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Executive Summary

Objectives

This study explores the current situation for Canadian public galleries and art museums with regard to touring contemporary art exhibitions, domestically and internationally. Conducted on behalf of the Canada Council for the Arts, the research sought to answer the following questions, identify trends and investigate the importance of circulating contemporary exhibitions to galleries and their publics:

- What funding programs currently support the touring of contemporary exhibitions?
- What funding programs were available over the last 10 years for this activity?
- What has been the impact of recent cuts to federal government programs?
- What are the trends in touring strategies?
- Have new touring strategies emerged in recent years?
- What are the trends in funding and fundraising for touring?
- Are there gaps in touring activity, and in funding for this activity? If so, what are they and what is their effect?

Approach and Methodology

This study was carried out between April 2012 and March 2013 by Mela Constantinidi, an independent consultant who pursued several lines of inquiry to address the study’s objectives. The consultant

- conducted a review of Canada Council application files, which concentrated on galleries that received support through the Visual Arts Section’s program of Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries;
- developed and sent an online survey to the successful applicants from that program’s 2010–2013 competition;
- examined documents relating to federal and provincial programs of support, past and present, to determine how such programs have assisted or continue to assist public galleries and art museums to tour contemporary exhibitions within Canada and abroad;
- conducted 25 interviews with senior museum professionals;
> attended and gathered information at the 2012 annual meetings of three professional organizations from the museum milieu; and

> consulted with professionals from federal and provincial government departments and agencies, arts service organizations and public galleries who provided important information that contributed to the study.

The research primarily focuses on institutions that received grants through the Canada Council’s Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program in 2010–13. While the study describes a number of federal and provincial programs that directly or indirectly assist museums to tour contemporary exhibitions in Canada and abroad, it is not intended to represent an exhaustive list of programs that support travelling exhibitions.

**Report Structure**

Following a brief introductory chapter, the report’s main components are structured as follows:

> **Chapter 2, “Programs of Assistance Past and Present: A Scan,”** examines relevant funding support, including programs currently or previously offered by the Canada Council for the Arts; federal government departments and agencies, such as Canadian Heritage (PCH) and the former Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT); and provincial arts councils, funders and other organizations.

> **Chapter 3, “Touring Exhibitions of Contemporary Art,”** looks at the findings gathered through the interview process, online survey and stakeholder meetings.

> **Chapter 4, “Trends in Touring Strategy,”** discusses touring as an extension of the museum’s public engagement role, in that reaching audiences is an essential institutional objective. It looks at different models used in circulating contemporary art exhibitions, how trends have evolved over time, and provides examples of successful touring initiatives.

> **Chapter 5, “Key Findings and Observations,”** summarizes the main research findings, drawing upon the consultant’s analysis and interpretation of all the data collected for this study through the various lines of inquiry.
**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

*The Interest in Touring Contemporary Art Exhibitions*

The data collected for this study indicates there is a high level of interest, among public galleries and art museums, in touring contemporary exhibitions within Canada and internationally. For example, 73% of survey respondents indicated that their institution tours contemporary art exhibitions nationally as part of its regular activities. Furthermore, 95% of survey respondents consider it “very important or quite important to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour nationally,” while 91% deem it equally important to “tour internationally.”

Despite the value placed on touring contemporary exhibitions, the data also suggests that the organization or borrowing of touring exhibitions takes place on an uneven basis. This may, to some extent, reflect the uncertainty that galleries experience in projecting budgets. With a degree of unpredictability about the overall level of private and public-sector revenues, and the lack of targeted project funding available for touring, the organization of exhibitions to circulate tends to happen irregularly.

*Current Funding Programs*

At the federal level, there are no funding programs specifically targeted to support the touring of contemporary exhibitions nationally or internationally. Canadian Heritage’s Access to Heritage component of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) continues to support touring exhibitions of retrospectives by senior artists and exhibitions that are deemed historical. However, the introduction of stricter eligibility criteria in 2011 means the program now excludes most contemporary projects.

The Canada Council’s program of Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries contributes to institutions’ operations and programming, and is flexible in that it allows funds to be expended for travelling exhibits. Nevertheless, with so many competing priorities to satisfy, galleries feel little incentive to use this crucial source for contemporary touring support.

Provincial programs for regional, national and international touring vary from province to province, and some programs assist individual artists as well as organizations. Both Alberta and Saskatchewan are involved in directing specific programs to tour smaller exhibitions to less populous regions within their provinces, while the Ontario Arts Council has programs available to help fund touring performances, exhibitions and arts events provincially. The availability of provincial support, however, is unequal across the country.
The Impact of Program Changes and Cancellations

A number of federal programs that formerly encouraged and assisted the touring of contemporary exhibitions have been eliminated in the past five years. The March 2008 closure of the Arts Promotion Program (PromArt), which was delivered by DFAIT, means that no federal program exists to help defray costs associated with touring Canadian exhibitions abroad. Trade Routes, a PCH initiative intended primarily for the commercial sector, was similarly phased out over 2009–10. Although not used extensively by the museum community, both programs offered crucial support to the visual arts sector in leveraging additional funds and encouraging collaborations with international partners.

Of all the federal program cuts affecting the museum milieu, none was felt more acutely than the 2008 cancellation of Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS). Under the aegis of PCH through the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI), it supported museums and galleries by providing expert transportation services specialized in handling artworks and artifacts. Approximately 92% of respondents surveyed for this study had used its services to ship exhibitions prior to its closure. ETS was particularly important to smaller institutions and museums located off the main transportation corridors. The cancellation is so strongly felt in Atlantic Canada that the Atlantic Provinces Art Gallery Association (APAGA) has commissioned a study to examine the question of the transportation of art exhibits in the Atlantic region.

Trends and Strategies in Touring Contemporary Exhibitions

Survey findings indicate that the ability of institutions to tour contemporary exhibitions has been adversely impacted by the recent changes and closures of federal government programs on both the national and international front. However, galleries are developing alternative strategies by increasingly looking to co-productions and collaborations as a way to ensure that selected exhibitions are seen in multiple venues.

Indeed, a major theme running throughout interviews and discussions with museum professionals was that partnerships and collaborations are the most interesting way to engage in future touring initiatives. Co-productions and partnership strategies are increasingly employed by museums as the preferred way to extend the reach of a given exhibition. In this way, not only can expenses, workload and professional expertise be shared, but by pooling resources, galleries are able to undertake more ambitious projects.

Benefits and Challenges of Touring

The majority of professionals interviewed for this study were positive about the benefits of touring contemporary art exhibitions, while expressing caveats. Identified advantages to organizing and borrowing touring contemporary art exhibitions include: giving greater access to more people;
promoting local artists within other regions; advancing scholarship; presenting diverse perspectives to a greater number of people; developing curatorial and institutional relationships; and fostering contemporary art practices. The main challenge centres around the lack of adequate financial and human resources.

Touring exhibitions are seen as having a positive impact on the visual arts sector, and on the ability of public galleries to service the public, for a number of reasons: they enrich public programs by offering a range of viewpoints to engage audiences; provide the public with opportunities to access work by different artists; disseminate knowledge and contribute to education, and contribute to “nation building” given that Canada is a country of regions.

**Trends in Funding and Fundraising**

In discussing funding and fundraising for touring, there is a gap between galleries that support the premise for touring exhibitions and those that actually organize exhibits to circulate, and the principal perceived reasons for not touring exhibitions is the lack of resources. While most galleries are adept at obtaining funding and sponsorships from a variety of sources, they have competing priorities within their operating budgets. Organizing a touring exhibit is a major venture in human and financial resources, and brings with it an element of risk. Without targeted support from the federal level, national contemporary touring exhibitions will continue to take place only on an occasional basis, and international touring exhibitions of contemporary Canadian art will happen very infrequently. The findings demonstrate that the investment of a moderate level of additional funding specifically for touring exhibitions would yield a significant return for museums and their publics.
### List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AARCA</td>
<td>Association of Artist-Run Centres from the Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA</td>
<td>Alberta Foundation for the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>Art Gallery of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAGA</td>
<td>Atlantic Provinces Art Gallery Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADAC</td>
<td>Canadian Arts Data / Données sur les arts au Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALQ</td>
<td>Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMDO</td>
<td>Canadian Art Museum Directors Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Canadian Conservation Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Centre for Exhibition Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN</td>
<td>Canadian Heritage Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>Canadian Museums Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGHB</td>
<td>Heritage Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAIT</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Exhibition Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Exhibition Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI</td>
<td>Independent Curators International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Museums Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Ministère de la Culture et des Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>Ministère des Relations internationales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC</td>
<td>National Gallery of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSAC</td>
<td>Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH</td>
<td>Canadian Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PromArt</td>
<td>Arts Promotion Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREX</td>
<td>Travelling Exhibition Program, Alberta Foundation for the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMC</td>
<td>Virtual Museum of Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 This Department is now called Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (DFATD). However, DFAIT continues to be used in this study as that was the name of the Department during the time in which the programs discussed here were in place.
**GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed exhibition</td>
<td>An exhibition organized by one institution and borrowed by one or more other galleries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulating exhibition</td>
<td>A term used in the visual arts milieu to describe touring an exhibition. Often the exhibition is originated by one institution and offered to other institutions for a fee, usually as an organized package. The exhibition may tour to one or more other galleries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-production</td>
<td>A co-production may refer to a co-produced exhibition, publication and/or public programming initiative. Co-productions allow institutions to pool resources, both financial and human. By sharing workload and costs, galleries often undertake more ambitious projects than they would be able to do alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-produced exhibition</td>
<td>An exhibition organized by two or more institutions, usually for the purpose of presenting it at each locale. On occasion, the exhibition may be offered to other galleries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaged exhibition</td>
<td>An exhibition organized by one or more galleries and offered to other galleries for a fee. The fee would likely include a specified number of artworks with instructions regarding installation, labels, information panels, educational materials, and a stipulated number of catalogues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented exhibition</td>
<td>An exhibition that is on view to the public. Exhibitions presented at the originating gallery may or may not be presented elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Objectives**

This study explores the current situation for Canadian public galleries and art museums with regard to touring contemporary art exhibitions, domestically and internationally. To this end, it seeks to answer the following questions:

- What funding programs currently support the touring of contemporary exhibitions?
- What funding programs were available over the last 10 years for this activity?
- What has been the impact of recent cuts to federal government programs?
- What are the trends in touring strategies?
- Have new touring strategies emerged in recent years?
- What are the trends in funding and fundraising for touring?
- Are there gaps in touring activity, and in funding for this activity? If so, what are they and what is their effect?

The purpose of this study is to identify current trends and investigate the relative importance of touring activity for public galleries and art museums and, by extension, the diverse publics that they serve.

1.2 **Approach and Methodology**

This study was carried out between April 2012 and March 2013 by Mela Constantinidi, an independent consultant. In order to address the objectives, the consultant pursued several lines of inquiry, including

- a review of Canada Council application files and documentation;
- an online survey of selected applicants to the Council’s program of Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries;
- a review of documentation relating to other programs of support, federally and provincially;
- interviews with senior staff from public galleries and art museums across Canada;
• information gathering at stakeholder meetings; and
• conversations and consultations with a range of stakeholders at those meetings and at other opportunities.

Application files were reviewed to establish the context for the present study. A decision was made to focus on institutions that have received support through the Canada Council’s Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program, in order to determine the trends of the past decade regarding the use of Council funds for travelling exhibitions.

An online survey was sent to the 76 successful applicants in that program's 2010–2013 competition. The survey's overall completion response rate was 61% (respondents are considered to have completed the survey if all questions are answered). While an additional number of respondents did not fully complete the survey, their responses to questions answered are reflected in the results. (See Annex 2 for a list of institutions awarded grants through the Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program in 2010–2013, and Annex 3 for a copy of the Online Survey).

Documents relating to federal and provincial programs of support, past and present, were examined to determine how such programs have assisted or continue to assist public galleries and art museums to tour contemporary exhibitions within Canada and abroad. These programs include

• the Department of Canadian Heritage's Museums Assistance Program (MAP);
• the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's Arts Promotion Program (PromArt);
• the Canadian Conservation Institute’s Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS);
• the Saskatchewan Arts Board program Culture on the Go: Touring; and
• the Ontario Arts Council's Ontario Touring, and National and International Touring programs.

One-on-one interviews with museum and gallery professionals were conducted by telephone or in person. Twenty-five senior staff participated in the interviews, representing 19 institutions. As well, some 40 professionals from government departments, arts service organizations and public galleries provided essential information. (See Annex 4 for a list of Museum Professionals Interviewed and Annex 5 for a list of Professionals Consulted).

The consultant also gathered information by attending stakeholder meetings where issues pertaining to travelling exhibitions were an important topic of discussion: the Canadian Museums Association (CMA) conference (Gatineau, April 2012); the Canadian Art Museum Directors Organization (CAMDO) annual meeting (Vancouver, May 2012); and the Atlantic Provinces Art Gallery Association (APAGA) annual meeting (Wolfville, Nova Scotia, June 2012). These occasions provided an opportunity for direct interaction and further conversation with individuals from the milieu.
1.3 **Scope**

While the consultant sought opinions from a wide spectrum of knowledgeable professionals, the research primarily focused on institutions that receive grants through the Canada Council's Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program. Although this study additionally outlines other federal and provincial programs that provide assistance to tour contemporary exhibitions, it is not intended to serve as an all-inclusive listing or review of programs that support travelling exhibitions in Canada and abroad.

As well, CADAC data regarding exhibitions is not included in this study because it was believed that comparable information was not specific to the contemporary area. CADAC, the national online database Canadian Arts Data / Données sur les arts au Canada, began collecting statistical data from arts organizations in 2010–11. Its statistical form includes a number of disciplinary-specific questions and is used by organizations across all arts disciplines. However, 2010–11 was the first year that arts organizations were required to complete the statistical form and the information may not be consistent in this transitional year.

2. **Programs of Assistance Past and Present: A Scan**

2.1 **The Canada Council for the Arts: Programs of Assistance**

The Canada Council for the Arts’ mandate is “to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works in, the arts.” It offers a broad range of grants and services to professional Canadian artists and arts organizations in music, theatre, writing and publishing, visual arts, dance, media arts and integrated arts. The Canada Council recognizes art museums and public galleries as institutions that collect, preserve, present and interpret works of art from the past and present. In so doing, these institutions give shape to the meaning and value of works in the visual arts, locating these works within a critical and historical context. The Canada Council regards public galleries and art museums as a fundamental link between artworks and Canadian audiences.
a) An Overview of Council Programs

Mid-1980s to 1998: Exhibition Assistance Program

Prior to 1998, the Canada Council’s principal program of support to public galleries for contemporary visual arts was the Exhibition Assistance Program (EAP). A project-based program, it allowed organizations to apply for funding in four different categories: Curatorial Assistance; Presentation Assistance; Circulation Assistance; and Publication Assistance. Institutions could apply to one or all categories and there was no limit on the number of requests from any applicant.

Like most Council programs, the process was competitive and the average overall rate of success for each juried competition ranged between 26% and 34% in dollar terms, and between 32% and 41% with regard to the number of requests. The introduction of the EAP in the mid-1980s was highly controversial because it eliminated annual grants to 16 of the largest art museums across the country, transferring those funds to the new project-based program. However, many institutions appreciated the program, particularly smaller galleries that had not previously had the opportunity to access Council funds. Grants were awarded on merit, and a new level of curatorial rigour (that continues today) can be traced back to this period. For Canadian galleries seeking Council support, this policy shift sent a strong message that they bore a primary responsibility to present, disseminate and catalogue the work and ideas of professional practising Canadian artists, including Aboriginal artists and those of culturally diverse backgrounds, for the benefit of the public.

1996: Touring Office Program for Visual Arts Organizations

In the mid-1990s, the Canada Council’s Strategic Plan put particular emphasis on touring and dissemination. The Council’s Touring Office already provided support to performing arts organizations and companies in Dance, Theatre and Music to tour nationally and, to some extent, internationally. In 1996, the Touring Office introduced a new program specifically to assist visual arts organizations: the Visual Arts Presentation, Distribution and Audience Development Program. There were two separate components to the newly-minted program. The first, Borrowed Exhibition Assistance, was intended to “assist Canadian non-profit visual arts organizations and curatorial collectives to borrow contemporary art exhibitions that originate elsewhere.” The second, Artists in the Community, “offered matching grants to visual arts groups and organizations to invite professional artists for extended visits in the interest of audience development.” These programs were cancelled after one year in the face of continuing cutbacks at the Canada Council. The Board of Directors made the decision to restructure the Arts Division and the Touring Office ceased to exist. Funds from its programs were integrated and consolidated into their respective disciplinary sections.

3 It is interesting to note the high demand of requests from the visual arts milieu for these new programs in this introductory year: Borrowed Exhibition Assistance considered 48 applications and the amount requested was $507,347; 24 grants were awarded for a total of $226,460. Artists in the Community received 49 applications that totaled $211,478, and 21 grants were awarded for $73,100, with a maximum grant of $5,000 per project (Canada Council for the Arts, Arts Tracking System).
1998 to today: Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries

In 1998, the EAP was replaced by the program of Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries, which today is the Council’s primary means of support to these institutions. The program is open to incorporated, non-profit Canadian art museums or public galleries with a mandate to serve the public. Applicants must also have at least three years of experience in ongoing programming in contemporary visual art.

This program, which provides a contribution to each institution’s operations and programming activities, is described in the November 2009 application form as follows:

This program offers financial assistance to art museums and public galleries in support of work that advances knowledge and enjoyment of contemporary visual art. For this program, visual art includes architecture, fine craft and photography. The program provides financial assistance for the following activities in contemporary visual art: collections management; curatorial research; presentation of exhibitions; publication; public programming activities; audience development; administration, and promotion.

Although the number of successful applicants may vary with each competition, approximately 75 institutions across Canada are funded through the Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program. This includes a wide spectrum of galleries located in urban, suburban and rural environs, from modest-sized city and university galleries to major provincial and municipal art museums. While applicants may use Council funds for touring exhibitions as an extension of their own programming, this program was not designed to support touring activity.

Other Council Programs

Other Canada Council programs that offer assistance include Project Grants for Organizations in the Visual Arts, a biannual program that is available to not-for-profit arts organizations that do not receive ongoing operational funding. This program accepts applications from visual arts and fine craft organizations for a variety of projects that may include costs towards touring exhibitions. Grants awarded through this program pay a maximum of 50% of the total cost of the project and rarely exceed $15,000.

On the international front, the Council’s Visual Arts Section has consistently encouraged initiatives that foster international exchange by individuals and organizations through its programs. Specifically, it now offers the International Residencies program, which provides professionals in the visual arts with studio facilities and conditions to work in an international context; and the Assistance to Major International Exhibitions program, which supports Canadian visual arts organizations whose primary mandate is to organize, on a recurring basis, major visual arts exhibitions of national and international importance in Canada. Historically, the Canada Council has also contributed to Canadian participation in
recurring major international events such as the Venice Biennale, Documenta and the Sydney and Sao Paulo Biennials.

b) Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries: Review of Application Files

The consultant reviewed files from recent competitions of the Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program with deadlines in November 2007 (two-year funding program) and November 2009 (three-year funding program). The latter program, which had a total annual program budget of $8 million, awarded grants to 76 public galleries and art museums. The grants are modest in some cases, ranging from $14,000 to $300,000 per annum, and support activities from April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2013. Grants are paid in annual installments upon receipt and approval of an interim report and updated budget.

With a view to understanding trends in touring exhibitions, the consultant also reviewed a sample of application files dating back to 2000. Grants awarded through the program of Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries are intended to make a contribution to the institution's contemporary program and administration—within the categories described above—and each gallery determines how best to apply the funds received. Therefore, each institution makes its own case by providing the following three statements in its application:

- Statement of Institutional Direction “addressing the clarity and coherence of institutional objectives and strategies, organizational vision, planning and administrative merit.”
- Statement of Artistic Direction “addressing the artistic merit of the organization through the quality of activities in contemporary visual art in the areas of research and exhibitions, collections, publications and dissemination activities.”
- Statement of Institutional Engagement “addressing the institution's public profile and civic engagement.”

While the information required of each applicant is comprehensive, galleries are not required to submit details about touring activities. Therefore, the information provided on touring is difficult to summarize overall. However, information provided as part of the grant application's “Summary of Activities” was a source of relevant information and is discussed below. Selected survey findings are also included here for purposes of comparison and clarification.

Summary of Activities: Data Analysis

Data from applications to the Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program from 1998–2010 was analyzed to ascertain the number of contemporary exhibitions toured and/or borrowed by
galleries. The data was extracted from the “Summary of Activities” page in response to the following categories:

- Total number of exhibitions
- Contemporary art exhibitions only
- Exhibitions circulated
- Exhibitions borrowed (contemporary art only)

Findings are analyzed by geographic region and operating budget size:

- Small Galleries (budgets of less than $1 million)
- Medium Galleries (budgets of $1 to $5 million)
- Large Galleries (budgets of $5 to $10 million)
- Extra-large Galleries (budgets of more than $10 million)
- University Art Galleries

See Annex 1 for the complete list of institutions included in this analysis and their respective categorization by budget size.

Analysis of the data over the 12-year period shows consistency in numbers, and where shifts occur it is hard to determine whether there is a specific reason (such as an increase or decrease to a provincial program) or if the shifts are part of a natural cycle. The organization of an exhibition can take up to several years depending on its scale and complexity, and touring exhibitions is not necessarily a regular annual occurrence.4

---

4 The number of organizations awarded grants through Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries may vary with each competition cycle as new galleries enter the program and others are dropped. Over the period reviewed, several galleries changed names and/or category (data is included in the appropriate category without duplication).
In reviewing the total number of contemporary exhibitions presented by geographic region from 1998 to 2010 the following trends were noted:

**Figure 1: Number of Exhibitions Presented by Region**

- Over 100 exhibitions more were **presented** in Ontario, more than in any other region. This may be attributed to the fact that there is a higher concentration of public galleries in the province. Consequently, a relatively high number of galleries receive funding through the program, as illustrated in Figure 1 above. Many of these are in the Small Galleries category, so it is likely that the Ontario Arts Council’s consistent support toward the province’s public galleries is also a factor.

**Figure 2: Number of Exhibitions Borrowed by Region**

- The number of exhibitions **borrowed** tends to be lower than the number circulated, especially in Quebec. Ontario and the Maritimes are the exceptions. For Ontario, this can be attributed to the high number of organizations funded by the Canada Council’s program, and probably the financial assistance available through the Ontario Arts Council for touring exhibitions within the province. Despite a notable dip in 2004–05, the Atlantic region demonstrated a consistent borrowing practice over the period, likely due to the informal network of sharing exhibitions that is in place within the region.
With regard to the number of contemporary exhibitions circulated, figures for Ontario and West/North are reasonably consistent between 2007–10 after a surge between 2005–07. The Prairies show a rise in 2007–08 with a steady decline thereafter, although research has failed to uncover any causal explanation. With the smallest number of institutions reporting (8), the Atlantic region indicates a leveling off since 2004–05, with a drop in 2009–10 that could be attributed to the demise of ETS, as this region has been particularly affected by its closure (an issue that will be discussed further in Chapter 3).

Looking again at the data gathered from the Summary of Activities page, the analysis of the number of contemporary exhibitions by operating budget (with University Art Galleries as a separate category) yields the following observations:

The Small Galleries category represents almost half the total number of galleries examined: Figure 4 above accordingly shows a higher number of exhibitions presented. However, since 2006, that number is slowly declining, whereas other categories show a gradual upward swing during this period. It is likely that with fewer resources, smaller galleries are extending the presentation period for each exhibition, thereby producing fewer exhibitions each year. The
University Art Galleries display a marked increase from 2006 onward that can be explained by the fact that five university art galleries entered the program in that year.

Figure 5: Number of Exhibitions Borrowed by Budget Size

▷ Aside from a couple of unaccountable anomalies, the data showed that the Extra-large and Large organizations borrowed relatively few exhibitions. Again, no clear trend emerges in any category, with ups and downs reported annually over the 12-year period.

Figure 6: Number of Exhibitions Circulated by Budget Size

▷ The Small Galleries category shows a marked increase in the number of exhibitions circulated in the 2005–07 period compared with a downward trend in the following three years, consistent with the number of exhibitions presented. Comparatively, the medium-sized galleries circulated more exhibitions than their counterparts, with ups and downs over the period terminating in a fairly even trend over the last four years examined. Looking at comparatively small numbers for Large and Extra-large organizations, it is hard to discern any trend other than to note that the organization of touring exhibitions is evidently not a regular annual occurrence, and may be dependent upon other funding.
The inconclusive pattern for both borrowing or circulating exhibitions may to some extent reflect the uncertainty that galleries experience in projecting budgets. With a degree of unpredictability about the overall level of reveues from the public and private sectors and the lack of targetted project funding available for touring, the activity of organizing exhibitions to circulate tends to happen on an irregular basis. Yet, as will be discussed in the following section, the online survey data shows that the interest in touring contemporary art exhibitions appears strong, particularly in regard to touring nationally.

**Related Online Survey Data**

**Figure 7: Data from survey respondents reporting regional, provincial, national and international tours of contemporary art exhibitions as part of their regular activities.**

Figure 7 above shows a graph of responses to four questions from the online survey of public galleries and art museums: “Does your institution tour contemporary art exhibitions (regionally) (provincially) (nationally) (internationally) as part of your regular activities?”
Figure 8: Data from survey respondents replying to the question, “In the past decade (2002–2012), has your institution been involved in touring exhibitions or presenting contemporary art projects internationally?”

Interestingly, while Figure 7 shows only 25% reported touring contemporary art exhibitions internationally as part of their regular activities, Figure 8 shows that 54% have been involved in touring or presenting contemporary art projects internationally at some time between 2002 and 2012. From discussion around the subject of international touring and commentary included in the survey, this is interpreted to mean that a number of galleries are interested to engage on the international front, but do not have the financial or human resources to do so on a regular basis. The word “regular” may also be open to interpretation. While statistical data is gathered annually, programming and related budget decisions are part of longer term planning, and do not necessarily fit into an annual agenda. For the purposes of the survey, “regular” implied consistent and recurring, which could mean every two to three years or every five years.
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Figure 9: Data from survey respondents reporting it was “very important” or “quite important” to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour regionally, provincially, nationally and internationally.

Figure 9 illustrates responses to the survey questions: “How important is it to the visual art sector that contemporary exhibitions tour (regionally) (provincially) (nationally) (internationally)?” In each of the four categories, respondents could answer: Very important; Quite important; Fairly important; Slightly important; Not at all important. Respondents considered that touring regionally was “Very important” (35%), and “Quite important” (31%) for a combined total of 66%. Provincially, the final total percentage was almost identical at 67%, although 42% of respondents considered touring provincially was “Very important” while 25% answered “Quite important.” An extremely high percentage of respondents (95%) answered that touring nationally was “Very important” (83%) or “Quite important” (12%). Survey respondents also demonstrated strong support for touring internationally, with 62% identifying it as “Very important” and 29% as “Quite important,” for a total of 91%. This persuasively demonstrates that the museum community regards the touring of contemporary art to be important, especially at a national and international level.

The introduction of the Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program for operational funding in 1998 recognized over 70 institutions across Canada, reflecting an increased maturity by many public galleries. This annual allocation ensured that galleries were provided with reliable, albeit
modest, support. However, for risk-averse public galleries with limited budgets, touring an exhibition is likely one of the first programming items to be eliminated.

While the application files have provided a reliable overall context for the research, they have yielded little reliable data. What they have revealed, however, is the considerable value placed on touring contemporary exhibitions within Canada and internationally. This happens in a variety of ways and for a number of reasons, and will be explained more fully in Chapter 4, “Trends in Touring Strategy.”

### 2.2 The Federal Government: Domestic Programs of Support

Several federal Ministries have offered or continue to offer direct or indirect program support towards the touring of national and/or international exhibitions. One of the most important of these is the Museums Assistance Program, directed and administered by the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH).

**a) The Museums Assistance Program (MAP)**

MAP has been key to enabling art museums and public galleries to reach wider audiences through touring exhibition initiatives and the sharing of important collections across Canada. The program was introduced in 1972 with the objective “to ensure access for all Canadians to Canada’s natural and cultural heritage.” Over the past two decades MAP has experienced changes in its budget and operations, including the following developments:

- MAP was re-affirmed with the 1990 Canadian Museum Policy when it was announced that its “eligibility criteria would be broadened and its $8.5 million budget increased to $18 million.” However, the budget did not increase as predicted due to cutbacks that were part of a government-wide effort to reduce deficits in the 1990s.

- In 2005, consultations took place as part of a process to design a new Canadian museum policy, but one was never announced. In 2005–06, “the approved Treasury Board budget according to the Main estimates for MAP was $9,678,200; MAP resources were reduced by $2.315 million in September 2006 in response to the Government’s announcement to identify $1B in program savings.”

- In 2012–13, MAP’s annual budget envelope was $6.6 million.

A 2010 Evaluation of MAP proposed that the museum policy needed “to be updated, taking into consideration the needs of the museum community, the role of the federal government vis-à-vis other levels
of government, and the range of support currently available, and that a “new” MAP program should be
designed.”5

MAP has five separate components of which three are pertinent to the dissemination of
exhibitions: **Access to Heritage**, **Exhibition Circulation Fund**, and **Aboriginal Heritage**.

- **Access to Heritage** is intended to foster greater access to heritage across different
geographic regions of Canada. Eligible projects are related to travelling exhibitions in order to
assist heritage organizations to reach audiences and to reflect Canada’s diverse cultural and
natural heritage.

- The **Exhibition Circulation Fund** assists museums with the costs related to borrowing a
travelling exhibition originating from a museum in another province/territory or from a federal
heritage institution.

- The **Aboriginal Heritage** component provides funding to Aboriginal organizations and partner
heritage organizations to enrich, preserve, present and manage Aboriginal cultural heritage.
This component also seeks to increase public awareness and understanding of the rich and
diverse cultures of Aboriginal Peoples.

The Access to Heritage component has primarily focused on contributing to the production and
circulation of historic or scientific exhibitions, with the understanding that the Canada Council offered a
program of assistance for the research, production and presentation of contemporary art exhibitions.
Nevertheless, this program component has supported contemporary art exhibitions, although such
assistance has become progressively limited. In the 2004 MAP guidelines, it stated that: “In the case of
contemporary art exhibition projects, MAP can only finance the development of retrospective exhibitions
and the circulation phase of travelling exhibitions.” This meant that public galleries were eligible to apply for
funding towards the development, presentation and touring of contemporary retrospective exhibitions, but
only costs associated with touring for other contemporary art exhibitions. By 2007, the program guidelines
announced: “Only (contemporary art) exhibitions which are retrospective or from an historical perspective
may be considered eligible under MAP for research, production, presentation, and circulation.” Additional
restrictions introduced in 2011 further reduced the eligibility of contemporary art exhibitions:

> Design, production, promotion and circulation of travelling art exhibitions that are
retrospective or present an historical perspective. In order for an exhibition of
contemporary art to be considered retrospective, a minimum of 75% of the artifacts or the
visual artworks should be drawn from public/private collections (other than the artist's

---

5 “Evaluation of Museums Assistance Program,” Office of the Chief Audit and Evaluation Executive, Evaluations Services
Directorate, January 2010.
collection). Additionally, a minimum of 90% of the artifacts or the visual artworks must have been created at least 10 years prior to the date of application.

The Exhibition Circulation Fund and the Aboriginal Heritage components have imposed the same restrictions as those cited above, so that the prospect for borrowing contemporary art exhibitions or developing and touring contemporary Aboriginal art is also severely reduced. However, in recognition of the 2008 closure of Exhibition Transportation Services (discussed below) the amount eligible for each request through the Exhibition Circulation Fund increased from $10,000 to $15,000. This assists those museums borrowing historical or scientific exhibits.

The Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program document noted in 2010 that “the level of demand for the Access to Heritage component has declined in recent years, although there still appears to be a sufficient number of museums interested in developing and touring travelling exhibitions.” It is likely that this decreasing trend will continue, in light of MAP’s lean budget. This was one reason cited by PCH regarding the added restrictions towards contemporary projects. The second major reason was that galleries that undertake contemporary programming are eligible to receive funding through the Canada Council, whereas museums that organize historic or scientific exhibits are not.

In the past, a changing panel of experts was convened annually to assess applications submitted to the Access to Heritage and Aboriginal Heritage components. The panel’s recommendations were integral to the decision-making process. However, a determination was recently made by PCH to curtail the practice of using review panels. Beginning in 2012 the majority of PCH programs—including MAP—are assessed internally, without input from peer assessors.

b) Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS)

The Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI) is a Special Operating Agency of Canadian Heritage (PCH) that supports conservation and heritage institutions by creating and disseminating conservation knowledge and providing expert services. One such service it provided was Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS). Created in 1976, this program offered shipping services to art galleries and museums on a cost-recovery basis by providing climate-controlled vehicles and drivers trained in handling artworks and artifacts. The service came into existence because of specialized requirements for shipping art and cultural objects across the country.

The ETS program was canceled as of April 2008. Given that transportation is an inherent museum function, this decision was greeted with dismay by the museum community. Galleries and museums require shipping services, not only to tour exhibitions, but also for their core business. This includes transporting works from different sources (private lenders, dealers, public collections) for in-house exhibitions, or shipping newly acquired works from other locations for their permanent collections.

[6] Ibid.
The major reason for closing ETS related to a required change in employment status of the people engaged to drive the trucks, from a contract to an employee relationship with the Government of Canada.

Prior to the program’s cancellation, the Board of Directors of the Canadian Art Museum Directors Organization (CAMDO) formed an ETS Task Force in May 2007 in an attempt to influence CCI to reverse its decision or find an alternative solution. This three-member committee was “charged with researching the impact of the cancellation of ETS, studying the capacity among private sector carriers, posing solutions and leading lobbying efforts.”7 The Task Force proposed three solutions: “transfer ETS to another government agency such as the Canada Council Art Bank; establish an exhibition transportation service with an NGO such as the CMA or CAMDO; consider options in the private sector, including fostering competition, competence and consistency.”8

The Task Force solicited feedback from its membership through a survey to which 27 art museums responded. While it was determined that museums did use alternate carriers (fine art and commercial), ETS was the preferred shipper and used much more frequently than other carriers. CAMDO held meetings with senior bureaucrats at PCH and CCI, and wrote a brief urging the Minister of Canadian Heritage to discuss solutions for Canadian museums regarding transportation concerns. Canadian Heritage was not persuaded to change its mind regarding ETS and none of the other proposed options proved feasible. With the demise of ETS in 2008, Canadian museums lost a valuable service: reliable shipping at a reasonable cost as well as unique expertise guaranteed by a trusted service provider. Smaller institutions and those in more remote regions of the country were the most seriously affected.

In the survey conducted for this study, 46 out of 52 respondents replied that they used ETS to ship exhibitions before its closure. In response to the question, “When undertaking touring exhibitions, how often did your institution use ETS for shipping?”

- 12 out of 46 responded “Always”;
- 25 said “Usually”;
- 4 answered “About half the time”;
- 3 responded “Occasionally”; and
- 2 replied “Rarely.”

---

7 CAMDO, Task Force Report, “Impact of Cancellation of Exhibition Transportation Services.”
8 Memo to CAMDO Board of Directors from ETS Task Force, 8 June 2007.
c) Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program

The federal government established the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program within Canadian Heritage (PCH) in 1999. For travelling exhibitions that are eligible and approved, the program assumes financial responsibility for loss or damage to art objects and related materials. The Program has two objectives: to increase access for Canadians to Canada’s and the world’s heritage through the exchange of artifacts and exhibitions in Canada; and secondly, to provide Canadian art galleries, museums, archives and libraries with a competitive advantage when competing for the loan of prestigious international exhibitions. The Minister of Canadian Heritage retains complete discretion to approve or reject applications for indemnification. Two types of exhibition qualify:

- exhibitions that are organized domestically and shown at venues within at least two provinces in Canada; and
- exhibitions where the total fair market value of objects borrowed from sources outside Canada exceeds that of the total fair market value of objects borrowed from within Canada.

Eligibility is also determined by the value of each individual travelling exhibition. The total fair market value of all objects and accessories in an exhibition must be at least $500,000 to be considered for indemnification. (Indemnification is limited to a maximum of $600 million per exhibition). The program is primarily designed for major exhibitions of high value, and these tend to be historical in nature.

d) Canadian Heritage Information Network (CHIN)

Canadian Heritage (PCH) has invested in the Canadian Heritage Information Network (CHIN). It administers the Virtual Museum of Canada (VMC) portal and the Professional Exchange website, enabling Canadian museums to connect with each other and their audiences through digital technologies. It serves as another resource for Canadian museums.

The VMC explores Canada’s history and culture through virtual exhibits and interactive learning resources on numerous subjects created by Canadian museums. It contains over 600 virtual exhibits that deal primarily with history and science topics, as well as cultural and art historical ones. The VMC highlights Canadian museum collections through virtual exhibits, such as the McCord Museum’s The Photographic Studios of William Notman; and revives interest in artists, such as Nova Scotia ceramicist Alice Egan Hagen (1872–1972), the focus of an exhibit organized by Mount Saint Vincent University Art Gallery. There is a wide range of topics, including Investigating Forensics (SFU Museum of Archeology and Ethnology); The Astonishing World of Musical Instruments (Laboratoire de recherche sur les musiques du monde); The Story of the Masks (U’mista Cultural Society); and The Great Storm of 1913 (Huron County Museum and Historic Gaol). However, the VMC has very little content about contemporary art and artists. Occasionally, a virtual tour of an exhibition presented in a gallery space is included, such as Joe Fafard at
the National Gallery of Canada (NGC), organized by the NGC and the MacKenzie Art Gallery in 2008. While virtual exhibitions are rich sources of knowledge and information—and serve as excellent research tools—they do not replace the effect of experiencing original artifacts or works of art.

CHIN’s Professional Exchange provides an online space for heritage professionals to “learn, share and collaborate.” Examples of its resources include standards and best practices documents; online courses on topics such as image digitization and automated collections systems; bibliographies, data dictionaries and reference databases; and reports and studies on topics such as intellectual property and digital preservation.

e) National Travelling Exhibition Programs

Canada’s national museums play an important role in circulating exhibitions nationally, primarily to share their collections. Exhibits of varying size, complexity and value are offered for a fee to museums, galleries, and cultural and community centres across the country. Such exhibits may include original works of art and artifacts, historical documents, archival photographs, interpretative texts, graphic displays and audiovisual elements, but rarely contemporary art.

The only national museum that regularly offers touring exhibitions of contemporary art is the National Gallery of Canada (NGC). The NGC’s On Tour program (recently renamed The Art Network) is, according to Director Marc Mayer, “one of the largest and oldest touring exhibition programs in the world.”9 As one of its components, the program continues to offer historical and contemporary exhibitions drawn from the NGC’s collections at a flat rate, which includes transportation, insurance and technical support. The Gallery’s curators organize several new exhibitions each year, some of which are also presented at the NGC, and about 30 Canadian bookings are organized annually. Recently, the NGC has introduced a new satellite program in partnership with three Canadian public galleries: the Art Gallery of Alberta (AGA), the Museum of Contemporary Canadian Art (MOCCA), and the Winnipeg Art Gallery (WAG). Each of these institutions provides a designated branded NGC space. In exchange, they have access to the NGC’s collections to undertake research, and have priority when borrowing works for display at their institutions.

The NGC’s Exhibitions Management Division, a small group of professionals with the requisite managerial and technical skills, oversees their travelling exhibitions program. Given this infrastructure, the NGC has taken on the responsibility for touring selected travelling exhibitions organized by other public galleries, and these partnerships have made it possible for a number of important exhibitions to be seen in different regions of the country.

Centre for Exhibition Exchange (CEE)

The Centre for Exhibition Exchange (CEE) has been functioning since 1999, under the direction of a Steering Committee comprised of representatives from the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI); the Canadian Heritage Information Network (CHIN); the Heritage Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage (DGHB); and the Canadian Museums Association (CMA). In early 2002, these parties signed a Memorandum of Understanding:

_The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is for the Parties to develop and maintain the Centre for Exhibition Exchange (CEE) and to provide various services in support of travelling exhibitions. The objective of the CEE is to promote and stimulate the development and circulation of travelling exhibitions across Canada and abroad. To reach this objective, the CEE has been established to develop and maintain a travelling exhibit website database and develop and implement a centralized coordination service._

Each party took on different responsibilities with regard to developing the database and promoting the use of the CEE. The overall budget was set at $80,000, with financing from the CCI and DGHB in 2001–02, and it was anticipated that the CEE would increasingly function on a cost-recovery basis. Managed through the CMA, the CEE was located in an office at the CCI’s Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS), and worked closely with that service.

The services provided by CEE were open to all types of museums as well as art galleries, but it is difficult to determine whether it was used to tour exhibitions of contemporary art; if so, it was in a limited capacity. Two reports relating to CEE have been commissioned: Equinox Marketing’s “Feasibility Study for a Centralized Coordination Service for Travelling Exhibitions,” which was presented to the CEE Steering Committee in April 2000, and likely determined the basis for the more formal agreement between the four interested parties; and Learning Systems International’s January 2004 “Evaluation for the Centre for Exhibitions Exchange,” which found that, overall, the CEE played an important role in facilitating the circulation of travelling exhibits, and users were asking for it to provide additional services. However, the CEE initiative does not appear to have continued after 2004.

A recent CMA initiative recognized the continued need among its membership for sharing information about travelling exhibitions. In April 2011, two conference calls were held with interested parties to discuss a dedicated space on the CMA website for an interactive database that would serve as a “marketplace” for exchanging information about touring shows. Such an undertaking would require the CMA to charge a user fee and—while interest was expressed—the plan has not yet developed further.

---

10 Memorandum of Understanding, signed by CCI, CHIN, DGHB and CMA in February 2002.
g) Canada Cultural Investment Fund

Before completing this overview of federal government programs that support domestic touring, it is worth mentioning the Canada Cultural Investment Fund: although not directly linked to the touring of contemporary exhibitions, the Fund has the potential to assist art museums and public galleries with initiatives in this area. Within its granting structure, Canadian Heritage (PCH) recognizes art museums and public galleries as heritage organizations, and performing arts organizations as arts organizations. The Endowment Incentives program, a component of the Canada Cultural Investment Fund, encourages arts organizations to build new revenue streams through donations to endowment funds, but does not provide the same funding incentive to heritage organizations for this purpose. Although this is speculation on the part of the consultant, museums and galleries could potentially earmark proceeds from this program towards touring exhibitions, or free up funds from other gallery activities for touring.

2.3 The Federal Government: Programs of Support for International Projects

On the international front, the Departments of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) and Canadian Heritage (PCH) have both had programs of support for international cultural initiatives. A 1995 paper entitled “Canada in the World” proposed a foreign policy (see the following section entitled Trade Routes) for Canada based on three pillars: the promotion of prosperity and employment; the protection of Canada’s security within a stable global framework; and the projection of Canadian values and culture. From that time until around 2006, the third pillar emphasizing Canadian culture provided the rationale for several DFAIT programs.11

a) Arts Promotion Program (PromArt)

Historically, the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) has promoted the Canadian cultural sector as part of its efforts to advance Canadian foreign policy objectives, and it has done this primarily through its Arts Promotion Program, also known as PromArt:

- PromArt provided support in the form of grants to individuals, institutions or organizations that create, interpret, promote or market Canadian cultural products internationally. These grants were awarded in the areas of performing arts, film/video/TV, visual and media arts, and literature.

- PromArt transferred grant funds to Canada’s key missions abroad in order to support cultural strategies that responded to the missions’ diplomatic objectives.\(^{12}\)

The performing arts received the greatest support from this program (in 2004 over $3 million was awarded to performing arts, representing almost 71% of total funding), but visual and media arts also received substantial support. The average grant size varied from discipline to discipline. Performing arts and visual and media arts were on the higher end, with average amounts of $18,911 and $11,857 respectively, reflecting the nature of their activities that require higher transportation and travel costs. The average grant for film, video and television was $4,827, and literature was $2,309. Between 2001 and 2005, PromArt awarded approximately $22.4 million in grants that contributed to the development of professional opportunities abroad for Canadian artists. During this period, the largest grant awarded in visual and media arts was $110,000 to support the Canadian pavillion at the 51st Venice Biennale. Missions abroad had different cultural strategies and approaches to cultural programming, but examples of typical activities included:

- Canadian participation in internationally or nationally recognized cultural events (festivals, fairs, biennials, etc.).

- Exhibits, performances, tours of Canadian artists.

- Visits to Canada by foreign buyers, impresarios.

- Embassy organized or co-organized events (such as Francophone celebrations, Canada Week, Canadian film festivals, Canadian retrospectives).

- Communication tools such as websites, newsletters, or brochures highlighting Canadian cultural presence.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
A 2006 DFAIT Evaluation of the program concluded that: “In general, the Arts Promotion Program [PromArt] is recognized for meeting its objectives of promoting Canadian arts and culture that have guided its development since the 1970s. There is a cultural presence in selected countries, although the level may be insufficient in some cases. The Program has clearly helped to improve professional opportunities for Canadian artists and it has facilitated—along with other members of the cultural community—a place for Canada in the mainstream of international artistic excellence.”13 Despite the generally positive assessment, the program was terminated in March 2008.

The online survey conducted for this study explored the impact of PromArt’s cancellation on public galleries and art museums. Highlights of responses are as follows:

- Ten out of 50 survey respondents said that their institution had received assistance from the PromArt program before it ended in 2008.
- Nine out of the 10 reported that the closure of the program had affected their institution’s ability to tour exhibitions internationally.
- One respondent commented: “With little or no federal assistance now available to tour/partner internationally, we look for other means by which to share contemporary Canadian art outside our borders. Naturally, without access to a competitive but reliable source, our capacity for imaginative, prudent planning is much curtailed, and we must instead act opportunistically and episodically. What has been lost is our ability to shape our plans in a sustained and programmatic fashion.”
- Another respondent stated that “the program allowed for artist travel and shipping costs that spurred many collaborative efforts with international institutions.”

The termination of PromArt means that no federal program exists to assist with costs associated with touring exhibitions internationally.

b) Trade Routes

An initiative of Canadian Heritage (PCH), Trade Routes was a unique comprehensive trade development program specifically designed for the arts and cultural sector, which included performing arts, visual arts, crafts, design, film/television, sound recording, publishing, heritage and new media:

13 ibid.
In May 2001, as part of the $500 million Tomorrow Starts Today investment in Canadian arts and culture, the Government of Canada announced a series of initiatives to ensure the growth and development of Canadian culture. Trade Routes, with a budget of $23 million over three years, was officially launched November 28, 2001. This initiative is the PCH’s strategy to expand international markets for Canada’s arts and cultural sector.14

Trade Routes provided international business development services to support Canada’s entrepreneurs in the arts and cultural sector so that they could take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace. It was comprised of four components:

- **Market entry support**, in which services were provided directly to arts and cultural clients from both PCH headquarters and Foreign Affairs (DFAIT’s) regional offices. These services included a focus on export preparedness and international market development, as well as help with skills development and export counseling.

- **In-market assistance services to arts and cultural exporters in five key sites** around the world: Shanghai, New York, Los Angeles, Paris and London. Each site was staffed with a cultural trade development officer who worked with Canadians interested in exporting to specific markets, and with local partners interested in Canadian contacts.

- **Financial support for the arts and cultural sector** through the Trades Routes Contributions Program, in order to assist with export preparedness and international market development.

- **Research and targeted studies of specific markets and countries**, including surveys and profiles of export patterns for Canadian cultural sectors, and the development of cultural trade data.

Trade Routes was part of the Trade Team Canada (TTC) initiative. The “TTC CGS” was the Trade Team Canada Cultural Goods and Services working group. This group represented the cultural sector’s interests in the broader working group on trade - led by International Trade. Each cultural subsector had its own working group comprised of a team of public and private representatives. These subsector working groups created international trade action plans that would inform the Trade Routes program of market priorities for the sector. Under its aegis, various working groups of both public and private sector representatives formulated international trade action plans that would inform the Trade Routes program in each sector. In the case of the visual arts, a three-year plan outlined which markets were of interest, and the international trade action plans were used to prioritize funding requests and undertake market initiatives.

---

The Trade Routes program started in 2002 and was phased out between March 2009 and March 2010. This program was intended primarily for the commercial sector, and was used by the visual arts community for events such as international art fairs and book fairs with targeted commercial markets.

In response to the survey question “Did your institution receive assistance from the Trade Routes program before it ended?” only five out of 50 respondents replied in the affirmative. Four out of those five reported that the program’s closure affected their institution’s ability to tour exhibitions internationally.

2.4 Provincial Programs for Regional, National and International Touring

Some provinces offer programs to assist with touring contemporary art exhibitions regionally, nationally and internationally. For the most part, these are modest programs with varying guidelines. Such programs are also subject to change depending on the priorities of arts councils and funding bodies. This overview is therefore only intended to describe in general terms the types of programs currently available.

British Columbia

The British Columbia Arts Council offers a Touring Initiatives program that “supports professional artists and arts and cultural organizations in British Columbia to develop markets outside the province or to represent British Columbia at significant national or international exhibitions or events.” In 2011–12, the program provided $187,000 in support of 20 activities across all artistic disciplines. The Visual Arts allocation was $61,000 for three distinct activities, including support to the National Gallery of Canada for artist Steven Shearer (Canada’s representative at the 54th Venice Biennale), and support for six British Columbian artists to present work at Documenta 13 in Kassel, Germany. In 2010–11, the program awarded a total of $149,975 for 16 activities, with $10,000 awarded for one project in the visual arts.

Alberta

Through its Cultural Relations Project Grant Stream, the Alberta Foundation for the Arts (AFA) “supports professional artists and arts organizations in any arts discipline that will represent Alberta at a national or international level.” This program’s annual budget—currently in the $300,000 range—was increased following the closure of PromArt to ensure that Albertan artists would not be adversely affected. In fiscal years 2010–11 and 2011–12, $27,770 and $48,402 were awarded respectively in visual and media arts, with most grants going to individual artists.
The AFA also supports a provincial Travelling Exhibition program (TREX) that is intended to provide every Albertan the opportunity to enjoy art exhibitions wherever they live. The AFA has established partnerships with four arts organizations that coordinate the program on its behalf in different regions of the province. These organizations, which include the Prairie Art Gallery and the Art Gallery of Alberta, organize exhibitions from the AFA’s extensive art collection, as well as exhibitions of work by contemporary Alberta artists for circulation to libraries, schools and rural locations throughout the province. The annual budget for TREX is $546,000.

**Saskatchewan**

Culture on the Go: Touring and Market Access, a partnership between the Saskatchewan Arts Board and the province’s Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport, is intended to help Saskatchewan artists further their careers and share their art within Saskatchewan and beyond. The program is open to individual artists and arts organizations in all disciplines, and although the performing arts are the dominant players, visual and media arts projects are also successful.

Arts on the Move, the touring program of the Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils (OSAC), provides Saskatchewan communities with visual and media art exhibitions accompanied by educational materials designed to complement the Saskatchewan arts education curriculum. Professional artists and curators are asked to submit proposals that are adjudicated annually. Public galleries in Saskatchewan are invited to contribute by organizing and producing small exhibitions (with accompanying educational materials), and programs suitable for touring to smaller communities and schools. OSAC pays a fee for this service and coordinates tours. Its exhibitions circulate to some 24 communities over a two-year period.

**Manitoba**

The Manitoba Arts Council (MAC) offers a number of different programs across all arts disciplines to individuals and organizations, including a Touring Grant for Organizations (dance, music and theatre). However, there are no specific programs to assist with touring contemporary art exhibitions. MAC’s Special Opportunities Grant program offers grants in all disciplines for projects not funded through its other programs, and could potentially provide project support of up to $10,000 for touring exhibitions. The program is currently under review.

**Ontario**

The Ontario Arts Council’s touring programs are intended to help artists and organizations reach and develop new audiences and markets by supporting the touring of performances, exhibitions and

---

15 OSAC is a provincial non-profit charitable organization founded in 1968. Funded by the Saskatchewan Arts Board and the Saskatchewan Lotteries, it is a member-based cultural organization that offers programs and services in the visual and performing arts.
arts events. Its three programs—Ontario Touring; National and International Touring; and Ontario Arts Presenters—are open to professional artists and organizations that wish to tour live performances, travelling exhibitions, festivals and other arts events. Normally, three venues are required to be considered for touring grants. The majority of grants therefore contribute to performing arts projects, but visual and media organizations have access to the first two programs to assist with touring their contemporary exhibitions. In 2011–12, the envelope for National and International Touring was $800,000, and approximately $766,000 for Ontario Touring.

Quebec

While Quebec’s Ministère de la Culture et des Communications (MCC) supports the province’s art museums and public galleries through its program Soutien aux musées québécois, there is no designated assistance for touring contemporary art exhibitions. On the international front, the Ministère des Relations internationales (MRI) has established cooperative agreements (ententes de cooperation) with other countries and regions. Financial support for cultural projects, which could include touring exhibitions, is available through the MRI and through the MCC on occasion. The Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec (CALQ) does have a program to assist visual arts organizations that tour contemporary exhibits within Canada and abroad. However, museums supported through the MCC are not eligible to apply to CALQ programs.

Atlantic Canada

Regular program support for touring contemporary exhibitions is not available in Atlantic Canada, although galleries that receive operational funding from provincial government bodies may use funding to that end. However, the four provincial arts councils from Atlantic Canada signed a memorandum of understanding in August 2012 with the aim of fostering collaborative initiatives that could lead to support for touring exhibitions. In addition, the Atlantic Public Art Gallery Association (APAGA) is exploring ways to ensure that public galleries and artist-run centres continue to tour contemporary art regionally as well as nationally and internationally. This region of Canada has been especially affected by the closure of Exhibition Transporation Services (ETS) since galleries are limited in their choice of commercial transportation companies. APAGA is currently working with an arts consultant to find practical solutions to the challenges inherent in touring contemporary exhibitions.

---
16 Memorandum of Understanding on Atlantic Cooperation in the Arts, St. John’s, Newfoundland, 21.August 2012. The signatories (the New Brunswick Arts Board, the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, Arts Nova Scotia and the PEI Council for the Arts) made “an agreement to establish a joint regional strategy for arts development initiatives”.

**Provincial Art Galleries**

Certain provincial art galleries are mandated to provide touring exhibitions to smaller communities within their province. Others, such as institutions with greater resources, consider it their responsibility—as part of their educational and outreach programming—to provide art exhibits to small centres, schools and libraries. In many cases, these galleries organize exhibitions of works from their permanent collections and initiate exhibits by contemporary artists in their respective regions, assuming the inherent costs as part of their regular operations.

3. **TOURING EXHIBITIONS OF CONTEMPORARY ART**

3.1 **INTERVIEW FINDINGS**

To clarify and assess the current situation for public galleries and art museums with regard to touring exhibitions, the consultant conducted interviews with 25 museum professionals representing 19 institutions across the country (see Annex 4). The interviews, which took place between April and June 2012, were based on a series of 10 questions. Below is a summary of responses to each question.

**Question 1 – “Do you consider that there is value for your institution to organize touring contemporary art exhibitions? If so, why or why not?”** Sixteen interviewees provided positive or very positive responses; one response was negative; and two interviewees did not respond. Positive reasons included the following:

- To reach and serve wider and more diverse audiences.
- To promote local artists outside of their regions.
- To increase the profile of both artists and institutions nationally and internationally.
- To advance scholarship.
- To foster contemporary art practices.

It was noted that a partnership between two or more institutions is especially productive since this allows for a division of resources and labour, and combines complementary expertise. Despite the positive responses, interviewees also identified obstacles to organizing touring exhibitions, including:
Lack of financial and human resources.

Drain on already scarce resources.

Difficult to earn revenue from organizing touring exhibitions.

**Question 2 – “Do you consider that there is value for your institution in borrowing exhibitions organized by other arts organizations? If so, why or why not?”**

Ten interviewees gave unequivocal positive responses to this question, and four were interested in presenting exhibits where their institutions had contributed as partners. One interviewee said that there was rarely value in hosting borrowed exhibits. For another interviewees, borrowing international exhibitions is a priority.

Positive reasons given are as follows:

- To present diverse perspectives to a greater number of people.
- To fill gaps in scholarship where no in-house expertise exists.
- To take advantage of excellent touring shows and curatorial expertise.
- To contextualize the work of regional artists.
- To develop relationships with other galleries.
- To give institutional curators a “breathing space.”

Barriers to taking borrowed shows include the following reasons:

- Lack of exhibition space.
- Not knowing what exhibitions are available at any given time.

**Question 3 – “Has your institution received public funding assistance to circulate or borrow exhibitions? If so, from which levels of government?”**

Some fifteen interviewees provided the following information:

- Nine had received funding through Museums Assistance Program (MAP), either to circulate exhibitions nationally or to borrow exhibitions from elsewhere in Canada.
- Two had used PromArt to present shows internationally.
- Four had funding from the Ontario Arts Council (OAC) to tour within Ontario.
- One had funding from the Alberta Foundation for the Arts (AFA).
One had received provincial funding (British Columbia) to tour exhibits internationally.

Three received funds from provincial governments to tour exhibitions provincially to smaller centres and/or rural communities.

This appears to demonstrate that galleries are keen to tour and receive exhibitions nationally and even internationally, when additional funding sources are available.

Question 4 – “Has your institution been successful in securing private sector funds for touring contemporary art exhibitions?”

Ten of the 15 interviewees had procured private sector funding for one or more touring exhibitions, either from corporations, foundations or individuals.

The other respondents had not been successful or had not sought private sector funding.

However, interviewees expressed the view that it was especially challenging to procure funds for contemporary exhibitions that tour.

Question 5 – “Has your institution developed successful strategies for sharing contemporary exhibitions? Are there other strategies or models you would wish to consider?”

Every interviewee discussed the importance of establishing partnerships or collaborations in one form or another, giving the following reasons:

- To build relationships between curators.
- To build relationships between institutions.
- To pool resources to enable more ambitious projects.
- To share costs and expertise.
- To collaborate with a group with similar interests (i.e., university art galleries).
- To ensure that all galleries involved are invested in the project.

Institutions make choices about how each partnership will be formulated. For instance, some galleries may partner solely to produce an exhibition catalogue, while others may divide all aspects of producing a national tour, as well as the publication. Presenting exhibitions that are relevant to each museum’s community was deemed an important factor, allowing for greater public engagement.

Question 6 – “In your opinion, what are the key inhibitors to circulating contemporary exhibitions?” Responses to this question primarily related to lack of funds for the following reasons:
High cost of shipping.

Increased insurance costs.

Increase in artists' fees.

Considerable staff time required for planning and managing a tour.

Lack of access to private sector funding, particularly for university galleries (due to restrictions imposed by universities).

Demise of Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS) has had adverse impact on organizing tours, including additional costs.

Lack of a forum for curators to get together means that there are limited opportunities to build relationships, especially in more isolated regions of the country.

The huge landmass that is Canada has obvious cost implications for touring.

The global economic times have an impact on museums generally as institutions tend to become more cautious.

To be responsible for touring exhibitions has an inherent risk factor and galleries are risk-averse, having to answer to Boards of Directors and funding agencies.

Interviewees suggested that the way to move forward was in collaborating with like-minded institutions.

Question 7 – “Has your institution been affected by the loss of federal government programs such as ETS, MAP, Trade Routes (PCH) or PromArt (DFAIT)?”

Ten out of 16 interviewees believe that the demise of ETS has seriously narrowed the options available for shipping exhibitions nationally.

Nine interviewees reported that recent changes to MAP have had a negative impact on art museums wishing to organize national tours of contemporary art.

Several interviewees added that without ETS to ship works, museums are limiting themselves when considering which works to borrow for in-house exhibitions, due to the high cost of shipping.

With regard to touring internationally, nine galleries have used the previously available federal programs. The loss of DFAIT’s PromArt was acutely felt by those galleries that used the program to assist with tours of Canadian exhibits and the promotion of Canadian artists abroad. From a complementary component, DFAIT also invited senior personnel from abroad to meet and consult with Canadian museum professionals that in turn led to useful contacts. The loss of Trade Routes was mentioned in relation to
artists invited to represent Canada in international biennials, such as the Sydney Biennale, or major events like Documenta in Kassel, Germany.

**Question 8** – “What would assist the public gallery sector in facilitating the circulation of contemporary exhibitions?” prompted the following responses:

- Establish a website to post available exhibits and exhibition ideas for potential partnerships.
- Establish a central coordinating office to organize touring exhibitions produced by galleries.
- Establish a separate exhibition circulation fund or supplementary grant program designated for touring initiatives nationally and internationally.
- Provide seed money to kick start projects and assist at different stages of development including curatorial travel.

Themes that surfaced are as follows:

- It is a challenge knowing which touring exhibitions are available at any given time.
- It is necessary for institutional curators to have the means to travel.
- There is a need to explore a more collaborative approach nationally to improve communications (i.e., what are institutions doing currently and what are they planning in the next few years).
- The need for designated funding for touring nationally and internationally.

**Question 9** – “Does the activity of touring (or not touring) exhibitions have an impact on the institution’s curatorial objectives?” elicited the following responses from interviewees:

- Touring allows for public engagement with different and expanding audiences.
- Institutions have a responsibility to ensure that contemporary artists’ work is “out in the world,” and to “place the local in the context of the global.”
- Touring enables organizations to keep in touch with peers, recognizing the complexity of the professional world in which galleries operate.
- Collaboration is an important way to create and broaden discourse.
- The activity of disseminating artists’ work broadly is advantageous to artists, to the organizing institutions, and to diverse publics, in Canada and internationally.
Reservations expressed by respondents pertained to the additional demands that touring exhibitions place on institutional curators who are already stretched.

**Question 10** – “Do you consider that touring contemporary exhibitions has an impact on the visual arts sector as a whole, and on the ability of public galleries to serve the public” prompted a strongly affirmative response from 16 respondents for a variety of reasons, as follows:

- To enrich public programming by offering a range of viewpoints to engage audiences.
- To provide the public with more interesting opportunities to access work by different contemporary artists.
- To expand scholarship on the artists and issues presented and discussed (touring exhibits and their publications tend to be ambitious and stimulate additional program initiatives).
- To create opportunities for artists, curators and institutions, especially on the international front.
- To provide potential exposure to collectors and markets in different regions.
- To build relationships on multiple levels.
- To contribute to “nation building” given that Canada is a country of regions.
- To disseminate knowledge and contribute to education, from school children to interested publics.
- To promote a sense of excitement about artists that contributes to a “star” system that in turn attracts media attention.

Interviewees expressed the view that contemporary visual art should be accessible to the broadest public possible, nationally and internationally, and that touring exhibitions contribute to this objective. Partnerships and collaborations can also add to achieving goals by increasing capacity.

### 3.2 Summary of Interview Findings: Advantages, Challenges, Suggestions and Comments

The analysis of responses shows that the majority of interviewees are positive about the benefits of touring contemporary art exhibitions, while expressing several caveats. A major theme running throughout the discussions was that partnerships and collaborations are the most interesting way to engage in future touring initiatives. As cited by interviewees, key advantages to touring exhibitions include:
Increased value for the public (children, students, tourists, regular gallery-goers) who have the opportunity to experience a wider range of contemporary practices by different artists.

Increased exposure for Canadian contemporary artists whose works can be seen by more people, potentially leading to additional opportunities.

Higher profile for Canadian institutions that organize touring exhibitions.

Collaborating with one or more institutions has the advantage of sharing human and financial resources, potentially producing a more ambitious project and limiting risk.

**The key challenges**, which prevent galleries from programming touring exhibitions, primarily relate to a lack of funding:

- Institutional curatorial and professional staff is already over-worked, and more staff resources are needed in order to organize touring exhibitions.
- Operational funding is limited and there are few options for additional funding from governments or the private sector.
- The cancellation and changes to relevant federal programs has discouraged institutions from embarking on projects.
- Public galleries are risk-averse and while costs can be estimated, there are inherent risks as exhibitions tend to tour over extended periods.
- Canada’s geography is in itself a challenge when considering touring exhibitions.

Interviewees offered a number of **suggestions for improving the situation with regard to touring contemporary exhibitions**, including the following ideas:

- Develop a process for communicating what exhibitions are available to tour; possibilities included a managed website or a centralized office.
- Explore a more collaborative approach to communications about touring exhibitions so as to share information about current and future programming initiatives, possible partnerships, etc.
- Reinstate a similar program to ETS, which was cost effective on many levels.
- Introduce opportunities for galleries to obtain designated funding to tour contemporary exhibitions nationally and/or internationally through the Canada Council or MAP.

**Other comments and queries** that surfaced during the interview process included the following:
The lack of funds for institutional curators to travel is a major concern; yet as funds become scarcer, museums are forced to curtail travel for their curators.

Establishing and maintaining curatorial networks is important, especially for isolated regional institutions.

There is no professional association advocating on behalf of institutions that promote contemporary visual art. While the Canadian Museums Association (CMA) includes public art galleries in its membership base, its mandate is so broad that it does little to advance the specific interests of contemporary art. In contrast, the Canadian performing and literary arts sectors appear to be better served by having a number of different professional associations advocating on their behalf.

3.3 **Survey Findings**

An online survey comprised of 26 questions was sent to the 76 successful applicants in the Canada Council’s 2010–2013 competition for Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries (see Annex 2 for a list of institutions awarded grants and Annex 3 for the complete Online Survey). The completion response rate for the entire survey was 61% (46 out of 76), with additional respondents answering some questions. Typically, between 25 and 35 respondents provided written commentary in addition to the “Yes” and “No” answers. The following is a summary of comments provided in response to selected questions.

**Question** – “Have the changes to the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) affected your institution’s ability to circulate and/or present contemporary traveling exhibitions?” Twenty-seven out of 37 respondents replied in the affirmative, citing the following reasons:

- Changes further restrict the possibility for touring contemporary art exhibitions, even retrospectives of senior Canadian artists.

- The new MAP definition of “retrospective” is considered problematic in that 75% of the works included in the exhibition must come from public or private collections (other than the artist's) and 90% of the works presented must be produced 10 years prior to the first presentation.

In contrast, one respondent felt that the change had clarified the meaning of “contemporary” art, thereby “ensuring that the standards are the same across the country.” This is likely in response to the oft-repeated complaint that “MAP rules are not applied equally across Canada.” The consensus is that the recent changes to MAP will see far fewer contemporary art exhibitions touring in Canada.

**Question** – “Has the closure of ETS affected your institution’s ability to tour contemporary exhibitions?” Thirty-three of 46 respondents said “yes” and 33 out of 35 written responses
indicated that the closure of ETS has had a negative to strongly negative impact on their institution's ability to organize and receive touring exhibitions for the following reasons:

- The higher cost of alternative shipping.
- The extra time needed for planning and coordinating shipping with other carriers.
- The lower quality of service.

Five respondents said that they were now working successfully with other transport companies.

**Question** – On the international front, "has the closure of the PromArt program affected your institution's ability to tour exhibitions?" Nine out of 10 respondents indicated they had been adversely affected by the closure of PromArt. In response to a similar program about the Trade Routes program, four out of five said they had been affected its closure. Written responses to these two questions indicate the following:

- The programs played a crucial role in leveraging other funds.
- The programs stimulated collaborative efforts and negotiations with international partners.
- The programs helped ensure Canadian work was seen overseas and "played a crucial role in opening the world to contemporary Canadian visual art."

**Question** – “Has your institution developed or is it in the process of developing alternative strategies for touring contemporary exhibitions?” This question elicited a number of responses, with 33 out of 50 respondents answering in the affirmative. The 35 written responses can be summarized as follows:

- Emphasis on developing collaborations and partnerships to ensure that contemporary exhibitions are seen in two or more locales.
- Co-productions and collaborations are seen as the way forward for international initiatives.
- More consideration given to touring a “core” exhibition that is augmented and/or transformed in each venue, sometimes with works from the presenting institution’s permanent collection.

Several galleries mentioned that they relied on their provincial funding body to tour exhibitions within their provinces, and others talked of developing smaller exhibitions that are less expensive to ship and insure.

**Question** – “How critical is it to your institution to circulate contemporary exhibitions?” Responses revealed a strong support overall with 41 out of 49 respondents saying it was “critical” or
“somewhat critical”; seven said “neither critical or insignificant”; and one replied “somewhat insignificant.” Written comments revealed the following information:

- Presenting exhibitions from elsewhere enriches the experience of viewing contemporary art for the public in different regions of Canada.
- It is important for institutions (particularly in more isolated parts of Canada) to organize exhibits that include regional artists so as to give them wider exposure nationally and internationally.
- It is beneficial for the profile of a gallery with its own audiences, and also with potential sponsors and peers in the visual arts sector.

Several museums indicated that organizing touring exhibitions was integral to their institutional mandate.

Question – “How important is it to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour regionally, provincially, nationally and internationally?” Respondents conveyed the following information (also see Figure 9, previously discussed in Chapter 2 of this report).

- **Regionally**: 35% of respondents answered that touring regionally was “very important” and 31% said “quite important.” Comments emphasized the importance of touring regionally given that a region can encompass a very large geographic area. One comment stated: “Canadian visual culture takes root in the regions. The dialogue that occurs when exhibitions are shared and exhibited regionally fuels development on a local, regional and ultimately national level.”

- **Provincially**: 42% of respondents answered that touring provincially was “very important” and 25% said “quite important.” Many of the same reasons for touring regionally apply for touring province-wide: to enable more remote communities to access a greater range of contemporary art. Such touring shows give higher exposure to practicing artists and can also provide access to works from museums’ permanent collections.

- **Nationally**: Significantly, 83% of respondents answered that touring nationally was “very important,” and a further 12% said “quite important” for a total 95% of respondents. Touring nationally is seen as vital in order to introduce audiences to a variety of work, raise the profiles of professional artists and institutions, and develop conversations around contemporary discourse on a wide geographical scale. As one respondent said: “For obvious reason, it is important to experience what is happening elsewhere in a country as vast and with so many diverse cultures (as Canada).” Another noted that “Canada is too large not to tour exhibitions nationally.”

- **Internationally**: Overall 91% of respondents identified touring internationally as “very important” (62%) or “quite important” (29%). It is considered important for the country itself, “in
order to heighten Canada’s profile culturally, politically and economically,” and touring internationally provides unparalleled opportunities for artists, curators and institutions to grow and develop future partnerships. As one respondent said: “we are doing amazing work in Canada and should be on the world stage.”

As demonstrated by the survey findings, there appears to be an enormous sense of frustration caused by the changes to MAP and the closure of ETS, and yet optimism was expressed by galleries intent on exploring ways to continue to tour exhibitions through partnerships and collaborative ventures. Canada’s vast geography and the challenges it presents was a constant theme, making it more practical for some institutions to look at regional solutions. The majority of respondents emphasized the importance of touring contemporary art nationally. While few respondents had taken advantage of past federal programs of support for international ventures, a high number stressed the importance of touring contemporary visual art internationally for the reasons previously cited and for Canada’s image in the world.

3.4 Findings from Meetings with Professional Associations

In addition to the one-on-one interviews and online survey, the consultant also gathered information by attending stakeholder meetings where issues pertaining to travelling exhibitions were an important topic of discussion: the Canadian Museums Association (CMA) conference (Gatineau, April 2012); the Canadian Art Museum Directors Organization (CAMDO) annual meeting (Vancouver, May 2012); and the Atlantic Provinces Art Gallery Association (APAGA) annual meeting (Wolfville, Nova Scotia, June 2012). A summary of findings from each of these gatherings follows below.

Canadian Museums Association National Conference

The 65th National Conference of the Canadian Museums Association, On the Edge! (A la fine pointe !), took place in Gatineau, Quebec, from 23–27 April 2012. Throughout the conference, there were a variety of sessions, including keynote addresses by prominent speakers, workshops, and educational sessions, as well as opportunities for social interaction with colleagues across the country.

The first conference workshop dealt specifically with the issue of touring exhibitions. Entitled “Where are Travelling Exhibitions Headed,” it proposed that panelists consider the position occupied by travelling exhibitions in the museum landscape, particularly in light of related program cancellations. Panelists spoke of their respective museum’s experience, focusing on organizing travelling exhibition programs (from the perspective of history and natural science museums), or borrowing travelling exhibitions (from the perspective of a small, geographically-isolated exhibition centre). The workshop highlighted common restrictions and benefits to both organizing and borrowing touring exhibitions:

- Restrictions
  - High shipping and insurance costs.
Difficulty in obtaining sponsorship for traveling exhibitions.

> Benefits
  - Opportunity to create special programs and events around a particular exhibition in different contexts.
  - Favourable conditions for networking.

Representatives from the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) then spoke about the changes to the Museums Assistance Program (MAP), noting that MAP has had the same overall objectives for 30 years. The increase in the federal 2012 budget to the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program was identified as a major departmental achievement on behalf of the museum community.

Although common concerns were expressed during the workshop, it did not address specifics with regard to circulating contemporary exhibitions, or discuss how touring might be redefined. Rather, it seemed to afford an opportunity for federal and provincial history and science museums to provide information about their own travelling exhibition programs.

**Canadian Art Museum Directors Organization**

The Canadian Art Museum Directors Organization (CAMDO) held their Spring meeting and AGM in early May 2012 in Vancouver. As a member-based organization for art museum directors, presentations and panel discussions were only open to CAMDO's members. However, the consultant was invited to make a presentation about the research being undertaken on the current situation for public galleries and art museums in regard to touring contemporary art exhibitions. She also had the opportunity to speak to a number of individual museum directors on a one-to-one basis through the interview process and on an *ad hoc* basis, and these findings are integrated into this study. The following concerns emerged during a discussion after the consultant's presentation:

> The introduction of MAP's new restrictions means that no programs currently exist to assist galleries to tour contemporary exhibits within Canada.

> International projects require supplementary funds for items such as artists' fees and translation costs for publications, in addition to shipping, brokerage fees, insurance, etc. The Canada Council's annual grant allocation is not enough to allow for such initiatives.

> A website/listserv would enable galleries to exchange information and better communicate; the fundamental challenge, however, would be obtaining funds to establish and maintain it.

CAMDO's membership welcomed the opportunity to discuss challenges around touring contemporary art exhibitions and projects, nationally and internationally, while simultaneously considering
this topic in the larger context of their institutions’ many other responsibilities as public galleries and art museums. For example, panel discussions organized at this meeting focused on topics such as “The role of the public gallery in the ecology of the visual arts” and “Fundraising: approaching the private sector in the current economic climate.” Strategic planning is also an ongoing priority for members of the organization.

Atlantic Provinces Art Gallery Association

In June 2012, the Atlantic Provinces Art Gallery Association (APAGA) held its annual general meeting and conference in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, in collaboration with the Association of Artist-Run Centres from the Atlantic (AARCA). The event addressed issues around community engagement, and the exchange of information was key. The consultant was invited to brief attendees on her research and to solicit their input. Some of the issues raised during discussions include:

- The importance of developing relationships (institutionally and professionally) in order to be able to tour exhibitions.
- The value for the public in all parts of the Atlantic to engage with art from other regions.
- The worth of producing publications, even on a modest scale, for all exhibitions; touring exhibitions open up opportunities for co-publishing.
- The emergence of collaboration and partnership in the organization of touring exhibitions as a preferable alternative to the model of the single institution.
- The dire impact of the ETS closure on museums and galleries in the Atlantic region. Shipping costs are reported to have doubled and tripled as few companies operate regularly in the region.
- The necessity to redesign exhibits by curators and artists so as to reduce shipping costs.

Touring contemporary art exhibitions proved a particularly relevant topic for galleries in the Atlantic as they seek ways to connect regionally, nationally and internationally. Given that many receive modest support provincially, Atlantic galleries have been hit hard by the reduction and closure of federal programs of assistance. The conference included a session entitled “Going down the road: Disseminating our exhibitions and publications – Models, Challenges, Opportunities” in which presenters discussed their various experiences, including what was successful or not. Galleries in the Atlantic region appear to have a strong will to overcome the obstacles they face in touring contemporary art exhibitions and projects. In order to benefit the region and beyond, APAGA has recently commissioned a study to investigate practical solutions to touring within the Atlantic provinces and elsewhere. Its parameters are to “examine strategies to offset the high cost to art galleries and museums in Atlantic Canada of circulating exhibitions, focusing on the cost of shipping via private fine-art transport companies, with particular attention to the perceived loss of service levels resulting from the loss of the Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS).”
4. **TRENDS IN TOURING STRATEGIES**

This section looks at trends at touring strategies. It draws upon all of the data gathered for this study, as well as the consultant's own knowledge and expertise.

The principal reason that museums and art galleries organize touring exhibitions remains much the same today as it did 50 years ago: to reach greater audiences. It is therefore important to discuss trends in touring strategy by providing some insight into how museums adapt over time.

**Education, Public Programming and Public Engagement**

The inherent purpose of a museum is to collect, conserve, display, and interpret, with an emphasis on research and learning. Given the emergence of new technologies, enhanced training of museum professionals and new thinking about museum practices, the way the museum operates has changed significantly over the years, and nowhere is the shift more apparent than in the area of education.

The word “education” in the gallery world can be synonymous with “public programming,” “outreach” or “public engagement.” It can be ascribed to a far-ranging scope of activities that may include publishing informative text panels, expanded labels, and fully illustrated publications with critical text, or delivering school tours, summer camps and specialized workshops. It can include artist and curator talks and exchanges, conferences and symposia, film screenings, volunteer opportunities for young people, and even fundraising events and social gatherings. Cross-disciplinary events are also part of the mix, with readings by authors and poets, performing arts presentations, and activities in partnership with community groups. In addition, new technologies have provided possibilities to reach more people— particularly the young—through videos, podcasts, virtual exhibitions, online lesson plans and social media.

Touring contemporary art exhibitions is considered an extension of the “public programming” mission of a gallery in that it makes art and knowledge accessible to a greater number of people. For example, the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia explains its Travelling Exhibitions Program as follows:

*Our Travelling Exhibitions Program plays a vital role in supporting the Gallery’s commitment to creating exciting opportunities for access, outreach and educational experiences by making a select group of exhibitions, curated by Art Gallery of Nova Scotia staff, available for circulation. Drawing on a variety of media, art styles, subject matter,*
periods, and cultures, these touring exhibitions offer opportunities for dynamic engagement and stimulating conversations among regional and national audiences.17

Touring exhibitions enable the work of practising artists to be viewed by more people, and the ideas behind curatorial thinking to be considered and discussed in varying contexts. In addition, professional and institutional contacts are strengthened and the profile of a gallery—and even its city or region—is enhanced beyond its own boundaries.

Trends in “Pre-packaged” Exhibitions

Historically, the most familiar model was that of the large institution organizing “pre-packaged” exhibitions for smaller centres. The Art Gallery of Ontario’s (AGO) Extension Services exemplified this genre at its most sophisticated. In the mid-1970s, the department had a staff of 18 that included exhibition producers, assistants, a scheduling manager, a crate-builder and framer, installation technicians, and even the AGO’s graphic design unit. It organized various-sized exhibits with accompanying brochures, text panels and, on occasion, fully illustrated catalogues. Everything was managed in-house, including the research and development of exhibition content, design of published material, framing and crating. Installation officers were available to assist with setting up more complex exhibits. Exhibitions were offered to public galleries, as well as to libraries and community centres within Ontario, and occasionally beyond. Each exhibition was a complete package in itself.18

Other major institutions offered, and in some cases still offer, similar services to outlying galleries by organizing travelling exhibitions for a modest fee. These can be provincial galleries—such as The Rooms Art Gallery in Newfoundland and Labrador—which have a mandate to assist smaller centres in their province, or art museums like the Vancouver Art Gallery and Saskatoon’s Mendel Art Gallery, which view it as their responsibility to do so. (The Vancouver Art Gallery’s Across the Province program, for example, circulates exhibitions drawn from the Gallery’s extensive permanent collection to partner institutions throughout BC.) Contemporay exhibits are included in the blend of offerings, and a number of galleries, such as the Winnipeg Art Gallery and the Musee d’art contemporain de Montreal, organize exhibitions drawn from their respective collections. This has the advantage of promoting and sharing key works from a museum’s collection with galleries and audiences in other regions of Canada, as well as reducing the cost of assembling works from elsewhere.

While packaged shows are still offered for circulation provincially (e.g., the Art Gallery of Alberta is one of four organizations to tour exhibits on behalf of Alberta’s TREX program) and nationally (e.g., the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia’s Ed Burtynsky: Photographs; Galerie de l’UQAM’s Manon de Pauw:

---

17 Quote taken from the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia’s web page under Travelling Exhibitions:

18 The AGO gradually reduced its Extension Services, amalgamating it with the Curatorial branch in the early 1980s and then transferring it to the department of Education, Outreach and Public Programming in 1992 before disbanding it completely in 1995.
Intrigues; and the Carleton University Art Gallery’s Carol Wainio: The Book), there are galleries that neither want to organize nor present this kind of touring exhibit. In some measure, this can be attributed to a lack of resources; however, it is also due to the fact that gallery personnel have become more selective and want to influence the curatorial content of exhibitions presented in their spaces. Museum professionals are more responsive than before to their regional and cultural environments and are connecting with their own communities on a deeper level. Galleries tend to plan their exhibition schedules at least two to three years in advance, and in so doing, seek to present a coherent program that attracts and engages audiences within their own particular environment. In order to tour such exhibitions, institutions and professional colleagues increasingly seek out and establish relationships with like-minded partners and collaborators. Considerations include scale (larger institutions have greater resources at their disposal, which puts pressure on a smaller partner aiming to share responsibility equally); common interest; compatibility in regard to professional relationships; and overall dependability.

**Trends in Collaboration and Partnership**

Co-productions, partnerships and collaborations are all part of a strategy currently employed by galleries to ensure that the research and planning that leads to the production of certain contemporary exhibitions is disseminated more widely. While the notion of working in partnership is not new, it is fast becoming the preferred option for galleries wishing to tour contemporary exhibits. This strategy requires partners to be identified in the planning stage and certain commitments made in advance—including the confirmation of venues—rather than waiting until the exhibit is a complete package before offering it for tour, as was the previous norm. There is no one way to make a partnership agreement, as each is tailored to the particular project under discussion and can be simple or complex. Yet the overall objective is to strengthen the proposal by sharing expertise, labour and costs, and ensuring greater audience participation. Collaborations may include the following kinds of agreements:

- Two or more galleries share expertise, workload and cost by dividing different tasks in order to organize a contemporary travelling exhibition. This might mean that institutional curators are responsible for the exhibition, or that an independent curator is commissioned to curate the show.

- One museum assumes responsibility for the publication and editorial content, and another takes charge of loans, crating, shipping and managing the exhibition’s itinerary. In the exhibit *Kai Chan: A Spider’s Logic*, the Textile Museum in Toronto took the lead on the curatorial content and supervised shipping for the tour while the Varley Art Gallery in Markham assumed responsibility for the catalogue production, including translation, negotiated loans, and setting up the tour. The exhibition was shown at both locations simultaneously, and a smaller version of the overall show was selected to tour to four more Canadian galleries that each paid a fee.
A gallery partners with an organization that has a particular curatorial expertise in order to produce a touring show. The Ottawa Art Gallery (OAG) and the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective (with no designated space to present exhibitions) co-produced the exhibition and catalogue *Oh So Iroquois*. The guest curator, a founder of the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective, selected the 22 artists and works included in the exhibit, and invited six guest writers to contribute essays to the catalogue, in addition to his own. OAG supervised everything else including the editing and production of the trilingual (Mohawk/English/French) publication, tour itinerary, shipping, loans, artists’ and writers’ fees, and the guest curator’s travel to give a talk at each participating gallery.

A host gallery may select additional works from its permanent collection to include with a touring exhibit, so as to highlight an artist’s association with the region or institution.

Partners collaborate on one aspect of an exhibit’s production, such as sharing costs for the catalogue:

- The Robert McLaughlin Gallery in Oshawa organized the exhibition *Simone Jones: All That Is Solid* and made an agreement with three other galleries to present the show for a $6,000 fee. In exchange, the galleries were recognized as full copyright partners for the publication. This straightforward arrangement ensured that different audiences would see the exhibit elsewhere and the catalogue would be more substantial.

- Curators from the Agnes Etherington Art Centre in Kingston and Carleton University Art Gallery in Ottawa organized the exhibition *Erin Shirreff: Available Light*. The Contemporary Art Gallery in Vancouver produced a different show, *Erin Shirreff: Pictures* (which exclusively presented her film and video work), but co-produced the publication with the two other galleries, enabling the production of an ambitious publication that relates to the artist’s overall practice.

- Several galleries interested in the work of Montreal artist Milutin Gubash organized their own exhibitions; however, the five galleries (Rodman Hall Art Centre, St. Catherine’s; Carleton University Art Gallery, Ottawa; Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery; Southern Alberta Art Gallery, Lethbridge, and the Musée d’art de Joliette) decided to co-produce a publication about the artist’s work, to which their respective curators contributed essays. Instead of several modest exhibition catalogues, the result is an illustrated, 196-page hardcover, bilingual publication that is likely to have national and international appeal.

Either the lead partner or the host galleries commission the presenting artist(s) to originate public presentations that are relevant to the community involved. In the case of the exhibition *Gordon Monohan: Seeing Sound*, organized by the Robert McLaughlin Gallery, sound artist Monohan collaborated with all eight galleries that presented the exhibition in Canada, as well as the art centre in Germany that received the show. In this case, each organization was also a co-producer of the 160-page, hard cover, trilingual
(German/French/English) catalogue, contributing a $4,500 collaboration fee to assure a significant publication.

It appears evident that collaborations are the way forward to ensure that exhibitions tour regionally, nationally and even internationally. Museums and gallery professionals are keen to work with like-minded partners and share knowledge and expertise. The high cost of organizing touring exhibits, particularly shipping costs, and the increased workload for gallery staff are the obvious impediments to such undertakings. With targeted assistance to contribute to the underlying costs, more galleries would willingly take on the tasks and risks associated with the organization of exhibitions to circulate more widely.

**Examples of Successful Touring Initiatives**

Among the recent national touring exhibition initiatives that have taken place as partnerships in Canada, *Traffic: Conceptual Art in Canada 1965–1980* must rank as one of the most successful, as well as the most complex. While this example is an exception rather than the rule, it offers a model for cooperation that could be developed on a less ambitious scale. The exhibition was organized and circulated by the Art Gallery of Alberta (Edmonton), the Justina M. Barnicke Gallery (Toronto), and the Vancouver Art Gallery in partnership with the Leonard & Bina Ellen Art Gallery (Montreal), and Halifax INK, a consortium of university art galleries in Halifax; it involved six curators, both institutional and independent. The first major exhibition documenting the many manifestations of conceptual art in Canada, *Traffic* presented more than 450 works by over 100 artists from across Canada, Europe and the United States. Planning began in 2003, and the first presentation took place in September 2010 at the four university art galleries connected to the University of Toronto. Similarly in Halifax, the exhibit was on view in the city’s four university art galleries. It then continued on to the Art Gallery of Alberta, followed by the Leonard & Bina Ellen Art Gallery at Concordia University, where it was shown in two parts, and ended its Canadian tour at the Vancouver Art Gallery in January 2013. The exhibit gained international legs as well: *Traffic* opens in April 2013 at the Badischer Kunstverein, Karlsruhe, Germany, in a reconfigured adaptation. The publication that accompanies the exhibition is available in separate French and English versions: erudite, detailed and visually well documented, it includes essays by several guest writers as well as the exhibition’s curators. An extensive chronology of Canadian conceptual art is also available online.

This multifaceted undertaking resulted from the determination and hard work of the institutions and curators involved, but it also would not have happened without essential funding from the Museums Assistance Program (MAP), which recognized the exhibition’s significance to Canadian art history in an international context. From this example, it can be deduced that ambitious projects that are strictly contemporary in nature could not take place at this time unless special funding assistance is available. The initial seed money from MAP provided funds for research and travel that cemented the partnership; a second grant contributed to the presentation and publication costs; and a third assured the Canadian tour. The Canada Council subsequently provided a grant to assist with artists’ and curators’ travel expenses, artists’ fees and shipping costs for the exhibition to be presented in Germany.
An alternate model for touring contemporary exhibitions is the successful Independent Curators International (ICI) that produces exhibitions, events, publications and training opportunities for diverse audiences around the world. Based in New York, ICI was founded in 1975 by two resourceful women who realized how difficult it was to see contemporary exhibitions of quality artworks in places outside the main US centres, and thus developed exhibitions that would tour. It has grown into “a catalyst for independent thinking, connecting emerging and established curators, artists, and institutions, to forge international networks and generate new forms of collaboration.” A recent Canadian connection relates to the exhibition Martha Wilson, offered for tour by ICI from 2011–14 and curated by Peter Dykhuis, Director of the Dalhousie Art Gallery in Halifax. ICI is a non-profit organization with a Board of Trustees and an active membership program. It covers its operational costs through fees and annual fundraising events.

Interestingly, none but the most well-funded Canadian galleries borrow exhibits offered by ICI due to the high exhibition fee, which is a significant issue for Canadian institutions. Fees charged by ICI and some foreign organizations are high in comparison to those charged by most Canadian museums: ICI does not receive government funding and must recover all associated costs. In most Canadian galleries, the production of exhibit content is supported through grants from the Canada Council as well as provincial and municipal governments or agencies. Consequently, Canadian institutions tour exhibits without anticipating a profit and do not expect to pay high fees for touring exhibitions.

The ICI model was identified by several museum professionals in the course of this research as a promising example for Canada, with some variation. Discussions related to an independent office that would coordinate the circulation of national and international contemporary touring exhibitions developed by Canadian institutions (and possibly independent curators). This would have the advantage of establishing a one-stop repository for information about what exhibits are or will be available. This would considerably reduce the time gallery staff spend on the technical aspects of tour organization, theoretically enabling public galleries to offer a richer selection of exhibitions to their publics.

Other Collaborations and Partnerships of Note

There are also groups with similar backgrounds and/or interests that come together so as to further their professional practices. The previously mentioned Atlantic Provinces Art Galleries Association (APAGA) is one such organization; another is the University and College Art Galleries Association of Canada, an important and active organization within the gallery milieu. It circulated a questionnaire in 2005 to better understand its membership, and although useful, the responses indicated that more specific questions needed to be asked. A detailed survey that included questions about touring exhibitions and collaborative touring projects was circulated to the membership in 2012, and the results are currently being reviewed.
Less formal partnerships have also emerged in order to organize touring exhibitions for galleries within particular regions and beyond. One example is the Small City Art Museums (SCAM), where curators from different galleries—such as the Moose Jaw Museum and Art Gallery, and the Art Gallery of Swift Current in Saskatchewan—are developing partnerships.

5. **Key Findings and Observations**

The purpose of this study—to identify current trends with regard to touring contemporary art exhibitions and investigate the level of its importance to art galleries and their publics—sought to answer a number of questions. What follows is a synopsis of the key research findings.

- **What funding programs currently support the touring of contemporary exhibitions?**

  At the federal level, there are no funding programs specifically targeted to support the touring of contemporary exhibitions nationally or internationally. Canadian Heritage's Access to Heritage component of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) continues to support touring exhibitions of retrospectives by senior artists and exhibitions that are deemed historical. However, the introduction of stricter eligibility criteria in 2011 means the program now excludes most contemporary projects.

  The Canada Council's program of Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries contributes to institutions’ operations and programming, and is flexible in that it allows funds to be expended for travelling exhibits. Nevertheless, with so many competing priorities to satisfy, galleries feel little incentive to use this crucial source for contemporary touring support. Primarily through Director’s grants, the Council does contribute to major international projects, such as the Venice Biennale or Documenta, but no specific program exists to fund exhibits touring internationally.

  Provincially, programs vary across the country, but there are some provincial governments and agencies that assist institutions and artists with touring major projects abroad or in Canada. Several provinces offer programs that assist touring contemporary exhibitions in their provinces, such as OSAC's Arts on the Move, funded by the Saskatchewan Arts Board and the Saskatchewan Lotteries, or the Ontario Arts Council's program Ontario Touring. Other provinces prefer to ensure that smaller and isolated communities have the benefit of experiencing art first-hand and fund art museums to organize provincial travelling exhibits as outreach programs. Examples include Newfoundland and Labrador's Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation that provides funding to The Rooms Art Gallery to tour within the province, or the AFA's provincial travelling exhibition program TREX in Alberta (See 2.4).
What funding programs were available over the last 10 years for this activity?

While there were a number of programs offered at the federal level over the past decade, most of these programs have shut down:

- The Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS) program was dismantled in 2008. Under the aegis of the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) through the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI), it supported museums and galleries by providing expert transportation services specialized in handling artworks and artifacts.
- The March 2008 closure of DFAIT’s Arts Promotion Program, also known as PromArt, means that no federal program exists to help defray costs associated with touring Canadian exhibitions abroad.
- Trade Routes, an initiative of PCH intended primarily for the commercial sector, was similarly phased out over 2009–10.
- As mentioned above, as of 2011 MAP is no longer open to accepting proposals from art museums for touring exhibits with contemporary content.

What has been the impact of recent cuts to federal government programs?

Of all the federal program cuts affecting the museum milieu, none was felt more acutely than the 2008 cancellation of Exhibition Transportation Services (ETS): approximately 92% of respondents surveyed for this study had used its services to ship exhibitions prior to its closure. ETS was particularly important to smaller institutions and museums located off the main transportation corridors. While it is hard to gauge statistically how ETS’s demise has affected the circulation of exhibitions in Canada (in that we have no accurate “pre” and “post” touring data), survey comments indicate that the cost of shipping has risen and the level of service provided is potentially less reliable. The cancellation is so strongly felt in Atlantic Canada that APAGA has commissioned a study to examine the question of the transportation of art exhibits in the Atlantic region.

Although the survey indicated that only one in five institutions received assistance from PromArt, and even fewer from Trade Routes, those that did benefit considered it important. The programs were particularly helpful in providing leverage to secure other sources of funding. Ultimately, their cancellation means that Canadian artists are less likely to be featured in exhibitions internationally; contacts between artists, curators and museum professionals in other countries is limited; and Canada becomes marginalized on the world stage in spite of its thriving contemporary visual art scene.

Through its programs of support, MAP has previously supported the development, presentation and circulation in Canada of retrospective exhibitions of senior Canadian artists as well as
exhibitions of art that provide a historical perspective. With the 2011 introduction of more stringent guidelines, retrospectives of mid-career artists or contemporary exhibitions that are thematic in nature are unlikely to be eligible for support. MAP’s parameters concerning the production dates of work and contributing collections put excessive constraints on the curator’s vision for an exhibition, and limit the potential selection by excluding the most recent work in an artist’s corpus. These changes not only adversely impact the Access to Heritage program, but also the Aboriginal Heritage and Exhibition Circulation Fund components.

▶ What are the trends in touring strategies?
▶ Have new touring strategies emerged in recent years?

Historically, larger institutions tended to organize “packaged” exhibitions for circulation to smaller, less urban centres, and there is evidence that this practice is still actively promoted at the provincial level in certain regions – e.g. the Vancouver Art Gallery’s Across the Province program, the Mendel Art Gallery’s long-standing provincial touring program in Saskatchewan and the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia’s Travelling Exhibitions program. These touring shows serve an important purpose by making contemporary art accessible to communities that do not have the resources to initiate their own exhibits. Some packaged contemporary exhibitions are still offered for national circulation as well.

Increasingly, however, the approach to travelling exhibitions is through partnerships and co-productions, and away from packaged exhibits. The obvious reason for collaborating with partners is to reduce costs, but this is not the only benefit. Galleries see the potential for undertaking more ambitious projects by working in tandem. Not only can expenses be shared, but also workload and professional expertise. Co-productions mean that institutional curators have the opportunity to work with colleagues, likely resulting in more depth to exhibition content and publications. In addition, collaborations can be tailored to fit the objectives as well as the scale and cost of the project in question. While the idea of sharing costs and partnering is not new, it is definitely a strategy that has become more significant in recent years and—in the right environment—would gain momentum.

▶ What are the trends in funding and fundraising for touring?

As noted above, there are no designated federal programs to support touring contemporary exhibitions nationally or internationally. At the provincial and municipal levels, available assistance is unequal across the country and favours provincial and regional tours. Attracting sponsorship for touring

---

contemporary exhibitions is particularly challenging. Corporations rarely see such initiatives as giving them sufficient return and are wary of contemporary exhibitions that may prove controversial, preferring exhibits with historic content. The research revealed no evidence of new thinking or approaches to funding tours of a contemporary nature other than the trend to work collaboratively and share resources.

That being said, gallery professionals are agile at pursuing funds from various sources. They seek sponsorships and in-kind donations from small business; apply for grants for specialized programming from foundations; utilize interest from endowment funds; and funnel a contribution from their operating budgets, thereby building a budget to enable a desired project to go forward. However, this approach is not feasible on a recurring basis, and any project must be a suitable fit in relation to the funding source.

Are there gaps in touring activity, and in funding for this activity? If so, what are they and what is their effect?

As deduced from the survey results, interviews and conversations with museum professionals across Canada, there is a discrepancy between those museums that say they would organize and receive touring exhibits and those that actually do.

The principal reason for not touring contemporary exhibits is the availability of funds, or lack thereof. Museums are multifaceted organizations with competing cost priorities: running a building, paying professional staff, and caring for collections of valuable objects or artworks in a secure and climate controlled environment. Institutions must make choices about how to allocate their annual budget among curatorial projects, publications, new acquisitions, public programming and educational activities, publicity and marketing, initiatives using new technologies, fundraising, and more.

These competing demands and the costs associated with touring exhibitions mean that galleries view the organization of touring exhibits on a regular basis as a low priority, and evidence from the research suggests it happens only occasionally.

Based on the statistical and qualitative information gathered for this study, the consultant has concluded the following:

1. More museums would organize touring contemporary exhibits if they had increased human and financial resources available to them. No federal program presently exists that is specifically designed to assist with the costs of touring contemporary art exhibitions nationally or internationally.

2. The current trend indicates that galleries prefer to organize touring shows in partnership with other compatible institutions.
3. While galleries are risk-averse, they are experienced in obtaining funds from a variety of sources. In this regard, seed money is often enough to kick-start a project, and can serve as leverage to secure additional funding.

Survey respondents suggested ways to encourage their sector to become more proactive in regard to touring exhibits, with an emphasis on flexible partnerships that respond to a particular situation. One respondent observed that “rather than create fixed curatorial projects … we are collaborating on projects with partner galleries and artists who are willing to create content changes from venue to venue. This includes sharing resources for catalogues with multiple curatorial voices, including guest curators, rather than producing a single-voiced, single institutional publication.” Every interviewee asserted the importance of establishing partnerships and collaborations in one form or another, and the establishment of a website to post available exhibits and exhibition ideas for potential partnerships was proposed, among other suggestions.

The Canada Council’s Visual Arts Section has the expertise and infrastructure to address these requirements. The research demonstrates that most organizations prefer a model that includes some kind of institutional collaboration in order to maximize the benefits of touring exhibits. This could be addressed in different ways, but a flexible option incurring limited additional administrative work for either Council staff or applicants is desirable.

Much has been discussed with regard to the challenges facing public galleries and art museums wanting to tour contemporary exhibitions, as well as the advantages in doing so. Challenges cited in interviews and qualitatively include the high cost of shipping; increased insurance costs; higher artists’ fees; additional staff time for planning and managing a tour; lack of opportunity to build relationships among curators across the country; and Canada’s vast geography, which has inherent cost implications for touring. The value of touring places great importance on reaching wider and more diverse audiences, promoting artists and their work and advancing scholarship, in addition to forming professional partnerships to enhance projects undertaken collaboratively. It is worth reiterating that 95% of survey respondents consider it is “very important or quite important to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour nationally,” while 91% deem it equally important to “tour internationally.”

Without doubt, organizations in Canada would tour more contemporary exhibitions with increased funding support. They have already shown themselves willing and capable by forging flexible partnerships to ensure more substantial products and a greater level of public engagement, a trend that is increasing. They are actively searching for ways to minimize costs and maximize benefits, and consistently demonstrate resourcefulness. There is a need for a federal program that is specifically designed to assist with the costs of touring contemporary exhibitions nationally and internationally. An investment at the federal level for touring exhibitions would have a profound impact on the ability of arts organizations to
strengthen their performance, making the work of contemporary artists—and the ideas emanating from that work—accessible to far greater numbers of people.
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Annex 1.1 **Small Galleries (Budgets Less than $1 Million)**

- Art Gallery of Calgary, AB
- Art Gallery of Mississauga, ON
- Art Gallery of Peterborough, ON
- Art Gallery of Regina (former Rosemont Art Soc.), SK
- Art Gallery of Southwestern Manitoba, MB
- Art Gallery of Sudbury, ON
- Cambridge Galleries, ON
- Canadian Clay and Glass Gallery, ON
- Centre A - Vancouver International Centre, BC
- Centre d'exposition de Val d'Or, QC
- Confederation Centre Art Gallery, PEI
- Contemporary Art Gallery, BC
- Dunlop Art Gallery, SK
- Esplanade Arts and Heritage Centre, AB
- Expression, Saint-Hyacinthe, QC
- Grimsby Public Art Gallery, ON
- Kelowna Art Gallery, BC
- Koffler Gallery (The), ON
- MacDonald Stewart Art Centre, ON
- Mann Art Gallery (A.G. Prince Albert / Little Gallery), SK
- Moose Jaw Art Gallery, SK
- Musée de la ville de Lachine, QC
- Oakville Galleries, ON
- Ottawa Art Gallery (The), ON
- Plein sud, Longueuil, QC
- Plug In Inc., MB
- Presentation House Gallery, BC
- Prince George (Two Rivers Art Gallery), BC
- Richmond Art Gallery, BC
- Robert McLaughlin Gallery, The, ON
- SBC Gallery of Contemporary Art (Saidye Bronfman Centre Art Gallery), QC
- Southern Alberta Art Gallery, AB
Annex 1.2  **MEDIUM GALLERIES (BUDGETS OF $1 TO $5 MILLION)**

- Art Gallery of Alberta (Edmonton Art Gallery), AB
- Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, BC
- Art Gallery of Hamilton, ON
- Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, NS
- Art Gallery of Windsor, ON
- Beaverbrook Art Gallery, NB
- Corporation du Musée régional de Rimouski, QC
- George R. Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art (The), ON
- Kamloops Art Gallery, BC
- Kitchener Waterloo Art Gallery, ON
- Museum London (London Regional & Historical Museums), ON
- MacKenzie Art Gallery, SK
- MacLaren Art Centre, ON
- Mendel Art Gallery, SK
- Museum of Contemporary Canadian Art, ON
- Musée d'art de Joliette, QC
- Power Plant (The), ON
- The Rooms Art Gallery (AGNL), NL

Annex 1.3  **LARGE GALLERIES (BUDGETS OF $5 TO $10 MILLION)**

- Glenbow Museum, AB
- McMichael Canadian Art Collection, ON
- Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal, QC
- Vancouver Art Gallery, BC
- Winnipeg Art Gallery, MB
Annex 1.4 Extra-large Galleries (Budgets More than $10 Million)

- Art Gallery of Ontario, ON
- Canadian Centre for Architecture, QC
- Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal, QC
- Musée national des beaux-arts du Québec (Musée du Québec), QC

Annex 1.5 University Art Galleries

- Agnes Etherington Art Centre, ON
- Art Gallery of Newfoundland and Labrador, NL
- Art Gallery of York University, ON
- Blackwood Gallery, ON
- Carleton University Art Gallery, ON
- Charles H. Scott Gallery, BC
- Dalhousie Art Gallery, NS
- Galerie d'art du Centre culturel (U. de Sherbrooke), QC
- Galerie d'art Leonard & Bina Ellen Art Gallery, QC
- Galerie de l'UQAM, QC
- Kenderdine Art Gallery, SK
- McIntosh Gallery, ON
- Morris & Helen Belkin Art Gallery, BC
- Mount Saint Vincent University Art Gallery, NS
- Owens Art Gallery, NB
- Saint Mary's University Art Gallery, NS
- The Justina M. Barnicke Gallery, ON
- University of Lethbridge Art Gallery, AB

- Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston
- Art Gallery of Alberta, Edmonton
- Art Gallery of Calgary, Calgary
- Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, Victoria
- Art Gallery of Hamilton, Hamilton
- Art Gallery of Mississauga, Mississauga
- Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto
- Art Gallery of Peterborough, Peterborough
- Art Gallery of Southwestern Manitoba Inc., Brandon
- Art Gallery of Sudbury, Sudbury
- Art Gallery of Windsor, Windsor
- Art Gallery of York University, Toronto
- Beaverbrook Art Gallery, Fredericton
- Blackwood Gallery, Mississauga
- Cambridge Galleries, Cambridge
- Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal
- Canadian Clay and Glass Gallery, Waterloo
- Carleton University Art Gallery, Ottawa
- Centre d'exposition de Val d'Or, Val d'Or
- Charles H. Scott Gallery, Vancouver
- Confederation Centre Art Gallery, Charlottetown
- Contemporary Art Gallery Society of BC, Vancouver
- Dalhousie Art Gallery, Halifax
- Dunlop Art Gallery, Regina
- Esplanade Arts and Heritage Centre, Medicine Hat
- Expression, Centre d'exposition de Saint-Hyacinthe, Saint-Hyacinthe
- Foreman Art Gallery of Bishop's University, Sherbrooke
- Galerie de l'Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal
- Galerie Leonard & Bina Ellen Art Gallery, Montreal
- George Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art, Toronto
- Grimsby Public Art Gallery, Grimsby
- Hart House - The Justina M. Barnicke Gallery, Toronto
- Kamloops Art Gallery, Kamloops
- Kelowna Art Gallery Association, Kelowna
Kenderdine Art Gallery / University Art Collection, Saskatoon
Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery, Kitchener-Waterloo
Macdonald Stewart Art Centre, Guelph
MacKenzie Art Gallery, Regina
MacLaren Art Centre, Barrie
Mann Art Gallery, Prince Albert
McIntosh Gallery, London
Mendel Art Gallery, Saskatoon
Moose Jaw Art Museum & Art Gallery, Moose Jaw
Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery, Vancouver
Mount Saint Vincent University Art Gallery, Halifax
Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal, Montréal
Musée d'art de Joliette, Joliette
Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal, Montréal
Musée national des beaux-arts du Québec, Québec
Musée régional de Rimouski Inc., Rimouski
Museum London, London
Museum of Contemporary Canadian Art, Toronto
Oakville Galleries, Oakville
Owens Art Gallery, Sackville
Plein sud, centre d'exposition & d'animation en art actuel à Longueuil, Longueuil
Plug In Institute of Contemporary Art, Winnipeg
Presentation House Gallery, North Vancouver
Robert McLaughlin Gallery, Oshawa
Saint Mary's University Art Gallery, Halifax
SBC Gallery of Contemporary Art, Montreal
Southern Alberta Art Gallery, Lethbridge
Surrey Art Gallery, Surrey
Textile Museum of Canada, Toronto
Thames Art Gallery, Chatham
The Koffler Gallery, Toronto
The Ottawa Art Gallery, Ottawa
The Power Plant, Toronto,
The Rooms Provincial Art Gallery, St. John's
Thunder Bay Art Gallery, Thunder Bay
Tom Thomson Memorial Art Gallery, Owen Sound
Two Rivers Gallery, Prince George
University of Lethbridge Art Gallery, Lethbridge
Vancouver Art Gallery, Vancouver
Vancouver International Centre for Contemporary Asian Art, Vancouver
Walter Phillips Gallery, Banff
Winnipeg Art Gallery, Winnipeg
Woodland Cultural Centre, Brantford
Yukon Arts Centre Public Art Gallery, Whitehorse
Dear colleagues,

The Canada Council for the Arts wishes to ascertain the current situation for art museums and public galleries with regard to the touring and circulation of contemporary art exhibitions. I have been asked by the Canada Council to undertake the research necessary to analyze trends from the past decade and assess the current conditions and circumstances for Canadian public galleries in this regard, specifically those that benefit from funding through the Visual Arts Section’s Assistance to Art Museums and Public Galleries program. The value of the research depends on accurate and up-to-date information from the galleries involved, and it is important to know your views. Please take 20 minutes to respond to this short questionnaire. Please ensure there is only one respondent from your organization completing this survey. Please submit your questionnaire by June 6, 2012. If you have any questions about the survey or the survey process, you may contact me by email at mela.constantinidi@gmail.com. The system will timeout after 15 minutes of inactivity, so please ensure that you have time to complete it before starting. Do not use the Forward or Back buttons of your web browser to navigate the survey as this may result in the loss of your responses to the questions.

Does your institution tour contemporary art exhibitions regionally as part of your regular activities?
1. Yes
2. No

How many regional touring contemporary exhibitions does your institution typically organize within a 12-month period?
1. 0
2. 1–2
3. 3–4
4. 5–6
5. 7 or more

Does your institution tour contemporary art exhibitions provincially as part of your regular activities?
1. Yes
2. No
How many provincial touring contemporary exhibitions does your institution typically organize within a 12-month period?
1. 0
2. 1–2
3. 3–4
4. 5–6
5. 7 or more

Does your institution tour contemporary art exhibitions nationally as part of your regular activities?
1. Yes
2. No

How many national touring contemporary exhibitions does your institution typically organize within a 12-month period?
1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4 or more

Does your institution tour contemporary art exhibitions internationally as part of your regular activities?
1. Yes
2. No

How many international touring contemporary exhibitions does your institution typically organize within a 12-month period?
1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4 or more

In the past decade (2002–2012), has your institution received support through Canadian Heritage’s Museums Assistance Program (MAP) to circulate and/or present contemporary travelling exhibitions?
1. Yes
2. No
From which of the following categories of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) did your institution receive support? (Check all that apply)

1. Access to Heritage
2. Exhibition Circulation Fund
3. Aboriginal Heritage

Have the changes to the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) affected your institution’s ability to circulate and/or present contemporary travelling exhibitions? Please explain:

1. Yes
2. No

Before the closure of the Exhibition Transportation Service (ETS) in 2008, did your institution use these services to ship exhibitions?

1. Yes
2. No

When undertaking touring exhibitions, how often did your institution use Exhibition Transportation Service (ETS) for shipping?

1. Always
2. Usually
3. About half the time
4. Occasionally
5. Rarely

Has your institution found alternative, comparable shipping services?

1. Yes
2. No

Has the closure of the Exhibition Transportation Service (ETS) affected your institution’s ability to tour contemporary exhibitions? Please explain:

1. Yes
2. No

In the past decade (2002–2012), has your institution been involved in touring exhibitions or presenting contemporary art projects internationally?

1. Yes
2. No
How many international touring exhibitions or contemporary arts projects does your institution typically organize within a 12-month period?
1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4 or more

Did your institution receive assistance from the Trade Routes program before it ended in 2009?
1. Yes
2. No

Has the closure of the Trade Routes (Canadian Heritage) program affected your institution's ability to tour exhibitions? Please explain:
1. Yes
2. No

Did your institution receive assistance from PromArt (Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada) program before it ended in 2009?
1. Yes
2. No

Has the closure of the PromArt program affected your institution's ability to tour exhibitions? Please explain:
1. Yes
2. No

Has your institution developed or is it in the process of developing alternative strategies for touring contemporary exhibitions? Please explain:
1. Yes
2. No

How many contemporary exhibitions does your institution typically borrow from other public galleries within a 12-month period?
1. 0
2. 1–2
3. 3–4
4. 5–6
5. 7 or more
How critical is it to your institution to circulate contemporary exhibitions? Please explain:
1. Critical
2. Somewhat critical
3. Neither critical or insignificant
4. Somewhat insignificant
5. Insignificant

How important is it to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour regionally? Please explain:
1. Very important
2. Quite important
3. Fairly important
4. Slightly important
5. Not at all important

How important is it to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour provincially? Please explain:
1. Very important
2. Quite important
3. Fairly important
4. Slightly important
5. Not at all important

How important is it to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour nationally? Please explain:
1. Very important
2. Quite important
3. Fairly important
4. Slightly important
5. Not at all important

How important is it to the visual arts sector that contemporary exhibitions tour internationally? Please explain:
1. Very important
2. Quite important
3. Fairly important
4. Slightly important
5. Not at all important

Do you have any other observations or comments with respect to the circulation of Canadian contemporary art?
Annex 4.  **Museum Professionals Interviewed**

- Bellerby, Greg; Director, Charles H. Scott Gallery, Emily Carr University of Art and Design, Vancouver
- Cowell, Elspeth; Head, Collection and Program Services, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal
- Cronin, Ray; Director and CEO, Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Crowston, Catherine; Executive Director, Art Gallery of Alberta, Edmonton
- Fischer, Barbara; Director/Curator, The Justina M. Barnicke Gallery, Toronto
- Gagnon, Paulette; Director, Musée d'art contemporain, Montreal
- Gallanti, Fabrizio; Associate Director, Programs, Canadian Centre for Architecture
- Garcia, Emeren; Head of Touring Exhibitions, Musée d'art contemporain, Montreal
- Godwin, Sharon; Director, Thunder Bay Art Gallery, Thunder Bay
- Love, Karen; Manager of Grants and Publications, Vancouver Art Gallery, Vancouver
- Meehan, Brian; Executive Director, Museum London, Ontario
- Metcalfe, Robin; Director/Curator, Saint Mary’s University Art Gallery, Halifax
- Mills, Josephine; Director/Curator, University of Lethbridge Art Gallery, Alberta
- Nagy, Nataley; Executive Director, Kelowna Art Gallery, Kelowna
- Normandin, Pascal; Head of Exhibitions Management, Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, Montreal
- Pappararo, Jennifer; Curator, Contemporary Art Gallery, Vancouver
- Perinet, Francine; Director, Varley Art Gallery, Markham
- Perry, Sheila; Director, The Rooms Provincial Art Gallery, St. John’s
- Prince, Nigel; Executive Director, Contemporary Art Gallery, Vancouver
- Rimmer, Cate; Curator, Charles H. Scott Gallery, Emily Carr University of Art and Design, Vancouver
- Theriault, Michelle; Director, Leonard & Bina Ellen Art Gallery, Concordia University, Montreal
- Tolmach, Elaine; Grants Co-ordinator for Government and Foundation Giving, Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, Montreal
- Tupper, Jon; Director, Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, Victoria
- Watson, Scott; Director/Curator, Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
- Zardini, Mirko; Executive Director/Chief Curator, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal
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