

***A SYNTHESIS OF RECENT RESEARCH
INTO DANCE IN CANADA***

Report Prepared for the Canada Council for the Arts

By Roy MacSkimming Consulting

August 2005

Background

Like any vibrant art form, dance in Canada is continually evolving. But in recent years, the dance community has articulated a collective sense that it has entered an especially critical period of transition. A time of such fundamental change presents major challenges to the community, policymakers and funders.

An important statement of these challenges appeared in *La danse en péril / Dance at Risk*, a report released by le Regroupement québécois de la danse (RQD) in 2001. The report's analysis was that dance in Canada faces a creative, structural and financial crisis. This analysis was widely accepted and supported across the country. The report warned of a discipline "slowly dying of starvation" and called for constructive dialogue with policymakers, followed by concrete action. The report's central point was this:

"Dance has reached a stage in its development that will require...greater commitment and support from all levels of government. The problems that the RQD is bringing to your attention cannot find solutions without structural changes based on a strategic and global vision of conditions underlying the development and evolution of all aspects of our discipline." (p. 3)

Subsequently, several research initiatives were undertaken to document and analyze specific aspects of the situation. These initiatives gathered data, identified issues and proposed options for action in support of the dance community's policymaking efforts.

Taken together, this research portrays a Canadian dance ecology that is complex and increasingly fragile. Its activities range across a continuum from creation to production to dissemination. The continuum embraces not only dancers, choreographers and dance companies, but marketing and touring, agents and presenters, festivals and audiences – both in Canada and abroad. The continuum in turn receives essential support services from an elaborate infrastructure comprising training, professional development, management, facilities, advocacy and professional discourse. All these elements are intimately interrelated and interdependent.

The research suggests that Canada's dance community confronts a felt need to develop a holistic, balanced approach to shaping its future. Such a strategic policy approach would nurture the dance ecology to ensure the vibrancy of both the art form and the infrastructure that sustains it.

Purpose and Structure of this Paper

The Dance Section of the Canada Council for the Arts has initiated and/or supported many of the research initiatives that followed release of *La danse en péril / Dance at*

Risk. The Dance Section has also commissioned this paper, containing a synthesis of the research findings produced to date.

This paper does not attempt to comprehensively summarize each research document, but to collate their key issues and findings. The paper's purpose is to provide detailed context for further informed debate and policy development, and to assist policymakers in identifying remaining research gaps.

The paper groups the key issues and findings under the following headings:

1. *Training and Professional Development*
2. *Creation and Production*
3. *Dissemination*
4. *Management Services*
5. *Infrastructure*
6. *Discourse*
7. *Wider Policy Issues*

Documents Discussed

The nine research documents to be discussed are listed below, along with the abbreviations used to identify them:

1. *Danse en péril/Dance at Risk*, report by le Regroupement québécois de la danse, March 2001: **RQD**
2. *Mapping the Professional Field of Dance in Canada as supported by the Canada Council for the Arts, 1983-2003*, report by the Canada Council Dance Section, fall 2004: **CCA**
3. *Minutes of the Canada Council Dance Advisory Committee in response to the "Mapping the Field" document*, November 13-14, 2004: **DAC**
4. *Summary of Key Outcomes, Funders' Roundtable on Dance in Canada*, February 26-27, 2005: **FUND**
5. *Findings from the Survey with Aboriginal Dance Groups and Artists in Canada*, report prepared by Poirier Communications for the Canada Council for the Arts, May 2003: **ABOR**
6. *A Profile of Professional Dancers in Canada*, survey compiled by Hill Strategies Research Inc. for the Dancer Transition Resource Centre, February 16, 2005: **DTRC**

7. *Environmental Scan of Contemporary Dance Presentation in Canada*, report prepared by Gagné Leclerc Groupe Conseil for the Canada Council for the Arts, the Department of Canadian Heritage, and le Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec, May 2005: **SCAN**
8. *Financial and Structural Analysis of the Canada Dance Festival and Festival international de nouvelle danse*, report prepared by Gagné Leclerc Groupe Conseil for the Canada Council for the Arts, the Department of Canadian Heritage, and le Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec, 2005: **FEST**
9. *Flexible Management Models*, report prepared by Jane Marsland for the Canada Council for the Arts, March 2005: **MARS**

While not covered in this paper, a related research tool commissioned by the Canada Council for the Arts, *Facts on Dance* (April 2004), also contains much valuable data.

1. Training and Professional Development

1.1 Pre-professional Training

The research documents do not comment extensively on the area of pre-professional training. **CCA** notes that *federal responsibility for funding pre-professional training institutions* passed to the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) in 1995 (p. 10). Since then, PCH has substantially increased its funding of such institutions, broadening its support to include a greater diversity of dance practices. **CCA** identifies as a significant issue the recognition of this diversity and related training needs. It proposes that PCH and the provinces increase their assistance to training for culturally diverse dance.

DTRC documents the levels of *pre-professional dance education* of professional dancers (p. 6). Of 489 active professionals surveyed, 61% attended a professional dance school and 43% a private dance school. One-third of respondents have a dance-related university degree. Respondents have an average of eight years of dance education before their first professional dance performance.

ABOR surveyed *Aboriginal dance artists*, of whom 42% trained at a dance school and 11% at a college or university (p. 16). The majority received training from community members (58%) and/or family members (50%) and/or elders (42%), reflecting the importance of dance in the transmission of culture and its fundamental place as an art form within aboriginal communities.

Obstacles in *the transition from pre-professional training to the workplace* were identified as a serious issue by **CCA**. Citing the 2002 report of the National Arts Training Program, **CCA** proposed striking a working committee of stakeholders from schools and dance companies (p. 10) to research and design shared initiatives to facilitate this transition; such initiatives would be submitted to the funding partners. **FUND** noted that schools should take greater responsibility for the training-workplace transition.

1.2 Professional Development

1.2.1 Professional Development for artists: **RQD** stated that dancers benefit least from the current environment. Unless working conditions and professional opportunities for dancers improve, “the development of dance itself is threatened” (p. 4). A major problem for freelance dancers is that low remuneration compels them to take on too much work, increasing the risk of injury and *limiting access to regular, costly professional training and development*, which they need to stay in peak form.

CCA agreed, noting (p. 11) that the definition of professional development has broadened to include self-directed PD, visiting artist programs, mentorships, and choreographic labs and workshops. **CCA** stated that *ongoing professional training should be a long-term investment priority*, to be reflected by increased financial support and trans-provincial agreements. In addition, said **CCA**, *dancers’ health and well-being* should be priorities.

In that regard, **DTRC** found that professional dancers earned an average of only \$18,000 from dance-related sources, compared to an average \$32,000 in the national labour force. Fifty-one per cent of dancers earned \$15,000 or less, and the median was \$11,000.

DAC recognized the pressing need for leadership in creating training and PD programs (p. 10-11). A flexible range of apprenticeship models and transitional opportunities is required.

FUND stated as its *strategic objective #4* (p. 2): “to create more opportunities for the transmission of knowledge and professional practices within all areas of the discipline.” Achieving this objective involves conducting research into existing program gaps and new models; identifying partners to deliver opportunities; running pilot programs; and establishing performance measurements.

ABOR (pp. 56-59) stressed training and PD among the future needs identified by both Aboriginal dance groups and artists and the absence of a full time national, Aboriginal, training centre in Canada.

1.2.2 Professional Development for administrators: Not only artists (dancers and choreographers) need training and professional development opportunities. **CCA** flagged *the serious shortage of young arts administrators entering the dance profession* to replace outgoing senior administrators. Partly this problem is due to low wages, but also to a lack of mentoring opportunities. Although the Dance Section’s Flying Squad offers dance companies short-term support for administrative mentoring, “few companies have the administrative flexibility and/or financial stability to offer a meaningful mentorship opportunity.” To create a framework for mentoring the next generation, the **CCA** document proposed action to invest significantly in PD and mentoring for dance administrators.

MARS, focusing on development of *alternative, non-traditional production entities* in the arts, had much to say on PD for administrators. If “*flexible administrative frameworks*” providing services to alternative producing entities (p. 16) are to be viable, individuals must be developed to manage them. Several recommendations in MARS address this issue.

Recommendation 2 of MARS (p. 17) calls for investment in young managers and administrators capable of helping innovative young artists realize their artistic goals. Recommendation 3 (pp. 18-19) sees a role for the Canada Council’s Outreach Office in developing strategies to support training of tour managers, producers and presenters. Recommendation 4 (p. 19) sees a need for National Arts Service Organizations (NASOs) to broaden their PD programs beyond traditional institutional models in order to address emerging artistic and management models.

In addition, MARS states that reports from Canada Council Flying Squad interventions could be “a tremendous resource” if they were reformatted to illustrate systemic problems in arts organizations that could be solved by behavioural change. Recommendation 5 (p. 20) asserts that the Flying Squad program could be “an important tool for the development, health and sustainability of the non-traditional arts entities” by assisting in transmission of knowledge through mentoring of producers, agents, tour bookers and managers.

DAC included a proposal (p. 12) that the Canada Council work with the Dancer Transition Resource Centre to create *a PD program for dance administrators*.

2. Creation and Production

The area of creation and production encompasses the work of dance companies and independent choreographers, with all the related issues of funding, research, repertoire, staffing, rehearsal, presentation, international co-production, documentation, legacy, etc.

2.1 Dance Companies

While pointing to *the internationally recognized excellence* of much Canadian dance, **RQD** made it clear that *money is at the heart of problems* in creation and production. Dance companies invest the majority of their resources in developing new work. But production costs are rising, creating problems for achieving artistic quality, maintaining international competitiveness, and attracting audiences. Funders are not addressing these difficulties: “Under-funding is preventing a new generation of choreographers from expressing themselves and attaining their full artistic potential” (p. 4).

CCA fleshed out this situation. It documented how *growth in the overall Canada Council budget for dance companies was outstripped* by the increase in the number and diversity of companies supported. The Council’s budget for dance creation and production roughly doubled from 1982 to 2002, to nearly \$12 million (p. 9). But at the same time, the companies being funded more than doubled, from 26 in 1983 to 57 in

2003. When inflation and other factors are considered, Council support fell from a combined average of 26% of companies' total revenues in 1983 to 14% in 2003 (p. 13).

CCA described the *impacts of this funding decline*. In artistic terms, they include less new repertoire, less rehearsal time, lower production values, and a reduction of 50% in touring activity.

In organizational terms, the situation has resulted in a lack of stability (p. 14). Companies depend increasingly on international revenues and on short-term stabilization, capacity-building and employment grants (p. 15), using these to staff essential positions. Yet companies remain understaffed – unable to afford the necessary personnel for such duties as fundraising and international tour management. Overworked senior staff burn out and depart. Succession planning is undermined.

CCA documented (pp. 15-16) the condition of companies with budgets of less than \$500K, companies with budgets from \$500K to \$1M (“especially precarious”), and the six ballet companies, which absorb 52% of the Creation/Production program budget. Other issues mentioned were the “huge problem” of new work being produced by companies at the expense of repertoire; insufficient resources to fulfil the expectations of the community; and lack of resources to support research and choreographic process (pp. 17-18).

In specifying potential actions to address these issues, CCA placed *a priority on increasing core operating funding to dance companies*, to improve conditions for creation, production, presentation and mentoring (p. 18), and also to reduce the need for “other” grants directed to staffing positions. Emphasis was also placed on promoting companies' relationships with all parts of the dance ecology. In addition, the Flying Squad could address issues of company legacy and choreographer development.

DAC contained a free-ranging discussion (pp. 12-15) of creation and production, touching on such questions as the need for companies; benefits for artists from working within company structures; the need for flexibility to migrate between different structures; co-productions; partnerships; choreographic centres; relevance to community; multi-year funding, etc.

ABOR compiled a comprehensive profile of the scale, activities and needs of *Aboriginal dance groups*, based on survey returns from 50 respondents. Almost half of these companies consider their dancers are professional, and about 20% of them operate full-time. The groups' immediate objectives include expanding programming, training, touring and media coverage, and promoting Aboriginal culture. Longer-term goals are greater self-sufficiency and the ability to operate on a full-time basis, as well as touring nationally and internationally.

2.2. Independent Choreographers

RQD made the point that the current funding environment is inadequate to nurture new choreographic talent. *The failure to encourage independent choreographers is compromising the evolution of the discipline.*

CCA strongly agreed. Even though the Canada Council introduced funding for independent choreography in the 1980s, the field remains underfunded today. For example, nearly half of the 58 production project grants awarded in 2003 were below \$60,000 – an amount considered the minimum level for such grants 20 years earlier. To be eligible for this support, choreographers must also form non-profit dance companies, even when it is not necessarily appropriate (p. 19).

Issues raised by CCA (pp. 19-20) began with the need to become more proactive in funding independent choreography. The time has arrived to *distinguish between dance creation and company creation*, which are different things. The lack of resources for mentoring, workshopping and rehearsal time means that too much work is being presented before it is ready. Similarly, resources are insufficient for documentation, discourse and audience development, which results in marginalization of new dance works.

Actions proposed to address these issues included studying international models and investing in choreographic centres, long-term production project grants, creative partnerships, and residencies. These measures would enhance both the choreographic process and audience appreciation of new works.

CCA also engaged the issue of enabling choreographers to grow artistically outside traditional company structures. This could be done through revising creation and production program criteria to fund alternative production and presentation models.

Reinforcing this last point, **FUND** stated as its *strategic objective #2*: “to better support alternative models of creation / production / dissemination” (p. 1). This goal would be achieved by conducting research to identify such models at home and abroad; and by revising program criteria, encouraging applications for alternative models, and monitoring the response from the community.

A rationale for these alternative models appeared in **MARS**. It described the various structures for alternative producing formats (pp. 3 and 13). Basically, artists or an artistic director act in an entrepreneurial fashion, combining both the artistic and administrative functions, and obtaining management, marketing, touring and similar services from an umbrella or cluster management entity. Such production entities may be created for purposes of a single project or for multiple related projects; in addition, they may involve multi-function production centres or collaborative ventures.

MARS cited a precedent (p. 13) in the form of a new music entity that functions in this manner and has received support from the Canada Council. In its various recommendations, (pp. 17-21), MARS urged that alternative production entities be made

eligible for Council programs in all disciplines. The main argument in MARS ran as follows:

“Generally there has been the belief that an artist must build an institution to support and sustain the work. But with fewer resources to go around, many artists now see this as an imbalance: that more time and resources go into developing the organization than go into developing the work. They also realize that there is just not the funding available from funders such as the Canada Council to support an increasing number of institutions.” (p. 13)

On a supportive note, **DAC** stated (p. 18) that management structures in dance must change as company definitions change.

2.3 International Co-productions

CCA developed the theme of international co-productions in dance (p. 20). Funded by the Canada Council since 1998, these are predicated on investment from a foreign partner. They are considered a viable way for Canadian companies, including younger artists, to obtain international experience while reducing the high costs of working abroad. CCA noted that *foreign investment capital for international co-productions has become scarcer due to increased competition*. A less expensive alternative may be to support artistic residencies and choreographic centres here at home.

In addition, Canada has not offered sufficient *reciprocal opportunities for foreign artists* to work in Canada. CCA proposed i) to encourage Canadian producers, presenters and companies to engage in co-productions with both Canadian and foreign companies and choreographers; and ii) to make co-productions eligible for production project grants.

DAC commented positively about the value of international co-productions and the need for Canadian dance to be *proactive in developing international markets* and benefiting from the value-added of foreign residencies (pp. 17-18).

3. Dissemination

Dance dissemination covers presenting, festivals, touring, and in general, outreach by companies, presenters and others to develop audiences at home and abroad.

3.1 Presenting and Festivals

CCA outlined the historical development of Canada Council *support for presenters and festivals* in the 1980s and '90s through the Dance Section and the former Touring Office (pp. 20-21). These modalities of support were followed by the advent of the Arts Presentation Canada program (APC) at PCH in 2001, funding presenters and festivals. Today both APC and the Council support dance festivals. Audience development, community education, and company-presenter collaboration remain ongoing activities of companies and presenters.

CCA raised a series of issues (pp. 21-22):

- ?? The marginalization of dance, resulting from a lack of dance literacy in society, and public perceptions of the art form as elitist, inaccessible or frivolous
- ?? The need for audience development through marketing and improved media coverage
- ?? The dependence of most dance companies on a small body of presenters (only larger companies self-present)
- ?? The need for presenters to be more knowledgeable about dance, and more collaborative with, and accountable to, the discipline
- ?? The needs of presenters for professional development and enhanced funding
- ?? The role of festivals in contributing to promotion and marketing of the discipline

In response to these questions (p. 22), CCA proposed studying the role and contribution of dance festivals, as well as creating opportunities for the dance community to share best practices. (See re Gagné Leclerc studies below.)

In addition, CCA flagged the value of artist/community collaborations and advocated federal-provincial partnerships to support such projects.

FUND declared *strengthening the place of dance in society as its “overarching guiding principle”* (p. 1). It also stated, as its *strategic objective #3*, “to cultivate public engagement by encouraging dance in new contexts and new partnerships” (p. 2) through “dance presentations in new contexts with new partnerships.” Achieving this objective would be aided by collaboration between the Canada Council and PCH in compiling a national directory of “presentation opportunities”; collaboration between PCH and the Ontario Arts Council in developing a toolkit on “cultivating public engagement”; harmonization of data among funders; and a public-awareness promotional campaign about dance featuring prominent Canadians.

DAC made a wide variety of points about presenting, festivals and audience development (pp. 15-16). Key concerns included:

- ?? Need to develop the market for Aboriginal dance and avoid ghettoization
- ?? Need for collaboration between the Council and PCH
- ?? Need for more regular presentation of dance to develop audiences
- ?? Need for more accountability and collaboration from presenters
- ?? Need for more showcasing and festival opportunities

ABOR surveyed dance groups and artists about *the market for Aboriginal dance* (pp. 35-45). Less than 20% of groups give more than 50 performances a year, while the majority of artists give fewer than 20. Relatively few groups or artists use a booking agent or tour manager. Although the most important presentation venues are ceremonial events, festivals and pow wows, groups report that just 35% of their audience is Aboriginal; for dance artists, the average is 50%. Most performance venues are local to the groups or artists, but significant percentages want to develop their market by touring nationally and internationally.

The *two presentation / festival studies* by Gagné Leclerc Groupe Conseil contain considerable data concerning their respective interrelated subjects:

SCAN summarized its findings about *the presentation environment for contemporary dance in Canada* in a 13-page executive summary. It very usefully graphed the ecology of dance presentation (p. iv), defining two main presentation modes: i) self-presentation and ii) presentation by a specialized presenter, a multidisciplinary presenter, or a festival. The study also described the presentation models existing in the Canadian dance market, whether specialized in a single discipline (including specialized festivals) or multidisciplinary.

In its overview of the field, SCAN described the “market framework” for dance presentation as co-existing with a “cultural action framework”. The latter is subsidized by PCH through Arts Presentation Canada and by provincial funders. Indeed, public funding is key to every aspect of dance presentation. *Grants “define and influence the whole architecture of contemporary dance presentation in Canada”* (pp. v-vi).

SCAN discussed Canadian presenters’ networks, festivals, dance presenters abroad, agents for development and touring, and performing arts marketplaces (CAPACOA, RIDEAU and CINARS), as well as venues and infrastructure (pp. vii-viii).

In summarizing its findings on dance presentation activities at home and abroad (p. ix), SCAN concluded that the six largest contemporary dance companies (not including ballet companies) accounted for a significant share of the performances, touring activity and revenues of all 43 contemporary dance companies supported by the Canada Council. The small and medium-sized companies did comparatively poorly in the domestic market, yet they fared considerably better in the international market: “Performances [abroad] by small and medium-sized Canadian contemporary dance companies now account for a considerable share of their presentation activities and, relatively speaking, generate far higher revenues than can be generated at home.”

As an overall observation, SCAN drew this familiar but stark conclusion:

“Without government assistance, all the data seem to indicate that the entire chain of the creation and presentation of contemporary dance would crumble because it could not generate enough revenue from its presentation activities and attract sufficient private funding.” (p. ix)

A table (p. x) tabulated total public funding for dance creation / production, dissemination and associations from the federal, provincial and municipal governments in three provinces: Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia. The table is helpful but incomplete, since it omits dance activities in the rest of Canada.

SCAN noted that public funding for presentation and touring has increased considerably in recent years; yet strong dissatisfaction with the allocation, amounts and conditions of funding persists in the dance community. The potential for private-sector sponsorship of dance presentation, while limited, is not yet fully exploited.

SCAN concluded with major issues and challenges facing contemporary dance presentation in Canada. These included:

- ?? Enriching and diversifying presentation offerings
- ?? Supporting presenters
- ?? Providing multi-year funding
- ?? Compiling reliable statistics
- ?? Ensuring the continuing dynamism of Canadian dance and its ability to reach audiences.

FEST, the related study by Gagné Leclerc, conducted *a financial and structural analysis of two important but troubled dance festivals*: the Canada Dance Festival (CDF), which was forced to make significant programming cutbacks in 2004; and the Festival international de la nouvelle danse (FIND), which terminated activities in 2003. Although focusing on these two events, the report also examined the broader festival phenomenon within the environment of dance presentation nationally and internationally. It was therefore able to draw conclusions about the elements necessary for success, and the pitfalls to be avoided, in staging contemporary dance festivals.

FEST provided its findings in a detailed executive summary. Pages iii-iv summarized key factors in understanding specialized festivals in the performing arts. In addition to the immediate audience impact, *dance festivals can provide a nexus for professionals, with the capacity to create a multiplier effect on dance presentation domestically and internationally by acting as a catalyst for presenters.*

At the same time, *festivals are complex phenomena*, fraught with problems and requiring:

- ?? a clear vision and mandate;
- ?? careful planning, management and marketing; and
- ?? close collaboration among many partners, including funders.

Because of the risks inherent in organizing biennial festivals, multi-year funding is needed. It is generally impossible for festivals to recover all their expenses. Most biennial festivals seek to move to a permanent annual cycle to reduce these risks.

Challenges and problems shared by the two specific festivals were explored (pp. v-viii). Some related to internal management, e.g.: the decision to hold the event biennially; risks of dependency on public funding; and difficulties with board governance. Although both CDF and FIND received substantial public subsidy from various programs, a key difference was that CDF was funded primarily by programs with an arts and culture mandate, whereas much of FIND's funding was non-recurring and came from programs with non-cultural objectives. The latter situation undermined FIND's financial stability and contributed to its demise.

Other challenges to the two festivals emanated from complexities in the external environment. Expansion in the number of dance companies and offerings, fragmentation of audiences for the art form, conflicting demands of public and private funders, varying

expectations of creators, and lack of media coverage all contributed to the festivals' difficulties.

FEST examined the ingredients of some successful dance festivals around the world and extracted best practices regarding leadership, programming, related activities, management, audience, and relationship to the artistic community (pp. ix-xi). It also summarized the expectations about dance festivals on the part of creators, presenters and funders (p. xii).

This in turn led to creation of an “analytical framework” of organizational principles, offered as a practical tool for reassessing and redefining existing and future dance festivals (pp. xiii-xv). These principles were listed under the following headings: mandate and mission (including artistic programming); organization (including leadership and staffing); audience as primary focus (including youth); other considerations (including location, timing and other disciplines); and financing.

3.2 Touring

Since touring overlaps somewhat with presenting and festivals, various references to touring appear in the preceding section. *Touring has, in addition, a vital international dimension.* This was noted in CCA: “According to the [Canada Council’s] Dance Advisory Committee, “The dance sector should be international with roots grounded in Canada”” (p. 22).

CCA went on to state that, since dance companies are now touring only half as much as 20 years ago and touring costs remain high, the companies are contributing more of their operating budgets to touring.

CCA raised the issue of international promotion as critical to Canadian dance. As a response, it proposed that artists should be provided with opportunities for training in the international market. It noted that the CALQ was analyzing changes in the international touring market and proposed that these findings be circulated for the funders’ roundtable in February 2005.

Under the heading “International Co-productions” (pp. 22-23), CCA also noted that there has been a shift from presentation to process: i.e. international presenters increasingly see *the value of artistic residencies*. A valid response by Canada would be to increase resources for residencies overseas. And if an increased emphasis on residencies were to result in a decrease in the availability of touring engagements, Canada should relax criteria that restrict support for companies’ international touring.

DAC made these points about touring (pp. 15-16):

- ?? The touring market for ballet is nearly saturated
- ?? There is a need to share best practices, e.g. from Quebec (“Danse sur les routes”) and English theatre
- ?? Touring is being held together by community involvement – hence a need for greater collaboration and animation.

3.3 Dance and Media

Another aspect of dissemination is *the use of new media to document and promote dance and create public appreciation of the discipline*. CCA referenced two Canada Council programs supporting the intersection of dance and visual language: Dance on Screen, a pilot program in the Dance Section, and production project grants from the Media Arts Section which support dance films. Dance on Screen in particular has already facilitated partnerships with broadcasters and international players.

CCA raised the potential of CD and DVD productions on dance to act as educational and audience-development tools; these could also generate revenue for dance companies. The Canada Council should explore partnerships to fund such productions with broadcasters and federal government departments, tying them to the Council's 50th anniversary celebrations in 2007.

A related but different subject is the potential for *media-based dance creation*. This concept has the support of both the Council's Media Arts and Inter-Arts Sections. CCA advocated (p. 24) developing a paper on this hybrid form and pursuing dialogue and partnerships with other funding bodies, private companies and academic researchers.

FUND also recognized "new media and visual technology as a growing means of dissemination." (p. 6)

4. Management Services

RQD flagged the important role played by an agent / manager / producer in planning a choreographer's career (p. 4). Continuous involvement of such a manager over many years can be vital to successful career development, and hence to the success of a choreographer-led dance company. Most other commentary on dance management in the research documents focused on mentoring (see sub-section 1.2.2 above, on PD for arts administrators) and, in particular, on *umbrella and cluster management organizations*.

These are organizations that exist to provide management services to small-scale artistic projects or producing entities that do not wish to build a full company infrastructure. They are treated most fully in MARS, where they are seen as *a natural and necessary corollary to alternative producing formats* (see subsection 2.2 above). Such artistic entities do not have the resources, or desire, to employ an administrative infrastructure. Yet to realize their artistic objectives, produce their work and reach their audience, they need critical support from managers, promoters, agents, tour bookers, technicians, etc.

MARS defined *three "flexible management models"* – cluster management organizations (serving selected artistic entities), umbrella management organizations (providing services more broadly on a fee-per-service basis), and individuals who act as artists' agents, producers, managers, dealers, etc. (p. 7). After an avowedly theoretical analysis of the current and future artistic environment, and of the needs of emerging artists

working in new media or practices (pp. 8-11), the paper identified critical issues to be addressed in arts management (pp. 11-13). This led to the description of alternative producing entities (pp. 13-14) as already cited in subsection 2.2 above.

The paper concluded with a series of *eight recommendations on “the need for flexible administrative frameworks supporting artists who work in non-institutional or alternative producing structures”* (pp. 16-21). These recommendations urged the Canada Council to support such management entities in all disciplines.

MARS acknowledged that the recommendations are based on an examination of relevant Canada Council programs in dance and new music. In dance, the paper saw the Flying Squad as a vehicle for assisting in the development of managers required to support the new artistic entities (pp. 16 and recommendation #5, p. 20). Recommendations #6, 7 and 8 (pp. 20-21) focused more clearly and specifically on supporting the “administrative collaborative ventures” and “culture of shared resources” necessary to meet the needs of emerging artists in a resource-scarce environment.

CCA briefly outlined (p. 24) the Canada Council’s experience in supporting umbrella management organizations in dance (e.g. Dance Umbrella of Ontario, Diagramme in Quebec, and the now-eclipsed Vancouver Independent Dance Agency); and, more recently, in supporting cluster management and artists’ managers. CCA stated: “*As we work to stabilize companies, we still need to support creative models of shared resources and better acknowledge the role of producers through our programs.*” (p. 24)

Accordingly, CCA proposed actions very much in line with the recommendations in MARS, i.e. to encourage: greater collaboration in management services; greater mentoring of administrators, managers and agents; and more public-private relationships in sharing facilities and other resources.

FUND appeared to support this approach (p. 5) when it cautioned *that “traditional models of organizations cannot be sustained with the current levels of funding available and need to be rethought.”* It also warned of unstable management in dance companies and a shortage of skilled administrators, producers and technicians. These problems require “a strategic focus on specialized training initiatives.”

5. Infrastructure

Covered here are dance venues and facilities (physical infrastructure) and dance associations (advocacy infrastructure).

5.1 Facilities

CCA (p. 25) described the Deloitte and Touche survey of key stakeholders in dance (2003) as pointing to *a lack of rehearsal studios and dedicated venues for dance in Canada*. CCA called for further research to document the number of existing and

planned dance facilities in this country, and to examine how they will impact on companies' need for operating resources.

CCA cited the increased investment in dance facilities in the U.K. as part of support for regional dance agencies there. A recent British policy review demonstrated that dedicated dance facilities bring highly positive benefits in terms of quality of work, strength of community engagement, attendance, and earned revenues.

DAC (p. 16) expressed a range of opinions on facilities. Studio space is more than a workspace, it is also common ground for artists to collaborate, conduct research, experiment, and present to the public. It can also raise the public visibility of the discipline. On the other hand, funding bricks and mortar can deprive dance of operating funds. The Dutch model of three levels of venue was cited. Physical facilities can house and facilitate the administrative / business side of the discipline as well. The potential for upgrading and sharing existing theatre spaces was mentioned.

5.2 Advocacy

CCA (p. 25) outlined the history of Canada Council support for *national arts service organizations (NASOs)* in dance since the 1970s. After a hiatus in the mid-'90s, the Council restored NASOs' eligibility for operating support in all disciplines in 1998. The Dance Section has funded the RQD on a multi-year project basis and has provided the Canadian Dance Assembly (CDA) with two years of project funding.

CCA stressed *the need for a national, representative voice for dance to advocate for the discipline and ensure that artists can improve their standard of living*. In the process, it will be necessary for NASOs to play an active political role, mobilize artists collectively, and forge strategic alliances. Actions proposed included investing further in NASOs for dance, while ensuring that diverse interests are represented. Allied to this was promoting dance education and literacy in the public sphere and through the education system.

DAC (pp. 16-17) discussed the complexities of different constituencies working together in NASOs. There are *issues of leadership, representation and inclusion*. NASOs must contend with the tendency of the profession to pull away from collective structures. It is also necessary to collaborate with non-dancers to achieve wider political support and win advocacy goals.

6. Discourse

Dance discourse spans historical and critical writing, publishing, debate, animation, collecting, archiving and promoting dance literacy.

After describing the Canada Council's efforts to support and stimulate certain forms of discourse, CCA (p. 26) acknowledged that the Council has never formulated a clear policy on the matter. Nonetheless, it has recently commissioned research into a range of matters including collecting, archiving and publishing.

Because the dance community itself has insufficient resources, the Council needs to fund *writing and publishing to capture Canada's dance legacy* – especially at a time when some companies have reached historic anniversaries and other milestones. Canadian dance history must be documented and compiled before the protagonists pass away. This means enhanced efforts at recording, collecting, preserving and archiving. The Council should introduce *an archiving / legacy policy* and apply it to organizations receiving operating funding. It should also provide a one-time infusion of funds to digitize existing archival materials, and to assist the community in developing shared strategies on discourse and legacy preservation.

The importance of archiving, writing and publishing was strongly supported by **DAC** (p. 17). Collaboration with libraries, universities and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council was urged.

7. Wider Policy Issues

1. **CCA** (p. 26) raised *the valuable social role played by dance in communities across the country* in terms of recreation, fitness, health, education, personal development, and community building. This role should be researched and documented. A strategic policy platform could then be created to position dance more visibly and positively within the wider social and governmental agenda.
2. **CCA** also saw the need for all funders to address *unnecessary complications and discrepancies in granting criteria and application deadlines*. Funders should collaborate to address these problems by streamlining and coordinating their forms, criteria and deadlines.
3. **FUND** (pp. 5-6) raised basic questions about *budget tensions between adequately supporting existing companies and supporting new artists, including culturally diverse and Aboriginal artists*. How can public funders find the right balance in their investments, while respecting artistic quality and public / audience engagement? **FUND** also attempted (p. 6) to define the characteristics of “sustainability” in dance.