involving senior management more directly in the design of cultural policy
- shifting the ethical and policy basis of government more away from economic and financial policy to cultural and broader well-being issues.

Detailed responses are listed in Table C7 below.

7. Indicators of success in cultural policy (Q7)

In this question, facilitators try to push participants hard on the question of the most effective indicators for cultural wellbeing, not just the most obvious or desirable. Responses were sought to three successive questions:

- What indicators are the best measures?
- What are the most ‘measurable’ indicators?
- What indicators will most influence people outside cultural policy?

(1) The best measures

Responses here often mixed ‘outcomes’ with ‘measures’, but the main themes in rough order were:

- Level of community participation, engagement in and ownership of cultural programs
- Improved health, wellbeing and happiness
- Sustainability of arts/culture programs and activities
- Increased quantity of cultural activity, jobs, participation, ‘bums on seats’
- More diverse activities and projects
- Cultural policy better built into government, all departments having cultural officer etc
- Better quality of cultural activity, better evaluation measures
- Artists being taken more seriously and supported better
- New communities feeling valued.

Detailed responses are listed in Table C8.1 below.

(2) Most ‘measurable’ indicators

The different phrasing of this question prompted a more focused and literal response: most answers were specific and measurable indicators, often variations on indicators now available, but also some proposals for new ones, for example through extended surveys. The main categories of response in approximate order were:

- Community satisfaction and valuing of cultural programs (much the most frequently named indicator)
- Percentage of people involved in cultural programs
- Number of new arts and culture partnerships with communities, businesses etc.
- Changes in social and health outcomes of culture program participants
- Number of cultural workers and trainees
- Changes in local government arts budgets.
- Specific targets of cultural programmes being met
- Improved media reporting
- Higher income of artists.

Detailed responses are listed in Table C8.2 below.

(3) Indicators most likely to influence external decision makers

This question suggested some sharp examples of the cultural indicators likely to be taken most seriously by key funders and decision-makers in government and business. Main categories, in rough priority order, were:

- Increased economic activity, business turnover, tourism, employment resulting from cultural programs etc
- Increased skills, capacity, education attainment, school retention, arts/culture trainees
- Improvements in health and wellbeing, reduced isolation, reduced incidence of gambling, improved safety
- Stronger participation in community, sense of community
- Visual images of arts/culture programs, publicity
- Increases in arts/culture programs patronage, attendance
- Greater engagement of marginalised and disadvantaged people
- Community pressure for improved culture programs
- Increased business partnership/sponsorship of arts/culture programs
- Local government CEO's visibly engaged in cultural programs.

Detailed responses are listed in Table C8.3 below.

PART 3 Conclusion and next steps

This workshop was intended as a starting point for discussion about improved well-being indicators in cultural policy. The aim was to provide a broad introductory overview for a general audience, and to work with them by graduated steps towards more specific indicator definition.

From this perspective, the workshop threw up a very broad range of information from participant responses, and should provide a good basis and information bank for the ongoing discussion and development of cultural indicators in Victoria.

There may be value in future workshops focused on more technical issues of the design and use of cultural indicators in government, for those cultural workers already familiar with the basic issues.

It may also be valuable for the Cultural Development Network to consider some form of ongoing partnership with Community Indicators Victoria (CIV) to develop and support cultural development indicators and the capacity of cultural development officers in local government to use them in policy and planning. Developing such partnerships with community and local government bodies is one of the key tasks of the CIV, which was set up last year at the Vic Health McCaughey Centre, at the University of Melbourne with generous long term funding from VicHealth. The CIV is in effect the institutional continuation of the Victorian Community Indicators Project (VCIP).

APPENDIX A PowerPoint slides

A1: Victorian Community Wellbeing Framework

Wellbeing Domain	A. Social	B. Economic	C. Environment	D. Cultural	E. Democratic
Goal	<i>Healthy, safe and inclusive communities</i>	<i>Dynamic, resilient and fair local economies</i>	<i>Sustainable built and natural environments</i>	<i>Culturally rich and vibrant communities</i>	<i>Healthy democracy and active citizens</i>
Policy areas	A1: Personal health & wellbeing	B1: Economic activity	C1: Access to open space	D1: Arts and cultural activities	E1: Healthy democracy
	A2: Community connectedness	B2: Employment	C2: Transport accessibility	D2: Recreational & leisure activities	E2: Active citizens
	A3: Early child- hood development	B3: Income and wealth	C3: Energy use	D3: Cultural diversity	
	A4: Personal and community safety	B4: Work-life balance	C4: Housing affordability		
	A5: Lifelong learning		C5: Air quality		
	A6: Services availability		C6: Water quality		
			C7: Biodiversity		
			C8: Waste management		

Source: VicHealth et al. 'Measuring Wellbeing, Engaging communities'. Final report of the Victorian Community Indicators Project (VCIP). VicHealth, Carlton. July 2006, pp. 39-46

A2: Culturally rich and vibrant communities: VCIP

Our culture and leisure activities shape our community identity. Art film and literature reflect and comment on the social issues of the times. A culturally rich community protects heritage sites, preserves social knowledge and provides opportunities to participate in sporting and recreational activity – all of which assist in creating a better work-life balance. It is also a community that celebrates diversity and is welcoming to people of diverse cultures.

Indicators in this domain will provide important information to Council policies and plans including: leisure and recreation, neighbourhood action plans, social policy and planning, heritage, integration, diversity, public health and urban design.

(Source: VicHealth et al. 'Measuring Wellbeing, Engaging communities'. Final report of the Victorian Community Indicators Project. VicHealth, Carlton. July 2006, p. 44)

A3: Defining culture (UNESCO)

Culture should be regarded as the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and ... it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs”.

(Source: UNESCO. 2002. Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity)

A4: Cultural wellbeing indicators: VCIP

Suggested Indicators	Potential Data Sources
Opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities	DVC Community Strength Indicators by LGA, 2004-2006, Victorian Community Survey 2007
Participation in arts and culture activities	Arts Victoria
Participation in sporting and recreation activities	ABS, VPHS, Sport Victoria, Victorian Community Survey 2007
Maintenance or protection of heritage buildings	Victorian Heritage listing on-line DSE Victorian Heritage Information Map
Percentage who rate variety of arts and cultural events as adequate or better	DVC council performance ratings in the area of recreational facilities
Average occupancy of community cultural centres per month by recurrent hirers	Local Council Records
Number of performing and visual arts venues	ABS: Performing Arts, Australia (8697.0) once off survey, national data only. Local Council Records
Community satisfaction with the range of community events and festivals	CSS collects council performance ratings data in the area of Recreational Facilities
Local places of significance	Victorian Heritage listing on-line
Cultural diversity: percent of people who believe their community accepting of people from different cultures	Victorian Community Survey 2007

Source: VicHealth, Victorian Community Indicators Project, Final Report. 2006

A5: Key outcome areas for cultural wellbeing indicators

1. Community participation in arts and cultural activities	8. Variety and diversity of arts and culture activities etc.
2. Quality of artistic and cultural life and outcomes	9. Diversity of ethnicities and cultures within community
3. Impact on individuals of arts and culture activities (health, wellbeing, skills etc)	10. Skills and experience of arts/culture workers and policy-makers
4. Adequacy and availability of arts and cultural facilities and programs	11. Efficient administration of arts and culture facilities and programs
5. Adequacy of arts/culture funding and resourcing (government and non-government)	12. Economic effects of cultural and arts activities (jobs, tourism, events, facilities, building and maintenance etc)
6. Equitable access and participation in arts and cultural activities across different groups (socio-economic, ethnic, age etc)	13. Impact on communities of arts/culture activities (sense of community, networks, facilities, beautification, heritage etc.)
7. Integration of arts and culture into mainstream government policies and planning	

APPENDIX B **References and web-sites**

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2004, 'Measures of Australia's Progress', Canberra.
- Community Indicators Victoria, the McCaughey Centre, Melbourne University:
<http://www.mccaugheycentre.unimelb.edu.au>
- Jackson, M. et al. 2006, 'Cultural vitality in communities: interpretation and indicators', The Urban Institute:
<http://www.urban.org/publications/311392.html>
- Mills, D. and Brown, P. 2004, 'Art and Wellbeing', Australia Council.
- Scottish Executive. 2005, 'Quality of Life and Wellbeing: Measuring the benefits of culture and sport'. Scottish Executive Social Research, Edinburgh.
- Simons, D and Dang, S. 2006, 'International perspectives on Cultural indicators', Creative City Network, Simon Fraser University, Canada.
- Victorian Community Indicators Project. 2006, 'Measuring wellbeing, engaging communities'. Melbourne, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.
- Windsor, J. 2005, 'Your health and the arts', Arts Council England.

APPENDIX C Detailed responses

TABLE C2: Occupation/interest of workshop participants (Q. 1)

1	local government cultural officer	22	local government - graduate
2	local gov - community planning	23	LG Arts and culture worker City of Melbourne CCD
3	state policy	24	project manager across cultural and education sectors at local and state Gov't levels
4	local government, visual arts, cultural services	25	Local Government Arts officer
5	State Gov program leader	26	project management for CCD
6	policy researcher and educator	27	local govt.
7	local government - libraries	28	local government cultural planner
8	project officer, local government	29	University community arts and professional development
9	Local government, indicators project officer	30	Local Gov't Project Officer
10	arts & cultural development officer, City of Darebin	31	CEO - NGO of national significance
11	local government cultural projects	32	community development manager in a social change oriented CCD organisation
12	local government - cultural worker	33	local gov't arts and cultural team leader
13	local government program manager	34	Cultural Planner within local government, artist, atavist
14	federal service and support agency	35	Local government Knox practising artist, educator
15	LGA, Cultural Planning	36	CCD exec officer
16	state government arts	37	local gov't project person, policy and active local government cultural projects
17	Local Gov't Arts Project Officer	38	executive officer NGO not for profit arts and cultural centre
18	local gov't - policy & strategy development	39	philanthropy, capacity building
19	theatre/community outreach	40	local gov't arts venue manager
20	teacher, academic researcher in community development social marginalization	41	local gov't arts coordinator
21	local gov't planning & projects	42	artists/arts management student

TABLE C3: What is your vision or ideal for arts/culture policy? (Q. 2)

1	enhancing creativity or all people in the community	31	inclusive, diverse with culture in its broadest sense embedded as the whole got approach.
2	cultural and artistic freedom of expression for all	32	supports creative vitality and is all encompassing and welcoming to all elements of the community
3	holistic	33	culture to be a main measure across council
4	diverse engaging	34	arts embedded into social planning unit
5	engaged communities	35	active, inclusive, culturally diverse, inclusive, respectful and representative
6	an engaged and creative community	36	adventurous and challenging
7	Quadruple bottom line: culture, social, environment, economic adopted by Local Gov's.	37	high profile
8	diverse	38	objective education about true history of place
9	more Australians actively enjoying arts and culture	39	Arts considered as intrinsic for all levels of policy making
10	Real Impact and an ability to mobilize social change	40	Once we try and put arts/culture into the policy realm we have already lost, it's dead.
11	strengthening and supporting diversity	41	value of subjective measurements
12	community ownership	42	arts/cultural 'stuff' included across ALL areas of Gov't - inclusive, diverse, engaging etc. it's there ALL the time and everyone needs, knows/wants it!
13	intrinsically linked to community need with a broad approach	43	to be a starting point for economic and tourism strategies
14	A cultural policy that is embedded in council development and operations with cross organisation understanding and acknowledgement.	44	integrated
15	sustainable	45	value measuring of happiness instead of numbers
16	arts excellence with and emphasis on practice informing society e.g. change the way we work, and	46	resources to support the work being done
17	local Gov't to take it seriously-valued, engrained	47	unfettered opportunity for cultural and creative expression and addressing of disadvantage to ensure equality in community voice and participation
18	facilitate participation on all levels - planning and participation	48	Engage and support communities to be creative
19	Supports creative vitality and diversity with a balance between community arts and professional practice	49	build networks and relationships between people
20	artists embedded within the strategic planning processes at all levels	50	vibrant, connected, inclusive, open, respectful, educative, , encouraging,
21	building communities through arts and culture	51	emphasis on bringing together of diverse community groups
22	inclusive	52	crayons for all!!!!

23	link with other aspects of cc=council activity	53	art built into all urban environment
24	diverse vibrant accessible arts and culture projects achieving individual and community health and well being	54	well resourced now will impact the future
25	tangible	55	Recognizes authentic sustainability opportunities within the arts - uniting the different domains of sustainability
26	inclusive of all voices in the community in a bottom up manner	56	Involve all people in targeted projects.
27	Policy that is practical enough to actually be implemented and have attainable goals	57	to be regarded as important as a rec. strategy
28	an ability to engage those who see them marginalized by the processes	58	including the broadest ideas of arts and culture
29	well supported cultural facilities, fully engaged community, accessible cultural activities, diverse expression, - fully resourced	59	acknowledgement that Indigenous culture is central.
30	Inclusive, diverse, broad parameters engaging, creative, sustainable links, access for all.		

TABLE C4: State of current cultural policies and programs in Victoria

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly %</i>	<i>Disagree %</i>	<i>Undecided or no view</i>	<i>Agree %</i>	<i>Agree strongly %</i>	<i>Average on 1-5 (1)</i>	<i>Issue rating (2)</i>	<i>Summary</i>
1. Among those working in the culture sector, there is a shared vision and broadly agreed goals.	11	31	13	44	0	2.9	0	Opinions divided, some strong disagreement
2. Cultural policy workers are influential and respected in the wider planning and budget processes in my local Gov't/in the State Gov't.	59	27	5	7	2	1.7	-77	Strong and nearly universal disagreement
3. The standard of cultural facilities and programs in my community/in Victoria is good	17	17	29	29	10	3.0	+5	Opinions divided, many undecided, stronger feeling on negative side
4. Cultural programs in my LGA/in the State are generally well targeted to, and participated in by, different groups in the community	12	50	10	21	7	2.6	-34	Clear majority disagree, few strong views
5. Generally cultural programs are well funded compared to other areas in my LGA/in the State	56	19	11	10	3	1.9	-62	Strong disagreement by majority.
6. There is a high level of genuine community engagement in cultural programs and policy making in my LGA/ at the State level	10	31	17	27	12	2.9	-2	Opinions divided, few strong views.
7. Cultural officers in local government generally have good skill levels in broader policy and planning	5	21	29	36	10	3.2	+20	About half agree, many undecided, few strong views.
8. The indicators or measures of success now used by my LG/by the State properly reflect the most important goals of culture policy	38	31	21	7	2	2.1	-60	Large majority disagree, many strongly, others mostly undecided
9. Cultural policy is well integrated into broader planning and policymaking in my LGA/the State.	36	43	12	7	2	2.0	-70	Large majority disagree quite strongly, few undecided.
10. All things considered, I would rate the state of health of culture policy and programs in my local community/in Victoria on a scale from 0-100 as	Average: 56/100, a bare pass. Most in band 45-65. Few (11%) very poor ratings (0-25), and few (9%) very good (75-100)

Notes:

- (1) Average value on agreement scale, where 1 = 'disagree strongly', 2 = 'disagree', 3 = 'don't know, no view', 4 = 'agree', 5 = 'agree strongly'.
(2) Difference between total 'agrees' and total 'disagrees'

TABLE C5: Key outcomes (Q. 4)

'To achieve our goals and values, what are the most important outcomes that need to be achieved, the practical things that need to be done, and in what fields?'

1	increased community connectedness	34	the 4th pillar being the 1st pillar!
2	community identity and stronger sense of belonging	35	councillor support
3	raised status of cultural policy within cultural planning	36	Seeing , raising profile of arts/artists
4	diversity in programs more c	37	more resources
5	agreement on what our actual goals and values are	38	skills development e.g. interpersonal abilities, management and project planning
6	employment of more artists	39	building community capacity to participate in cultural activity
7	more creative community	40	Cross-fertilization / integration between creative arts and other areas of community service and local business
8	evidence of coherent action in response to community consultation	41	we need indicators to prove ourselves and to better understand achievements - common space understanding
9	capacity building' - self-reliance	42	arts organisations being well-resourced enough to extend their programming to target and engage a diversity of audiences
10	community ownership and a sense of belonging, community driven process	43	better and more facilities
11	attendance figures that reflect diverse audiences	44	How important is the arts to our society ?
12	happy punters	45	culture of valuing dialogue or diverse expression
13	increased opportunities for people to learn in a cultural context	46	participation with such outcomes as improved mental health integrated planning & service delivery across Council
14	participation in democracy	47	incorporating those areas of community that are ,marginalized
15	greater participation, greater skill level	48	increased local capacity to foster ideas, actions, active participation, including the broadest demographic in arts and cultural stuff!!!!
16	senior management understanding and support 9	49	more funds for CCD projects and programs
17	active participation of the community in the planning of cultural based activities	50	Diverse programming covering many art forms
18	providing info in other languages, acknowledging minority groups	51	minority groups involved & participating
19	sense of ownership of an identifiable product/program	52	recognition & respect for specialist skills - artistic, social support integrated
20	budget commitments	53	creation of comm. environments that are safe yet stimulative - encourage creativity
21	Raising the value of arts in society in general	54	Young people connected to the arts

22	active participation in the development o policy by the community	55	respecting children - opinions of.
23	skill development and empowerment of community - increase capacity of community to engage with democracy	56	acknowledgement of artists in the area
24	fundamental respect/understanding of Arts/cultural activity/value across ALL of Gov't - WoG approach. Totally embedded ax Gov't from start of process and thro out process.	57	not homogenized values
25	evolving, sustainable, organic growth of projects and organisations - from the bottom up	58	different departments and non arts organisations working collaboratively with arts
26	diverse programs & sense of community happiness	59	sustainable outcomes
27	programs tailored towards disadvantaged communities (with successful participation)	60	a community that is open to experiencing new and diverse ideas, art forms, cultures, was to engage with each other
28	vibrant & engaged community	61	mobilization - leadership within the community - capacity building - tools to be able to achieve it. Connect success
29	environment where the community's voice is included, marginalised included, personal significance valued, from ground up	62	space to stop and think
30	ongoing meaningful dialogue	63	Lifelong learning in the arts
31	greater integration into council overall policy and programs	64	arts& culture is not the icing in the cake
32	Sense of fun and excitement and satisfaction about where people are in world	65	targeted funding
33	enhanced valuing of council by community when cultural policy addresses and reflects their needs	66	tolerance and community openness

TABLE C6: Main problems and barriers to good cultural policy (Q. 5)

1	the lack of \$\$ resources to engage the community	50	The infighting within the Arts and Culture community
2	Lack of informed senior management	51	professional preciousness!
3	John Howard	52	lack of belief from senior decision makers in the power of the arts to achieve significant outcomes in the other 4 pillars
4	gaps/lack of rigorous research	53	lack of lateral thinking capabilities in community leaders
5	egos and personal agendas	54	Being labeled as arty farty
6	lack of consultation with arts and community workers	55	lack of awareness by both government and community of what c cultural practice and exchange exists
7	too much focus on measurable outcomes	56	lack of integration ,compartmentalized thinking
8	ditto	57	difficulty measuring cultural and devaluation of the subjective
9	That it is seen as apolitical and set within a capitalist consumer society	58	lack of money
10	Lack of recognition of the value of arts and culture	59	managers in local Gov't working in silos
11	lack of recognition of the importance and value of culture to a community or society by residents/councillors	60	assumption that we all want the same thing
12	totally undervalued - not wanting to value. The FLUFF factor. Not willing to engage with getting it	61	CCD is only for the marginalized.
13	the lack of understanding of what is culture	62	insular development of policy development - not engaging with other Gov't depts and whole of community
14	economic viability focus of policy/ governance	63	arts is always fluffy!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
15	culture seen as ballet and opera	64	misunderstanding ad recognition of cultural polity
16	the arts having to justify itself in terms of health etc and not being able to be accepted as a legitimate activity	65	not being taken seriously
17	lack of common language	66	lack of time to concentrate on putting the policy together
18	everything is in English - lack of multilingual & everything is written & thus disadvantages non-literate	67	lack of knowledge of useful data
19	The supremacy of the growth economy and the lack of importance of arts/culture in this	68	hesitancy to forge partnerships across diverse sectors within communities
20	Arts and Cultural policy rhetoric and not genuinely integrated and used p	69	narrow definitions of arts and cultural activity (e.g. car-culture)
21	lack of knowledge of useful data that demonstrates the value of a rich cultural policy	70	ego
22	funding	71	Sometimes informed by middle-class notions rather than reflecting the voices of diverse communities - generalised, jargonistic, based on

			assumptions rather than meaningful inclusion :-)
23	lack of awareness of Indigenous culture, esp. in education	72	lack of showing community how they can engage
24	advocacy	73	having to prove value, not being accepted across the organisation
25	lack of flexibility of cultural workers to think outside the square	74	high art vs community art not helpful - fighting over same small resources funding
26	arts and culture is seen as 'other' by mainstream Gov't and business	75	non-communication to non-arts sectors - e.g.: corporate
27	skills level of arts cultural workers	76	presumptions of ethnic superiority & hierarchies of arts and cultural practices
28	A conservative federal government	77	lack of understanding in the community about cultural development and policy
29	genuine dialogue with the community	78	unrealistic timelines that are driven by budget cycles as opposed to cultural needs and characteristics of community
30	developing effective process that feed into cultural policy	79	Australia is very, very small! Business and Gov't don't really get us
31	representation of Indigenous community in policy making positions	80	lack of understanding of role of arts and culture as central to society
32	integration - embedded in other policies	81	councils prioritization of service to community. rubbish collection over the arts
33	confusion to if culture if art or people	82	articulated arguments to support proposed policy
34	dearth of knowledge	83	ensorship
35	lack of influence by minority groups - either cultural, language, age	84	too few 'champions' and advocates within the wider community
36	political agendas	85	diversity within the arts - much art is undertaken individually and some artists don't understand community engagement as they work sol
37	ego	86	confidence of cultural sector
38	it's not money making	87	Always the same people from the community having input into arts and cultural policy
39	not enough people in positions of power understand, value and engage with arts and culture	88	lack of talking to other sectors to see how we can interact
40	skills in policy interpretation & possibility for multi interpretations	89	lack of social planning and good urban design
41	Not hitting the nail on the head ! - i.e. not addressing what the community requires with the arts, the document is for documents sake...	90	conflict between methods of arts practices
42	lack of meaningful/appropriate community consultation	91	marginalisation of artists
43	professional preciousness	92	lack of relationship building with other sectors
44	resources lack of respect, reactive senior management afraid to commit to creative approaches, wanting to be politically safe	93	timelines and budget constraints
45	mismatch of resources vs expected outcomes (to support policy)	94	philistines!
46	narrow focus of notion of cultural practice	95	what policy?????
47	mass culture	96	fear of its power to subvert and challenge and ask

			the tough questions
48	no understanding of the broader benefits of good cultural outcomes	97	no one to write it
49	lack of funds to really talk to community about what they want. lack of \$\$\$ to commit long term	98	people in arts and culture talk too much to each other, using inward-focused language, instead of reacting out to engage and increase understanding

TABLE C7: Integrating cultural policy into government planning (Q. 6)*'How can we better integrate cultural policy into local and state government planning?'*

1	involve multiple stakeholders in the development of policy	35	Mandated cultural policy - like Health and Wellbeing plan
2	leadership	36	arts officers popping off to get a masters of business and becoming local government CEO
3	advocacy	37	a willingness from other planners to come and talk to us and believe we are relevant
4	internal communication /marketing	38	more of this!
5	play the game	39	we have to demonstrate the power of arts and culture to deliver outcomes in other policy areas
6	getting policy makers along to really well run community cultural activities	40	state wide support available for the development of local cultural policies
7	articulate the value of the arts well so everyone gets us	41	the arts can be used as at
8	all planners and council officers need to have proformas to make them think about the arts and how/what they are going to do re the arts	42	create regional cultural forums which bring together people from education, cultural and health and other sectors for the planning processes
9	arts officers in every department - health, youth ... everywhere!	43	we need to make the links with others e.g. engineers not wait for them to be arts friendly
10	Strategic planning that adopts a whole systems approach	44	need to find ways to champion cultural change within Gov't at a high level
11	providing more evidence and ways of linking holistic outcomes to the arts.	45	The problems are our culture, not just the policy, how do you create a cultural shift ??
12	negotiation skills	46	arts & cultural workers need to toughen up & get louder
13	VicHealth and arts Vic holding education forums for local Gov't	47	increased research data
14	we need to orchestrate a mind set change	48	cultural impact statements on each new policy
15	stronger partnerships between LG and the State	49	give govt proof of why we need to be heard/supported
16	awareness of internal stakeholders e.g.: finance managers	50	the arts can be used as a tool to achieve outcomes by other department
17	lets look at the environment movements success in policy integration...	51	time to think write and act
18	More genuine peer dialogue with Arts Vic	52	Engaging senior management in creative processes - penetrating their silos and getting them to experience its power first hand
19	Peter Garret for PM	53	learn to speak other peoples' languages
20	developing a stronger evidence base for the value of the arts and learning to be more persuasive in its presentation	54	getting Gov't to value things other than economics
21	make lots and lots and lots of noise	55	creating policy that can live beyond the page
22	different dep'ts coordinating their visions and goals	56	evaluation process

23	develop uniform project planning templates to include arts & cultural outcomes	57	Shout!
24	we have plans and policies that are not shared	58	Telling them the advantages of the linked approach
25	break out the crayons and regularly map your community (again!)	59	- and business world too need to be convinced of our value /broader meaning. More than the bloody ballet...
26	need a simple campaign to make everyone understand it -- especially corporates	60	realistic and recognizable indicators
27	get it up the political agenda	61	Identify shared values - e.g. sustainability - and align accordingly
28	get the indicators sorted out so we can sell that info	62	Training of cultural workers in policy development
29	Policy writing, policy implementation and policy evaluation skills	63	shift in culture should be looked at,
30	Federal Gov't needs to take a leadership role.	64	arts AND culture - communicate the broader sense
31	move arts & culture into centralized thinking	65	Community participants inviting policy makers to listen to their stories and the impact of the arts in their lives
32	Design an arts project for local and state government policy makers to participate in get them involved feel it for themselves	66	More selling of the state wide policies to dep't on all 3 levels - just don't write them- sell them
33	culture as a bottom line	67	it's much better than it was 20 yrs ago
34	Dictated Cultural strategy	68	all dept need to have cultural KPI's

TABLE C8.1. Indicators that best measure success (Q. 7 (1))

'To show that cultural policy is succeeding, what are the best measures of success?'

1	community running the program itself -	32	witnessing and sharing in other people's lives
2	culturally inclusive organisation	33	health happy vibrant community
3	front page stories	34	increased participation rates, diverse that reflect the community
4	Each dept in local Gov't including cultural KPI's	35	increased participation; increased feelings of cohesiveness; more proactive demands for cultural activity
5	community engagement at all levels of program planning and delivery	36	successful projects that are hijacked by community
6	Sustainability - participants who continue with activity on a deeper level in an ongoing capacity.	37	engage the younger generation with their community
7	Healthy, happy engaged community	38	celebration of cultural diversity as a measure of cultural policy success
8	improved health and wellbeing across community. Increased level of inclusion. Community capacity to solve problems - rather than wanting Gov't to always do it	39	give community to experts who help guide/lead them
9	guaranteed recurrent funding	40	perceptions of quality of life, a vibrant and vital community
10	arts being more visible and creating a community dialogue	41	no. of arts jobs being advertised
11	active participation, perhaps in local arts projects/events or communities of interest	42	greater proportion of budget for arts
12	High % of participation from marginalized communities	43	audience profiles having increased cultural diversity
13	demand for programs to exist and to continue to exist	44	not just level of participation, but the changes that happened to the people who attend.
14	sustainability - can operate without ongoing funding support	45	qualitative evaluation processes
15	increase in quality and quantity of arts and cultural activities	46	people engaging with the arts who would never have done so in previous years
16	newly arrived communities actually FEEL VALUED and able to have influence on policy. Policy change directed by the community itself b/c they have a voice...	47	Level of community connectivity and resilience resulting from creative engagement
17	Percentage of the population actually engaged in cultural activities	48	no. of quality cultural organisations, events, activities, resources
18	public demonstration of community cultural activity	49	measure diversity of art and participation so what is offered and what is done is broad and reflective of multicultural society
19	mental health and well being outcomes of the community	50	no. of cross sector collaborations
20	when people express that they no longer feel isolation	51	diversity and number of projects in the community

21	pollies being elected on a platform of strong cultural commitment	52	All services having to look for funding/sponsorship to provide basic services
22	every part of corporation have cultural aspect in its own mission statement. And same for each level of Gov't (federal, state, local)	53	policies across all levels of Gov't dep'ts take cultural factors into account
23	employment rates of artists	54	a cultural office in EVERY dept and company. Always the 1st port of call!
24	bums on seats	55	The identification of youth generated policy/ideas
25	community knocking on our door asking for programs - advocating for our policy	56	less demands for mental health and health resources
26	a healthy inclusive connected community	57	increased awareness of cultural diversity - language, lifestyle, ethnicity and abilities etc.
27	Lower suicide rates (Youth)	58	no of partnerships between arts and non arts entities
28	number of creative industries	59	contribution of cultural planning to a healthy community9
29	Investment in the arts on a personal level, Gov't level and business - and the economic spin off recognised	60	John Howard with a paint brush in his hand
30	more programs of good quality, more events	61	valuing the role of professional artists and their achievements. Volume of artists making money from art
31	empowering people in community to run own programs - have own tools to do - so we all become redundant!	62	mandatory representation of cultural workers on cross directive teams

TABLE C8.2: Most measurable indicators (Q. 7 (2))*'What outcomes of success are currently most easily measured?'*

65	meeting the objectives of the project within the available timeline	83	Cultural workers invited to participate on other policy reference groups - planning, etc
66	75% engagement with identified stakeholders	84	self evaluation
67	participation by members of the target group in the planning processes. E.g. youth arts policy/events	85	new arts partnerships with the community/business sector etc for funding and program delivery
68	range and diversity and size of attendances at events	86	number of people involved in arts activities
69	increased demand & increased participation	87	measuring councils increased budget to arts
70	% of community place value on programs	88	Social connectedness of participants coming through programs
71	number of arts business partnerships; number of new applicants for grants; diversity of participation	89	internal funding resources increased
72	audience feedback	90	No. of artist-run spaces increases
73	increased demand and level of activity - and measure its diversity	91	arts and cultural activity is VALUED
74	high satisfaction rate of participants	92	artists reporting increased sales of arts work (higher incomes)
75	measurable positive change in social and health outcomes	93	no. of funded CCD traineeships and courses
76	range of programs for different groups within the community	94	using currently available measurements for well being, as arts are integrated
77	Tracking participants - participation/audience - longitudinal	95	implement existing research tools that measure individual's levels of sense of belonging, mental health and sense of community safety
78	Art & culture contributing to health & happiness indicators	96	before and after surveys
79	how many cultural workers are there in the organisation - how many are there- how respected/valued are they?	97	Asking people if they are culturally fulfilled
80	increased participation at all levels.	98	media
81	Satisfaction/pride of self and wide community	99	% of local community members stating they enjoy diverse community life
82	participant satisfaction		

TABLE C8.3: Indicators that will influence external decision-makers - Q. 7 (3)

'What indicators of the success of cultural programs and policy will most influence people outside cultural policy?'

101	reduced rate of gambling addiction/activity	127	visitation/tourism/.
102	Consumption increased community profile, community improvement	128	Local government embracing Indigenous community, e.g. flag, MoU's, etc
103	increased economic activity in the area due to arts.	129	increased graffiti. Increased quality (no tags thanks)
104	positive publicity	130	programs that bring people together from different area, they are networking opportunities
105	increased enrolment in men's behaviour change programs	131	Skill development of recent arrived refugees
106	lots of people participating	132	conviviality - you know when it feels good
107	great photos	133	increased educational attainment
108	increased capacity of teachers to engage students in a dialogue on violence	134	Young people embarking on an arts or cultural career
109	increased awareness of local indigenous history	135	reflection & evaluation of all aspects of program
110	participation in programs rather than just being an audience	136	that A/C workers are seen as leaders/helpers/connectors ax community.
111	increased connection of workers across family violence in local area	137	programs that bring kudos and outside recognition
112	increased perception of community safety	138	individual transformation and empowerment
113	winning awards!	139	re-engaging people in formal education
114	arts program attracts sponsorship from the business community	140	the CEO enrolls in a pottery program
115	connect to economic (thru tourism, domestic and o/s visitation outcomes, e.g.: CoM's Laneways program	141	marginalized sectors of community have engaged with social structures again thru the arts and culture activities and programs
116	increased business turnover	142	More smile street signs..
117	engaging diverse communities	143	coordination of local service delivery
118	increased pressure from the community to improve arts facilities and services	144	increased awareness of increased capacity building of marginalized communities
119	School retention	145	conduit for conflict to be resolved
120	increasing civic participation	146	cost benefit analysis
121	reduced graffiti	147	community healing
122	cultural programs aimed to engage , to understand broader arts/culture impact	148	reduced violence and discrimination in the community
123	increase people attraction	149	Increase in public art in the community
124	less attendance at services	150	tangible eco benefits
125	good project design has inherently identifiable outcome	151	prevents the potential health and criminal consequences of social isolation
126	building relationships with indigenous community		