



**Submission by Museums Australia (NSW)  
on a strategic plan for the visual arts & museums sectors  
in NSW**

**Part 2: Selected sources and commentary**

28 June 2011

Museums Australia (NSW)  
PO Box 2421 Bondi Junction NSW 1355  
Phone 9237 7307 Mobile 0416 121 347  
Email : [www.museumsaustralia.org.au/nsw](http://www.museumsaustralia.org.au/nsw)

\\mansw\...\artsnsw\2011\review\museumsectorsubmission110628appdx

## CONTENTS

This document lists sources and comments used in preparing the accompanying submission *Supporting Regional and Community Museums in NSW*.

<b>1</b>	<b>GENERAL</b>	2
	Some seminal publications	2
	Other general publications	3
<b>2</b>	<b>USE OF TECHNOLOGY</b>	5
<b>3</b>	<b>ROLES &amp; SERVICES</b>	8
<b>4</b>	<b>FUNDING</b>	
	General	9
	Metrics, value, economic impact	12
	Volunteers	14
	Private funding & social entrepreneurship	15

## GENERAL

### Some seminal publications

1. **Museums Australia (NSW).** *Museums in NSW: a Plan for the Future [and] a Strategy for the Sustainable development of a NSW State Museum Network.* Prepared by Shar Jones, Julie O'Dean and Anne Brake. Sydney: Museums Association of Australia Inc (NSW) and Museum Studies Unity, University of Sydney, with support from the NSW Ministry for the Arts, 1991. Includes sections on development, roles, support and recommended structures and levels of support for local and regional museums in NSW.
2. **Museums Australia (NSW).** *The Future of Collecting in NSW: A discussion paper* by Brenda Factor and others. Sydney: Museums Australia (NSW) with assistance from the NSW Ministry for the Arts, 1996.
3. **Museums Australia (NSW).** *Community Culture & Place: A Local Government Handbook for Museums.* Editor: Shar Jones. Prepared by the Museum Studies Unit, University of Sydney and Museums Australia (NSW). [Sydney]: NSW Ministry for the Arts and Local Government Shires Association of NSW, 2000. "It is our hope that the publication will lead to greater involvement of councils in this important area." To what extent has there been greater involvement or what happened to the momentum? To what extent has the National Standards for Australian Museums and Galleries changed the guide? What is the link between standards and accreditation? Is there a case for the State Government and local councils to firmer policies and infrastructure for the preservation of cultural heritage and provision of services by museums, galleries, libraries, archives and historical societies in concert with professional associations?.
4. **Arts NSW.** *Museums Program Policy, March 2000.* Had four elements following the establishment of M&GNSW: (1) Support for the development of a network of exemplary regional museums that in turn will provide advice and support to surrounding local and community museums; (2) support best practice models of community and theme based museums; (3) assist in raising standards of collection care and presentation in museums throughout the state; (4) stimulate involvement with and access to museums and their collections. So what's changed?
5. **Heritage Collections Council.** *Study into the Key Needs of Collecting Institutions in the Heritage Sector (2002)* identified eight broad needs: documentation (ie provision of access through cataloguing and delivery systems); conservation; interpretation (through exhibitions and the like); professional development; a wider understanding of heritage collections; quality and consistency (through benchmarking and adoption of standards, and accreditation systems); a recognition of professional isolation and diversity; and, importantly, a perceived lack of nation-wide coordination. The report provided useful insights into specific needs requiring additional personnel, equipment, advice, training, and information.
6. **Collections Council of Australia projects 2004-2010.** Planned to implement a comprehensive survey of cultural heritage facilities and services in Australia, but the study was never implemented. Completed a Survey of Human and Financial Resources in Australian Conservation and Preservation, which found that there is a shortage of funds for collecting organisations to achieve a range of reasonable conservation and preservation goals, a shortage in the availability and suitability of conservation and

preservation workers, and the probability that shortages of skilled conservation staff will intensify. Faced with competing demands of deteriorating collections, increased public access, and rapid technological change, it has recommended the development of integrated education, training and workforce planning, promoting needs to appropriate stakeholders, and further research. Contributed to the National standards for Australian Museums and Galleries. Produced a second edition of *Significance* to guide all domains in assessing the quality of collections, funding decisions and online strategies. In endeavouring to create an Australian Framework for Digital Heritage Collections, completed a Development Plan and an Advocacy Plan to identify areas for improvement. Completed CollectionsCare as a regional hubs proposal to coordinate, promote and preserve Australia's regional history and facilitate the work of regional libraries, archive, galleries, and museums. The proposal called for a trial regional hub in each state, based on the employment of regional collections co-ordinators, followed by a wider implementation. A trial was initiated in Western Australian.

### Other general publications

7. **NSW Department of State and Regional Development's Regional and Rural Taskforce** in 2008 provided recommendations on economic, environmental and social issues affecting rural and regional communities outside the Hunter, Illawarra, Central Coast and Sydney. The report proposed, among other things, reforms to the NSW planning system, streamlined coordination, enhanced telecommunication services, integrated local educational resources, a review of library network funding, and partnerships with local governments, the Commonwealth Government and the Non-Government Sector. It encouraged the Government to recognise that there are rarely 'one size fits all' solutions for rural communities. Government agencies, it said, need to continue to work with local communities to better understand and respond to their issues. Most of the recommendations are relevant to the museum sector, particularly the proposal for a 5-year Regional Infrastructure Fund, enhanced telecommunication services, improved integration of local educational resources, proposals for library network funding, and supporting regional arts. **In partnering local governments**, the report acknowledged that significant work needs to be undertaken to rebuild the relationship between state and local governments and to address the large degree of variations in handling sustainability issues and widespread concerns about 'cost shifting' between governments. **In partnering the Commonwealth Government**, it recommended a renewed focus on reforming Commonwealth-State relations, **In partnering with the Non-Government Sector**, it acknowledged that NGO organisations provide enormous benefits to the communities they serve. The sector, it said, is dominated numerically by very small organisations that rely heavily on the dedication and skill of a few key volunteers or part-time staff. These are prone to 'burnout' and are experiencing difficulties in attracting younger people. Government funding, it said, is characterised by unrealistic short term grants, and regular changes to administrative procedures that add to the operating burden of small NGOs. There are fragmented, duplicative and sometimes overblown requirements for reporting. Government program design is often inflexible when it comes to the needs and logistics of particular country communities. There is a need to develop skills in relation to tendering for and administering government funded services. The report promoted a whole-of-government approach, formal and informal arrangements, for developing partnerships to mobilise cross-agency and cross-sector resources, through the State Plan's regional framework: priority delivery plans, regional delivery plans, and Regional Coordination Management Groups.

8. **Heritage Preservation.** *A Public Trust at Risk: the Heritage Health Index Report on the State of America's Collections* by Heritage Health Index a partnership between Heritage Preservation and the Institute of Museum and Library Services, 2005. Reported the lack of comprehensive information about the cultural heritage sector, the need for cataloguing, the need for improved environmental and storage conditions, emergency planning, staffing and funding. Some of these findings are presumably relevant to the Australian situation.
  
9. **Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities.** *Report on Archives Survey (2007)*, conducted by the CAARA in partnership with Australian Society of Archivists (ASA) and Archives New Zealand, provides an understanding of collections controlled by archives, historical societies and related recordkeeping agencies. The report concluded that there is an overall higher proportion of website visitors than in-person visitors. Most archives hold materials such as objects, art works, clothing, and books, suggesting the differences between smaller archives, museums, libraries and galleries are less distinct than it is for major archives. A large proportion also holds digital archives. A large quantity of archive materials is not documented. Donations and grants are common sources of funding. Half the employees have formal archival qualifications, but employees without formal archival qualifications may have qualifications in related areas. Volunteers are a major component of the workforce. Only a few volunteers have formal archival qualifications, but may have qualifications in other areas. Major issues and challenges were identified as funding shortfalls, coping with a lack of space, gaining control over collections, managing digital archives and handling staffing changes or lack of staff were also of concern.
  
10. **Council of Australasian Museum Directors.** Annual statistics report activities of the 21 major museums it represents and their success in promoting access to collections, as cultural destinations, fostering learning and building knowledge, and building cultural and social capacity.
  
11. **IBISWorld.** *Museums in Australia* (industry report P9220T, October 2007. Asserted the following trends and challenges: many museums will continue to struggle financially if they do not tap into the significant changes which have occurred in what people now demand from museums (more multimedia and interactive educational displays). museums are increasingly being recognised as having a role to play in attracting and holding domestic and international tourists. The industry has a major role to play in cultural tourism and this is expected to be assisted by the continuing expansion in international and domestic tourism.
  
12. **NSW State Government.** *Rural & Regional Taskforce report; Report of the Review of (Local Government) Public Library Funding.*
  
13. **Museums and Galleries NSW.** *Issues identified for the Museums and Galleries Sector*, Paper prepared for MGNSW reference committees meeting 23 September 2010. Identified issues are: community engagement, role of government at all levels, funding, networks and partnerships, human resources, NSW Aboriginal Culture, access, collections, sustainable development, technology.
  
14. **Australian Bureau of Statistics.** *Museums, Australia 2003-2004 and Museums, Australia 2007-2008.*

15. **UK Department for Culture, Media and Sports.** Understanding the future: museums in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – the value of museums (2005). Understanding the future: museums in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – priorities for England’s museums (2006)
16. **Museums Libraries Archives Council.** *Leading Museums: A Vision and Strategic Action Plan for English Museums*, 2009.

## USE OF TECHNOLOGY

17. **David Bearman and Jennifer Trant**, significant figures in contemporary archival and museum thinking, said in *Issues in Structuring Knowledge and Services for Universal Access to Online Science and Culture* (Paper presented at Virtual Museums and Public Understanding of Science and Culture, Stockholm, Sweden, 26-29 May 2002, that museums and libraries still needed to develop methods for constructing knowledge models that “are sufficiently forgiving to permit useful aggregation of content, structured by a number of disciplines, yet sufficiently architecturally sound to enable useful computing across resource domains.” In calling for museums to pay attention to approaches for metadata declaration and utilisation, they said that, in a networked environment, the value of these knowledge models will be determined more by their ability to connect to other knowledge representations by other groups, than by their ability to represent all subtle aspects of terms used for indexing aspects of cultural heritage. The basic principles of information engineering, they said, must be respected from the outset in the construction of cultural information utilities, not the least because cultural knowledge bases will be built up over many years or decades. The promise of the web is to virtually unite and re-unite digital objects in contextual information spaces. However, our current web practices stand squarely in the way of achieving those goals. Flash-built, exhibition-focused web features that present the equivalent of a closed CD-ROM on the web, may have a sound pedagogical and communications goals. But as they are now implemented, the digital objects in these expensive and labour-intensive resources are rarely reusable, and rarely locatable outside their local navigation. They stand in the face of the developing perspectives of museums as sources of information for society...What is critical is that we begin to work together to surface the true impediments local practice has on collective knowledge construction.
18. **Council of Library and Information Resources.** Diane Zorich in her report for CLIR, *A Survey of Digital Cultural Heritage Initiatives and Their Sustainability Concerns*, 2003 commented on the lack of business plans, poor coordination and competing interests. For CLIR, she has also written *A Survey of Digital Humanities Centers in the United States*, 2008.
19. **US Institute of Museums and Library Services.** *Its Status of Technology and Digitization of the Nation’s Museums and Libraries* (2006), probably reflecting the situation in Australia, reported that museums are behind other sectors in aggregating data and need a more systematic approach. Large libraries lead the way. Small museums and public libraries still lag behind in the use of technology. Many technology and digitisation activities, it says, are not supported by institutional plans and policies. While collaborative digitisation efforts are underway, they were not yet widespread. Only a small proportion of museums and libraries assess user and visitor needs for digitising collections and services. Later data is available in the *International Survey of Library & Museum Digitization Projects 2011* (Edition Primary Research Group, Dec 2010).<sup>1</sup> This

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.researchandmarkets.com/product/84d749/the\\_international\\_survey\\_of\\_library\\_museum](http://www.researchandmarkets.com/product/84d749/the_international_survey_of_library_museum)

reports on programs in a number of countries, including Australia, and data on sources of funding, the outlook for raising money for additional projects, collaboration within and outside of institutions, staffing of digitization projects, spending on hardware and software, practices on rights, permissions and copyright clearance, outsourcing, staff training, impact of digitization on preservation mediums, cataloguing issues, marketing of digitization projects and other aspects of library and museum digitisation project management.

20. **Kenneth Hamma (J Paul Getty Trust), Clifford Lynch (Coalition for Networked Information) and Robert Martin (Institute of Library and Museum Services).**

These leading US executives made a number of critical observations following the release of the IMLS report in 2006. The boundaries *are* blurring (libraries are behaving more like museums and museums are behaving more like libraries; it is important to remember that there are different kinds of libraries and different kinds of museums; everyone is not moving at the same speed). Convergence happens mainly at the network level (the issue is not so much what happens in individual repositories as how we construct services across them). Metadata is the largest issue to be addressed, but there are levels of complexity within the metadata debate. These questions are a matter of attitude rather than money.

21. **Library of Congress's National Digital Information Infrastructure Preservation Program.**

This decade-long experience has been instructive about the nature of the challenge in digital infrastructure programs and the need to be clear about roles in managing similar programs. Established in 2000, with government funding of around A\$145 million from the US Congress, it has moved through three phases for seeding the network, identifying common tools and services, and building a network of partners with functional roles as content custodians, developers and dissemination experts, service providers and capacity builders. Abby Smith, in her mid-term report about the NDIIPP, noted the experience had demonstrated that "simple operations can be hard" and "complex negotiations among partners even harder". Martha Anderson in her commentary on the NDIIP has offered a number of useful points. Relationship between public and private enterprises are not always interoperable. Even within the same domain, there are barriers to collaboration. Although partners share a common interest, their work in diverse communities is not necessarily conducive to thinking and working as a larger network. Interoperability challenges become greater as user communities broaden their interest. Metadata in standardised formats very often represent an institutional context that is not easily transferable to a larger context. At the moment, the greatest common ground for preservation processes, tools and standards lies at the bit level. Long term preservation is data-centric not system-centric. A single tool may not provide complete coverage and extraction of useful information. The challenge should not be under-estimated.

22. **OCLC.** Its report by Diane Zorich, Gunter Waibel and Ricky Erway *Beyond the Silos of the LAMs: Collaboration Among Libraries, Archives and Museums*, provides lessons from experiences in the university sector, where libraries, archives and museums (LAMs) are bound together by a parent institution but depend on a number of crucial catalysts. The lessons have wider import. Governments can play a role in setting mandates for LAMs, especially in countries where significant funding for cultural heritage organizations comes from government departments. In the US context, the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) promotes cross-domain initiatives through its funding guidelines. The absence of the unifying, orchestrating and directing impetus of a single administrative entity emerges as a systemic handicap. Without many of the catalysts at play, it is

difficult to imagine deep, long-term collaborations among independent LAMs. It requires extraordinary motivation, committed resources over a long time horizon and significant changes in institutional perspective and behaviours. See also OCLC work on a Museum Data Exchange project.

23. **Mary W Elings and Günter Waibel**, in *Metadata for All: Descriptive Standards and Metadata Sharing across Libraries, Archives, and Museums* (First Monday, vol 12 no 3, March 2007), looking at the challenge of integrating digital content from libraries, archives and museums, concluded: "The successful integration of digital images of material culture from library, archive and museum collections hinges on the emergence of a more homogenous practice in describing like-materials in different institutions. While data structures can be mapped with relative ease, data content variance still effectively prohibits economic plug-and-play aggregation of collections. Data content standards such as CCO emerge as the linchpin in a cross-community strategy to make descriptions versatile, shareable and readily integrated into union resources." Web: [http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue12\\_3/elings/](http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue12_3/elings/).
24. **National Archives of Australia** international digitisation forum in September 2007 concluded that: (1) partnerships and convergence across sectors and international borders were vitally important to make best use of technology; and (2) there was a need to increase investment in skills and infrastructure to maximise application and return on investment in digital content. The uneven and often inadequate levels of investment are impairing not only access to this digital content, but its very survival. There is substantial investment in the creation of digital content, as indicated by levels of investment in ICT systems and research projects that generate substantial quantities of data. However, matching proportional investments in preserving and providing appropriate access to this digital content is often missing.
25. **Michael Middleton and Julie M. Lee**, in their report *Cultural Institutions and Web 2.0* (November 2007) investigating how Australia's cultural institutions are taking advantage of Web 2.0 technologies, made a number of observations and conclusions. Among them: improvements in access will depend upon improving retrieval capabilities in repository software and rationalisation of descriptive metadata to permit unification of different types of information repositories; and a flexible approach to management of digital content is desirable under the umbrella of wider sector strategy that responds to the rapid environmental changes.
26. **Museums Australia (NSW)** executive officer Paul Bentley has summarised many of these trends in recent issues of the branch newsletter *Museum Matters* and, independently, for Thomson Reuters' in its publication *Online Currents*. Articles relevant to the museum sector include *Creating a Bit of Magic: Making Museum Exhibitions* (Dec 2010); *Mastering Digital Lives: Cultural Heritage Institutions Tackle the Tower of Babel* (Apr 2010); *Putting a Value on Museums: a Question of Evidence* (2009); and *Changing the Horseshoe on a Galloping Horse: Connecting Museums to Information Seekers* (Aug 2009). Other articles, while emphasising library developments, also report on issues relevant to museums, including *Operating in a World of Ornate Variations and Tipping Points; the 2011 ALIA Information Online Conference, Part 2* (Aug 2011), *Winning and Losing in a World of New Paradigms: the ALIA Information Online Conference 2011, part 1* (Jun 2011); *Talking up the Back End in an Evolving Revolution: the VALA Conference 2010* (June 2010); *Getting in the Game of Creative Collaboration: the ALIA Information Online Conference 2009* (Apr 2009); *The Digital Economy Dance: Getting into Step with*

*Government Policy* (Feb 2009). Most are accessible on the Wolanski Foundation website <http://www.twf.org.au>.

27. **Christine Borgman**, as reported by Bentley in his *Operating in World of Ornate Variations and Tipping Points*: "Borgman sees four great challenges. First, there's a need for libraries to take back information retrieval. Search engines don't do everything and they don't do enough: the world needs both generic and specialised searching. Second, there's a need to engage in the large life cycle of information management, to partner with domain experts. Third, there's a need to distribute the architecture. We now have more data than we have capacity to store it. It is now also difficult to move big data through the pipes. We need to think about the economic conditions, the huge duplication of effort and technology and the cost of the information grazing land. And finally, we need to match policy with incentives. Data management is expensive, poorly rewarded, and highly inconsistent. Data curation is a means rather than an end. Standards still matter. Selection still matters. Stewardship still matters.
28. **Australia. Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy.** Reports include *Community ICT Transformations: Next Steps* (a report on submissions received in response to the discussion papers *ICT Transforming the Nonprofit Sector*, and *The Role of ICT in Building Communities and Social Capital* (2005); *Economic Benefits from Cultural Assets: the Digitisation Programs and Standards of Collecting Institutions and the Scope for Collaboration with the Creative Industries: Final Report* (2003); *The role of Government Agencies as Market Place Participants in Digital Content Markets* (2003); *Research and Innovation Systems in the Production of Digital Content and Applications* (2003); *The Measurement of Creative Digital Content: a Study to Assess User Requirements for Creative Digital Content Statistics and a Possible Collection Strategy to Address Them* (2003); *From Cottages to Corporations: Building a Global Industry from Australian Creativity: Report on Access to Overseas Markets for Australia's Creative Digital Industry* (2003); *Creative Industries Cluster Study* a preliminary analysis of the industries producing digital content and applications, identifying key enterprises, their location and productivity drivers and barriers, (2002).

## **ROLES & SERVICES**

29. **Muir, Adrienne and Oppenheim, Charles.** *Report on Developments World-Wide on National information policy*, CILIP. March 2002. Muir and Oppenheim charted national information policy issues on three levels – broad society issues (such as the knowledge economy and competitiveness), areas to which the library sector must contribute (such as information quality, content delivery, interoperability, legal deposit, e-government and e-business), and areas of most pressing need, where the library and information profession should be seeking to achieve greatest change (such as skill and organisational capacity).
30. **The US Institute of Museum Library Services (IMLS).** The \$250-million agency has a \$200-million grants program in the US, revolving around a four-pronged strategy for responding to broadly-based educational imperatives, preservation and digitisation initiatives, building workforce skills, capacity, and innovation, and boosting the role of libraries and museums within their local communities. Its encouragement of collaborative projects by libraries, archives and museums has been noteworthy.
31. **The Museums Libraries and Archives Council (MLA)** in the UK has provided a mechanism for integration of collections sector needs over the last decade. Its

responsibilities will be continued by other agencies from October 2011, possibly as a result of the state of the UK economy following the GFC.

32. **Western Australia Museum CEO Alec Coles**, at the MANSW Symposium in April 2011, draw on his experience in commenting on the MLA Renaissance in the Regions program, the relationships between national, state, regional and local museums, between public and private museums, and between the volunteer and professional curators. Before Renaissance, he said, there was an absence of regional leadership, poorly articulated aims and objectives, decision-making based on expediency rather than strategy, inefficient and ineffective use of resources, and failure of constituent parts of the sector to work together or share best practice. The Renaissance in the Regions program created 9 regional museum hubs involving a lead museum and partners, a museum development officer network, traineeships, accreditation support, and other services. It led to improved performance, improved engagement and an improved profile for museums. Museum development officers created real change. Volunteering improved massively. But it was far from perfect: there was a lack of clarity in a number of areas; performance varied; there was a lack of objective measures of performance; there was a focus on quick wins over long term strategy. All things to be improved in future developments of the New Renaissance program.
33. Making improvements in the UK is the subject of ongoing debate. **The Museums Association**, for example, recently called for the core museum concept in the New Renaissance program to be scrapped.<sup>2</sup> It called for "something radically different that better meets the needs of audiences and of the whole sector...the core museum model is risky and untested." MA instead advocated a single, simple funding stream that every museum can apply for.
34. **NSW Legislative Assembly Public Works Committee**. *Report of the Inquiry into Arts and Cultural Infrastructure outside the Sydney CBD*. Made 12 recommendations including a larger role for Arts NSW in future planning decisions, the wider adoption of the Western Sydney Arts Strategy, increased collaboration between local government and non-profit agencies, new ways of funding training, substantial increase in arts and cultural funding outside the Sydney CBD, introduction of a consultative process at the electoral level similar to the Community Building Partnerships, establishment of a Premier's Arts Partnership Fund following the example of SA, WA and Tasmania, a full audit of arts and cultural infrastructure across NSW, provision of funding for feasibility studies on better ways to utilise existing arts and cultural infrastructure, and the provision of incentives for developers to incorporate arts and cultural infrastructure within strategic developments.

## FUNDING

### General

35. **Australian Bureau of Statistics**. *Cultural Funding by Government, Australia, 2008-09*. Local governments spend significantly more on libraries than they do on museums. Local government expenditure on archives is not indicated separately, but may be included in the categories, other museums and cultural heritage or cultural or arts services. Funding by state and territory government. NSW, the largest state, ranks third behind Queensland and Victoria in total expenditure on art museums, ranks first in spending on other museums, 2nd in spending on libraries, and third in spending on archives. Funding

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.museumsassociation.org/news/24052011-ma-calls-on-ace-to-scrap-core-museums>

per person by state and territory government. NSW ranks last in terms of per capital spending on arts museums, 4th in terms of spending on other museums, last in terms of expenditure on libraries, and 7th in terms of expenditure on archives. Local government funding by state/territory & category of cultural service. NSW increased its expenditure on art museums, other museums, and libraries from 2008 to 2009

36. **MLA publications.** *Cultural Spend and Infrastructure: A Comparative Study, (2006)*, a comparative overview of the museums, libraries and archives sector in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, United States and Singapore, looks at the architecture of cultural policy and spending, the level of investment in the three domains, supporting infrastructure, and the following trends and issues relating to Australia:
- Digital collections.** Approaches to digitisation and management of born-digital material by collecting organisations in Australia are uneven. Libraries and archives appear to be more alert to the challenges associated with the long-term management of digital repositories than are museums. **Copyright and licensing.** Compliance with complex legislation is an ongoing challenge for collecting organisations. **Skills.** The different professions within the collecting sector each seem to be grappling with the issue of developing and sustaining an appropriate skills base for the collecting organisations. In the museums domain, where there is a large number of volunteer-initiated museums, training is a perennial issue. Also in the museums domain, there is ongoing concern about the levels (vocational, undergraduate, postgraduate) at which educational programs should be offered. **Convergence.** This trend is typically manifested in the fields of exhibitions, digitisation of collecting items and information, online access to information and the use of multimedia display. **An ageing voluntary workforce for community collections.** There is a real concern that this workforce is not being replaced, that information about the collections is being lost through lack of adequate documentation, and that the infrastructure necessary for the survival of organisations is neglected and not sustainable. **Collaboration between collecting institutions,** between different collecting domains and between collecting organisations and the higher education sector has been encouraged with the availability of government funds. The MLA study also identifies the following issues in relation to museums. Included in a list of similarities in policy and funding priorities are: consistently in recent decades, a greater focus on infrastructure investment or development than on supporting and funding 'what's where'; a more recent but noticeable shift in emphasis from largely 'supply driven' policies (focussing on levels of provision) to policies defined in relation to public outcomes; a shift in the language of cultural policy to focus increasingly on the composition on cultural audiences, the need to 'democratise' the definition of, and access to, culture; policy language which instrumentalises cultural policy in the context of wider government agencies, appears to be shifting from the focus on economic impact (the buzz words of the 1980s and 1990s) to one linked to social value; a desire to diversify and draw in new source of funding, in particular from the private sector, in line with the so-called US model as a way to address fiscal challenges; different attitudes to volunteering and the role of volunteers in the delivery of cultural provision, particularly in museums.
37. **Institute of Museums and Library Services.** *Exhibiting Public Value: Government Funding for Museums in the United States (2008)* raises a number of issues that may be relevant to the situation in Australia: the diversity of museums in terms of disciplines, attendances, resource needs, and geographic reach; the inconsistent pattern of public support across the museum sector; the difficulty of tracking and analysing data because of differences in the way the sector codifies museum grants; the lack of a federal-state partnership program with the goal of increasing the capacity to the museum sector as a

whole; the flow of Government support through a variety of different agencies and funding mechanisms; different perceptions about museums and different fiscal conditions in jurisdictions; uncertainties on the best way of coordinating future options.

38. **The Institute of Museum and Library Services** in the US signals its strategies through a matrix of grants under the headings collections management, community engagement, conservation, demonstration, digital collections/tools, formal education, informal learning, partnerships, professional development/continuing education, public programs, and research. Although grants are sometimes labelled with catchy and sometimes obscure grant names, the matrix is an effective indication of why and how the money is being spent.
39. **NSW Regional and Rural Task Force** report urged the Government, in relation to library network funding, review the funding it provides to public libraries, particularly in rural and regional communities, with a view to increasing its contribution to a significant proportion of the required revenue and to consider opportunities to better link public libraries to broader educational and training opportunities and use of broadband should be considered. Although schools and higher education providers are increasingly relying on public libraries to meet the needs of students in rural and regional communities, the taskforce noted that the contribution of NSW Government to funding of local public libraries had fallen from 24% in the 1980s to 7.8% in 2004-05 with a further reduction in 2006-07, in contrast to other State governments who appear to have sustained their investment in public libraries.
40. **Arts NSW Report of the Review of (Local Government) Public Library Funding** recommended the introduction of a funding model that: retains a per capita subsidy amount, contains a meaningful component that ensures an acceptable minimum level of access to library services across the State, with transparent allocation criteria the determination of which has input by key stakeholders, and retains a grant component that is targeted to strategic outcomes, including the reinforcement of cooperation between councils to deliver regional and State wide development outcomes. Review existing administrative processes to reduce unnecessary complexity and red tape in application and reporting processes. It commented that NSW.net had provided a significant contribution towards public library internet access but may have served its purpose with initial infrastructure setup and is no longer justified as a discrete funding component. It recommended that consideration be given to a comprehensive review which explores the broader benefits of public libraries to the community. A simpler funding model that better focuses on the strategic objectives of enhanced minimum levels of access and improved regional co-operation and networks could comprise three components: **Per capita subsidy** (target 50%, to replace the 55% component (\$12.6M) of total funding; **access funding** (target 25%); and **strategic and development grants** (target 25%). It urged consideration be given to its scope including encouragement of co-located cultural facilities (libraries, galleries and museums operating as one facility) and joint funding of physical infrastructure. links with the capital infrastructure grant program by Arts NSW shaped annually in consultation with stakeholders and approved by the Minister. It was not clear that existing arrangements provided sufficient mechanisms for network-wide or regional initiatives to be supported. current arrangements focus heavily upon individual councils making applications for grants or receiving subsidy and other payments. Discussions have focussed on using this component to more effectively encourage cooperation between councils. This may be achieved through application criteria or the allocation of the funding pool for specific purposes such as regional and State-wide initiatives. The proportion of total library

funding to be available for such grants would also need to be phased in over a few years in order to allow for Council budget planning.

41. **Report of the Independent Expert Panel on the Review of the NSW Heritage Act 1977** (2007). At present there are a range of funding programs and incentives available from both the State and local governments. Some examples include: NSW Heritage Grants (administered by the NSW Heritage Office; community strategic project grants; Aboriginal heritage project grants; kick start grants (State and local items); Local government heritage management grants (local items); historical research and local archive project grants; special purpose grants (emergency); conservation documents and management reports (State items); heritage advice cash back funding (State items); Conservation management plans (State items); land tax and local rate rebate grants (State items); works projects (State items); on ground interpretation works (State items). local Government grants; local heritage funds small grants and loans (local items). Other grants / funding: NSW Environmental Trusts program (natural environment projects), Railcorp (railway heritage projects); Royal Australian Historical Society (small grants program); Community Heritage Grants Program (administered by National Library of Australia). Since its inception in 1977, the NSW Heritage Grants Program has offered approximately \$2.3M of financial assistance annually. In 31 years of operation (1977 to 2007) this amounts to funding of around \$71.3M that has been offered to assist in the conservation of heritage across NSW. In 2008-2009 the NSW Heritage Grants contain the five programs and notional budget allocations. *How to Establish a Local Heritage Fund*, prepared by the NSW Heritage Office (2004) provides valuable guidance to councils to assist them in formulating appropriate procedures for establishing and managing such funds.
  
42. **Brian F Lavoie.** *The Fifth Blackbird: Some Thoughts on Economically Sustainable Digital Preservation* (Dlib Magazine March/April 2008, <http://www.dlib.org/>), said that "we have not yet established a systematic mapping between general economic models of resource provision and particular digital preservation contexts." The ease with which we create information in digital form tends to obscure the true cost of maintaining it over long periods of time. Our capacity to produce digital materials far exceeds our capacity to maintain. A key aspect of the challenge is the need for a transition from "lakes of funding" to "rivers of funding" — from a reliance on project-based, one-time grants of soft money, to the establishment of self-sustaining flows of resources sufficient to support ongoing digital preservation activities. Another challenge is to change perspectives from a micro approach to a macro approach — organising limited institutional preservation resources as community-wide initiatives that produce maximum output of digital preservation activities from a given set of inputs. Economic sustainability is not an issue that can be considered in isolation: it must take into account surrounding technical, social, and legal environments.
  
43. **Museums Australia (NSW).** *Submission to Arts NSW on the Review of Arts NSW Cultural Grants Program*, October 2007; *Submission to the NSW Legislative Assembly Public Works Committee Inquiry into the Development of Arts and Cultural Infrastructure Outside the Sydney CBD*, August 2008; *Submission to Arts NSW about the arts funding program*, April 2009.

Metrics, Value and economic impact

44. **Australian Bureau of Statistics.** Its *Arts and Cultural Heritage Information Development Plan* reports on the scope and value of the arts and cultural heritage and

on existing data and data gaps. Issues are explored under the headings cultural indicators, perceived value, economic outcomes, cultural outcomes, social outcomes and quality of life outcomes. Recommendations for future research and surveys relate the need for data on the health of the arts and cultural heritage in Australia, willingness to pay for services, private sector support, economic viability, impact of technology, contribution of the innovation, supply of skills, cultural tourism, impacts on cultural identity, awareness and relevance, accessibility, impacts on community networks, impacts on learning, motivations for consumption of arts and cultural heritage services, and impact on well-being.

45. **The Australian Bureau of Statistics**, in developing its statistics for Australia's knowledge-based economy and society, adopted a suite of indicators after concluding that a single index presents an over-simplified and possibly misleading representation of the extent to which an economy or society is knowledge-based. It also said a number of conceptual and methodological challenges need to be overcome before a direct measurement approach could be adopted. Its suite, incorporating metrics around contexts, economic and social impacts, innovation and entrepreneurship, human capital, information communication and technology, may be relevant to questions of funding cultural programs in NSW.
46. **David Throsby** has written that cultural value consists of aesthetic, spiritual, social, historical, symbolic and authentic components, and although economics is central to the way it is managed, the arts can never be reduced to figures.
47. **Arts Council of England**. *Measuring the Economic and Social Impact of the Arts, 2002*. Michelle Reeves' report noted a lack of conceptual clarity and narrow conceptualisations of social and economic impact, the reliance on self-reporting with little corroborating evidence, an over reliance on official statistics which give a partial picture of the arts and creative industries, simplistic and naïve explanations for attributing positive outcomes to arts projects, among other conclusions.
48. **Museums Libraries Archives Council**. *Developing Performance Indicators for Local Authority Museums, Libraries and Archives* (2005) put forward indicators for development of cultural heritage infrastructure, based on volunteering, participation by priority groups, participation in online access, learning, value for money, satisfaction and museum accreditation. A more recent paper *Securing Excellence: Delivering for Communities, a Museum, Libraries and Archives and the Local Government White Paper* (2007) endeavours to articulate an outcomes framework for community cultural heritage organisations.
49. **Arts Business Ltd**. *Measuring the Arts seminar, 1991*. Drew together useful lessons on the subject and offered a checklist of 99 indicators under the headings funding client, funding program, employment and training, equal opportunities, innovation, audience building, responses, quality, organisational and strategic indicators, and economic impact. Some of these may be relevant to effective measurement of funding in relation to museum grants – such as ratio of centrally provided funds to locally provided funds, centrally provided subsidy per head per region, centrally provided subsidy per square kilometre per region, subsidy per artform per region, training days per employer per annum, average number of cultural opportunities per person, and percentage of customers local to visitors.

50. **Innovation and Business Skills Australia.** *Cultural and Creative Industries: Key Economic Metrics*, says there are barriers to measurement created by the ubiquity and pervasive nature of cultural and creative industries, including libraries and museums. It concentrates on four components relating to cultural works, goods and services — creation, reproduction for sale, distribution and embedded activities — and observes, among other things, that no single source of existing data is ideal for measuring and analysing the cultural and creative industries.
51. **McShane, Ian.** *Bringing in the Public: Community Facilities and Social Value*. PhD thesis Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology, December 2007. Traces the history of public support for the arts and culture in Australia and assesses evolving government thinking about funding in relation to culture and community planning. He notes the emergence of new models that connect intrinsic and instrumental outcomes and the emergence of digital content production supporting arguments for economic investment. The gross value added multiplier of investment in digital content, he reports, is estimated to be the second highest of any industry sector. Extensive bibliography p.399-423.
52. **Bentley, Paul.** *Putting a Value on Museums* (Museum Matters December 2009)
53. **Iain McCalman.** *Museum & Heritage Management in the New Economy* (Humanities Research Vol 8, no 1 (2001) examines the status of Australian museums particularly with reference to tourism, civic infrastructure, their educational role and global and regional markets. Proposed strategies are outlined under the headings: innovation and the new economy; mapping the needs of heritage consumers; research and communicative learning processes; social application of information technologies; urban and rural civic environments; cultural research precincts; international research and development initiatives; and integration of science and cultural heritage initiatives. McCalman concluded: "In the new global, information-based knowledge economies of the future, the ability to be innovative both in generating research and applying it for social use is more important than at any other time since the onset of the first industrial revolution in the second half of the eighteenth century. Yet the psychic and intellectual properties that generate a creative, innovative and critical culture during times of bewildering social and technological change remain elusive. The governments of Britain, Singapore and New Zealand, to take examples of clear relevance to Australia, have recently stressed a precious pioneering spirit of innovation. Australia needs it".

#### Volunteers

54. **Australian Bureau of Statistics.** *Voluntary Work, Australia, 2006*. Cat no 4441.0. Reports volunteers contribute 623 million hours to non-profit Australian institutions (including museums and museum support agencies). This equates to 317,200 full-time equivalent jobs. The economic value of these hours is estimated to be \$14.6 billion. The Productivity Commission's draft report, seeking to capitalise on these efforts, makes general recommendations for consideration by the government.
55. **Australian Productivity Commission.** *Contribution of the Australian Not-for-Profit Sector. Draft research report*. October 2009.
56. **The Independent Sector** in the US, in its annual assessment of the value of the volunteer hour, suggests a dollar value at \$US19.51 or \$AUD20.83, while acknowledging

that it is difficult to put a dollar value on volunteer time. Volunteers, it says, provide many intangibles that can not be easily quantified.

57. **Volunteer Australia.** *The Rising Cost of Volunteering*, offers 6 options that government might consider when addressing the escalating issue of volunteer expenses against the principles of equity, universality, simplicity for volunteers, simplicity for organisations, simplicity for government, transparency, not undermining the Principles of Volunteering, positive impact on recruitment and retention of volunteering, cost and availability of new funding.

#### Private Funding and social entrepreneurship

58. **Australian Business Arts Foundation.** *Survey of Private Sector Support for the Arts 2008: Key Findings* (July 2008). Private support for Australian arts and culture amounted to \$171.1 million in 2006/2007. Museums and galleries were the primary beneficiaries of private sector support (\$61.3 million), followed by the performing arts sector (\$54.8M). New South Wales (\$66.7 million) and Victoria (54.7 million) receive the lion's share of private sector support. Donations greatly outweigh sponsorship in museums and galleries, and donations are slightly more than sponsorships for state libraries. Sponsorships significantly outweigh donations in performing arts, festivals, and other arts. Smaller arts organisations derive a higher percentage of their income from private sector support than do larger organisations, although larger organisations receive more dollars

59. **Australian Bureau of Statistics.** *Australian National Accounts: Non-Profit Institutions Satellite Account, 2006/07*

60. **Mawson, Lord Andrew.** [Interview with Margaret Throsby ABC Classic FM Thursday 4 September 2008]; *The Social Entrepreneur: Making Communities Work*. Atlantic Books (Penguin). Lord Mawson developed the Bromley-By-Bow Centre in East London and co-founded the Community Action Network in the UK.