



P.O. Box 1749
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3A5 Canada

Item No.
Community Planning & Economic Development Standing Committee
June 16, 2016

TO: Chair and Members of Community Planning and Economic Development
Standing Community

SUBMITTED BY: Original Signed by: _____
Brad Anguish, Director, Parks & Recreation

DATE: June 8, 2016

SUBJECT: ArtsHalifax Advisory Committee Recommendations

ORIGIN

May 12, 2015 Regional Council Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Watts that Halifax Regional Council:

1. Adopt Administrative Order 2014-019-GOV, "ArtsHalifax Advisory Committee Administrative Order" as outlined in Attachment 1 the Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee report dated April 20, 2015 (as amended to remove Section 12 (c)).
2. Amend the Administrative Order to delete section 17 and subsequently renumber the Administrative Order accordingly for clarity in regard to the Committee's role as a staff advisory committee.
3. Approve the consolidation of the current public art annual operating programs (open projects and artist in residencies) and the associated budget of \$60,000 into the Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organizations Program, subject to the procedural conditions outlined in Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM, "the Administrative Order on Grants to Professional Arts Organizations"; and
4. Approve the approach for remaining Special Arts and Culture Advisory Committee recommendations as outlined in Table 2 of the March 17, 2015 staff report. **MOTION PUT AND PASSED**

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Halifax Regional Municipality Charter, Subsection 21(1): "The Council may establish standing, special and advisory committees".

Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Community Terms of Reference- Section 5, Oversight- Community Building Initiatives.

Administrative Order 2014-019-GOV, Section 22: A report making recommendations on the peer jury assessment process for the Interim Professional Arts Grant Program shall be submitted to staff by December 31, 2015.

RECOMMENDATION ON PAGE 2

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee recommend that Halifax Regional Council:

1. Approve the approach to the establishment of peer jury review processes for the Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organization Program as outlined in the Discussion section of this report;
2. Direct staff to prepare amendments to Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM Respecting Grants to Professional Arts Organizations to establish the peer jury review processes and return to Council with the proposed amendments for Council's consideration prior to October 31, 2016; and
3. Defer consideration of the recommendation 5.7., "Notification of grant recommendations is communicated directly to the Corporate Administrative Officer (CAO) for final approval" to be considered concurrently with the Committee's final reporting requirement as required in Administrative Order 2014-019-GOV respecting the ArtsHalifax Advisory Committee, Section 24, anticipated to be delivered to staff in advance of the 2018-2019 budget planning process.

BACKGROUND

In the report presented to Regional Council on April 29, 2014 recommendations of a previous Special Arts and Culture Advisory Committee (SACAC) were organized into two distinct timelines for consideration—those to be addressed immediately within existing municipal administrative processes; and those which required further consideration and would be deferred until such time as the necessary elements were in place to address them. Included in the latter category was the recommendation that the Municipality implement peer jury review processes 'for the consideration of merit of applications'. Currently, the Municipality's Community Grants and Special Events grant programs apply a staff review process that intakes and scores applications, culminating in a series of staff award recommendations to the HRM Grants Committee or the HRM Special Events Advisory Committee for further review and deliberation, before being directed to Regional Council for approval.

One of the SACAC recommendations outlined that the development of a peer review process specific to arts and culture grants administration should be informed by subject matter experts. Subsequently, at the May 12, 2015 meeting, Regional Council approved the terms of reference for the ArtsHalifax Advisory Committee. The terms of reference for the ArtsHalifax Committee were developed such that the first task of the new Committee would be the research of best practices for peer jury review and the development and delivery of a series of recommendations to staff prior to December 31, 2015. The Committee has met their prescribed timeline, and the Committee's recommendations are included in Attachment 1.

DISCUSSION

The recommendations of the ArtsHalifax Committee are enumerated within the body of this report. In addition to the background provided regarding the value of peer juries within the professional arts context, the Committee has identified 27 points of procedural consideration as the basis of its overall recommendation to staff on the implementation of a peer jury. Further to the implementation of its recommendations, the Committee is proposing a phased schedule of Initial Implementation and Full Integration.

In responding to the Committee's recommendations, staff has utilized the same approach and categorized the individual recommendations made by the Committee as either Initial Implementation or Full Integration. Due to the number of recommendations made by the Committee, and the amount of resources required for implementation, and given that the 2016-2017 Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organizations Program has closed, it is recommended that the Initial Implementation phase begin in the spring of 2017-2018.

PHASE 1: INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION

Recommendations for 2017-2018 Implementation: Definitions	
2.1	Peers will perform the assessment.

Note on Recommendation 2.1: On April 29, 2014 Regional Council passed a motion directing staff to initiate the creation of an arts and culture sector advisory Committee with a peer jury process. Subsequently, through the adoption of Administrative Order 2014-019-GOV, Regional Council has requested that the ArtsHalifax Committee make recommendations on peer jury review, and has indicated support to integrate a peer jury review to the assessment process for the Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organizations program. Staff concurs with the definition of ‘peer’ as outlined in Attachment 1.

Recommendations for 2017-2018 Implementation: Jury Selection and Composition	
3.1	The Program officer shall disseminate an open call for jurors.
3.2	Peer jury applicants will be asked to identify themselves and relevant information.
3.3	Prospective jurors will identify any potential conflict of interest.
3.4	The Program Officer will review and assess potential conflicts of interest.
3.5	The Program Officer will select the Peer Assessors.
4.1	Separate juries will assess Operating and Project grants.
4.2	Juries will consist of at least three and no more than five people, facilitated by the Program Officer.
4.3	Whenever possible, the variety of artistic disciplines and experience in the applications will be reflected in the selection of jury members.
4.4	The composition of juries will be guided by values of diversity of practice, culture, age and gender equity.
4.5	A juror shall sit on no more than one jury every two years.

Notes on ArtsHalifax Recommendations: Jury Selection and Composition:

In order to integrate the peer jury process, AO 2014-007-ADM would require amendments. The peer jury would assess applications using the current evaluation criteria as set out in Section 13 of the Administrative Order. The peer jury would provide advice to staff, who would then present recommendations to the Grants Committee, followed by Regional Council, in keeping with the existing process.

The revisions to the Administrative Order would direct the CAO, or his delegate, to establish a roster of potential jurors on a bi-annual basis, from which a peer jury could be drawn. The appointments would be short-term in nature, lasting only for one cycle of grant applications. The amendments would establish the process by which these individuals would be solicited, and the criteria they would be required to meet to be eligible. It would also establish rules around conflict of interest.

3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5: As noted, the proposed amendments to Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM would establish the process for soliciting interest from potential jurors. Staff will select the jurors from the active roster for each of the two program streams and will attempt to balance the makeup of the jury in relation to artistic discipline, regional perspective, cultural and gender diversity.

3.3 and 3.4: Interested applicants to the advertised recruitment would be asked to self-identify potential conflicts of interest as part of their submission. The amendments to Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM would also include provisions regarding conflict of interest

3.5: The amendments to Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM would provide that the members of the peer jury will be selected by the CAO or his delegate.

Recommendations for 2017-2018 Implementation: Adjudication	
5.1	Jurors are provided the applications, evaluation form, Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form, and related materials to review.
5.2	Jurors discuss each application as facilitated by the Program Officer.
5.3	After discussion, Jurors provide their individually assessed application-scores to the Program Officer.
5.4	During a break, the Program Officer will aggregate these scores into an overall score for each recommended applicant, resulting in a rank order of all applicants.
5.5	The Jury then reviews the rank of all applicants and available funds then proceeds to recommend funding amounts (on the basis of the rank order agreed to by the jurors) until these funds have been fully depleted.
5.6	Peer assessors must treat both the material that they review and any discussions related to their assessment as confidential.
5.8	Applicants are informed of the jury's decision in writing.
5.9	The names of jurors will be kept confidential until three months after a given grant deadline.

Notes on ArtsHalifax Recommendations: Adjudication

5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.9: Generally, the ArtsHalifax recommendations reflect those processes that have been used in peer review committees for public art competitions as well as for internal (staff-mediated) selection processes under the Municipality's Community Grants Program. These are recognized as best practice standards for group assessment, and have also been employed internally in adjudicating the 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organizations processes.

5.8: The peer jury will make informed, expert recommendations on funding awards to staff, who will present those recommendations to the Grants Committee for direction to Regional Council. The decisions of Regional Council represent the final decision relative to the assessment process of the Grants to the Professional Arts Organizations program. Once conferred, staff will alert all applicants to the decisions of Regional Council.

Recommendations for 2017-2018 Implementation: Administration	
6.3	The Program Officer will generate the following documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Jury Nomination/Application Form • Copy of Peer Assessment Guidelines • Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form • Jury Feedback Form
7.1	The Program Officer will submit a report for annual assessment.

Notes on ArtsHalifax Recommendations: Administration

6.3: HRM staff will generate the documents as described; the nomination/application form will be released annually as a call for prospective jurors to be added to the active roster; the peer assessment guidelines, conflict of interest disclosure form and jury feedback form will accompany the submission packages sent to the jurors for each particular selection committee. The peer assessment guidelines, conflict of interest disclosure form and jury feedback form will accompany the submission packages sent to the jurors for each particular selection committee.

7.1: Once the recommendations are determined and the report generated, staff will compile feedback from the jurors as well as HRM's assessment of the process, and will inform ArtsHalifax on the outcome of the peer review process and any challenges that may have been experienced.

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR 2017-2018 IMPLEMENTATION

Elements Proposed by ArtsHalifax not Recommended for 2017-2018 Implementation	
2.2	Peer Assessors will be remunerated.
5.7	Notification of grant recommendations is communicated directly to the Corporate Administrative Officer (CAO) for final approval, immediately following the jury process.
7.2	ArtsHalifax will submit an annual report to Regional Council.
7.3	Additional Labour will be hired to facilitate the needs of the jury and ArtsHalifax.

Notes on ArtsHalifax Recommendations Not Recommended for 2017-2018 Implementation:

2.2: HRM does not currently remunerate volunteers who sit on the various committees and provide valuable advice and service to municipal programs. Due to the variety of municipal committees, there are a range of skills and experiences that are recruited to fill the positions.

Under Section 15(2) of Administrative Order 35, the HRM Procurement Policy, for the procurement of "Special Services - Professional Services (i.e. Architectural, Engineering, Communications, IT, Human Resources) "peer jurors" may be considered "consultants" and acquired by staff through a Request for Qualifications, as "the acquisition of goods, services, construction and facilities with a value of at least \$1,000 but less than \$15,000". The service being provided would be the "review and recommendation" of grant awards to staff and is thereby a "service" as defined in the Procurement Policy. Remuneration of services would be acceptable should this method be undertaken. However, this method would change the approach for the selection process for peer jurors and is not in keeping with HRM's usual practice for the evaluation of grants or the selection of members for committees.

It is acknowledged that remuneration for peer jury panels is a best practice employed regionally, provincially and nationally; however, there is no precedent for providing payment to members of HRM arts and culture panels established for decision making on public art projects, the Poet Laureate appointment and past open arts projects. As well, Section 1.3.2 of the Public Art Policy, the guiding policy on "Ad Hoc Public Art Peer Juries", is silent to this issue. To recommend compensation for members of the peer jury would be inconsistent with existing processes, and would create an inequity with advisory committees generally. Therefore it is recommended that participation in peer juries be exclusively volunteer-based.

5.7: This item reiterates a recommendation made by the previous SACAC and responded to in the April 16, 2015 report to Regional Council. The exact original recommendation read, "*The decisions of the peer jury will be presented to the CAO for authorization and disbursement. Neither Regional Council nor ArtsHalifax will have final approval for funding decisions.*" The response at that time was that this was not feasible and that Regional Council held the sole authority to approve the budgets of the Municipality.

Under the existing municipal structure, a peer jury would effectively be making recommendations to staff,

who would deliver those recommendations in the form of a report to the Grants Committee, for direction to Regional Council. The basis of the recommendation from ArtsHalifax relative to the delegation of authority to approve awards is twofold:

- (1) the belief that such a change would expedite the approval of the recommendations and the allocation of awarded funds to the recipient organizations, and
- (2) that the process would better respect the expertise of the peer jurors as their recommendations would not be subject to further review and possible modification, at two subsequent committee stages.

As per Section 24 of Administrative Order 2014-019-GOV, the ArtsHalifax Committee is scheduled to deliver its final report to staff in advance of the 2018-2019 budget planning process with recommendations concerning the roles and responsibilities of a successor committee. While the makeup and orientation of the future phase of ArtsHalifax is yet-to-be-determined, it is anticipated changes may be proposed to the governance and administrative processes (including the reporting structure) related to the municipal service delivery to the professional arts sector. It is therefore recommended the current reporting structure through the Grants Committee to Regional Council be retained until the final report has been submitted and considered in full.

7.2: As per ADM-2014-019-GOV, ArtsHalifax does not currently have the mandate to report directly to Regional Council and is structured as an advisory body to staff. It is recommended the terms of reporting be maintained as currently outlined in the terms of reference until the final report has been submitted and considered in full.

7.3: Staff will monitor and assess the integration of the peer jury system and determine what, if any, additional resources are required, or where additional resources may be gained through collaboration with other business units with grant administration mandates. Any consideration of additional resources would have to be considered through the annual budget and business plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications related to the recommendations outlined in this report. It is expected that the additional duties required by the implementation of a peer jury process can be accommodated within the existing staff complement and operating budget. Should the additional duties result in a requirement for additional resources or funding, those would be considered through the annual budget and business planning process.

RISK CONSIDERATION

There are no significant risks associated with the recommendation in this report. The risks considered rate Low. To reach this conclusion, consideration was given to operational, financial and reputational risks.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The ArtsHalifax Advisory Committee is a volunteer based advisory committee with representation from across the arts sector of HRM. In the course of making their recommendations they undertook stakeholder consultation with funders at other levels of government.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

None.

ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 1: Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee may recommend that Halifax Regional Council not approve the establishment of peer jury review processes for the Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organization Program and not

amend Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM Respecting Grants to Professional Arts Organizations

Alternative 2: Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee may recommend that Halifax Regional Council amend the recommended approach to the implementation of a peer jury process for the Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organizations program. Should any of the amendments result in additional funding requirements, staff would need to be directed to present funding options to Audit & Finance Standing Committee for consideration.

Alternative 3: Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee may recommend that Halifax Regional Council not defer consideration of the recommendation 5.7 to the Committee's final report and direct staff to review it separately.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: ArtsHalifax Advisory Committee Report, Peer Jury Guidelines

A copy of this report can be obtained online at <http://www.halifax.ca/council/agendasc/cagenda.php> then choose the appropriate meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 902.490.4210, or Fax 902.490.4208.

Report Prepared by: Jamie MacLellan, Community Developer, Culture & Events, 902.490.1039

Report Approved by: Original signed by:
Denise Schofield, Manager, Program Support Services, 902.490-6252

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following document represents ArtsHalifax's recommended steps to administer a peer assessment process for the determination of merit and the allocation of arts funding. Following Special Arts and Cultural Advisory Committee (SACAC) Recommendations (March, 2014) and ArtsHalifax's review of peer assessment processes from federal, provincial and regional practices, this document outlines a process for peer assessment in Halifax Regional Municipality.

Currently, Halifax Regional Municipality does not use the peer assessed process for arts-grants. Instead, evaluation of arts-grant applications is assessed by staff-persons, with a list of recommended amounts sent to the grants council for review, before council reviews and approves of arts funding.

Peer assessment is considered the best method of assessment across many jurisdictions including the fields of academia, professional awards and in medical and scientific research. This assessment method invests in and empowers experts in their field to identify and determine excellence and merit while recognizing the unique values and character of their field. The arm's length nature of the process is integral to the success of peer assessment and fosters credibility, integrity and equity, while ensuring independence in decision-making. With this in mind, ArtsHalifax has outlined a process that defines a peer jury, while describing how a Cultural Initiatives and Events staff person - referred to as "Program Officer" in this document - can facilitate a peer assessment process, beginning with juror selection and including composition, adjudication, and administrative structure, that can best serve core funding and project funding programs for eligible arts organizations in the Halifax Regional Municipality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Background	3
2. Definition of a Peer Jury	4
3. Jury Selection	5
4. Jury Composition	6
5. Adjudication Process	7
6. Implementation	9
7. Administration	10
8. References	11

1. BACKGROUND

The purpose of the ArtsHalifax Committee is to advise staff on the development of administrative processes in support of professional arts and culture in Halifax.¹ In September 2015, we launched our three-year process for setting out a shared vision of the arts and creative industry in Halifax.

In line with that executive order, our recommendations work to support the recommendations of the Special Arts and Culture Advisory Committee, the Halifax Cultural Plan, and the five strategic directions that have been adopted as part of the Halifax Regional Plan which include the following strategic directions:

- 1) Focused Service Delivery & Partnerships
- 2) Cultural Access & Equity
- 3) Community Character & Heritage
- 4) Lifelong Learning & Creative Development
- 5) Investment & Promotion²

In addition to these directions, we appreciate Council's need, as stewards of public funds, to implement processes that are accountable, effective, and transparent. The following document is guided by these values. It aims to provide recommendations for a peer assessment process for evaluating the merit of arts-funding applications that values equality and diversity, is accessible and represents the character of the community in which it takes place. In creating these recommendations, models of granting processes from regional arts councils (from multiple municipal and provincial organizations) and the Canada Council for the Arts were consulted, as well as representatives from Arts Nova Scotia, Music Nova Scotia, and the Canada Council.

¹As advised in March 2014 by the Special Arts and Culture Advisory Committee Recommendations, and as executed in ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NUMBER 2014-019-GOV.

² <http://www.halifax.ca/council/agendasc/documents/10-1-4Draft3.pdf>

2. DEFINITION OF PEER JURY

Peer Jury is a process for evaluating the merit of applications made for arts funding under the Interim Grants to Professional Arts Organization Program, which has been approved by Regional Council and structured under Administrative Order 2014-007-ADM.³

Peer assessment provides a method that is accountable as it empowers experts in their field to identify and determine excellence and artistic merit⁴.

2.1 Peers will perform the assessment

A peer is someone who self-identifies as an professional artist⁵, arts administrator, cultural worker, or person actively involved in related communities of interest. This can include emerging artists who demonstrate a commitment to pursuing professional arts career through training, practice, or mentorship.

2.2 Peer Assessors will be remunerated

Many of the guidelines above include extensive time and labour from jurors in the review, adjudication, and assessment process. The value of consulting time from arts-professionals should be rewarded at minimum industry standards of \$100 per day⁶. Additionally, a reading fee per application shall be paid, that varies according to application length and type.

³ ArtsHalifax will advise staff on matters of administrative process within the approved parameters of the Administrative Order.

⁴ Merit is assessed through the following criteria: artistic merit, impact, and viability.

⁵ A professional artist is someone who has received public or peer recognition for their work, their work has been presented to the public, and they have received training in an educational institution or from a practitioner or teacher recognized within his or her profession or within the established practice of his or her cultural traditions. This can include emerging artists that are committed to pursuing their craft and have training.

⁶ to note, this is significantly lower than the minimum daily fee as recommended by Canadian Artists' Representation/Le Front des artistes canadiens, as described online at http://carcc.ca/fee_schedule_2015_4_professional.html#C1, and more in line with Nova Scotia Average wages for artists as described by Statistics Canada online at <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/labr69d-eng.htm>

3. JURY SELECTION

3.1 The Program officer shall disseminate an open call for jurors

It is part of the program officer's role to ensure that the call for jurors is disseminated widely and that diverse groups are engaged (see Appendix 2). Additionally, consideration could be given to bringing in jury members from outside of the Halifax Regional Municipality if necessary to ensure diversity of culture or experience.

3.2 Peer jury applicants will be asked to identify themselves and relevant information

Within the application, jurors will be asked to self-identify their practice/craft(s), experience in the field, any notable achievements related to the arts and any additional information that is deemed valuable, including an invitation to identify their diversity should they so choose.

3.3 Prospective jurors will identify any potential conflict of interest.

Each juror will be provided with a list of applicants prior to deliberations. Prospective jurors that are approached regarding an upcoming jury process are obligated to identify any potential conflict of interest in relationship to listed applicants.

A conflict of interest in the case of ArtsHalifax peer assessment process includes, but is not limited to, any situation where a juror may receive financial gain from the project, be an employee or employer, client, be a board member of an applicant, or be a spouse or relative of the applicant, or where a close personal relationship could be perceived as a conflict of interest.

3.4 The Program Officer will review and assess potential conflicts of interest

It is at the Program Officer's discretion whether the juror is still eligible to sit on the jury. Should the juror still be allowed to sit on the jury, they must abstain from deliberation and scoring of the application in question and should leave the room during the discussion of the application.

3.5 The Program Officer will select the Peer Assessors

A Program Officer will execute the juror selection process. Guidelines and criteria for this selection follow in Jury Composition.

4. JURY COMPOSITION

4.1 Separate juries will assess Operating and Project grants.

As operating and project grants may require different areas and breadth of expertise for their accurate assessment (ie. differences in administration and budgeting experience) separate juries will be composed for the Operating and Project grants to better reflect the nature of the applications.

4.2 Juries will consist of at least three and no more than five people, facilitated by the Program Officer

To support an efficient and timely process, the program officer will maintain a jury of 3-5 people.

4.3 Whenever possible, the variety of artistic disciplines and experience in the applications will be reflected in the selection of jury members.

As peers should assess applicants, the juror selection process shall always include jurors with experience that reflects the applicants. Jurors with multidisciplinary backgrounds can be considered to represent more than one discipline.

4.4 The composition of juries will be guided by values of diversity of practice, culture, age and gender equity.

Whenever possible, juries will represent the diversity of cultures, ages and genders in Halifax.

4.5 A juror shall sit on no more than one jury every two years.

It is important that a number of new jurors participate in the process each year. In order to ensure that perspectives remain balanced and fresh. Therefore a juror shall only sit on one jury every two years, and if possible, no single juror should sit twice for the same program

5. ADJUDICATION PROCESS

Before the Jury:

5.1 Jurors are provided the applications, evaluation form, Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form, and related materials to review.

Jurors will be provided with sufficient time to review applications, conduct associated research, and arrive on assessment day prepared to discuss the material in depth

During the Jury:

5.2 Jurors discuss each application as facilitated by the Program Officer

5.3 After discussion, Jurors provide their individually assessed application-scores to the Program Officer

5.4 During a break, the Program Officer will aggregate these scores into an overall score for each recommended applicant, resulting in a rank order of all applicants.

5.5 The Jury then reviews the rank of all applicants, the amount of available and then proceeds to recommend funding amounts (on the basis of the rank order agreed to by the jurors) until these funds have been fully depleted.

After the Jury:

5.6 Peer assessors must treat both the material that they review and any discussions related to their assessment as confidential.

They must not disclose information about grant applications or award nominations. They must not discuss the names of the applicants or nominees, the recommendations, nor any comments made by other peer assessors during a committee meeting

5.7 Notification of grant recommendations is communicated directly to the Corporate Administrative Officer (CAO) for final approval, immediately following the jury process.

When confirmed by the CAO, results are posted to the agency's website within 30 days of the jury. This will require amendments to administrative order 2014-007-ADM to allow the CAO to approve all peer assessment applications, expediting the current mutli-council system.

By altering this administrative order as outlined above, HRM will continue to invest in the five strategic directions outlined in the Cultural and Regional Plan by:

- Allowing a more direct, focused, and time-efficient process of service delivery while partnering with the talent and wisdom of the communities directly affected.
- Enabling programs to be assessed by peers whose experience, artistic discipline and with cultural backgrounds reflect the diversity of applications and HRM.
- Allowing peers from the community to review, assess, and make direct recommendations on applications supports the unique character and heritage of the communities they represent
- Including jurors of all ages and experience to be a part of the peer assessment process and recommendation process, we empower learning and connections between artists in different disciplines, experience, background and perspective
- Investing directly in the decisions made by the peer assessment jury allows HRM to promote a relationship of openness and faith in HRM's growing artistic community while removing risks of politicizing the funding decisions by those who are not peers.

5.8 Applicants are informed of the jury's decision in writing.

If after reviewing the decision, applicants who would like additional they may contact the program officer.

5.9 The names of jurors will be kept confidential until three months after a given grant deadline.

To protect jurors privacy and the integrity of the Jury's decisions, no personal information of the Jurors will be distributed or published until 3 months after the grant deadline.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation process will consist of two phases:

6.1 Spring Initial Implementation Phase

The initial implementation of the jury process will begin in the spring of 2016 for the Project and Operating Programs. This phase will include: drafting of documents (see below for list of documents), disseminating an open call for jurors, exploration of possible conflict of interests, selecting jurors and composing juries for the 2016 funding year, facilitating an adjudication process as outlined in this document - yet submitting recommendations to the existing grants committee in line with the existing process as outlined in administrative order 2014-007-ADM. A report will be composed by the Program Officer on the spring implementation phase for ArtsHalifax. Performing these duties may require the hiring or contracting of additional labour, as assessed by Cultural Initiatives and Events staff.

6.2 Full integration Phase

After the initial spring implementation, documents, policy and feedback will be brought back to the ArtsHalifax Committee through the report mentioned in section 6.1. This report, and feedback from other stakeholders, will be assessed by ArtsHalifax during the summer of 2016 in order to revise, improve, finesse the peer jury structure, and pursue amendments to administrative order 2014-007-ADM with the support of HRM staff. This review and recommendations for the future will be sent to council for approval.

6.3 The Program Officer will generate the following documents:

- Peer juror nomination/application form: A document that Halifax artists must submit in order to participate in a peer jury.
- A copy of peer assessment guidelines: For transparency's sake, a document must be available to jurors and to the public citing how decisions are made for Halifax's arts grants and why the peer assessment process is used.
- Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form: This document enables prospective peer jurors to identify potential conflicts of interest well before they meet to deliberate. The document also enables city staff to highlight what is considered a conflict of interest - and provides ample time for any issues of potential bias to be raised by artists and discussed by appointed city staff (see Appendix 1 for details on conflict of interest).
- Jury Feedback Form: This document enables jurors to provide feedback to the Program Officer regarding the peer assessment process, speak to the needs of the communities they represent, reflect on the program, city staff involvement, and criteria in order to maintain the integrity and responsiveness of programs.

7. ADMINISTRATION

7.1 The Program Officer will submit a report for annual assessment

To ensure that the process and composition of the jury remains in the spirit of the guidelines outlined in this document, the Program officer will maintain a record of the process, including a list of jurors, feedback, and other relevant records, to submit to ArtsHalifax for annual review and assessment.

7.2 ArtsHalifax will submit an annual report to council

Working with the Program Officer, ArtsHalifax will generate a final annual report of the peer assessment program, with further recommendations if needed.

7.3 Additional Labour will be hired to facilitate the needs of the jury and ArtsHalifax

The workload related to the “program officer” as outlined in the guidelines that follow are in addition to the current workload of Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) staff. Extra staff or contracted labour will be hired for this work.

REFERENCES

Canada Council for the Arts

[Peer Assessment: How the Council Makes its Decisions](#)

Arts Nova Scotia

[Peer Assessment Policy](#)

Hamilton Arts Council

[Recommended Approach to Strategic Municipal Investment in the Arts](#)

Saskatoon Arts Board

[Adjudication Process](#)

Statistics Canada

[Average hourly wages of employees by selected characteristics and occupation, unadjusted data, by province \(monthly\) \(Nova Scotia\)](#)