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Abstract

The arts are a thriving business in Canada. The arts and culture sectors contribute 3% to the Canada’s GDP each year: a larger share than the agricultural, hospitality, or forest industries. However, professional artists—the core cultural labour force—are not as prosperous, and BC artists are worse off than most. The median income of artists in BC is the second lowest in Canada, well below the low-income cut-off. Although they are far more likely than the average worker to hold a university degree, BC artists earn an alarming 48% less than the provincial median for all workers. Women, visible minorities, and aboriginal people working as artists in BC earn even less.

Using data collected from a jurisdictional scan, expert interviews, and an online survey of artists from across BC, I identify four potential policy measures to address the issue of low earnings in the arts sector. Options include an expansion of the existing project grants programs administered by the BC Arts Council, as well as three different plans to provide a monthly minimum income to artists. After analyzing each policy in terms of effectiveness, equity, budgetary cost, administrative complexity, and stakeholder acceptance, I recommend establishing a need-based but competitive grant stream providing a Basic Income to professional artists. Referring to survey data, I also propose a set of recommendations to enhance the accessibility, flexibility, and targeting of BC Arts Council programs.
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Executive Summary

The arts are a thriving business in Canada. In 2014, Canada’s arts and culture sectors contributed $54.6 billion, or 3%, to the GDP—a larger share than the agricultural, hospitality, or forest industries. Taxes generated by the cultural sector in 2007 were more than triple the $8 billion spent on arts and culture by all levels of government. However, professional artists are not as prosperous. Although artists are much more likely than the general workforce to be university educated, they earn an average of 32% less than other workers.

Artists in BC fare particularly poorly. British Columbia has a higher concentration of artists per capita than any other province in Canada, and studies show that British Columbians are more likely than the average Canadian to participate in a wide range of arts and culture activities. Still, the median income of artists in BC was reported as $19,319 in 2010: the second lowest provincial median, and well below the low-income cut-off for a single person living in a community of 500,000 people or more. Women, visible minorities, and aboriginal people working as artists in BC earn even less.

Methodology

With the goal of developing policy to address the problem of low income among BC artists, I undertook three forms of research.

Jurisdictional scan: To compose a picture of the status quo both at home and abroad, I examined policy documents from Canada, Australia, Finland, Norway, the Netherlands, and Australia, as well as BC, Quebec, Ontario and other provincial jurisdictions.

Expert interviews: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with three groups of stakeholders: professional artists, many of whom also occupy leadership positions in the arts community; representatives from government agencies, arts councils, and arts support organizations; and academic experts on cultural policy.

Online artist survey: In pursuit of a broader perspective on attitudes towards strategies to support artists in the community, I designed an online artist questionnaire. The survey was open to BC residents who self-identified as artists in any discipline, and addressed three main themes: work habits and preferences, the impact of public funding and
experiences with the BC Arts Council, and opinions about a range of policy options. A total of 111 responses were analyzed.

Findings

BC is home to an untapped creative force.

- Three quarters (75%) of survey respondents would prefer to spend more time than they currently do on their artistic practice.
- Most respondents (69%) reported that what prevented them from devoting more time to art was financial challenges. A few were constrained by the administrative burden of sustaining an artistic career (13%), caregiving responsibilities (12%), or lack of opportunities in their community (10%).
- The vast majority (95%) said they supplemented their artistic income with a second job. Almost a third said they worked two jobs in addition to their artistic practice, while 10% held three or more extra jobs.
- Most respondents (83%) felt that receiving a basic income would increase their artistic productivity and creativity. About a quarter (23%) said they thought it would improve their mental and physical health and wellbeing.

Respondents feel undervalued and underpaid, yet they are satisfied with their career choice.

- Just over a third of respondents (35%) believe they are fairly compensated for their artistic work.
- Less than a third (32%) said they felt their work is valued and recognized in their community.
- Nevertheless, a majority (56%) said they were satisfied overall with their life as an artist. That’s more than twice the number (27%) who are unsatisfied.

Public support in the form of artist grants plays an important role in the development and maintenance of artistic careers:

- Two thirds (67%) of those who had received a grant said it allowed them to complete work that otherwise would not have come to fruition. A quarter (24%) said it allowed them to attend a residency, workshop, or other career development opportunity, while 19% were able to tour and disseminate their
work. For 14% of respondents, the grant provided valuable recognition and validation.

However, respondents reveal an ambiguous attitude towards the BC Arts Council:

- A strong majority of respondents (70%) have never applied for a grant from the BCAC as an individual artist. One quarter of those who had not applied said they didn't know the funding was available.
- Half the artists surveyed (49%) agreed that the grant application process is too complicated.
- A majority (60%) share the perception that it is very difficult to get a grant as an individual artist.
- Just one quarter (25%) of those surveyed agreed that BCAC project grant programs are well aligned with their projects and goals.

**Policy Options and Analysis**

Based on my research, I developed four policy options aimed at improving the economic conditions of artists in British Columbia:

1. **Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists**: Based on a policy in place in Norway until 2012, this highly competitive option would award an annual income of $37,500 following the recommendation of an expert panel. A percentage of earned income would be deducted.

2. **Basic Income for Artists**: A second minimum income proposal, the Basic Income, offers a lower annual benefit in a selection process that is both means-tested and peer-juried.

3. **Artist Income Supplement**: Unlike the other proposed policies, this third guaranteed income plan is not a competitive grant awarded based on the recommendation of a jury. Instead, it would be available to all artists who meet the basic eligibility criteria: 1) institutional or equivalent training in their field, 2) some history of presentation, and 3) an average income of less than $22,600 per year.

4. **Expanded Project Grants**: The fourth policy is an augmentation of the current BCAC project granting programs, which provide short-term financial support for specific artistic endeavours.
I evaluated each option's performance against a range of criteria, including the policy's projected effectiveness in increasing the financial security of artists, its potential to contribute to the development of a stable and thriving arts sector, the acceptability of the option to artists, its estimated budgetary cost, and the complexity of its implementation.

**Recommendations**

**Basic Income for Artists:** The policy that performed the most consistently when all nine criteria were considered was the Basic Income for Artists. With its dual eligibility criteria of financial need and artistic excellence, the option is a solid plan to provide stable support to a variety of artists working in a plurality of styles. Moreover, the Basic Income shines when it comes to cultivating a stable, sustainable, equitable, and accomplished arts community in British Columbia.

**Review of BC Arts Council Programs:** In addition to the establishment of a Basic Income funding stream, I recommend a comprehensive review of BC Arts Council programs, with a view to engaging the individual artist. My proposed reconstruction entails changes in four key areas: boosting funding, improving accessibility, increasing the openness and flexibility of programs and eligibility criteria, and narrowing the targeting of funding streams. Specific recommendations include:

1. Double the budget of the BC Arts Council from $24 million to $48 million
2. Modernize website and establish social media accounts
3. Offer information sessions and webinars on grant programs and application procedures
4. Create an online application system
5. Separate funding streams open to individual artists and arts organizations
6. Complete Equity Plan
7. Commit to diversity targets on Council, staff, and juries
Chapter 1. Introduction

The arts are a thriving business in Canada. In 2014, Canada’s arts and culture sectors contributed $54.6 billion, or 3%, to the GDP—a larger share than the agricultural, hospitality, or forest industries (Canada Council for the Arts 2016b). Taxes generated by the cultural sector in 2007 were more than triple the $8 billion spent on culture by all levels of government (Canadian Conference of the Arts 2012). However, professional artists are not as prosperous. Although artists achieve substantially higher levels of formal education than the general workforce (44% have completed bachelor’s degrees compared to 25% of all workers), they earn an average of 32% less than the average worker (Hill 2014).

British Columbia has a higher concentration of artists per capita than any other province in Canada. In 2011, 1.08% of BC workers were artists, compared to 0.78% of Canadians overall. According to National Household Survey data, BC residents were more than twice as likely as residents of Alberta (0.54%), Saskatchewan (0.50%), Newfoundland and Labrador (0.47%), and New Brunswick (0.43%) to identify as professional artists. BC residents represent 18% of Canada’s artists, a larger share than the 13% of workers that BC contributes to the labour force as a whole (Hill 2016).

According to a 2016 report by Hill Strategies, British Columbians are more likely than the average Canadian to participate in a range of arts and culture activities. For example, 40.5% of BC residents reported they visited an art gallery at least once in 2010. That’s nearly 5 percentage points higher than the Canadian average (35.7%), and almost twice the rate for New Brunswick residents (22.6%). British Columbians are also more likely than the residents of other provinces to attend classical music concerts: 16.2% of BC residents said they had gone to at least one in 2010, compared to 12.6% of all Canadians. And only Albertans (79.3%) are more likely than BC residents (79.1%) to have read a book in 2010: just over three quarters (75.7%) of all Canadians read at least one (Hill 2016).

But despite the enthusiasm of the BC public for the arts, BC artists fare poorly compared to their counterparts in other provinces. The median income of artists in BC was reported as $19,319 in 2010, the lowest average in Canada after New Brunswick. In comparison,
Ontario artists, the best compensated, reported earning an average of $23,153, while the overall Canadian median artist income was $21,580. BC artists earned an alarming 48% less than the provincial median income for all workers (Hill 2016).
Chapter 2. Defining the Problem

2.1. Policy Problem

The policy problem to be addressed in this study is that the median income for artists in British Columbia is too low. Although artists are significantly more likely than the general public to be highly educated, the median income of artists in BC ($19,319) is well below the low-income cut-off for a single person living in a community of 500,000 people or more ($22,600) (Hill 2014). Women, visible minorities, and aboriginal people working as artists in BC earn even less.

2.2. Why Invest in Artists?

But why is this a public policy problem? Shouldn’t great artists earn their income through sold-out shows and spectacular sales? Doesn’t their impoverished state imply they should simply rethink their life choices and search for gainful employment? Shouldn’t governments, as British theatre critic Douglas McPherson suggests, stop funding “dreary, pretentious, self-consciously ‘arty’” pieces and trust that “the best” will achieve commercial viability (McPherson 2015)? Isn’t public funding of artists just a regressive tax that allows higher-income citizens to enjoy elitist productions at cut rates (Jarvik 1997)?

2.3. Investing in the Arts: The Economic Argument

While it is not within the scope of this paper to justify public investment in the arts, a brief summary of the arguments for arts funding provides a useful backdrop to a conversation about support for individual artists. Nowadays, the answer most often advanced by the arts sector itself is this: investing in the arts makes good economic sense. Creativity is increasingly prized as a driving force behind economic development. Not only did the so-called creative sector (which includes advertising, architecture, design, video games, and in some definitions R&D, software, and toys, in addition to the core arts industries) contribute $4 billion to the BC economy in 2012, but it promises still more for the future: a report from the 2013 BCreative Conference claims that “the creative economy has much to offer a relatively non-diverse, resource-based economy in a flat world of low-
cost-labour–driven international trade,” including creating jobs and wealth, sparking inter-industry collaboration, drawing talent to action clusters, fighting climate change, and stimulating tourism (Lorimier 2013). Creativity is at the core of innovation, which increases productivity, which in turn fuels economic growth, which—according to current hegemonic neo-liberal economic models—is necessary to maintain quality of life.

Governments have made explicit commitments to encouraging creativity. The federal government’s recent decision to double funding to the Canada Council can only be seen as an affirmation of the importance of the arts sector. According to the Canada Council for the Arts’ Strategic Plan 2016-2021, “Investing in the arts contributes to economic development, exports, job creation, social well-being and community-building—all measurable goals of a democratic society. And, particularly important in the 21st century economy, the arts nurture innovation (2016a). The BC Ministry of Community, Sport, and Cultural Development identified “growing B.C.’s creative economy and workforce” as one of its key priorities for 2015-2018.

The “creative economy” includes a much broader range of goods and services than just the arts or even the culture industries. However, according to David Thorsby’s concentric circles model, artists remain at its heart (Throsby 2008). The Canadian Framework for Culture Statistics places artists as the first links of the lucrative creative chain, where each link represents added value to the good or service “as it makes its way from invention to final distribution” (Waltman Daschko 2011).

Arts advocacy groups often defend public funding by invoking the economic multiplier effect, or “artistic dividend” associated with cultural activities. A study of almost 3000 not-for-profit organizations in the United States found that these organizations generated substantial economic activity. Not only did they pay employees, buy supplies, and rent spaces, but their events sparked considerable auxiliary spending on goods and services such as dinner before the show, concessions at the show, parking, and babysitting. In the same study, a national survey of arts consumers found that, on average, respondents spend $22.87 per event in addition to the price of the ticket (Cohen, Schaffer & Davidson 2003).

The economic multiplier effect holds true in the Canadian context. One accounting found that for every dollar invested by governments, arts organizations generate $2.78 (Hill
2008). This is a relatively conservative estimate. A report commissioned by the Toronto City Council found that every dollar invested in the arts by the city was leveraged to generate an impressive $17.75, including $5.15 of other government funding, $5.48 of private sector contributions, and $7.12 of earned revenue (2013).

2.4. Limitations of the Neo-Liberal Approach to Arts Investment

The irony is that the very argumentation advanced so gleefully by the arts community itself may in fact be detrimental to the health of the sector. In his Ph.D. thesis, Duncan Low traces the Canadian arts policy discourse as it morphed from prizing excellence in the 60s to prioritizing economic impact today, noting the steadily “increasing dominance of policy rhetoric over substance, with a neoliberal influence on engaging the arts for non-artistic purposes such as encouraging tourism” (2016). A survey respondent summed up the situation in BC:

> I am ashamed at the current level of support for the arts by the province of BC. But of course, when the province wants to make a big international splash (the opening of the Olympics, for example), who do they call on? The artists...Basically, I believe the arts are essential to wholesome human life and civilized society, and therefore deserve recognition and support--and not just as an ‘economic driver.’

By emphasizing the importance of economic success over excellence in the professional arts sector, in other words, public funders tend to seek out and support artists and organizations that have achieved, or at least have the potential to achieve, market success. Left out of the equation are those organizations that are working on truly original, ground-breaking, and perhaps unmarketable—literally priceless—work.

2.5. Investing in the Arts: Public Good Argument

In my opinion, too much energy is spent trying to shoehorn the arts into the capitalist discourse, and not enough illuminating their intrinsic qualities and their contribution to quality of life. There is no doubt that a policy that alleviates the economic uncertainty of BC artists would allow them to contribute more fully to the provincial creative economy. However, the promise of market returns is not the only reason to invest in professional artists.
A central motivation for arts policy in general is the idea that art is a public good. As a survey respondent pointed out, providing support for the arts “is part of what Government is meant to do. They are meant to support and fund those things that other forms of funding are not available for: roads, CBC, NFB, Post office, military, public art, transportation, emergency services, etc.”

Research reveals a dizzying list of the functional effects of the arts. A 2012 survey found that 92% of Canadians think that arts and culture make their community a better place to live. Nine in ten (92%) believe that “arts experiences are a valuable way of bringing together people from different languages and cultural tradition” (Phoenix, 2012). Respondents to a 2013 survey were more likely to report very good or excellent physical and mental health if they participated in any of a range of cultural activities. They were also more likely to volunteer (Hill 2013). These functional effects cannot be captured by the market.

A large portion of artistic output is also subject to Baumol’s cost disease, the effect that occurs when wages in an industry that has experienced no productivity gains increase to keep pace with wages in other industries. Since the industry with stable productivity experiences no increase in output in response to the increased price of labour, it is expressed instead as an increase in marginal cost (Greffé 2016). As Baumol explains, “the output per man-hour of a violinist playing a Schubert quartet in a standard concert hall is relatively fixed, and it is fairly difficult to reduce the number of actors necessary for a performance of Henry IV, Part II” (Baumol and Bowen 1965).

### 2.6. Arts Gratia....? Commercial Art vs. Creative Art

Of course, some works of art fare spectacularly well on the market. A Douglas Coupland painting, for example, or a Sarah McLachlan album does not need grant support to ensure its viability. Perhaps it is pursuit of such international prominence that arts councils are moving towards placing market success at the top of the list of criteria for grant support (Mulcahy 1998). As Litzenberger puts it, artists have a duty to reflect the

---

1 In fact, the 2008 one-man hip hop musical Clay, by Matt Sax, is an adaptation of Henry IV, Parts I and II. In From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre: Preparing the Play for the Stage (Cambridge, 1992), David Bradley devises a method of doubling that would allow the play to be performed by just 13 actors.
tastes of their community: “you can’t just put art on stage…you have to be relevant” (2013).

However, a central theme that emerged throughout my research was the dichotomy that often exists between commercial art and innovative art. It was frequently noted that the best, the riskiest, the most personal, the most important art work is the work that pays the least. SD Holman, Artistic Director of Vancouver’s Queer Arts Festival and independent visual artist, explained in powerful terms:

…there’s nothing wrong with being a commercial artist, but that’s pop. That’s talking about popular culture rather than being on the cutting edge of society and talking about what’s going on in the world. You know if you’re making art to please an audience, you’re always thinking about monetizing your art…. And when you take away the monetizing part of your work you can make art that is not sellable! My work, people don’t really want to have in their homes. The really great work of artists, people don’t necessarily want to have in their homes. But it’s really important that it was made. And it has a whole art history of why it has gone there and it’s speaking to the future and to the past and to the present. And that’s not necessarily something that someone would want to buy. But it’s important that it was made. It’s important to humanity.

Pianist Rachel Iwaasa agrees with the vital role public funding has in allowing non-commercial, avant-garde and controversial work to exist, noting that it is through art that we understand ourselves and the societies that came before us. She indicates the need for a plurality of artistic styles, pointing out the recklessness of allowing economic values to shape our cultural legacy:

“I don’t think we can in our time tell, actually, what those works are going to be [that define our society], and I don’t think that’s our role. And I also think those things change over time, coloured by the historical period that’s looking back. We see that now with the recovery and the restoration of the legacies of women’s work, of the work of artists of colour, the work of non-European artists…There’s been a movement where work that was previously silenced has started to move to the front and started to speak. So it’s finding the resonances with the culture today. The one thing that seems to be fairly consistent, though, is that art that was the most wildly popular is often not the art that survives….And I don’t know that in our own time we have the perspective to tell that. I think that what’s important is that we have support for a wide plurality of work. And if it’s only the work that the market supports, in our day that tends to have a certain sameness. So I think it’s dangerous to let that be the decider.”
In *The Arts in a State* John Pick cautions against defining the arts exclusively in terms of their economic value. Otherwise, he says, “all questions about the nature of creativity, about interpretation and criticism, about freedom and complexity, about diversity and choice, about value and about excellence will take second place to the supposed higher truths of economics” (1989). It is the duty of public funders to support precisely the complex, challenging and thought-provoking art whose value is not entirely captured by the free market.

### 2.7. Why Individuals?

If we accept the argument that the government has an obligation to support the arts, the question remains: why invest in individual artists? There are two reasons. First, artists are the creative core of the arts sector, the “research scientists” of arts and culture, as Australian policymaker Julianne Schultz puts it (2010). Individuals have “the ideas, the energy, the commitment,” that bring projects to fruition (Leadlay). And individual artists found arts organizations. Giving individual artists the freedom and stability to work without fear will have ripple effects throughout the sector.

Second, as I discuss in more detail in Chapter 5, artists subsidize the arts. By and large, the neo-liberal funding model that now seems hegemonic is detrimental to the wellbeing of the individual artist, identified by cultural policy expert Catherine Murray as “the most frequently forgotten component of the creative economy.” As BC Culture Critic Spencer Chandra Herbert brought up in a statement to legislature on the value of the arts, the BC government subsidizes forestry, mining, and oil and gas technology (2016)—yet there is a reasonable expectation that workers in those fields will be fairly compensated. In the arts on the other hand, sectoral funding is by no means guaranteed to trickle down to the frontline workers: the artists. The low profit margins of arts organizations necessitate a shift of costs to the individual artists, who, also motivated by a sincere desire to create the highest-quality artistic product, accept wages that are “remarkably low by any standards, and particularly so in light of the heavy investment that has often been made by the artists in their education, training, and equipment” (Baumol and Bowen 1965).
2.8. Why Now?

The basic arguments of modern arts funding have been rehashed ad nauseum since the 1960s. So why is now a good time to reconsider the support system for individual artists in British Columbia? For one thing, the upcoming provincial election provides an opportunity to question the policies of artistic austerity that have held sway in BC since the 2010 Olympics. Moreover, Brexit and the rise of nationalist extremism seem to place us teetering on a precipice. Artists have always been on the vanguard of the fight against extremism. As one survey participant put it, “the arts and culture help people rise above the knuckle dragging, pussy grabbing, xenophobic, moronic, selfish, fascism that is obviously just below the surface of humanity.” Another respondent stressed the positive impacts of the arts: “supporting the arts creates a society of people who are better able to think for themselves, are media literate, more difficult to manipulate, and are generally happier. It also has the benefit of creating a stronger sense of who we are collectively as a people.”
Chapter 3. Background

In 1980, UNESCO issued a Recommendation Concerning the Status of the Artist, affirming the important role that artists play in society, recognizing the challenges and atypical working conditions that face them, charging governments with the dual responsibility of encouraging freedom of expression and providing the economic conditions necessary for creation, and proposing specific measures related to artist income and social benefits. Although the document is not binding, it continues to set the international standard for the treatment of professional artists. The Recommendation is concerned not only with protecting the safety and freedom of expression of artists working within the member states, affirming their rights over their own intellectual property, and establishing fair working conditions, but also with providing economic conditions conducive to the “development and flowering of their talents.” Furthermore, it establishes the importance of including artistic voices when drafting significant cultural policy.

The UNESCO document was met with enthusiasm by artists, and inspired a flurry of discussion, if not action. Canada’s reaction was to create the Siren-Gélinas Task Force, which reported in 1986 with 37 recommendations concerning taxation, pension, education, training, and professional rates. Following the Task Force, the Status of the Artist Act was passed in 1992, came into force in 1995, ceased to function in 1996, and was finally eliminated in 2010. The government also commissioned two major studies on the economic status of artists, but neither has been publicly released.

In BC, the response was still more tepid: although the government commissioned a few studies, little tangible change resulted. Massive cuts to the budget of the BC Arts Council in the wake of the 2010 Olympics, followed immediately by the resignation of the highly respected Council Chair, Jane Danzo, only exacerbated the precarious and uncertain situation of local arts practitioners. BC dropped to the very bottom of the list of provinces in terms of per capita arts council funding. Interestingly enough, though, Status of the Artist principles seem to be enjoying a belated resurgence in BC and across the country: several of the experts I interviewed alluded to the ideas unprompted, and according to Gillian Wood, the document will provide the theme for the 2017 Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Public Arts Funders.
The government of British Columbia currently has no explicitly stated broad objectives in the realm of cultural policy. In 2013, the BC Creative Convergence, led by the Alliance for Arts and Culture, published a report recommending the establishment of a provincial cultural policy framework. The report was drafted following consultations with more than 600 individuals in 19 communities across BC, through a series of Community Roundtables. Intended as a “tool for continued dialogue between government and the culture sector,” the document provides a broad set of goals and priorities from the point of view of BC’s cultural sector (BC Alliance for Arts and Culture 2013). However, there has been no formal response from the BC government.

The recent announcement that the incoming Liberal federal government would double funding to the Canada Council for the Arts would seem to herald a new era of plenty for professional artists across the country. The Council’s Strategic Plan for 2016-2021 explicitly states increasing direct artist funding as a priority (2016a). However, it is currently unclear what the recent increase to the Canada Council budget may have on provincial arts policy. Some in the BC arts community are concerned that the availability of funds on the federal level will dampen provincial enthusiasm for policy development; in other words, they fear that generous funding at the federal level may be interpreted as an excuse to cut back provincial supports. More likely, though, the renewed commitment of the federal government to invest in the arts will be seen as signal of the importance of arts, and a blueprint for provincial budgeting.

That blueprint has yet to be followed in British Columbia, however. The BC Alliance for Arts and Culture has been spearheading a campaign lobbying the BC government to double its allocation to the BC Arts Council. This proposal comes with a request for “an immediate 34% increase to the BC Arts Council of $8.1 million in order to bring provincial arts funding on par with other provinces in Canada.” For three years in a row, BC’s Bipartisan Finance Committee has recommended that the government increase follow the Alliance’s advice and increase funding to the BC Arts Council. However, despite the fact that the BC posted a $700 million surplus in 2015/16, the 2017 Budget once again announced no increase. Investment the arts in affluent BC remains the seventh lowest per capita in Canada.
Chapter 4. Methodology

4.1. Literature Review and Jurisdictional Scan

The research for this study took four forms. First, I conducted a literature review. Academic sources were consulted with a view to establishing a brief history of cultural policy, identifying economic, social, and labour challenges that contribute to the problem being addressed in this work, and understanding current thought on artist support policies. I also investigated policy documents from Canada, Australia, Finland, Norway, the Netherlands, Australia, and the UK, as well as BC, Quebec, Ontario and other provincial jurisdictions to develop a picture of the status quo both at home and abroad. Policy documents drafted by international bodies like UNESCO and advocacy groups like the BC Alliance for Arts and Culture provided inspiration for policy proposals and normative priorities.

Secondary statistical data was drawn from a number of publicly available sources, including the National Household Survey, the Canada Council for the Arts, the BC Arts Council, Revenue Ireland, and Statistics Norway.

4.2. Qualitative Expert Interviews

To enhance the depth and quality of my research, to confirm findings, and to fill in any gaps in knowledge, I conducted qualitative semi-structured interviews with three groups of stakeholders. The first sample, consisting of professional artists in a variety of disciplines, many of whom also occupy leadership positions in the arts community, helped me assess the impact that proposed policy options can be expected to have on artists’ working habits, creativity, and productivity. The second group, representatives from government agencies, arts councils, and arts support organizations, shared insights about current policy motivations and potential jurisdictional and implementation challenges associated with policy change. The third group, academic experts on cultural policy, contributed a theoretical framework.
Table 1: Expert Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Relevance to Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Wood</td>
<td>Executive Director, BC Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Chandra Herbert</td>
<td>Culture Critic, BC Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Leadlay</td>
<td>Executive Director, BC Alliance for Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Lowe</td>
<td>Former Executive Director, Vancouver East Cultural Centre, Cultural Policy Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Murray</td>
<td>Professor, School of Communication, SFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Holman</td>
<td>Visual Artist and Artistic Director, Queer Arts Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Iwaasa</td>
<td>Pianist and Arts Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Tanasiychuk</td>
<td>Photographer and Editor in Chief, VANDOCUMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Ochoa</td>
<td>Pianist and Artistic Director, Blueridge Chamber Music Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Dziwenka</td>
<td>Visual Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Younger</td>
<td>Guitarist, Composer, and Improvisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Artist Survey

In pursuit of a broader perspective on attitudes towards strategies to support artists in the community, I designed an online artist questionnaire. The survey was open to BC residents who self-identified as artists in any discipline, and posed both multiple choice (36) and open-ended questions (13) for a total of 49 questions. Three main themes were addressed: work habits and preferences, the impact of public funding and experiences with the BC Arts Council, and opinions about a range of policy options. To determine the characteristics of the survey sample, I also asked a series of demographic questions.

The artist survey was launched on February 15th, 2017, and remained active until March 17, 2017. Participants were recruited through snowball sampling. I sent the survey to a total of 63 arts councils across BC, requesting that they disseminate it electronically to their members. Local arts organizations, as well as advocacy groups such as CARFAC and the BC Alliance for Arts and Culture, also advertised the link through email and social media. Finally, I shared the survey with my personal artist network.

Quantitative survey data was analyzed using Excel software. The interview sessions were transcribed and analyzed thematically. Rather than attempting to circumscribe the interviews on a pre-constructed theoretical framework, I coded the data for meaning in an “inductive or bottom-up” process (Braun and Clarke 2006). Individual codes were then combined to form themes that were identified as central to the research problem.
4.3.1. About the Survey Sample

A total of 224 responses were recorded. After filtering out those respondents who did not self-identify as artists or were not BC residents, as well as those that failed to answer at least one third of the questions, I analyzed a total of 111 responses.

Survey respondents came from a variety of artistic disciplines. Seven in ten participants were either musicians (41%) or visual artists (31%). Smaller groups said they were multi-disciplinary practitioners (11%), dance artists (5%) or creative writers (4%). A scattering classified their primary discipline as media arts (1%) or theatre (1%). Those who selected “other” (6%) identified themselves as photographers, tattoo artists, and textile artists.

Figure 1: What is your primary artistic discipline?

The distinct stages of the artistic career were well represented. Three participants in ten (30%) identified themselves as emerging artists. About a third (34%) said they were mid-career artists, while another fifth (19%) identified as established artists. A smaller group (15%) said they were senior artists, while a handful (3%) were students. Similarly, artists of all ages filled out the survey. The majority were between 25 and 64: about a third (34%) said they were 24 to 44, while 42% said they were 45-64. Another 16% were between 65 and 79, while small groups were under 24 (5%) or over 80 (3%).
The artists surveyed came from a variety of communities. About half (52%) described their community as urban. Another third (33%) said their home community was rural, while 15% came from a suburban neighbourhood.

The concentration of women in the BC artistic workforce (50%) is marginally higher than in the general labour force (48%) (Hill 2014). Still, women were slightly overrepresented among survey participants. Fifty-three percent of respondents were female (compared to 51% of all BC artists), while 45% were male. Two percent identified their gender as “other.”
Although BC artists in general tend to be highly educated, with 43% holding a bachelor’s degree compared to 26% of the overall work force (Hill 2014), the artists who participated in the online survey were even more likely to be university educated. More than half (54%) had obtained at least an undergraduate degree. One in four (26%) had obtained a graduate degree in their area of practice.

On the other hand, more than three quarters of respondents earn less than BC’s average annual salary ($47,914 in 2016). About a quarter each earned less than $20,000 (25%), $20,000 to $29,999 (25%), and $30,000 to $44,999 (26%). Less than a fifth (19%) earned between $45,000 and $89,999, while 5% earned more than $90,000 per year.

4.3.2. Limitations

Because of the non-random sampling method used to gather survey participants, the results can not be assumed to represent the BC artist community as a whole. In addition, the demographics of the survey sample fail to match the provincial artist population in several important ways. Artistic disciplines are not evenly distributed in the sample.
Musicians are overrepresented, making up 41% of the survey sample, but only 28% of the BC artist population, as are visual artists (31% of the survey sample compared to 15% of the artist population). Meanwhile, actors, writers, craftspeople and artisans are underrepresented.

The voice of minority artists is also faint in the survey results. Despite efforts to disseminate the survey to a broad audience, Indigenous artists (4%), artists with disabilities (7%), members of the LGBTQ community (11%), and visual minority artists (11%) were underrepresented among respondents.

4.4. Policy Analysis

Having gathered data from the literature, interviews, and survey, I conducted a policy analysis. Based on my research, I developed four policy options to address the problem of low income earning among BC artists. Three of the policies were direct support options offering qualifying artists a form of guaranteed minimum income: 1) a highly competitive Guaranteed Minimum Income for artists based on the recent Norway model and administered through the BC Arts Council; 2) a Basic Income proposal that offers a lower annual benefit that is both means tested and peer-juried; and 3) an Income Supplement for Artists distributed by an agency outside the BCAC contingent on a set of basic eligibility criteria. The fourth policy is an expansion of the current BCAC project granting programs, which provide short-term financial support for specific artistic endeavours.

I evaluated each option’s performance against a range of criteria, which included the policy’s projected effectiveness in improving the economic situation of artists, its potential to contribute to the development of a stable and thriving arts sector, the acceptability of the option to artists, its estimated budgetary cost, and the complexity of its implementation. The proposal that scored the highest across all criteria was selected as the recommended policy solution.
Chapter 5. Survey Findings

5.1. Work Preferences: Untapped Creative Potential

BC is home to an untapped creative force. Survey respondents reported that they spent an average of 23.2 hours per week on their artistic practice. Three quarters (75%) of those surveyed said that ideally, they would spend a larger proportion of their working time on their artistic practice than they actually do. About a fifth (18%) said they would prefer to spend less time on art, while 8% were satisfied with the way they divide their working life. Currently, respondents said they spent a little more than a quarter (26.8%) of their working time on artistic practice. On average, they would prefer to devote about three fifths (61.1%) of their working time to their art.

This finding is in line with a recent survey of Australian artists, that found that more than 80% of those who performed both arts and non-arts work would prefer to spend more time on their art (Throsby and Hollister 2004). Furthermore, a 1996 study of Norwegian artists with Guaranteed Income found that they devoted more hours to artistic practice and had more exhibitions and publications than groups of artists with less stable income (Heikkinen 2000).

Those who identify as artists are likely to earn a living from a variety of sources. Of those surveyed, almost half (49%) said they supplemented their income by teaching in their area of practice. About a quarter (24%) held an arts administration job, while a fifth (21%) worked another arts-related job. Jobs outside the arts provided some income for 44% of respondents. Just 5% of those surveyed said they made 100% of their annual income from their artistic practice.

Nearly a third of the artists surveyed said they augmented their income with jobs in two or more categories. One tenth (10%) held three or more different jobs.

This finding is also in line with statistical evidence. In 2011, more than twice as many artists (11%) reported having two or more jobs as did workers in the general labour force (5%) (Hill 2014).
Respondents were asked what challenges prevent them from dividing their working time as they would prefer. By far the most common response, cited by 69% of respondents, was financial concerns. There is a recognition of the link between time and money—in many cases, the obligation to earn a living leaves respondents with little time or energy to devote to creative work and development. Many artists also noted the complicating factor of increasing costs of living. Several also underlined the need to devote time to developing new ideas.

Figure 6: What challenges prevent you from dividing your time as you would prefer?

Besides the low pay, other idiosyncrasies of the typical artistic career kept respondents from spending more time on art. A handful of artists (13%) pointed out the constant administrative work necessary to sustain a contract-based career, some noting that longer-term work or funding opportunities would help to alleviate the administrative burden. Other artists said they were held back by a lack of recognition (9%), a lack of opportunities (10%), or a simple lack of space in which to work (4%). A small group (7%) explained that the seasonal or unreliable nature of their practice prevented them from relying on income from their artistic work.

External factors dictated the work time division of some respondents. About a tenth (12%) said they were limited by caregiving responsibilities, while another 4% cited their own health challenges.

Taken together, these findings paint a picture of an artistic work force full of energy and passion that, given more stable financial conditions, could potentially contribute more to BC society.
5.2. Attitudes: Unsupported, Yet Undeterred

Survey respondents tended to feel that their work is undervalued, both by the market and the community. Only about a third of respondents were satisfied with their income from art: thirty-five percent agreed with the statement “I am fairly compensated for my artistic work,” while more than half (55%) disagreed. Fifteen percent neither agreed nor disagreed.

*Figure 7: I am fairly compensated for my artistic work*

A majority also felt that their work was “not valued and recognized in [their] community.” Nearly half (49%) agreed with that statement, compared with about a third (32%) who disagreed. About a fifth neither agreed nor disagreed.

*Figure 8: I do not feel my work is valued and recognized in my community*
Nevertheless, a majority are content to be artists. More than half (56%) agreed with the statement, “overall, I am satisfied with my life as an artist.” That’s more than twice the number (27%) who disagreed. About one in five (18%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

*Figure 9: Overall, I am satisfied with my life as an artist*

---

### 5.3. A Preference for Direct Support?

Survey respondents were asked for their opinions on a range of policies. Options presented in the online survey comprised both direct funding proposals and tax-based interventions, including a guaranteed minimum income based on the Norwegian model, an income tax exemption for creative artists, income averaging for artists, and a tax credit for businesses that establish Artist-in-Residence programs. Not surprisingly, all of the policy measures introduced in the survey enjoyed support from a strong majority of respondents (*Figure 11*).

*Figure 10: Support for policy options*
However, when respondents were asked to rank the policies in order of preference, the guaranteed income emerged as a clear favourite. Nearly half the artists surveyed (46%) listed the guaranteed minimum income as their first-choice policy. To give a more nuanced picture of the policy preferences of respondents, rankings were indexed to arrive at a total score out of six. Guaranteed Minimum Income remains the definite favourite (Figure 12).

**Figure 11: Direct support and tax-based policies ranked**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Minimum Income</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Funding to BCAC</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-Friendly BCAC</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Averaging</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Exemption</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Breaks for Artist in Residence</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, respondents displayed a preference for maintaining support through the BCAC, with the three policies that would be administered through the Council ranking in the top three positions, and the three tax-based policies occupying the bottom three positions. Based on this finding, I narrowed the scope of my policy analysis to direct support options.

### 5.4. The Impact of Direct Public Support

Artist grants are a crucial mechanism both for compensating and recognizing artists. Public support in the form of grants plays an important role in the development and maintenance of artistic careers. When asked, unprompted, what impact grants had on their career or practice, two thirds of respondents (67%) reported that the funding allowed them to compete work that they would not otherwise have been able to undertake. In some cases, the extra money allowed them to obtain supplies:

“Without having to worry about things like using ‘too much’ paint or perhaps ‘wasting a canvas with a less than stellar composition, my work consistently
improved after each grant. I was able to devote the time to PAINTING rather than worrying about my stock of supplies, gas, etc."

In many others, the grant freed time for the artist to undertake a project without the need for other gainful employment. Artists expressed the opinion that their work was more skillful, more innovative, and more risky when supported by a grant.

*Figure 12: What impact did the grant have on your career or practice?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete work/project</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity/dissemination</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement/validation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage community/collaboration</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to bringing art projects to fruition, grants also provide the means for a variety of opportunities. About a quarter (24%) of respondents said their funding allowed them to attend a residency or workshop, grow creatively or to expand their practice. Grants gave other respondents (19%) the means to travel and disseminate their work provincially, nationally, and internationally, enhancing their both skills and profile. For a few (5%), grants provided dedicated time for research and exploration, or in-depth rehearsal and workshopping, without having to focus solely on production.

For some artists who responded (14%), however, the moral support implicit in an artist grant is as valuable as the financial benefit. Respondents noted that the "acknowledgement" or "validation" that comes with a grant from a major body gave them the confidence and encouragement to continue their practice. A few also mentioned that this support gave them the motivation or "push" to complete a planned project.

“For myself, I find that the sales, grants, awards, and booking exhibitions are half about the financial remuneration and the other half about the validation from awarding bodies or community and curators.”

Finally, a handful of respondents (8%) said that grants allowed them to form contacts, enter into collaborations with other artists, and engage more directly and fulsomely with the community at large.
Chapter 6.  Interview Findings

6.1.  Problem Driver: Difficulty of Addressing Specific Policies

In researching this report, I encountered an unexpected challenge: the difficulty of focusing the conversation on policy specifics. Survey participants, when asked to comment on the advantages and disadvantages of particular policy measures, often resorted to reiterating the need to support the arts in general. It was challenging to keep some expert interview participants on target: they tended to skirt specific questions and return to the basic philosophical discussions surrounding the value of arts and the status of the artist.

While I acknowledge my limitations as a student researcher might play a role in this fuzzy focus, I think the finding is worthy of note. I believe that BC artists and arts advocates are so accustomed to having to justify their very existence that they hesitate to move beyond the basic existential questions. The implication in policy terms is that it becomes difficult to contemplate practical, detailed solutions to specific problems.

6.2.  Problem Driver: Arts Advocacy Vacuum

It is tempting to pin BC’s poor investment on the arts squarely on BC’s primary-industry-centred, bottom-line focused, right-of-centre government. However, expert interviews revealed that British Columbia’s arts sector is also held back by a weak advocacy wing. According to Catherine Murray, one problem is lack of coordination among artists: “every so often BC goes into a process of saying, we have to get organized, let’s have a meeting. And the grassroots come together…and nothing happens.” Another issue, she believes, could be lack of knowledge: “the awareness of the different levels of policy levers is very low in the artist sector.” Spencer Chandra Herbert calls the level of advocacy for the arts at the BC provincial level “pretty abysmal,” and puts the onus for change on the arts sector. “It has to start at the arts level,” he says. “What do we want? What do we expect? Is it just grants, or is it something more? So many artists are so busy they don’t even come out to say, we want grants.” Chandra Herbert acknowledges
that advocates may be demoralized by BCs weak record on arts investment, noting “the government does have a responsibility.”

As the new head of the Alliance for Arts and Culture, BC’s preeminent advocacy body, Brenda Leadlay acknowledged the gap: “just last week I met with a couple of MLAs, and they said, ‘you’re the only person from the arts who has ever come to talk to me.’” Describing her approach to advocacy as galvanizing the grassroots, she said, “it’s one individual standing up and saying, ok, I’m going to take the lead on this and then getting people on board…and that’s why I love my job!”

There is a need for advocacy groups to lead the push for better conditions for individuals, and to champion specific policies to that effect. According to Gillian Wood, “in the Alliance and the argument for increased funding that they’ve made, it’s pretty heavily weighted towards organizations. I don’t think there’s a lot of mention in that material about providing support for individuals.” This focus on organizations, Wood mused, might limit the discussion of individual-focused policies such as a guaranteed income: “these kinds of interesting models that could be discussed, could be considered aren’t really coming to us. I’m not really hearing about it.”

This report identifies ways in which the government can support the artists that contribute their creativity, passion, and imagination to their communities. However this finding points to the need for artists to be active in their own destinies, first, by taking full advantage of the supports available to them, and second, by participating in advocacy efforts with clearly delineated goals.

6.3. Problem Driver: Artists Subsidize the Arts

One major problem driver that was often mentioned in interviews and survey responses alike is the tendency for artists to subsidize the arts sector. I think there is a perception that when the government invests in the arts, the money goes straight into the pockets of arts workers. Anecdotal evidence suggests otherwise. I run a publicly-funded not-for-profit music festival, and although the first objective in our strategic plan is to move towards union-level pay for musicians, we could not function without paying cut-rate honoraria. I sit on the board of a fully professional orchestra that makes ends meet by asking its players to donate one or more services each season. These are just two
completely typical examples of how artists themselves subsidize the work of organizations.

As Duncan Low reports in his 2016 thesis, although the total amount of government investment in the arts has increased since the 1960s, the amount spent on each organization or project has decreased in real terms (Low 2016). At the BC Arts Council, this decline is formalized: project grants are available to fund only up to 50% of a project. The result, according to Catherine Murray, is a “negative spiral” in which organizations begin to reduce the fees paid to artists. Duncan Low explains the “squeeze”:

Sitting on a funding jury one comes across applications that are eligible for a grant of say, $45,000 for a particular project. Unfortunately, due to lack of overall funds available individual grants are often ‘shaved’, offered a few thousand dollars less than the application request. In that situation, at the end of the day, what tends to get cut is the hourly rate of the artists. Because you still have to pay the material costs, the rent costs, the electrical costs, they’re all the same, they don’t change. The only variable is the artist costs.

Rachel Iwaasa agrees, pointing out that even when artists receive a basic paycheque, they end up subsidizing the industry:

The lack of funding means that every project ends up being a compromise. You end up sacrificing on production values, you end up not being able to support the artists. I mean, you pay the artists, but there are so many things artists need in order to do their work...they need to not be switching back and forth and doing the publicity and running back and forth doing all those things. It is nearly impossible to do your best.

For Duncan Low, the solution to this problem is to fund organizations “properly,” so that they can in turn “commission more artists, work with more artists, experiment with more artists.”

Spencer Chandra Herbert agreed with this assertion, noting that not-for-profit societies act “as kind of the check and balance,” providing accountability in granting. However, a real accounting of the vocational motivations of both artists and not-for-profit organizations indicate this solution may not have the desired effect (Baumol and Bowen 1965).

Public support of arts organization is a crucial element of any healthy arts policy. Multi-year core operational funding to organizations, in particular, is a key stabilizing force in
the arts sector. However, it is my position that to ensure the wellbeing of arts workers, a comprehensive policy framework must also include direct support of individual artists.

6.4. Dawn of a New Paradigm?

Conversations around this capstone tended to lead to a big idea: the need for a new social paradigm. A few different models were proposed. While Catherine Murray recognizes their unique challenges and working conditions, she sees artists as just one group of workers who would benefit from a new social welfare state. Her concept of “flexicurity” includes a combination of labour policy, social policy, and tax initiatives, all designed to support the precarious worker. While she acknowledged some minor improvement to the welfare of contract workers in the wake of the 2011 Act to Provide Special Benefits to Self-Employed Workers, she said, “I do not think that you have an integrated set of policies yet to protect part-time workers period.” Key for her is to target the most vulnerable first:

I think you need a structural reform to tax policy that addresses poverty problem first. On a moral and practical basis, and the fact that it’s been so overlooked for so long, that I think we really ought to do. I don’t think you tackle middle class policies at the moment. I’m not saying you ignore them. But in the race to the middle to get elected, people are not dealing with the structural problem of the bottom 20% of society. And artists disproportionately will benefit from that.

Pianist and arts administrator Alejandro Ochoa agreed that support for artists is part of a forward-looking labour policy. “If we assume that 100% automation is in the future, what are people going to do?” Many people, he theorized, would spend more time pursuing arts and culture activities. In that case, he explained, “we need a way of supporting that sector during the transition stage”

For Gillian Wood, a comprehensive artist policy builds on the idea, already enshrined at the BC Arts Council, of supporting individual artists throughout the arc of their career. In her vision, not only would this entail awarding grants, but creating opportunities for working and touring, and providing benefits and pensions to artists. Wood also stressed the need to nurture a public that is able to engage with the artistic discourse: “You need to be in the public education system and ensuring that not only is there arts education in the public system, but there’s access to professional artists. That people get the sense
that people are successful in their careers as artists and can talk about that before kids finish high school.”

Brenda Leadlay echoed the views of many survey participants when she stated the need for a new social order with the arts at the centre.

It’s putting the individual’s creativity at the heart of it all respecting and honouring that every human being is a creative being. And you know, working out from that. So when we talk about arts being the centre of communities, and if the value of one person’s individuality and creativity was really appreciated, then maybe we’d understand each other better, maybe we’d have less violence against women, maybe there’d be a way to combat the things that are happening in the world right now.

Leadlay envisioned a grassroots movement where support for the arts would grow one individual at a time. For BC Culture Critic Spencer Chandra Herbert, on the other hand, the BC government has a critical role to play in establishing the value of the arts to the community, either through political statements or tangible policy action. “I think it would help if we had a government that was clear and loud-throated in support of the artistic community,” he said, “that this is something we see as part of our society and must value. I think they’ve made that very clear in Quebec, that that’s something that’s expected of governments.”

Although each participant had different concepts of exactly what a new arts-positive paradigm would entail, interviewees tended to agree on the need for a complex and multi-faceted solution to poverty among BC artists. No one policy, they felt, would singlehandedly address the plight of low-income arts workers. Rather, a comprehensive artist support system would involve direct granting, tax incentives, mandated arts education and access to professional artists at the elementary and secondary school levels, affordable housing, safe and affordable work and presentation spaces, pensions and benefits, and opportunities for fairly-paying work.
It is not within the scope of this report to consider every possible angle to benefit BC artists, so I focus on the first piece of the jigsaw puzzle: direct support to individual artists through grants or other benefits. However, this finding provides an impetus for further research on a comprehensive arts policy framework in British Columbia.
Chapter 7. Criteria and Measures

What are the attributes of a successful artist support policy? Through interviews with artists and arts sector leaders, and referring to survey data, I compiled a list of qualities that an ideal solution would possess. This section describes the nine criteria, grouped into five overall objectives, that will be considered in determining the relative merit of the proposed policy options. A summary of all criteria can be found in Table 2.

Table 2: Criteria and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td>High: Benefit is more than $20,000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Benefit is $10,000-$20,000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Benefit is less than $10,000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of artists affected</td>
<td>High: More than 500 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Between 200 and 500 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Fewer than 200 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>High: Most likely to benefit lower earners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Equally available to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Most likely to benefit higher earners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>High: Awarded by peer jury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Partially determined by peer jury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Awarded automatically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes stability</td>
<td>High: Provides long-term support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Provides medium-term support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Provides project (short-term) support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports career arc</td>
<td>High: Supports artists at all career stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Somewhat supports artists at all stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Most likely to support established artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Acceptance</td>
<td>Accepted by artists</td>
<td>High: Relatively high support from BC artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Relatively moderate support from BC artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Relatively low support from BC artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>Ease of administration</td>
<td>High: Administered through BCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Administered through BCAC, complex reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Administered through another agency with complex reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Government</td>
<td>Government affordability</td>
<td>High: Less than $10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod: Between $10 and $20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: More than $20 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1. Effectiveness

The first criteria against which to measure proposed artist policies is the effectiveness of each strategy in achieving its primary objective; that is, its potential to improve the economic conditions of artists in British Columbia. In this report, effectiveness is measured in three ways: the average amount of the benefit, the approximate number of
artists affected each year, and the potential for the policy to promote economic equity in the arts sector.

7.1.1. Size of Benefit

The average size of the benefit determines the magnitude of the impact of each policy on the lives of the artists affected. A benefit of less than $10,000 per year is interpreted as having a relatively low impact, while between $10,000 and $20,000 is considered moderate. An annual benefit of more than $20,000 is seen as having a high degree of impact.

7.1.2. Number of Artists Affected

Many of the proposed policies are competitive, and would be awarded based on the recommendation of an expert panel, while some have limited eligibility. None of the policies set forth would affect all 24,800 artists in British Columbia. However, an option that would assist more than 500 artists annually receives a high score in this area, while an option affecting between 200 and 500 individuals is considered moderate. An option available to fewer than 200 artists each year receives a low score.

7.1.3. Promotes Economic Equity

Canada is acknowledged worldwide for its arms-length, peer-juried system of arts grants. However, this system does not ensure that low-income artists are supported—in fact, it is sometimes observed that artists with academic posts or established, lucrative careers are more likely to be rewarded. A policy is ranked highly in this category if it specifically targets low-income artists. Policies that are equally available to all are ranked as moderate, while those that are more likely to benefit higher income artists receive a low score.

7.2. Development

Another key objective in creating a direct artist support policy is to promote the health and development of the arts sector in general. In this study, I measure development in terms of three criteria: the potential of the policy to foster excellence in artistic
achievement, its ability to promote economic stability in the arts community, and its effectiveness at supporting artists throughout the arc of their careers.

### 7.2.1. Promotes Artistic Excellence

The process for selecting beneficiaries of an artist policy is important to consider. An oft-quoted concern in arts policy discussions is that not everyone who believes they are an artist truly possesses the skill and formation to be considered a professional in the field (Low 2016). The practice of making funding decisions through juries composed of artists in the same discipline, while not perfect, places judgements about artistic in the hands those most qualified to make them.

There is a second reason for maintaining the peer jury system. For some artists, the moral support of an artist grant is as valuable as the financial benefit. Survey respondents noted that the “acknowledgement” or “validation” that comes with a grant from a major body gave them the confidence and encouragement to continue their practice. A few also mentioned that this support gave them the motivation or “push” to complete a planned project.

In this category, selection by peer jury based on artistic excellence merited a high score, while selection based on other criteria earned a low score. A policy awarded partially based on juried input and partially on other criteria received a moderate score.

### 7.2.2. Promotes Stability

Through expert interviews and the online artist survey, lack of stability in the arts sector was pinpointed as a major problem driver. Not only do many BC artists earn incomes below the LICO, but they also tend to work on an intermittent or contract basis. In general, arts funding in British Columbia has moved from a primarily operating grant model to a largely project-based model, which, according to Rachel Iwaasa, “has completely destabilized the industry.” Without knowing where the next contract will come from, many artists face the necessity of working a “day job” to cover gaps. A number of artists I surveyed commented that the sporadic nature of their earning negatively impacted their mental health and general wellbeing.
A key component of the effectiveness of an artist policy is that it provides reliable and stable funding. Policy options received a high score in this category if they provided predictable long-term support for three years or more.

**7.2.3. Supports Artistic Career Arc**

Primary and secondary data alike demonstrates the importance of providing supports to artists at all stages of their careers. Artists in the early and late stages of their development often have difficulty competing with established mid-career artists. One of the BCAC’s objectives is to support the full career arc, and to that end the Council provides scholarship opportunities and grants for emerging artists, as well as funding available to mid-career applicants. However, senior artists in particular remain vulnerable—a noteworthy problem in BC, where almost three tenths (29%) of artists are 55 or over. In comparison, workers aged 55 and over make up just 20% of the overall BC labour force (Hill, 2014).

**7.3. Stakeholder Acceptance**

The UNESCO *Recommendation on the Status of the Artist* establishes the importance of including the voices of artists themselves in any discussion on cultural policy (UNESCO 1980). Taking this instruction as a guide, I consider the support of the BC artist community as a vital element in the analysis of each option. Stakeholder acceptance is measured by the responses to the online survey of artists from across BC.

It is important to note that all of the policies introduced in the survey received strong majority support. Ranking in this category is, thus, relative. A low score does not indicate that artists are opposed to the policy; rather, that they may not see it as a first priority. In addition, survey respondents were not presented with all four specific policy options investigated in detail in this report, as a result, qualitative data is presented here to fill in quantitative gaps and to give a more nuanced picture of the response from the arts community.
7.4. Ease of Implementation

Like effectiveness, ease of implementation and administration is a relevant consideration in any policy conversation. The policies evaluated in this paper include some administered through the BC Arts Council and others that would be distributed by another agency. Some would require complex reporting.

7.5. Budgetary Cost

The BC Alliance for Arts and Culture is currently spearheading a campaign to lobby the BC government to double its allocation to the BC Arts Council. This proposal comes with a request for "an immediate 34% increase to the BC Arts Council of $8.1 million in order to bring provincial arts funding on par with other provinces in Canada." The NDP has promised to double funding to the BCAC, should it triumph in the upcoming provincial election. In that case, increased availability of funds will allow the BC Arts Council more breadth in terms of individual artist support.

It should be noted that because most of the proposed policies are competitive, budgetary cost is linked to two of the components of Effectiveness: the size of the benefit, and the number of artists affected. In other words, these policies could be tweaked to affect fewer artists and cost less, for example, or to provide a larger average payoff and cost more. Policies are presented in their current form for the sake of comparison.

7.6. Measures

Although it is not possible empirically to measure each policy's success in a BC context, an educated prediction can be made by examining case studies in other jurisdictions. Criteria were evaluated according to the qualitative measures in Table 1 above. I then assigned points for each criteria: a high score received 3 points, a moderate score 2 points, and a low score 1 point. The final recommendation includes the policy that scored the highest across the nine criteria.
Chapter 8. Policy Options

8.1. Option 1: Expanded Project Grants

The BC Arts Council currently supports individual local artists through an array of granting programs. Grants are available for professional training and career advancement, touring, and project development. Many arts awards are grouped by discipline, and are available to dancers, musicians, theatre professionals, media artists, literary artists, visual artists, craftspeople, art critics, and curators.

However, my analysis of BCAC award listings indicates that only about one eighth (13.5%) of the Council’s annual funding is awarded to individual artists (BCAC 2016a). Although grants to organizations certainly improve conditions for individual artists, individual grants allow for more flexibility. In addition, as seen in Chapter 6, the filtering down of funding from non-profit companies to individuals can not be taken for granted: in some cases, artists subsidize the work of organizations (Low 2016), and in others they do not have access to organizations.

One possible policy action to address the problem of low-earning artists would be to maintain the basic granting framework currently in place, but double the amount of funding available to be granted directly to individuals.

8.2. Option 2: Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists

The Guaranteed Minimum Income as a general concept has gained considerable traction in recent years. Based on the idea, enshrined in the UN’s International Declaration of Human Rights, that “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and wellbeing of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services,” the policy ensures that every citizen reaches a given income threshold, regardless of productivity in the labour market. Guaranteed Minimum Income has an illustrious history in Canada—the first known trial of the policy took place in Dauphin, Manitoba from 1974 to 1979—and pilot projects are in the works in Ontario and PEI. Worldwide, pilot projects are underway or in development in Finland, France, the Netherlands, Uganda, and Kenya.
The Guaranteed Minimum Income specifically aimed at artists is based on a program in place until 2012 in Norway. The Norway Arts Council offers Guaranteed Income Grants to “professional artists…who have made a qualitative contribution to the arts over a period of several years.” As of 2011, nearly 500 artists across Norway were living with the grant (Statistics Norway, 2011). Artists in all disciplines are eligible to apply, provided they can demonstrate a substantial body of work. Once they are accorded the grant, artists receive the guaranteed level of income for ten years, renewable, and have little obligation to prove continued production. The objective of the program is to provide artists with the financial freedom necessary for creativity and artistic productivity.

The BC version of this policy would use the Norwegian level of benefit ($37,539), with 30% of earned income subtracted. Considering that BC artists earn a median income of $19,319, it is estimated that the average payout would be $31,743.

8.3. Option 3: Basic Income for Artists

The third option is also a type of guaranteed income for artists, but with quite a different design from the Norwegian model. Rather than providing complete economic freedom to create, as the previous option would, this alternative would provide a very basic living income of $15,000 per year for three years. Although it would not be enough for artists to live on the grant alone, it would provide basic stability, allowing beneficiaries to afford necessities, scale back secondary work hours, and plan projects in the medium term. Available only to artists with an average annual income of less than $50,000 over the three years prior to application, the grant would be awarded by a peer jury for a period of three years. Artists would be allowed to reapply at the end of the three-year term, but would have to re-enter the competition rather than receiving an automatic renewal.

8.4. Option 4: Artist Income Supplement

A final policy option is the Artist Income Supplement. This program is inspired by the Law for Work and Income Provision of Artists (WWIK), in place in the Netherlands from

---

2 In 2013, the Guaranteed Minimum Income was replaced by the Grant for Established Artists. Under the new system, earned income is not deducted from the grant. However, artists who earn more than an average of NOK 555,000 ($88,395) over the first four years of the grant lose the right to the benefit.
1999 to 2012, which provides 70% of welfare payment to qualifying artists for a period of 4 years (Cliche, Mitchell, and Wiesand 2001).

Unlike the other proposed policies, this one is not a competitive grant awarded based on the recommendation of a jury. Instead, it would be available to all artists who meet the basic eligibility criteria: 1) basic institutional or equivalent training in their field, 2) some history of presentation, and 3) an average income of less than $22,600 per year.

The Supplement would be tenable for a period of three years, providing the artist could demonstrate artistic productivity. However, it would only be available for three years out of each ten-year period. Thus, the objective would be to alleviate some of the pressure on low-income artists to earn a living, allowing them a window of opportunity to expand their artistic practice and earning potential.
Chapter 9. Policy Analysis

All four policy options were of interest to me because of their potential to improve the lives of artists in British Columbia. To arrive at a policy recommendation, I analyzed the six alternatives in terms of the objectives and criteria described in Chapter 7, identifying the advantages and disadvantages of each scheme, and weighing tradeoffs.

9.1. Option 1: Expanded Project Grants

9.1.1. Effectiveness

In comparison to the other policies studied, the option of reviewing BC Arts Council programs to make them more accessible to individual artists is predicted to be moderately effective in terms of the primary objective of increasing the incomes of BC artists. The BCAC currently awards grants to individuals in amounts between $1000 and about $20,000. The average benefit awarded is considered low in this analysis, at about $7400.

This option proposes doubling the amount currently granted from individuals from $3.25 million to $6.5 million. As a result, the number of grants would also be assumed to double, from approximately 425 (404 individual grants were made in 2014/15, compared to 439 in 2015/16) to approximately 850, which is interpreted in this analysis as a moderate increase.

The BC Arts Council makes no attempt to tailor its programs towards low-income artists. In fact, compared to its counterparts across Canada, which tend to promote accessibility, support, and community, the BCAC is particularly oriented towards artistic excellence. In the Strategic Plan governing 2014 to 2018, artistic excellence is mentioned in the first line of all three guiding texts: the stated organizational priorities, the core values, and the mission statement. Furthermore, interview data suggests that complicated project grant applications themselves tend to disadvantage low income artists, since they are so focused on “grantsmanship”—writing and presentation skills—in addition to artistry. As a result, this option earns a low score in the category of economic equity.
9.1.2. Development

This option performs unevenly on the three development criteria. Expanding the Project Grants streams of the BCAC would certainly promote artistic excellence in BC, since it provides short-term funding for specific projects that are deemed outstanding by a panel of peers. Project grants allow expert panels to reward not only excellent artists but also particular endeavours that are deemed of outstanding quality or significance to the community.

One of the major drawbacks of this option, though, is its exclusive reliance on short-term funding for individual artists. The BC Arts Council has recognized the destabilizing effect of project funding on arts organizations, and pledged in its 2014-2018 strategic plan to increase operational funding in that sphere. However, no such commitment has been made for individual grants. Project grants are seen as a way to guarantee accountability in public funding and to ensure that artists don’t “rest on their laurels,” however, the strategy prevents individuals from achieving financial stability and planning long-term.

When it comes to supporting the career arc, the BCAC already supports a wide range of artists with a fair attempt at equity: it offers separate funding streams for emerging artists, and under this plan it could add funds destined for senior artists, as well as for artists in emerging disciplines.

9.1.3. Stakeholder Acceptance

The proposal of expanding existing BCAC granting programs earned relatively tepid support from the artists surveyed when they were asked to compare it to a range of direct and tax-based interventions. Although it was the least likely of the alternatives they considered to be selected as a first choice, it ranked third overall. Respondents seemed to see a review of BCAC programs as an important component of a comprehensive artist policy strategy, if not as the cornerstone.

9.1.4. Ease of Implementation

This policy stands out for its ease of implantation. The idea seems politically feasible: according to the Executive Director of the BCAC, given the availability of funds she “would not hesitate to double the budgets that we have for individual artists.”
9.1.5. Budgetary Cost

At an annual cost of $3.25 million, the option is the most affordable of those assessed in this paper.

9.1.6. Summary

Bolstering the existing BCAC grants programs is a sensible policy. Although it is not the most effective of the options studied, it contributes to the development of the arts community in BC by rewarding outstanding artistic achievement and providing supports at all artistic career stages. Moreover, it is a cheap and relatively simple solution.

Table 3: Expanded Project Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholder Acceptance</th>
<th>Administrative Complexity</th>
<th>Cost to Government</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td># artists affected</td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>Promotes stability</td>
<td>Supports career arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Expand Project Grants</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2. Option 2: Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists

9.2.1. Effectiveness

With an estimated average benefit of almost $32,000, the Guaranteed Minimum Income based on the Norway model would, more than any other policy option, boost successful artists out of poverty and allow them to focus on creation and innovation.

However, the chief disadvantage of this model of GMI is that it would be available to a very few artists. In Norway, only about 500 artists are supported by the GMI at a time. Since the award can be held for ten years, it follows that no more than 50 new grants are available in any given year.

The highly competitive nature of the Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists leads to another drawback: it tends to reward higher income artists. Recipients are normally established artists boasting a widely-esteemed body of work. Although this does not preclude very innovative lower-income earners, artists with this profile are likely to have
attained some economic success. As a result, the policy earns a low score in terms of encouraging economic equity within the arts sector.

9.2.2. Development

The Guaranteed Minimum Income also performs unevenly at the task of developing a thriving arts sector. The GMI would be highly selective, granted by a jury of peers, and seen as a highly prestigious award. Analysis shows that it would be the best option to promote and honour outstanding artistry in British Columbia.

More than any other plan, it would allow qualifying artists the stability to plan long-term, take on major work, and devote themselves to risky projects. However, because relatively few artists would successfully compete for the grant, it is judged that this option would have only a moderate effect on the stability of the sector as a whole.

The Guaranteed Minimum Income scores poorly when it comes to backing artists throughout their working lives. Just as it is likely to support artists with more economic stability, it is also likely—though not certain—to reward artists at the height of their careers. Emerging artists and senior practitioners would probably be less competitive. On the other hand, the benefit is equally available to artists in all disciplines; in fact, in Norway quotas are in place to ensure equal distribution across the arts.

9.2.3. Stakeholder Acceptance

Guaranteed minimum income was clearly the most popular proposal among the artists surveyed. Nearly half (46%) selected it as their first-choice policy—that’s nearly three times as many as selected the next most popular choice. However, this finding does not necessarily indicate a preference for this model of guaranteed income in particular, since participants were not asked to rank the Basic Income or Artist Income Supplement. Rather, it demonstrates their enthusiasm for a monthly minimum salary in general.

9.2.4. Ease of Implementation

The Guaranteed Minimum Income is moderately complex in its administrative structure. The BC Arts Council would assume responsibility for its disbursement, like any other
granting program. However, the necessity for detailed reporting and careful accounting to calculate deductions from the awarded benefit add a complicating layer.

**9.2.5. Budgetary Cost**

In its current form, this policy alternative carries a cost to government of approximately $16 million. When compared to the other options, this is considered to be moderate.

**9.2.6. Summary**

The Guaranteed Minimum Income, as it has been administered in Norway, is highly effective at increasing incomes...for those artists who are lucky enough to get it. The program performs better than any other when it comes to the size of the option, its ability to promote artistic excellence, and popularity among artists. However, its extremely competitive selection process, which tends to favour higher-income and established applicants, is a disadvantage.

*Table 4: Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholder Acceptance</th>
<th>Administrative Complexity</th>
<th>Cost to Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td># artists affected</td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>Promotes stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9.3. Option 3: Basic Income for Artists**

**9.3.1. Effectiveness**

A contrasting model of guaranteed minimum income, Basic Income for Artists, proves more effective in achieving the primary objective of this study: raising the median income of BC artists. Qualifying artists would receive an annual benefit of $15,000, paid in monthly installments, which is considered moderate in this analysis. Proponents of Basic Income models usually press for a level of benefit that is enough to live on, since if the grant is less than a living wage, it does not actually provide the worker with options, and may even be seen as mandating poverty. However, because of the unique vocational
nature of artistic work, I believe that a more modest benefit is appropriate, and likely to be effective, in this context.

The Basic Income would support a total of 1000 BC artists at a time. Approximately a third of the awards (333) would become available each year, which is interpreted as moderate in this analysis.

The Basic Income model of GMI performs better than its Norwegian counterpart on the criteria of promoting economic equity. Unlike other BC Arts Council programs, artists would have to report low to moderate average earnings over the previous three years in order to compete for the award. The figure of $50,000 as an income cutoff was selected based on a 2017 report that found that Vancouver residents earning less than that amount spend over 30% on rent. The cutoff is intended to be as inclusive as possible while eliminating artists that hold well-compensated university or orchestra positions or have achieved unusual market success.

**9.3.2. Development**

The Basic Income stands out for its potential to contribute to a vibrant and flourishing arts community. Having demonstrated basic financial eligibility, artists would be evaluated by a jury of peers based on the artistic quality and impact of their previous body of work. The combination of economic and competitive selection criteria earns this policy alternative a moderate score in the category of promoting artistic excellence.

The Basic Income model rates highly in the category of providing stability to professional artists. Artists would have three years of steady and reliable support, and would be allowed to reapply at the end of that time. Without the need to propose a particular project, artists would be able to devote time to research and development, to undertake large-scale or longer-term work, and to focus on creation without having constantly to reapply for project grants.

Care would be taken to ensure that the Basic Income GMI supported a broad range of artists. A percentage of awards would be reserved for emerging and senior artists, accounting for the high score in terms of supporting the full artistic career arc.
9.3.3. Stakeholder Acceptance

This option was not specifically presented to survey respondents. Still, extrapolating from their enthusiastic reception of the other GMI model, stakeholder acceptance is expected to be high.

9.3.4. Ease of Implementation

The Basic Income GMI is one of the highest scoring options from the point of view of implementation. The BC Arts Council would simply need to add a new funding stream to its existing list of programs. Because no income would be deducted from the benefit, grant reporting would remain simple.

9.3.5. Budgetary Cost

This option is estimated to cost approximately $15 million per year in addition to administrative costs, earning it a moderate score in the area of affordability.

9.3.6. Summary

The Basic Income is an effective plan that excels at fostering a healthy arts sector. With its dual eligibility criteria of financial need and artistic excellence, this policy option is a solid plan to provide stable support to a variety of artists working in a plurality of styles.

Table 5: Basic Income for Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholder Acceptance</th>
<th>Administrative Complexity</th>
<th>Cost to Government</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td># artists affected</td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>Supports career arc</td>
<td>Accepted by artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Basic Income for Artists</td>
<td>Mod (7)</td>
<td>Mod (7)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Mod (7)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Basic Income for Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholder Acceptance</th>
<th>Administrative Complexity</th>
<th>Cost to Government</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td># artists affected</td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>Supports career arc</td>
<td>Accepted by artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Basic Income for Artists</td>
<td>Mod (7)</td>
<td>Mod (7)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Mod (7)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4. Option 4: Artist Income Supplement

9.4.1. Effectiveness

The Artist Income Supplement is the most effective of the four policy options I considered in terms of the primary objective: improving the economic outlook of BC artists. The policy is based on the Dutch WWIK program, which provides artists with 70% of the welfare payment without imposing any work restrictions. Since BC social assistance payments are so low that 70% would be nonsensical, I propose the equivalent of the Dutch payment: about $900/month, or $10,800 per year. Although this figure is lower than the benefit provided by the previous two options, it still represents a significant boost to the budget of BC artists.

Furthermore, this policy would support more individuals than any other. In order to qualify, artists would have to earn an income of less than $22,600; in other words, they would have to be living under the low-income cutoff for a person living in a community of 500,000 or more people. Since the median income for artists in BC is below that bar, at least half of the province’s 24,800 artists would be eligible. However, because the scheme would only be available to applicants for 3 years out of every ten, it is estimated that only 30% of that number, or 3720, would take advantage of the program at any one time.

Finally, the policy would be the best choice to foster economic equity among artists, since it would focus on improving the conditions of lower earners. In addition, the traditional grants system is often accused of disadvantaging lower income artists, since it tends to reward excellent skills in writing and argumentation in addition to artistic achievement (Iwaasa). The much more straightforward application process for the Artist Income Supplement would serve to correct that imbalance to some extent.

9.4.2. Development

The Artist Income Supplement also performs relatively well in terms of encouraging a healthy, stable and innovative arts sector. This option would vastly improve the financial security of BC artists. Although the program is only available for three consecutive years
in every ten-year period, it has the advantage of choice. Without having to rely on an unpredictable jury for a decision, artists can strategically select when to apply.

For the same reason, this policy is particularly effective in supporting artists at all career stages. Recent graduates might use the benefit to provide a buffer while establishing an emerging career. Aging artists might rely on it as their mid-career market success begins to fade. It could also allow artists to transition and develop new practices; for example, retired dancers reinventing themselves as choreographers.

However, the Artist Income Supplement is less well suited to the task of promoting artistic excellence. Unlike the other three proposed schemes, this policy is not competitive. Although artists would have to prove training in their field and some presentation experience, there would be no subjective assessment of the quality of their work. As a result, a potential criticism of the policy is that it would support “bad” artists. On the other hand, this policy would support a wide range of artists and styles, perhaps allowing talent to emerge that would not thrive under the jury system.

9.4.3. Stakeholder Acceptance

Like the Basic Income, the Artist Income Supplement was not tested with survey respondents. Qualitative survey data indicates a mixed response. Some respondents were concerned that the policy would engender mediocre art or raise public ire. On the other hand, some artists seemed to prefer this more objective selection process, pointing out that peer juries can encourage “cronyism.”

The policy earns a high score in this category, however, because several of the artists I interviewed expressed a preference for it over all other options. Rachel Iwaasa backed the plan: “if I were making policy, I would base it on the policy that the Dutch government used to have before they ripped their arts support structure to hell…. you still had to work, you had to do something, but it took the edge off.” Guitarist Jeff Younger also felt this was the best option, underlining that the policy is aimed more at supporting the artistic workforce than at producing great art:

“I’m thinking development and support of the individual artist. So if you’re a committed artist and you’re actually doing what you say you’re doing and you’re sacrificing for it and you need support then that’s it. I’m making that judgement based on the fact that there’s other funding available for projects
that involve merit. And this is more like, let’s make your life a little easier so you can make more stuff.”

Pianist Alejandro agreed, saying, “helping impoverished people is a priority over helping the arts—we have to do both.”

9.4.4. Ease of Implementation

At first glance, the Artist Income Supplement, distributed based not on subjective determinations but on objective criteria, appears relatively simple to implement and operate. In reality, however, setting and interpreting the criteria would be extremely complex. To qualify, artists would have to demonstrate financial need, basic training, and some level of artistic productivity. The first category would be easy to satisfy; the second and third, less so. As Alejandro Ochoa phrased it, “it would have to be the mission of the arts council to find ways to measure achievement in less mainstream forms of arts.” It is likely that a committee of artists would still be needed to make subjective judgements about eligibility.

9.4.5. Budgetary Cost

At an estimated annual cost of $40.2 million in addition to administrative expenses, this policy carries the highest budgetary cost of the schemes considered.

9.4.6. Summary

The Artist Income Supplement is the most effective of the policies studied at raising the median income of artists, promoting stability within the sector, and supporting artists of all walks of life throughout the span of their careers. It also receives the recommendation of some leaders within the arts community. However, its high budgetary cost—nearly twice the current budget of the BC Arts Council—and relatively complex administration seem fatally at odds with the BC government’s current attitude towards the arts.
### Table 6: Artist Income Supplement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholder Acceptance</th>
<th>Administrative Complexity</th>
<th>Cost to Government</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td># artists affected</td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>Promotes stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Artist Income Supplement</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 10. Recommendation: Basic Income for Artists

When all nine criteria are considered, the policy that performs the most consistently is the Basic Income for Artists (Table 7). Although my analysis shows it would be slightly less effective than the Artist Income Supplement at raising the median income of BC artists, its relatively modest budgetary cost and ease of implementation warrant its recommendation. Moreover, the Basic Income shines when it comes to cultivating a stable, sustainable, equitable, and accomplished arts community in British Columbia.

Table 7: Summary of Options and Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholder Acceptance</th>
<th>Administrative Complexity</th>
<th>Cost to Government</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of benefit</td>
<td># artists affected</td>
<td>Promotes economic equity</td>
<td>Promotes artistic excellence</td>
<td>Promotes stability</td>
<td>Supports career arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Expand Project Grants</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Guaranteed Minimum Income for Artists</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Basic Income for Artists</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Artist Income Supplement</td>
<td>Mod (2)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.1.1. Artists Speak: The Impact of a Basic Income

A basic income would have enormous repercussions on artists and artistry in British Columbia. Although they were not asked to differentiate between the three specific minimum income proposals compared in this report, survey respondents commented on the impact a reliable monthly income would have on their lives and work.

One criticism that is often levied at the Basic Income is that it disincentivizes work. Although it is impossible to accurately predict the policy’s impact, my research suggests that a basic income would, rather, facilitate work in the arts sector. When asked what they would do if they received a guaranteed income, the vast majority of respondents
(83%) said that they would focus on art work. They would do more work, better work, more interesting work, riskier work. It was noted that longer-term work would become possible. Several said they would quit or dial back their day job to be able to spend more time and energy on art practice. Only 1% of respondents said they would stop working or work less.

*Figure 14: What would you do if you received a guaranteed minimum income?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work at art practice</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve stability/wellbeing</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop practice/innovate</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/engage community</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire space/supplies</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A handful of survey participants (6%) said that a basic income would allow them to obtain the space and supplies necessary for their artistic work. A couple said they would be able to afford childcare to free working time.

Respondents underlined the dichotomy between artistic work that pays and artistic work that is interesting, innovative, and important. About a fifth (19%) said the basic income would allow them to take on more innovative work, and to experiment and develop as artists. One respondent said “I would be able to develop more serious work rather than generate more commercially acceptable small pieces which pander to generic tastes. Another agreed: “I would spend less time producing “product” which fits current models and needs. I would spend more time exploring and finding yet undiscovered needs to be addressed.”

Almost a quarter of respondents (23%) felt that a guaranteed minimum income would improve their general wellbeing. Many mentioned that the sense of stability would reduce their level of stress and anxiety. Some said that they would be able to afford healthier food. “I would continue working full-time as an artist, but I would sleep better, I would have far less anxiety less doubts and concerns about being an artist and less
struggle with depression. I think that I would be a far healthier and balanced human, and far better able to produce quality, cohesive work.”

A fifth of those surveyed (19%) felt that the basic income would have repercussions even beyond their personal work and wellbeing. They said that they would engage more with the community, volunteering more, offering free concerts, teaching children in need, and speaking about their work. Some said they would provide opportunities for other artists, and get involved with advocacy, production, and planning larger of community-based work.

I asked respondents what they would stop doing if they received the GMI. The answers fell neatly into 4 clear categories. Four in ten (40%) said they would quit their day job or cut back their hours. Another third (36%) said that they would reduce their secondary art-related work, such as teaching and gigging, in order to be able to focus on a more innovative and fulfilling primary practice. Some in this group also said that they would reduce their time performing administrative career tasks such as marketing and grant applications. A number of artists (15%) said they would simply stop worrying. About a quarter (23%) said they wouldn’t stop doing anything.

Figure 15: What would you stop doing if you received a guaranteed minimum income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day job</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts-related job</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrying</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a sense that artists have a duty to create art, and that they are of most use to society when they are engaged as artists. One respondents wrote, “regardless of what the artist does, making art is their obligation and contemporary capitalist society creates a number of barriers to that,” while another said, “it would provide serious artists with that invaluable resource of time, so they could fully serve their purpose in our culture.”
10.1.2. The Price of Creativity

The total estimated cost of this recommendation is $15 million, which, when added to the $3.25 million currently granted to individual artists, represents a hefty 76% of the BCAC’s current budget. However, the cost is not outrageous. The Alliance for Arts and Culture has been lobbying the BC government for a doubling of funding to the BC Arts Council, a move that has been supported by the Bipartisan Finance Committee for the past three years and that would increase its granting budget from $24 million to $48 million. Should the government change following the upcoming provincial election, this funding increase is likely; and in that context a more radical expenditure on individual artists seems more plausible.
Chapter 11. Epilogue: A BC Arts Council Serving Artists

The establishment of a Basic Income would have a profound positive effect on BC’s artistic workforce. However, it is not the only way that the BC Arts Council can better serve its constituents. My research shines a spotlight on an opportunity to improve the relationship between artists and the BCAC, which I believe would serve to galvanize the arts community.

Although they acknowledged the important impact of public funding on their practice and development, the artists surveyed for this report displayed a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards the BC Arts Council. Less than a third of respondents (30%) had ever applied for a grant from the BCAC as an individual. Seven in ten (70%) said they had never applied. This disconnect is exacerbated for artists from outside BC’s big urban areas: nearly half (48%) of city dwellers said they had applied, compared to just 18% of rural artists.

Figure 16: Have you ever applied for a grant from the BCAC as an individual artist?

11.1. Recommendation: BC Arts Council Review

In addition to the establishment of a Basic Income funding stream, I recommend a comprehensive review of BC Arts Council programs, with a view to engaging the individual artist. When asked, unprompted, how the BC Arts Council could better support individuals, artists gave answers that tended to fall into four main themes: increase funding, increase accessibility, increase the openness and flexibility of programs and eligibility criteria, and narrow the targeting of funding streams. My proposed
reconstruction would entail changes in these four key areas, with specific recommendations listed below.

*Figure 17: In your opinion, how could the BC Arts Council better support individual artists?*

| Increased openness, flexibility | 39% |
| Increase Funding               | 36% |
| Increase information, accessibility | 33% |
| Narrow targeting and diversity  | 24% |

### 11.1.1. Increase Funding

When I asked how the BC Arts Council could better support individual artists, the most common response, mentioned by 36% of respondents, was a need for increased funding, both to the Council in general, and to individual artists in particular. Of course, the BCAC cannot fund itself. My interviews suggested an openness and willingness on the part of the Council to improve and expand its services given the required resources. It is essential that the BC government increase BCAC funding in order to engender thriving arts and artists.

### 11.1.2. Increase Accessibility

A third of respondents (33%) highlighted the need for better accessibility to BCAC programs. The majority of this group mentioned the need for more information about BCAC programs and application procedures. Some respondents voiced a need for support with grant applications, requesting application workshops and more personal contact with program officers. Others focused on the need to simplify the application process so that artistic merit is rewarded rather than grantsmanship.
Lack of information emerged as a significant barrier to application for public support. Of those respondents who said had never applied for individual BCAC funding, fully a quarter of respondents (25%) said they had not submitted an application because they were not aware the funding was available. Other artists knew about the funding, but self-censored—approximately equal groups said they didn’t believe their application would be competitive (23%), and that they didn’t believe the BCAC would fund “artists like me” (22%). A small group of respondents (8%) was deterred from applying because the process was too complicated. The remaining fifth (22%) who selected “Other” elaborated their own reasons for not applying. These included a lack of information about BCAC programs and a perceived lack of staff support, and a sense that engaging in the unpredictable grants process is not a favourable time investment. A few artists responded that they had not been eligible, that they did not need grant support, or that they were philosophically opposed to the public granting system.

When asked directly, nearly half of respondents (49%) agreed that the application process for BCAC grants is too complicated. That’s more than twice the number who disagreed (19%). About a third (32%) neither agreed nor disagreed.
I was astonished to find that, unlike other provincial arts councils, the BCAC does not possess a Facebook or Twitter account (ED Gillian Wood admitted that the Council has, “some challenges with communication”). Posting grant information on social media, updating the Council website, and enabling online applications are cheap and easy actions that the BCAC could take not only to better inform the arts community about the supports available, but also to foster a more open, welcoming, and collaborative institutional character.

11.1.3. Increase Flexibility

Another key area for improvement, discussed by four respondents in ten (39%), was a need for increased openness and flexibility in terms of eligibility, guidelines, and the type of project supported. Participants stated the need for a plurality of styles, saying that the Council should support and encourage both innovative, avant-garde, and “out there” art, and more conservative modes of expression. Respondents also expressed a need for openness in grant timelines.

There is also a slight sense of disconnect between the goals of individual artists and the explicit or implicit priorities of BCAC programs. Only a quarter (25%) of the artists surveyed agreed with the statement “BC Arts Council programs are well aligned with my artistic projects and goals.” Four in ten (39%) disagreed (12% strongly), while another 36% neither agreed nor disagreed. At the same time, 43% of respondents agreed that
“grant application criteria influence my decisions about what projects to undertake.” Less than a third of respondents (31%) disagreed with the statement, although almost a quarter (23%) disagreed strongly.

Figure 20: BCAC programs are well aligned with my projects and goals

11.1.4. Narrow Targeting

While respondents expressed the desire for more flexibility in grant programs, they also revealed a need for grant streams targeted at specific groups. About a quarter of respondents (24%) requested more targeted funding so that applicants compete on the same playing field. Clearly necessary is the separating grant streams for individuals and organizations. Some respondents suggested dedicated streams for emerging, established, and senior artists. A few respondents mentioned a need for specific streams to fund touring and music composition.

There is a perception that BCAC grants for individuals are very competitive. A solid majority of artists (60%) agreed that it is very difficult to get a BCAC grant as an individual artist, including nearly a third (32%) who strongly agreed. Another quarter (25%) were neutral on the question, while just 15% disagreed.
BCAC data indicates that this perception is not misplaced, and part of the reason is that individuals and organizations compete for the same grants. The 2015/16 Annual Report announces that 1455 grants were awarded out of 2902 applications, a success rate of 50%. However, according to Executive Director Gillian Wood, acceptance rates for project grants—those open to individuals—are more like 1 in 4. Anecdotal evidence would suggest that even within those funding streams, individuals are less likely than organizations to be successful. According to Rachel Iwaasa, “my sense when I was on juries was that the bar was much higher for individuals. Because what an organization has the capacity to do and what an artist has the capacity to do are two completely different things. It makes [applying] as individual artists really difficult.” Wood was unable to provide data on this point, but she did note that “in recent years in the project programs that are open to both individuals and not-for-profits and collectives, there’s a significant increase in individuals who are applying.”

Participants also recognized the necessity for the BCAC to ensure that funding is available to a diverse community of artists. Other provincial arts councils are well ahead on this score. The Ontario Arts Council, for example, recently drafted an Equity Plan, setting diversity targets for Council, staff, and juries, and establishing grant streams for artists of colour, LGBTQ artists, deaf and disability artists, Francophones, and those living outside of major urban centres (2013). In comparison, although the BC Arts Council does have grants specifically targeted to Indigenous artists, there are no currently no incentives for other underserved groups.
11.1.5. Recommendations to the BC Arts Council

The findings point to a series of specific recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the BC Arts Council:

- Double the budget of the BC Arts Council from $24 million to $48 million
- Modernize website and establish social media accounts
- Offer information sessions and webinars on grant programs and application procedures
- Create an online application system
- Separate funding streams open to individual artists and arts organizations
- Complete Equity Plan
- Commit to diversity targets on Council, staff, and juries
Chapter 12. Conclusion: Artists Can Lead the Way

Artists are unusual in their vocational approach to work. With the rise of the sharing economy and the inexorable forward march of automation, though, artists are increasingly becoming emblematic of a general shift towards precarious work. On October 22, 2016, Finance Minister Bill Morneau announced that Canadian workers should get used to the idea of “job churn”—short-term contract work with quick turnover—“because it’s going to happen. We have to accept that” (Canadian Press). Gollmitzer and Murray describe the working conditions that typify the artistic labour force as a “seismograph that predicts larger disruptions, opportunities and developments in the world of work and in society as a whole” (Gollmitzer and Murray 2008).

It was often remarked, by interviewees and survey respondents alike, that a basic income is a policy worthy of serious consideration—and not only for artists. BC MLA Spencer Chandra Herbert underlined that “we do have to find ways to better support artists, but also just better support each other. Because I think one of the risks artists face in seeking things like the guaranteed minimum income…is that there are many other people in our world that need them in order for society to function, also making poverty wages. And not able to survive.”

Although the Basic Income is a hot topic in jurisdictions the world over, it has yet to gain much momentum in British Columbia. Chandra Herbert stated that, while he thought the idea was “worthy of debate,” he hadn’t heard much discussion of the possibility in this province: “It’s starting to happen federally, but I can’t think of too many organizations that have pushed the idea at all here in BC. Really, I can’t think of any off the top of my head.” Gillian Wood agreed that a GMI conversation has not yet reached prominence in BC:

I haven’t heard a conversation about a minimum income for anybody. I know these are really current in other parts of the world, but it hasn’t really emerged in British Columbia as an option. So unless there’s a real push from the general public to really move to that kind of model I wouldn’t really see it happening in the area of arts funding.

After a pause, Wood continued: “well, the other thing is, sometimes artists can lead the way.” I hope that this paper leads the way to a broader discussion about a basic income, first for artists, and eventually for every resident of British Columbia.
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Appendix A. Survey Questionnaire

The Price of Creativity: Policy and the Professional Artist in British Columbia

Principal Investigator: Dory Hayley, School of Public Policy, Simon Fraser University

Faculty Supervisor: Maureen Maloney, @sfu.ca, 778-xxxx

Are you a resident of British Columbia?

- Yes
- No

Condition: No Is Selected. Skip To: End of Survey.

Do you self-identify as an artist?

- Yes
- No

Condition: No Is Selected. Skip To: End of Survey.

What is your primary artistic discipline?

- Creative writing (1)
- Dance (2)
- Film (3)
- Media Arts (4)
- Music (5)
- Theatre (6)
- Visual arts (7)
- Multi-disciplinary practice (8)
- Other (please specify) (9) ________________

More specifically, how would you describe your artistic practice?
At what stage of your artistic career do you consider yourself?

- Student (1)
- Emerging artist (2)
- Mid-career artist (3)
- Established artist (4)
- Senior or retired artist (5)

In an average week, how many hours do you spend on your artistic practice?

Which of the following activities make up your working life? (Select all that apply)

- Artistic practice (1)
- Teaching in your area of artistic practice (2)
- Arts administration (3)
- Other arts-related work (4)
- Non-arts-related work (5)
- Arts-related studies (6)
- Non-arts-related studies (7)
- Volunteer work (8)
- Other unpaid work (eg. care of children, parents, etc.) (9)
- Other (please specify) (10) _______________________

In an average year, about what percentage of your income do you earn from each activity or source?

- Artistic practice (including artist fees, royalties, grants, etc.) (1)
- Teaching in your area of artistic practice (2)
- Arts administration (3)
- Other arts-related job (4)
- Non-arts-related job (5)
- Employment insurance, disability benefit, or other government subsidy (7)
- Other (6)
On average, about **what percentage of your working time do you** spend on each activity?

- Artistic practice (1)
- Teaching in your area of artistic practice (2)
- Arts administration (3)
- Other arts-related work (4)
- Non-arts-related work (5)
- Arts-related studies (6)
- Non-arts-related studies (7)
- Volunteer work (8)
- Other unpaid work (eg. care of children, parents, etc.) (9)
- Other (please specify) (10)

**Ideally**, about what percentage of your working time **would you like to spend** on each activity?

- Artistic practice (1)
- Teaching in your area of artistic practice (2)
- Arts administration (3)
- Other arts-related work (4)
- Non-arts-related work (5)
- Arts-related studies (6)
- Non-arts-related studies (7)
- Volunteer work (8)
- Other unpaid work (eg. care of children, parents, etc.) (9)
- Other (please specify) (10)

Q56 What challenges prevent you from dividing your time as you would ideally prefer?
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (5)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am fairly compensated for my artistic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my life as an artist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel my work is valued and recognized in my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an individual artist, from which of the following public sources have you received funding? (please check all that apply)

- Canada Council for the Arts (1)
- BC Arts Council (2)
- Municipal or regional arts council (3)
- First Peoples' Cultural Council (4)
- Other (please specify) (5) ____________________
- I have not received a grant from a public source (6)

What impact did that funding have on your career or artistic practice?

Have you ever applied for a grant from the BC Arts Council as an individual artist?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Condition: No Is Selected. Skip To: Why not? (please select the main reason). Condition: Yes Is Selected. Skip To: Please indicate the extent to which you...
Why not? (please select the main reason)

- The application process was too complicated (1)
- I didn’t believe my application would be competitive (2)
- The BC Arts Council doesn’t fund artists like me (3)
- I didn’t know the funding was available (4)
- Other (please specify) (5) __________________

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application process for BC Arts Council grants is too complicated. (1)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BC Arts Council supports artists with diverse ethnicities, sexual orientation, and abilities. (2)</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Arts Council programs are well aligned with my artistic projects and goals. (3)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very difficult to get a BC Arts Council grant as an individual artist. (4)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant application criteria influence my decisions about what projects to undertake. (6)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The duration of BC Arts Council grants do not allow me to undertake long-term projects. (5)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, how could the BC Arts Council better support individual artists in BC?
Now let's talk policy.

In Ireland, creative artists can apply for an income tax exemption on income earned from the sale of original works of art (for example, paintings, musical compositions, sculptures, paintings, novels), up to a maximum value of €50,000.

To what extent would you support or oppose a policy in BC that would waive income tax on original art works?

- Strongly support (1)
- Somewhat support (2)
- Neither support nor oppose (3)
- Somewhat oppose (4)
- Strongly oppose (5)

Why would you support or oppose this policy?

Income averaging is a tax mechanism designed to benefit workers whose income fluctuates substantially from year to year—a category that includes many artists. Because of progressive tax rates, an artist who earns a small amount in one year and a large amount the next year may pay more in taxes than an artist who earns the same 2-year total but with even amounts in each year. Income averaging is available to artists in Australia and many European countries, as well as in Quebec.

To what extent would you support or oppose a policy in BC that would introduce income averaging for artists?

- Strongly support (1)
- Somewhat support (2)
- Neither support nor oppose (3)
- Somewhat oppose (4)
- Strongly oppose (5)

Why would you support or oppose this policy?
In recent years, companies as diverse as Facebook, Planet Labs, and Adobe have developed corporate artist-in-residence programs. Artists are provided with work space, supplies, and a stipend, and are generally free to choose what they work on. In return, companies report gains in innovation, creative thinking, and a more pleasant work environment.

To what extent would you support or oppose a policy that would offer tax incentives to BC businesses that establish artist-in-residence programs?

- Strongly support (1)
- Somewhat support (2)
- Neither support nor oppose (3)
- Somewhat oppose (4)
- Strongly oppose (5)

Why would you support or oppose this policy?

In Norway, artists can apply for a grant that provides a Guaranteed Minimum Income for a period 10 years or more. Successful artists receive an annual payment equivalent to about $37,500, minus a percentage of the artist's earned income.

To what extent would you support or oppose a policy in BC that would provide BC artists with a Guaranteed Minimum Income?

- Strongly support (1)
- Somewhat support (2)
- Neither support nor oppose (3)
- Somewhat oppose (4)
- Strongly oppose (5)

Why would you support or oppose this policy?
What would you do if you were assured a Guaranteed Minimum Income? Please be as specific as you like.

Is there anything that you currently do that you would stop doing if you were assured a Guaranteed Minimum Income?

Please rank the policies in order of preference. (Please drag the options into your preferred order, with 1 being most preferred and 5 least preferred.)

- Income tax exemption for original works of art
- Income averaging for artists
- Guaranteed Minimum Income for artists
- Increase the accessibility, flexibility, and diversity of BC Arts Council grants programs
- Increase funding to the BC Arts Council
- Tax incentives for corporate artist-in-residence programs

In your opinion, should the BC government support the arts?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you wish.

In your opinion, should the BC government support individual artists?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you wish.
Finally, we have a few demographic questions for you.

What is your age?
- 0-24 (1)
- 25-44 (2)
- 45-64 (3)
- 65-79 (4)
- 80+ (5)

What is your gender?
- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Other (please specify) (3) ____________________

Do you identify as LGBTQ?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Prefer not to say (3)

Are you a person with a disability?
- Yes (1)
- No (3)
- Prefer not to say (4)

Are you a First Nations, Inuit, or Métis person?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Prefer not to say (3)

Are you a member of a visual minority?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Prefer not to say (3)
In an average year, what is your individual before-tax income?

- $0-$19,999 (1)
- $20,000-$29,999 (2)
- $30,000-$44,999 (3)
- $45,000-$89,999 (4)
- $90,000-$149,999 (5)
- $150,000+ (6)

How would you describe your community of residence?

- Urban (1)
- Suburban (2)
- Rural (3)

Which of the following have made up your artistic training? (Please check all that apply)

- Private studies (1)
- Apprenticeship (2)
- Diploma or certificate (3)
- Undergraduate degree (4)
- Graduate degree (5)
- Other (please specify) (6) ____________________