Sounds Like a Plan: Evaluating Cultural Plans

Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Masters of
the Arts in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Rachel May Smith, B.A.

Graduate Program in Arts Policy and Administration

The Ohio State University

2010

Thesis Committee:

Wayne P. Lawson, Advisor

Margaret J. Wyszomirski

Abstract

        As the sun sets on the industrial age, cities all over the world are

preparing themselves to be competitive in the new information age. In the United

States of America, cities are eager to differentiate themselves from each other in

order to attract residents, businesses and tourists. The city is expected to offer

some cohesive vision of this atmosphere in order to make it attractive to tourists,

residents and businesses. An increasingly popular way for a city to stay relevant

is to develop a cultural plan to foster a vibrant scene. A cultural plan provides an

overview of the cultural amenities that a city currently possesses, assesses the

needs of the city and the community, and produces a roadmap for future cultural

developments for the purpose of enriching the lives of its citizens, making the city

stand out to tourists and businesses, and encouraging economic development.

Cultural plans are often undertaken with different motives, varying levels of

preparation and understanding, uneven implementation, and rare evaluation.

There is a need for concise and compelling research on the subject that policy

makers can access and utilize in their cultural planning processes. The absence

of evaluative criteria and research makes it difficult to know the best way to

undertake new cultural plans. Evaluation of cultural plans allows cities to

determine if their plan was successful and if public resources were properly

utilized. Using research done on by The Urban Institute on Cultural Vitality

Indicators and the evaluation of the European Capitals of Culture program forms an analytical framework by which to evaluate cultural plans. There are many good reasons for studying the cultural planning process in the US. Strong cultural plans will benefit city economies. Cultural plans can have a positive effect on the community and on urban regeneration. It is a responsible use of public money to make cultural plans realistic and executable. Better understanding of the cultural planning process will help other cities develop plans of their own. This thesis uses data collection and analysis to understand the cultural planning processes better and inform longitudinal case studies of Austin, TX and Columbus, OH. The goal of the study is to deepen understanding of what criteria are most important to the planning process and how it can be best utilized before, during, and after the generation of a cultural plan. Clearer understanding of this information will lead to better implementation of cultural plans, a more vibrant urban environment, and a better use of public resources.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Wayne Lawson and Dr. Margaret Wyszomirski for challenging me to think about my research differently. I also thank the professors in the Art Education department especially Dr. James Sanders, for making my education stimulating and memorable. I thank the professors of the John Glenn School of Public Policy, especially Dr. Mary Marvel and Dr. Anand Desai, for extending my education in ways I could not have imagined. I would also like to thank the Barnett Family and the administrative staff in the Art Education department for making my education possible.

I want to thank my peers, colleagues, and now friends at OSU and the Urban Arts Spaces for their academic and social contributions to my education. I want to acknowledge my family, especially my mother, Emily and Dan, and my friend Tommy for their unconditional support. Also my gratitude to my "uncle" Rick, for helping me get started.

Vita

2003..B.A. Art History, Youngstown State University

2008-2010.....................................Barnett Fellow, The Ohio State University

2008-2009.....................................Research Assistant, Art Education, The Ohio

State University

2009..Intern, Art Alliance Austin

2009-2010.....................................Student Assistant, The Ohio State University

Urban Arts Space

Fields of Study

Major Field: Arts Policy and Administration

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One: Introduction

Overview

As the sun sets on the industrial age, cities all over the world are preparing themselves to be competitive in the new information age. Government officials, scholars, and citizens seek ways to make their cities and themselves relevant in the twenty-first century. Cities clamor for the recognition of being the most innovative city to live or work in. Development of new technology or processes, creative production, and highly educated populations are eagerly desired. To attract these assets, city governments develop various policies and programs designed to foster creativity and innovation.

In the United States of America, cities are eager to differentiate themselves from each other in order to attract residents, businesses and tourists. A country as large as the USA offers its citizens and visitors a wealth of opportunities socially, environmentally, and culturally. Cities want to offer the same level amenities as their peers, such as green space, cultural, retail and entertainment opportunities, but they also want to have their own individual flavor and character. Each city fosters locally developed characteristics or finds ways to import the desired traits. The city is expected to offer some cohesive vision of this atmosphere in order to make it attractive to tourists, residents and businesses.

Cities that do not transition into the information age will probably languish. As industrial production centers continue to move based on labor costs, cities that were once centers of production must find other ways to utilize abandoned facilities. Cities that do not do so will probably face a number of socioeconomic problems such as high real estate vacancy rates, high unemployment rates, high crime rates, depleted tax revenues, and heavy out migration. For a city to stay relevant, it has to offer a vibrant scene. Using the arts and culture is one way of projecting vibrancy. Graeme Evans states that using the arts and culture is one way of improving competitive advantage and quality of life (2005).

Cities like Austin, Texas and Columbus, Ohio have worked to differentiate themselves from other cities through arts and culture by developing a city cultural plan. Research institutes like The Urban Institute, service organizations like the National Governors' Association, and advocacy groups like Americans for the Arts have all recommended that cities develop cultural plans and have all produced research or guidelines on the subject (Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, & Herranz, 2006; National Governors Association, 2008; Dreeszen, 1998).

Cultural plans are often undertaken with different motives, varying levels of preparation and understanding, uneven implementation, and rare evaluation. Researchers have been calling for better substantiation of links between the arts and the economy for over 15 years (Lim, 1993; Evans, 2005, Markusen & Gadwa, 2009). This lack of research has not helped policy makers. As Markusen and Gadwa state: "Failure to specify goals, reliance on fuzzy theories, underdeveloped public participation, and unwillingness to require and evaluate

2

performance outcomes make it difficult for decision makers to proceed with confidence." (2009, p. 379). There is a need for concise and compelling research on the subject that policy makers can access and utilize in their cultural planning processes.

<div align="center">Statement of the problem</div>

A challenge in evaluating cultural plans is that considerations for evaluation have to be built into the process before the cultural plan even begins and must be incorporated into every phase of the planning process. An attempt at evaluation of a cultural plan will have to consider the formulation of the plan as well as the outcomes and outputs that the plan produced. The cultural planning process can be thought of in four major phases: the preplanning phase, planning, implementation, and evaluation. Each area has its own challenges.

Preplanning. Cultural planners may decide to undertake a cultural plan for a variety of reasons: economic development, to strengthen tourism, to have a culturally vibrant city, and more, but may not fully understand what goals and ends a cultural plan can and cannot accomplish. Planners may solicit input from a consultant, city planning officials, city officials in other departments, interested key citizens, and the public at large. Input at this phase has great bearing on the success of the plan. Research has shown that plans with more citizen input are more likely to be implemented (Dreeszen, 1998). In Columbus, Ohio key citizens were consulted and the public was invited to participate in survey research informing the planning process. Austin, Texas' plan was created with an invitation for all citizens to participate and implementation is largely citizen driven.

Planning. Once planners have been assembled from government, academe, consulting firms, and interested citizenry, the plan is formulated. Development of a cultural plan might take months or several years with many people working on different aspects simultaneously. A city department or official or a consulting firm, or in some cases both, generally takes ownership of the plan and is responsible for producing the actual document that is the cultural plan. Once the plan is produced and delivered, the involvement of some or all of these parties may cease. Recommendations of the plan may include who is to take ownership of the plan once it is realized.

Implementation. Implementing cultural plans has proven difficult for some cities in the past. The cohesiveness and scale of some plans can be too daunting to become a reality. The planning process can also be so taxing that there is not much impetus left to continue with the implementation phase. Resources to develop the recommendations of the plan are often not secured during the planning phase. Depending on the level of input solicited, the plan may or may not be well received by the community. If it is not well received, it has little chance of being implemented. This phase of planning is often the end of the consultant's involvement and oftentimes committees assembled to work on the plan are also disbanded, leaving little infrastructure to manage the plan.

Evaluation. A clear set of evaluative criteria is not available, maybe not possible. Research has asserted that evaluation must be tailored to fit an individual city's needs (Dreeszen, 1998; Throsby, 2001; Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, & Herranz, 2006; ECOTEC, 2009), but there is also a tension there.

Perhaps it speaks to the American competitive drive but rankings of cities by cultural offerings or value are not hard to find even within the same body of research (Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, & Herranz, 2006; McMarthy, Ondaatje, & Novak, 2007).   So while researchers call for individual evaluative criteria, they continue to search for measures that can be compared across cities. Though cultural planning frequently takes place in the public sector, it is unlike a public program such as education or welfare that is more typically evaluated. As previously stated, it might be unevenly implemented or not implemented at all, posing a challenge even to sophisticated evaluation methods.

Evaluation in the public sector can be difficult because the necessary expertise and resources for evaluation may not be available at the city level. This is exacerbated by the fact that pre-intervention data may or may not have been collected giving no baseline comparison if evaluation is desired. Some of the same factors that hinder implementation also hinder evaluation such as lack of resources, lack of infrastructure, and will to continue. The absence of evaluative criteria and research makes it difficult to know the best way to undertake new cultural plans. With so many cities in the US alone having cultural plans at different stages and phases, one might expect it to be easy to compare and adapt successful strategies to new cities, but this does not seem to be the case. Researchers still call for deeper research on the topic and cities still struggle through their cultural planning processes.

Background and need

5

Preplanning and planning phases. If citizen and community input is important to the success of a cultural plan, incorporating it into the preplanning phase is an important criterion. Research from a variety of sources shows that when community input is solicited, the community is more likely to take ownership and follow through with a plan (Markusen & Gadwa, 2009). Plans that are created with ambitious physical projects but no resources are unfunded mandates. If the suggested projects are developed at all, it could take many more years to secure the resources needed for development. If a city instead looks for resources during the planning phase, implementation can begin as soon as the plan is completed. Cultural planners should utilize available studies and research and produce a cultural plan after proper input is solicited and funding sources secured.

Implementation. Plans that are not implemented are a waste of time and public resources. Effective preplanning eliminates some of the barriers to implementation that cultural plans face. It also ensures that the plan is appropriate to community needs. Successful implementation is associated with many benefits to a city including improvement in employment rates, reduction of crime rates, higher citizen satisfaction and participation, better social cohesion, and increased tourism. It is notoriously difficult to prove causation between these factors and successful implementation of a cultural plan, but the fact remains that communities have seen these factors during and after implementation of a cultural plan whether they can be proven scientifically or not.

Evaluation. Evaluation allows cities to determine if their plan was

successful and if public resources were properly utilized. Evaluation will be most

useful if there are pre-implementation data to compare to post-implementation

data. Data sources should include both qualitative and quantitative data to be

most useful. The European Capitals of Culture (ECOC) program (or a similar

iteration) has been in existence since 1985 (ECOTEC, 2009). The program

currently provides a meager amount of funding and the prestige of being

designated a European Capital of Culture in a multinational competition. This

program functions more closely to a policy intervention than the way cultural

plans function in the US. Cities compete for the ECOC designation and form a

plan that can be realized during the year of designation. Evaluation of the ECOC

is incorporated into the process by the governing body as well as required by the

locality. This makes the ECOC an ideal framework for examining evaluative

criteria for cultural plans. Other researchers in the field have developed various

quantitative measurements for assessing cultural plans including looking at artist

migration rates, unemployment rates, home and property values, among others.

Work done by the Urban Institute on cultural vitality provides a set of simple

quantitative measures that cities can use to gauge their cultural environment.

Since it is either an implicit or explicit goal of most cultural plans to improve the

cultural environment, these criteria are a logical choice for evaluating the success

of a cultural plan empirically. Using these two analytical frameworks together

provides a more complete look at the resulting cultural environment of a city and

allows the government and citizens to judge the success of their cultural plan.

Purpose of the study

Purpose statement: The purpose of this study was to explore evaluative criteria and practices that might improve the whole cultural planning process for cultural planners and communities in US cities.

Rationale. There are many good reasons for studying the cultural planning process in the US.

Strong cultural plans will benefit city economies. As previously stated, it is difficult to attribute improvement in the economy, job rates, or production solely to a cultural plan (most probably because these factors are influenced by a whole host of environmental pressures), but there is enough research in the field to show that there is some correlation between the two (Markusen & Gadwa, 2009).

Cultural plans can have a positive effect on the community and on urban regeneration. Many communities report developing better networks and more social cohesion during and after the cultural planning process (ECOTEC, 2009). In certain cases, cultural plans have been used to address preservation of the traditions of minority populations as well as economic issues. Using the arts and artists to redevelop a sinking urban core is also a popular urban development strategy (Strom, 2002).

It is a responsible use of public money to make cultural plans realistic and executable. Developing a cultural plan can be a significant investment of time and money. Cities usually fund these plans out of their own budgets. In an effort to be accountable, it is the responsibility of the government to use these resources wisely. Cultural plans which are never implemented are a waste of

time, effort, and resources. Tendency to create cultural plans but never implement them also erodes the public value of arts policy, casting it as something extravagant and improbable.

Better understanding of the cultural planning process will help other cities develop plans of their own. With the research available on the benefits of a strong cultural plan, it seems as if it is a viable strategy for city and societal improvement. A cohesive body of research on the subject will add weight to this argument and better inform decision makers.

Methods. Data collection and analysis will be used to understand the cultural planning processes better and inform longitudinal case studies of Austin, TX and Columbus, OH.

Goals. The goal of the study is to deepen understanding of what criteria are most important to the planning process and how it can be best utilized before, during, and after the generation of a cultural plan. Clearer understanding of this information will lead to better implementation of cultural plans, a more vibrant urban environment, and a better use of public resources.

<div align="center">Research questions</div>

This thesis will explore research questions such as: How can the success of cultural plans be measured and evaluated? What evaluative criteria will improve the cultural planning process for cultural planners and communities in US cities? What are the barriers to implementation in the cultural planning process? How can the barriers to implementation be lessened?

<div align="center">Significance to the field</div>

As many researchers have pointed out (Lim, 1994; Dreeszen, 1998; Throsby, 2001; Evans, 2005; Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, & Herranz, 2006; Markusen & Gadwa, 2009), more research in the field of cultural planning is necessary, especially longitudinal studies. Benefits to the field of cultural planning are greater understanding and awareness of the best practice for cultural planning resulting in stronger and more usable cultural plans for communities. This research is intended to add to the body of research on cultural environment evaluation and serve as a base for more sophisticated research to be completed in the future.

Definitions

There are several terms that will be used in this thesis which require definition. This list is not intended to provide an absolute definition of the term, only a working definition for the purposes of this thesis.

Cultural plan/planning process - The term cultural plan most generally refers to the document that city governments produce about how they will develop their cultural sector. Dreeszen characterizes cultural planning as "a structured, community-wide fact-finding and consensus-building process to assess community needs and develop a plan of action that directs arts and cultural resources to address those needs." (1998, p.9). Later research states

> Cultural planning is concerned with how people live in places and
> communities (as citizens), and with the ways in which they use the arts
> and other forms of creative endeavor to enhance, consolidate and express
> these attachments. It is also about the way in which local government

plans and manages these processes for a range of political ends,

including social control and place management. (Stevenson, 2008, p.

124).

Since Dreeszen developed a cultural planning guide for Americans for the Arts in

1998, the usage of cultural plans has expanded. Dresden's idea of cultural

planning did not focus on the instrumental uses or benefits of cultural planning

that are often sought today by city planners, however, the process generally

remains the same. The "needs" and "cultural resources" Dreeszen refers to have

changed. Rather than solely the cultural needs of a community, a cultural plan is

often developed to address economic and social needs as well. Cultural

resources refers not only to brick-and-mortar resources such as a community's

art museum or library but also commercial businesses, nonprofit community

organizations, even programs existing in schools or within other organizations.

Cultural planner - Following Markusen & Gadwa (2009), cultural planner

will refer to anyone engaged in the process of developing a cultural plan. These

might be city employees, elected officials, paid consultants, interested citizens,

and in some cases the public at large.

Cultural district - The most citied definition comes from a report done on

cultural districts by Americans for the Arts: "a well-recognized, labeled, mix-use

area of a city in which a high concentration of cultural facilities serves as the

anchor of attraction" (Frost-Kumpf, 1998, p. 10). Since Americans for the Arts

commissioned a study of cultural districts in 1998, research on the subject has

increased considerably. Many scholars working in the field still use this definition

as a starting off point but it has also been modified over the past 10 or so years. Specifically, the understanding of what a "cultural facility" is has changed. To some, this definition still invokes the idea of a large cultural institution such as an art museum but the cultural facilities definition has expanded to mean schools, community centers, parks and natural attractions, libraries, commercial art galleries, and creative commercial businesses like design or architecture firms.

Infrastructure - This thesis uses the term infrastructure to mean internal organizational positions (i.e. human resources), policies, and procedures in place to ensure operations of that organization.

Sustainability - Sustainability has become a buzzword of late, especially in reference to environmentally responsible practices. This thesis uses the term sustainable in the sense that levels of business, activities or processes are able to be repeated or maintained. This use is more closely related to the business use than the environmental use of the term.

Policy Intervention - Policy intervention refers to a government sponsored program intended to address an issue or problem and as such usually has some evident results and evaluation. Rather than allowing the market to produce a program or product, a government entity has produced or facilitated production of that program or product. HeadStart is an example of a policy intervention intended to help children of low income families prepare for elementary school. In this thesis, a cultural plan which is usually produced by or in conjunction with city government is thought of as conceptually the same as a policy intervention with results that are able to be measured and evaluated.

12

Cultural policy - There is no settled definition of cultural policy in the literature. For the purpose of this thesis, cultural policy refers to governmental policies that directly affect or intersect with arts and culture activities.

Creative economy - The creative economy is another somewhat ambiguous term in the literature. The New England Foundation for the Arts defines the term on its website, creativeeconomy.org, as: "The creative economy encompasses creative enterprises -- both commercial and nonprofit -- and individuals that together provide a significant contribution to local and regional economies by creating and distributing cultural goods and services."   A problem with this definition is the categorization of the output as "cultural goods and services" because it seems to exclude commercial goods and services that would be produced in such enterprises as advertising, design and filmmaking, although it is all together possible that a good be both cultural and commercial. However, this definition is succinct and flexible enough for the purpose of this thesis. The term "creative economy" is often used to mean commercial activities of the creative industries, which in turn would require another definition. Another use of creative economy is to refer to the knowledge-based, rather than product-based, economy touted by Richard Florida and Daniel Pink. Griffiths address this confusion:

> The growing political salience of the cultural sphere seems to have been accompanied by, and in some ways has helped to generate, a good deal of conceptual confusion and terminological slippage. This can be seen by the way in which the notion of the arts has been displaced by the broader

and more amorphous idea of the cultural sector; the cultural sector has in

turn become the cultural industries; and the cultural industries have turned

into the creative industries. (2006, p. 416).

Limitations

There are limitations to any research and this thesis is certainly no

exception. If it were feasible to construct a true or even quasi-experimental

design to test cultural plans, that would be a very strong piece of research

indeed. As it is, that does not seem possible. The chosen method of case study

offers limited transferability in research. Cities that do not have cultural plans

could be used as a type of control group, but it is difficult to find cities that would

directly correlate to each other in meaningful ways. While there are limitations,

there is also great benefit to continuing to add to this particular body of research

and it is hoped that this thesis is a valuable contribution in understanding how to

best evaluate cultural plans.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

Cultural planning is a subject that is of interest worldwide. The European Union designates capitals of culture every year, Australian cities take great pride in their cultural offerings, and there is a growing body of literature about cultural planning in Asia. Cultural plans are useful to cities to carve out a niche for themselves to tourists and businesses, to revitalize dilapidated buildings or areas vacated by industry, and promote better social cohesion. American cities are interested in cultural planning; most of the top 25 most populated cities have cultural plans as well as a growing number of smaller and rural communities such as New Harmony, Indiana (Knack, 2008). Cultural plans are wonderful in concept but can pose challenges in the realization and evaluation phases. A lack of understanding about what a cultural plan might or might not be able to accomplish can lead to frustration and disappointment among citizens. Making the recommendations of a cultural plan a reality can be difficult if the resources, infrastructure and community support were not cultivated during the planning phase. Even understanding if the plan was a success if and when it is implemented is arduous without proper evaluation.

In order to better understand what makes a cultural plan successful, this thesis will look to the literature on the subject. There is a growing body of research on the evaluation of cultural plans and some valuable case studies

exploring communities that have enacted their cultural plans and the results they achieved. This thesis is particularly interested in what can be learned from the European Capitals of Culture program as it represents a more traditional policy intervention that is regimented and takes place over a strictly defined period of time rather than most US cultural plans which operate under nebulous assumptions about when and if they will accomplish the goals set out by their plans. Research on the subject of cultural planning evaluation acknowledges the importance of a holistic understanding, but hard data is important to the subject as well. Numbers and statistics can be powerful tools for understanding some impacts of cultural planning. Therefore, an approach which gathers quantitative data and contextualizes it with qualitative inquiry can be developed from the existing literature and used to inform the evaluation of cultural plans. Greater understanding about how to develop an effective evaluation of cultural plans will also inform the preplanning and implementation phases of cultural planning resulting in stronger, more effective cultural plans and more concrete models that other communities can use to develop their own plans.

The literature review that follows will address four areas related to cultural plans. The themes that exist in the literature include the definition of a cultural plan, different areas or types of cultural plans, the motivation for developing a cultural plan, and the evaluation of cultural plans. After exploring these themes in some depth, the place of this study in the literature will be explored.

Defining cultural plan and cultural planning

The term "cultural plan" is appearing more frequently as cities formulate strategies to attract new businesses, residents and visitors to their communities. As the term is used more frequently, the definition continues to expand. Most simply, a cultural plan is the document (or documents) that result from the cultural planning process. As previously stated, an early definition of cultural planning to work from is: "a structured, community-wide fact-finding and consensus-building process to assess community needs and develop a plan of action that directs arts and cultural resources to address those needs." (Dreeszen, 1998, p.9). Key phrases within that definition have taken on more meaning throughout the years. In general, the "culture" in cultural planning has shifted from the understanding of culture meaning high art activities to the anthropological definition of culture. So that the "cultural resources" mentioned by Dreeszen may now be nonprofit, commercial or environmental and "community needs" may be cultural, social, and economic.

A later definition of cultural planning says, "cultural planning is a strategic approach to city re-imagining and cultural industries development that variously involves establishing cultural precincts, nurturing creative activity, and re-evaluation public life and civic identity." (Stevenson, 2004, p. 119). This definition captures the shift from earlier thinking of cultural planning as a type of city-wide strategic plan for the major art institutions to a plan that uses culture instrumentally to ameliorate a number of societal problems. What seems to be overshadowed in cultural planners' excitement over the outcomes of a cultural plan is the weak explanation of the causal link between economic growth and

cultural plans (Markusen and Gadwa, 2009). Thinking of a cultural plan this way has set up an expectation that the plan could be expected to address every aspect of culture and produce an improvement there. This is beyond the limit of what a city plan can conceivably do. Stevenson states, "if cultural planning is to play any part in achieving socially progressive outcomes then culture must actually mean *something*, but it cannot mean *everything*." (2004, p. 129). A cultural plan provides an overview of the cultural amenities that a city currently possesses, assesses the needs of the city and the community, and produces a roadmap for future cultural developments for the purpose of enriching the lives of its citizens, making the city stand out to tourists and businesses, and encouraging economic development.

<div align="center">Areas or types of cultural plans</div>

Researchers have been studying and categorizing cultural plans in an effort to understand them better. This research and understanding could help city planners to understand the reasonable benefits and expectations of a cultural plan leading to the positive outcomes desired by cultural planners without disappointment that a plan fails to produce an ideal city. Scholarship is being produced worldwide on the subject, most notably in western countries of the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, the European Union countries, and Australia. Despite the local differences in history, language, ethnic populations and political infrastructure, there is uniformity in cultural planning because of the high degree of globalization present (Stevenson, 2004).

Greater understanding of the types of cultural plans will help city and community leaders to employ the best strategies for their city.

The focus of a cultural plan might be on any number of areas. Researchers on the subject have broken down the types of cultural plans by category. Craig Dreeszen's research focused on community cultural planning and he undertook a large survey of cultural planners in the US in the 1990s. He also completed a handbook for cultural planning for Americans for the Arts. Dreeszen highlighted several types of plans and assessments in this work (1998). Most notable include: comprehensive community arts and culture plan, issue-specific cultural plan, and district specific cultural plan (p.11). A comprehensive community arts and cultural plan is usually undertaken by a city or community and is the broadest category. A comprehensive community arts and cultural plan assesses the current amenities that a city has, these might include bricks-and-mortar facilities like an arts museum as well as community assets like a reoccurring festival. This type of plan will uncover weak areas and address them with projects and infrastructure. An issue-specific cultural plan addresses a social issue in particular; it would usually be undertaken by a community as well but on a much smaller scale than a comprehensive plan. Issue-specific plans frequently deal with diversity issues but may also address certain demographics like children or seniors. Dreeszen identified a district-specific cultural plan as one of the least frequently appearing, something that has changed a lot in the last ten years. A district-specific plan centers on a particular area like a downtown and is now one of the most popular forms of a cultural plan.

Cities may have many district-specific plans that they knit together to form a comprehensive cultural plan.

Graeme Evans is a British scholar who examines cultural planning processes. In his research around evaluation of cultural plans, he identified both types of reports and models of regeneration (2005). Both of these categories are interrelated and pertinent to this thesis topic. Types of reports include advocacy and promotion, project assessment, project evaluation, program evaluation, performance indicators, impact assessment, and longitudinal impact assessments. Advocacy and promotion reports are undertaken in the initial phase of planning to drum up further support. These reports are frequently positive and short in nature. Project assessment is often carried out internally by project managers, sometimes for external funders, and details expenditures more than outcomes. Project evaluation focuses on process rather than outcomes and might be undertaken by the project staff or an external consultant. Program evaluation looks at many types of projects that have a common theme or purpose. Program evaluation might be undertaken by a government body, a nonprofit organization, a consulting firm, or in academe. Performance indicators compare performance to benchmarks and are usually quantitative in nature. Impact assessment examines the impact a program has had on a particular area. Longitudinal impact assessments look at these impacts over time.

Evans also outlined several models of regeneration: culture-led regeneration, cultural regeneration, and culture *and* regeneration. In the culture-led regeneration, a cultural beacon leads the way for area regeneration. This

does not necessarily mean a new, remodeled, or repurposed flagship institution such as the Guggenheim Bilbao (although that is an example of this form of regeneration); it can also be an event or new usage of an area that ushers in the change. Cultural regeneration is the incorporation of culture into a larger public planning process for regeneration. The Ohio State University's South Campus Gateway with its retail and commercial space, residences geared toward students, restaurants and movie theatre, and space as well as marketing for arts organizations would be an example of this type of regeneration. Culture *and* regeneration is the process of regeneration happening concurrently and independently of cultural development. Evans described this as: "cultural activity is not fully integrated at the strategic development or master planning stage often because the responsibilities for cultural provision and for regeneration sit within different departments or because there is no "champion." (2005, p. 969). This category of culture *and* regeneration probably occurs most frequently in city cultural planning. Even if the development of a cultural plan is spearheaded by a general city official like the mayor, it is not often integrated within the overall city plan.

Also relevant to this discussion is Ann Galligan's description of types of cultural districts based on Hilary Anne Frost-Kumpf's 1998 report for Americans for the Arts on cultural districts (2008). Galligan detailed (1) cultural compounds, (2) major arts institution-focused district, (3) arts and entertainment-focused districts, (4) downtown-focused districts, and (5) cultural production-focused districts. A cultural compound is a group of cultural institutions that function

geographically as a whole. Major arts institution-focused districts coalesce around a single, large entity. Art and entertainment-focused districts are typified by mixed use areas of arts organizations like galleries and theaters with retail and restaurants. Downtown-focused districts may combine elements of the previous two but are expressly designed to draw people to a downtown area, presumably one previously in decline. Cultural production-focused areas cluster around places where artists and craftsmen are creating work.

These types of plans and models have not had a linear evolution, nor do they exist singularly. City planners probably do not sit down and say "today we are going to develop a culture-led regeneration plan," but perhaps being able to do so confidently would lead to more effective cultural planning. Cultural plans might emerge as a number of different documents within these categorizations and might or might not be integrated at the city level. Presently these delineations mostly exist in the research as a tool for grouping and understanding cultural plans in retrospect. Since research and evaluation of cultural plans is scant overall, there is very little in the way of evaluation of these types categorically. It is possible that with further, more detailed evaluation, it may become clear the best use of these models. Possibly, these models have advantages over each other and with deeper understanding, it may become clear that certain models are more useful in certain circumstances. Uncovering the relative strengths and weaknesses of each model might also allow scholars and academics to develop a new model. Currently, cities might use any number of these types or models in their cultural planning process, adopting what they like

from other cities, what makes the most sense based on their available assets and resources, and the experience of the people involved in the planning process. Study of the process and effects of these cultural plans, such as this thesis, might enable cultural planners to use these academic categorizations more effectively.

Motivation for developing a cultural plan

What motivations do communities have for developing a cultural plan? Cities and communities undertake cultural plans for a variety of reasons. There are some common themes that frequently appear in the literature. Cities increasingly aware of globalization seek ways to make themselves competitive in the twenty-first century. Cities want to differentiate themselves from their peer cities to attract tourists, businesses and the workforces needed for those businesses. Cities want to revitalize parts of their communities vacated by industries and slipping into disrepair. In a policy brief on arts and culture in communities, Jackson, Herranz, and Kabwasa-Green stated: "Neighborhoods and metropolitan regions across the country are seeking innovative strategies to address the promises, problems and uneven prosperity associated with an increasingly technological economy combined with far-reaching demographic shifts." (2003, pg. 1). The researchers explored ideas about definitions of arts within communities and available data to measure their impacts. Markusen and Gadwa found that "In the United States, the art and cultural sector's presumed ability to stimulate economic development, at both regional and neighborhood scales, is one of the most frequently invoked rationales for cultural planning."

(2009, p. 381). In regard to the extent policy should be concerned with "culture,"

David Throsby stated that economic policy has little to do with the broad,

dictionary definition of culture and that policy intervention is inappropriate (2001).

He further discussed the clear economic implications to the specific definition of

culture in the arts, heritage, film-making, publishing, and so on. Throsby

suggested policy interventions might be most appropriate at the intersection of

economics and creative production such as employment policies, tourism and

most important to this thesis, regional and urban development (2001, p.151).

In another Australian work, Jon Hawkes detailed the important role culture

plays toward social cohesion in public planning. In Australia, the arts and the

environment are more closely linked at the policy level, for instance, the national

department that deals with culture is the Department of the Environment, Water,

Heritage and the Arts. Hawkes' work placed culture as the fourth pillar of

sustainability, tying into an environmentally aware development strategy of the

three pillars of sustainability: economy, society and environment. Hawkes

pointed out: "Just as biodiversity is an essential component of ecological

sustainability, so is cultural diversity essential to social sustainability." (2001,

p.14). Culture is a natural fit with the other pillars of sustainable planning.

Increasingly, research is being undertaken on the positive effects that

cultural planning can have, and that could be contributing to a fundamental lack

of understanding about why and when cultural planning should be utilized. Ruth

Ann Stewart cautioned: "it is essential to keep in mind that the nonprofit arts in

and of themselves cannot and should not be positioned as engines of urban

revitalization." (2008, p. 113). The nonprofit arts arena is run by a small number of paid staff making meager salaries and volunteers, they frequently spend some money outside the communities they are located in (for talent, specialized goods, etc), it is subsidized by public and private funds, and it does not pay property taxes, therefore the true impact it is responsible for on the economy is minimal. Stewart also said the most successful plans incorporate for-profit creative ventures but reminded that they are businesses first and foremost and do not operate in the public interest (2008, p. 113).

In spite of the best intentions of cities to achieve positive outcomes with cultural plans, some negative outcomes have also been theorized and reported. There is a natural question of opportunity cost with competitiveness. This is probably the reason cultural planning is unlikely to take place at the national level in the US and that there is less at the state level. If cities are drawing business and tourists, those are dollars that are not being spent in other communities. There are issues of equality brought to the fore with many cultural plans. In a city's rush to create opportunity for knowledge workers to spend their disposable income, they are neglecting to provide opportunities for the lower class. There is also a body of research about gentrification displacing artists who have been instrumental in creating the regeneration of an area like in the SoHo neighborhood of New York City and Providence, Rhode Island (Stewart, 2008). Grodach and Loukaitou-Sideris pointed out: "Although ethnic diversity, a clean environment, and access to the arts hold a central place in this model, these goals are sought in order to manufacture the appropriate experiences desired by

the creative class, rather than for the benefit of the entire public." (2007, p. 355).

There is concern that development projects displace historical ethnic populations,

which some research is showing are instrumental to successful cultural plans

(Stern & Seifert, 1998, 2007; Dreeszen, 1998). Using cultural plans for

instrumental purposes in general is potentially problematic, as the ECOTEC

report on European Capital of Culture (ECOC) evaluation pointed out: "there is a

view that the introduction of economic and social objectives into cultural policy

risks skewing policy and practice towards those activities that have maximum

wider impacts, which arguably militates against the funding of "risky" and/or

avant-garde cultural activities." (2009, p. ii).

<div align="center">Evaluating Cultural Plans</div>

If cultural planning is so pervasive in the public sector, why is evaluation

not done more often? Evaluation of the ECOC program in 2009 was effective

enough to warrant a recommendation of making internal evaluation a

requirement for future designated cities (ECOTEC, 2009). One reason

evaluation is not done is that generally economic plans and interventions are

difficult to evaluate because so many other factors can affect the economy.

Economists like Throsby frequently use measures like cost benefit analysis but

cost benefit analysis does not fully capture the big picture or something like the

effectiveness of job creation (Bartik & Bingham, 1997). Moreover, most policy

interventions intended to ameliorate social problems do not have the resources

to make a measurable impact on those problems (ibid). Fear of negative

consequences is another reason evaluation is not undertaken more often. Bartik

and Bingham said: "If a program is not evaluated, one can always claim success." (1997, p. 20). They also cite the advice of economists Gary Burtless and Robert Haveman: "If you advocate a particular policy reform or innovation, do not press to have it tested." (Burtless and Haveman, 1984, cited by Bartik and Bingham, 1997, p. 20). Failure to quickly demonstrate significant, positive, quantifiable results may result in the (premature) termination of a program.

When it comes to cultural planning evaluation, planners are justified in their trepidation. Evans pointed out: "[research on urban regeneration] tend to be either descriptive and uncritical case studies, or highly critical (but lacking in robust empirical evidence), displaying a "culture of pessimism." (2005, p 965). Dwyer conducted a survey of planning professionals to get their opinions on arts and culture developments, published in 2008. She found that "Professionals in other fields are wary of the ways in which advocates for increased arts and culture investments have used data, including over-interpreting or over-generalizing results and claiming causal impact from descriptive or correlational designs and data." (2008, p.11). It seems that researchers and city planners may be worried that the arts and culture advocates are just crying wolf.

Since the 2002 publishing of Richard Florida's *The Rise of the Creative Class*, economic development strategies featuring creative economy enticements have been in vogue among city developers. In 2003, Americans for the Arts commissioned a study called *Arts and Economic Prosperity,* that though widely criticized for using gross measures rather than net measures (Sterngold, 2004), is still heavily referenced as a reason to support cultural planning. Many of the

27

evaluations that have been undertaken were in direct response to Florida's claims.

One such evaluation used statistical data from 276 municipalities across the US and reported no correlation between the creative class and growth (Hoyman & Faricy, 2008). Using mostly US Census data but also data from Florida himself, Hoyman and Faricy examined growth, human capital and social capital. The researchers examined education levels, sexual preference, and religious belief as well. A similar study was undertaken in which researchers examined similar criteria in 263 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA), using statistical information from the US Census Bureau and the Bureau of Economic Analysis (Donegan, Drucker, Goldstein, Lowe, & Malizia, 2008). These researchers further segmented their results by dividing them by population size. The researchers found that Florida's criteria for economic growth potential: talent, tolerance and technology (the 3Ts), do not strongly correlate with growth and traditional economic strategies are more strongly correlated. The cities were controlled for population size, traditional economic strategy, and Florida's 3Ts.

Case study research has also been generated to test this concept. Examples include Jeffery Zimmerman's study of Milwaukee (2008) and an examination of the Scandinavian city of Oresund and the British city of Manchester (Hosper & Pen, 2008). The study undertaken by Hosper and Pen does not address the counterfactual but Zimmerman compares Milwaukee's creative strategy to its previous economic development strategy. He finds that while the strategies had a measure of success, they also contribute to a growing

inequality in Milwaukee's classes. Hosper and Pen, informed by Florida, find that a creative city cannot be manufactured but that creative economy investments may be appropriate and nurturing in some cases. Case study research has been applied to other cities in the US and Europe, as well as a growing number of investigations into Asian city planning using creative economy developments. Case studies are important in contextualizing the aggregate research that is done in the field but offer limited transferability. Researchers and city legislators often want to see numbers that demonstrate the success of a program. To provide them with this information, evaluation of cultural planning also needs to be done as a matter of routine.

Confounding a lack of expertise with evaluation is that planners are unsure what to evaluate. Determining the best evaluative criteria has been the subject of several articles, as well as one of the goals of this thesis. Some type of standardized evaluation, such as those used in the educational field, is probably not possible for cultural plans. Evans, ECOTEC, Throsby, and Bartik and Bingham all espouse tailoring evaluative criteria to the individual city. To do this, it is important for cities to capture baseline measurements for comparison as well as clearly state goals they hope the cultural plan will accomplish and measuring outcomes based on those goals (Evans, 2003; Markusen & Gadwa, 2009). To be most effective, the foundations for evaluation have to be built into the plan itself. Constructing a plan with evaluation in mind will help to incorporate short-term outcomes which make a plan more likely to be implemented, as does knowing there will be an evaluation phase at the end (Dreeszen, 1998). Dwyer's

research also found that the arts and culture professionals are still unclear about how to present data best to different audiences (2008, p. 11). Advocacy reports and evaluations should play to their intended audience, not present the same information the same way to every audience. A mixed methods approach is advocated by most researchers. As previously described by Throsby, cultural implications cannot always be reduced to quantitative measurements (2001). The simplest way of finding out if a program is effective is by asking managers and involved parties what they think (Bartik & Bingham, 1997). Evans and Jackson, Kabwasa-Green and Herranz, Griffiths, and ECOTEC also recommend or use mixed methods approaches incorporating interview, questionnaire and/or survey with their recommendations for quantitative data. Clearly quantitative data is also valuable, if it is a goal of the plan to improve employment or property values, those numbers should be recorded.

Measuring a cultural plan's effect on culture can also prove difficult because the very definition of the word is nebulous, not to mention attempting to quantify it. Researchers Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, and Herranz produced a cultural vitality index which is recognized as an important starting point for measuring cultural impacts (Hawkes, 2001; Markusen & Gadwa, 2009). Research on the ECOC also advocates using qualitative measurements to asses a plan's impact (ECOTEC, 2009). These two reports form the basis for the instrument used in this study, described in more detail in Chapter Three: Methodology.

Cultural vitality is the atmosphere and environment that so many cities are striving for to attract knowledge workers, among other the other benefits. City planners need to adjust their thinking about cultural plans. As explored in the literature, a cultural plan can have many different outcomes associated but the focus should be on culture. Other fringe benefits such as economic development and social cohesion can certainly be mentioned in justifying the cultural plan, but cannot be its focus. A cultural plan should not be expected to "fix" a city. Creating, expanding and supporting a culturally vital environment should be understood as the main purpose of a cultural plan. Jackson et al. developed measurements to inform a city's cultural planning process using a definition of cultural vitality based on previous research. The researchers define cultural vitality as "the evidence of creating, dissemination, validating, and supporting arts and culture as a dimension of everyday life in communities." (2006, p.13). This definition is crafted to encompass community, nonprofit, and commercial art activities and their integral place in society. Jackson et al.'s definition was informed by previous studies undertaken which demonstrated just how important community and informal arts are to cultural vitality. The researchers were very careful not to limit their understanding of arts to just high arts. Research by Dwyer demonstrated how important this is because people tend to have a limited understanding of what is encompassed by "the arts" (2008). She further stated that those in the cultural sector face a challenge as "there are abundant stereotypes about the sector that may impede accurate understanding." (p. 14).

The authors identify three areas of cultural vitality as presence of opportunities for cultural participation, cultural participation, and support for cultural participation. They have developed a four-tiered system for collecting data on cultural vitality. Tier one is data that is publicly available, reoccurring, and national in scale. Tier two is also publicly available and reoccurring but local in scale. Tier three data is local data that is one-time, sporadically, or episodically collected. Tier four data is qualitative in nature. For tiers one and two Jackson et al. have selected specific categories and sources of data. In the remainder of their report, they rank cities based on these data.

The ECOTEC report on evaluating the 2007 and 2008 ECOC developed 55 mostly qualitative questions for stakeholders involved in the selection and execution of the program. These questions were developed around four areas: (1) relevance of the action to the ECOC goals; (2) efficiency of governance and of the ECOC mechanisms; (3) effectiveness of developing cultural activities, of achieving economic, urban development, and tourism impacts, and of promoting social development; and (4) sustainability of these activities. A full list of these questions appears in Appendix A of this thesis. This qualitative assessment is a natural fit with the measures of cultural vitality used above. While many of the questions are about the ECOC program, they were conceived within a framework and understanding that is similar to the spirit of a cultural plan. As such, they have been adapted to fit into an evaluation of a US cultural plan. More details about the adaptation of these questions will be discussed in Chapter Three: Methodology of this thesis.

The combination of the Cultural Vitality Indicators and the ECOC evaluation criteria will produce a more complete picture of a cultural plan. The use of both sets of information more thoroughly gauges the success of a cultural plan based on the primary goal of that plan, a culturally rich environment, by yielding hard data on indicators vetted by the literature and contextualization of the soft impacts a cultural plan has on things like perceived economic development and social cohesion. This model keeps the cultural impacts of the plan central to evaluating its success but does not discount the other instrumental impacts the plan may produce.

Summary

This literature review has addressed several areas related to cultural plans. A working definition of a cultural plan was built around existing types that have been identified in the literature. The most common reasons cities identify for undertaking the cultural planning process were identified as cultivating an interesting cultural environment and urban regeneration. Using available research to explore barriers to evaluation and reinforce the most effective kinds of evaluation, informs the design of this study. This study is important to the body of literature because it represents a fusion of available international literature and a practical application of that information. This study will focus on comparing a city's environmental internally rather than as a means of comparison to other cities, also addressing a gap in the literature about cultural plans. Importance of longitudinal study was frequently cited by scholars in the field and this study also will add to that purpose.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

Increasing globalization and population mobility have cities considering what approach is best to take for their future development. Cultural plans have emerged as one way that cities prepare for the new economic age. In the US, most of the larger cities and an increasing number of smaller cities and rural communities are developing their own cultural plans. As more cities generate cultural plans as a way to capture the workforce predicted to be most important in the twenty-first century, it is important to have criteria by which to evaluate those plans. These plans represent a public investment and as such have a responsibility to be undertaken intelligently and to be reasonably executable. Relatively little is done by cities in terms of assessing these plans, but as has been demonstrated, there is a growing body of literature on the subject to draw from. Using the available literature as framework, a method for the evaluation of cultural plans will be explored. With this instrument, this thesis will examine two cases, that of Austin, Texas and that of Columbus, Ohio to contribute to the body of literature on evaluation of cultural plans.

To address calls in the literature for more evaluation and more longitudinal studies on cultural plans, this thesis will use criteria developed by the Urban Institute and ECOTEC to assess the impacts of two cultural plans, those of Austin, Texas and Columbus, Ohio. To evaluate these plans, which are in

various states of implementation, data prior to the plan will be compared to most recently available data. For the purpose of this thesis, the criteria will be applied longitudinally to understand the effect the cultural plan has had on the cultural environment of the city. The literature also endorses a mixed methods approach of qualitative and quantitive data collection. Qualitative data collection and coding are outside the scope of this thesis, however the instrument will be developed for future use. Available press information will be used to contextualize the case studies where appropriate.

Instrument

The Cultural Vitality Indicators developed by the Urban Institute in 2006 have been recognized in the literature as valuable contributions to understanding cultural plans (Markusen & Gadwa, 2009). The researchers identified data and its sources and then applied it to larger US cities to understand their cultural environment in relation to each other. The report outlines three areas which the researchers feel correspond with cultural vitality: presence of opportunities for cultural participation, participation, and support. Presence of opportunities for cultural participation measures how many organizations exist in a community. The number of organizations in a community demonstrates that a city has interested citizenry that organize, operate and patronize the arts and cultural establishments of a city. Both nonprofit and commercial businesses are clearly affected by larger factors of the economy so some fluctuation in these numbers is expected to keep pace with the general economy. Participation measures how many people are taking advantage of the present opportunities by looking at

35

attendance and enrollment at arts and cultural events. There is collective benefit in having cultural opportunities available and evidence to show that even when people do not participate they support the opportunities for others (Dwyer, 2008), but this is not enough. Citizens should also be utilizing the opportunities of their community. Support is another way citizens can demonstrate their engagement. The researchers here use support both in terms of financial expenditures and community assistance. Support looks at both public spending and private giving to arts and cultural causes as well as presence of individual artists, as it is likely that individual artists who tend to be underemployed (Markusen, Gilmore, Johnson, Levi, & Martinez, 2006), will live in supportive communities. The report also acknowledges that individual community data should also be considered but does not attempt to develop a comprehensive list, rather it offers examples of data such as school directories, advocate research on art education, and local participation surveys.

In the report, measuring criteria were broken down into four tiers by the researchers. Tier one is comprised of certain national level data that are available publicly, the reoccurrence of these data allow for national comparison but offer somewhat limited picture of an individual community. These data are number of arts establishments, both nonprofit and commercial per thousand population retrieved from Zip County Business Patterns (ZCBP); percent of nonprofit and commercial arts establishments to all employment also collected by ZCBP; nonprofit arts organizations per thousand population collected by the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS); nonprofit community

celebrations, festivals, fairs, and parades per thousand also by NCCS (this category will be referred to as nonprofit event engagement for the purpose of this thesis); nonprofit art expenses per capita by NCCS; nonprofit art contributions per capita by NCCS; and percent of artists jobs to total employment by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and Non-Employer Statistics (NES). Data in this tier indicate economic intersections between employment and the creative sector and community support for cultural ventures. These data demonstrate whether artists are attracted to a city or not and whether the community at large is interested in cultural participation.

Tier two is comprised of local data in the following categories: administrative, survey, and directories and lists and as such, will be different for each city. These data provide richer context than the national level data can provide. Some types of examples of indicators in this area are survey data that is collected on performing arts attendance, databases of arts education programs, and information from cultural organizations like libraries. To be considered Tier two data, these data must be collected routinely.

Tier three is similar to Tier two in that it is local data that will be specific to each place, but is data that are collected one-time or episodically. Examples of tier three might be research studies or materials that are gathered in the preparation of cultural planning such as surveys about the needs of the community or economic impact studies. This tier provides even deeper local contextual data.

Tier four is designated as Qualitative Data but not developed by the report. The criteria established by ECOTEC for the ECOC evaluation is a natural choice for this tier. In November of 2009, ECOTEC completed a report on the ECOC of 2007 and 2008. These two years represented a policy shift in the way the ECOC were chosen that also resulted in the requirement of evaluation of the cities after the program was completed. The main goal of the evaluation was to determine if the program was meeting its stated objectives as well as make recommendations for selecting and evaluating future ECOC designees. To structure the evaluation, ECOTEC used the framework that the European Union uses in assessing all education and culture programs. Collecting qualitative information about the intent of the program allowed for the evaluations to be specific to each city but also produced results that allowed researchers to discover common themes and make cross-city comparisons.

ECOTEC developed 55 questions using the goals of the ECOC as a conceptual framework (for the full list of questions, see Appendix A). The researchers further specified these goals into categories governance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. Many of these questions are very specific to the ECOC program but their concepts can be adapted to the US cultural plan quite simply. For instance, a question like, "how did the Capitals of Culture seek to make the European dimension visible?" (it is a goal of the ECOC program to promote a city as both individual and reflective of European society), can inform the planning process by asking, "what aspects of the community unify all citizens?" Some of the questions need no adaptation at all but the overall list can

be culled. A simpler instrument is necessary for users less familiar with

evaluation, it will be easier to administer and still provide a level of detail that can

be useful in the future. Having a set of questions available before the planning

process starts can also be useful both to understand what data should be

collected throughout the process and to cast the process in the proper light

before starting. The following list of questions is most pertinent to capturing

necessary information to contextualize the success of a cultural plan in the US

(the parenthetical numbers refer to the question from which they were adapted):

- What was the main motivation behind creating a cultural plan? (EQ1)
- What role has organizational infrastructure or models played in developing the cultural plan? (EQ13)
- What was the process for securing financial resources? (EQ21)
- What was the total amount of resources used in the planning process? (EQ22)
- What proportion of resources was used for infrastructure? (EQ26)
- What quantitative indicators of the social and tourism impacts have been gathered? (EQ33)
- To what extent has the plan been successful in attaining its objectives? (EQ34, 35)
- What were the most significant economic outcomes of the plan? (EQ39)
- Are there any instances where the plan has exceeded initial expectations? (EQ42)
- Are there any expectations that have not been met? (EQ43)

- To what extent are the recommendations of the plan sustainable in the long term? (EQ47)

- What are the likely impacts of the plan on the long term cultural development of the city? (EQ52)

- What are the likely impacts of the plan on the long term social development of the city? (EQ53)

- What are the likely impacts of the plan on the long term urban development of the city? (EQ54)

Selection of cases

To test the developed instrument, cities which have engaged in the cultural planning process had to be selected. While it would be valuable to test a larger sample of cultural plans in this way, as would be collecting a control group of cities that have not undertaken cultural plans for a comparison, such research is outside the scope of this thesis. Case study can offer valuable insights into methods and rationale. Austin, Texas and Columbus, Ohio were chosen for their city's interests in the arts and culture as elements of urban planning, because they are among the top 20 most populated cities in the US, and because they frequently appear on lists of livable cities. Austin is frequently touted as a model of economic development for the twenty-first century. Austin and Columbus also share many characteristics: they are similar in population size, they are both state capitals, and they both are the home of major state research universities.

Data Analysis

The success of a cultural plan lies in whether it was able to accomplish the original set of goals. Some plans are clearer about the goals they wish to accomplish than others. Relatively few plans quantify goals specifically such as to increase jobs by such a percent or to increase cultural participation by so many events. Using the literature as a framework for the general goals of cultural plans and amassing developed instruments to evaluate cultural vitality, data from the sources named above was collected, critically assessed and analyzed. Rather than a strictly comparative analysis, this study compared data from the same city over time. This study will examine a city's data before and after the implementation of its cultural plan. The length of time will vary for each city. Because of the availability of data, the years from which each statistic is drawn may also vary. Not having data from the same year is potentially problematic but it is important to establishing a foundation. Many of the variables considered are not directly related to each other so having them come from different years is not much of a concern as long as they are reasonably close, that is within a year or two. One problem using the Cultural Vitality Indicators was availability of data. The Urban Institute's report claimed that Tier one and two data were available to the public and with no or minimal cost. The data for nonprofit art expenses and contributions is not readily available as the report stated. NCCS compiles data for IRS 990s, but not by these criteria. Americans for the Arts does capture this same data as part of its Arts and Economic Prosperity series. Austin however, did not participate in this study prior to 2005, therefore information on those categories was only available at one point in time.

41

Another problem encountered within the Cultural Vitality Indicators was the use of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). NAICS has been in use since 1997, prior to that the Standard Industry Classification (SIC) was employed. Data from prior to 1997 have to be converted to the SIC system. Additionally, some businesses are required to only define the number of employees they have in ranges rather than exact number, therefore averages have been employed in some cases. Another limitation with this approach is the geographic definition of the data. In some cases, Metropolitan Statistical Area level data is available, in some cases only county level data is available. Because of the size of the cities selected for this case and the fact that both exist wholly within one county, there is little difference between these two numbers as the cities claim the majority of the county population. If smaller cities, counties with multiple significant cities, or cities on a county line were to be evaluated using these methods, considerations would have to be made.

Despite limitations in the data, this approach is valuable for many reasons. First, it addresses a need in the literature for more longitudinal data. Second, it gives a deeper understanding of a cultural plan in terms of a policy intervention. Both of the cities that were the focus of this thesis have experienced growth over the last ten or so years. Assessing the impact of the cultural plan over time will uncover whether the cultural plan has resulted in improvement to the cultural environment or whether the city's cultural offerings have been outpaced by the growth of the city. This study intends to find the relative merits of cultural planning in the selected communities.

Columbus and Austin were selected out of the interest of the researcher but they do have many similarities that make them logical to use for comparison. The intention of this study is not to compare the cities in a normative way to conclude who has a "better" cultural plan, but as a way of understanding what cities can learn from each other about how to undertake cultural planning. Austin is a bit further ahead in the process than Columbus, and can possibly serve as an example to it. No two cities are enough alike to set up a proper experimental design but some of the externalities can be limited by examining cities that are similar such as Austin and Columbus.

Summary

As the interest in cultural planning grows, so does the body of research on the subject. Using methods and instruments that have been developed in the literature allows this study to contribute to the evaluation of cultural planning. This study collected criteria based mainly on two reports: Cultural Vitality in Communities and Ex-Post Evaluation of the 2007 and 2008 European Capitals of Culture. These two reports were selected for their recognition in the literature and strong foundational theories on the subject. Using the instruments (or adaptations) developed therein to analyze new cases represent a new addition to the field of cultural planning evaluation. The cases of Columbus, Ohio and Austin, Texas were selected for their interest in the cultural planning process as communities, as well as their appearance on livability lists generated using much of the same criteria that motivates cultural plans. By analyzing these cities longitudinally, the influence that their cultural plans has had on the cultural

43

environment will be revealed. This study expects to find that through the cultural

planning process, cities with clearly stated goals for their cultural plan have

expectations that are more likely to be met and that cities without clearly stated

goals will have relatively little impact on the factors they hope to influence.

Chapter Four: Analysis

Introduction

Developing a cultural plan is one way that city governments have

addressed the need to be competitive in the new economy in an era of increasing

globalization. By fostering a rich creative environment, cities hope to stand out

from their peers encouraging new business developments, attracting workers to

their cities, and boosting tourists' visits. The planning process itself can be

challenging to city governments especially those without much expertise and

unreliable or conflicting available research on the subject.

Cultural planning is still a relatively new concept, to be most effective

researchers and those developing cultural plans should cultivate an

understanding of the best success measures for those plans. By consulting the

literature and reports previously completed on the subject, an instrument for

assessing cultural plans has emerged. The merits of a cultural plan can be

judged on whether it fulfills its stated goals. Improvement of the cultural

atmosphere is usually the fundamental goal of a cultural plan. In communities

that are experiencing rapid growth, a plan might only keep pace with growth, or

even fall behind it, rather than improving the atmosphere of the city. A plethora

of evaluative criteria have been used in the past to assess the impact on the

community. Measures of economic growth are difficult to use because they

might not capture the full picture or because they cannot survive simple cost

benefit analysis. Assessing the cultural vitality of a community demonstrates the impacts that a cultural plan has had and also speaks to the atmosphere cities are trying to cultivate to be competitive in the twenty-first century. Each city in America has its own unique cultural identity. Comparing cities by population or to mega-arts cities like New York and San Francisco might not be useful in most cases. A cultural plan should take stock of its own community assets and resources and decide how to best utilize and expand on them rather than trying to create a cultural utopia. Therefore, cities should compare certain indicators, like the Cultural Vitality Indicators, over time to judge the impact the plan had. This allows a city to judge its success from within itself rather than basing it on a comparison to other places. Using qualitative measures adapted from the ECOC program demonstrates the layers of nuance that have been developed over the course of the cultural planning process. This method also gathers information from the most direct sources possible, the cultural planners. By using the qualitative data that this produces, coupled with the vitality indicators and examining one city before, during and after the implementation of its plan, allows a city a more holistic and reliable evaluation. Additionally the city can use this understanding to gauge future culture needs and understand its relationship to other cities.

To test this instrument, two case studies will be considered, those of Austin, Texas and Columbus, Ohio. Both cities have engaged in the cultural planning process for some time and are at various implementation points. This study will look briefly at the demographics of each city; explore the plan or plans

that they have developed; analyze those plans using data collected from the US

Census, the National Center for Charitable Statistics, and other sources before,

during and after the plan; contextualize those numbers with other information,

and evaluate the plan. In this study, it is more important to understand one city

longitudinally than in a national comparison but the two cities will be considered

briefly in comparison.

<div align="center">Case Analysis: Austin, Texas</div>

<div align="center">The City of Austin</div>

Austin, Texas was a city of about 750,000 people and the Austin-Round

Rock-San Marcos Metropolitan Statistical Area was about 1.7 million people

according to 2008 Census estimates. The city has growing Latino and Asian

populations and a shrinking Black population. Austin is considered a young city,

the median age being below the national average. The city has been

experiencing a rapidly growing population since the end of World War II. The

technology sector first settled in Austin in the late 1960s and more firms

continued to settle there into the 1990s and today. As the seat of Travis County

and the Texas capital, public institutions in Austin employ a significant number of

people. Austin Independent School District, city government, federal

government, state government and the University of Texas at Austin (a state

institution), are among the largest employers in the area. Dell, Apple, and IBM,

all computer manufacturing companies, are also major employers in the area.

Austin also has many energy companies and healthcare organizations

headquartered in the area that represent a significant portion of the local

workforce. Austin is also the headquarters to Whole Foods Market, a popular national specialty grocery retailer.

Austin is located in the central Texas hill country along the Colorado River in an ecologically diverse area displaying elements of both the desert and the tropics. The Colorado River supplies some of the city's energy. The climate in Austin tends to be subtropical with average yearly temperatures in the 70s, marked by hot summers and mild winters. The city of Austin was founded in 1839 as the capital for the Republic of Texas. Austin's central location and natural amenities favored it to be the capital but more populous cities like Houston and Dallas also vied to be the seat of government. In 1846 it became the capital of the state of Texas. Today it is the fourth most populated city in Texas.

The Austin cultural environment is dominated by the music sector. Austin is labeled "the live music capital of the world." Festivals and events like SXSW, a music, film and interactive (gaming) conference; Austin City Limits festival, a music festival presented by local company C3 who also produces Lollapalooza in Chicago; and Fun Fun Fun Fest, an indie music festival, draw hundreds of thousands of visitors and have major economic impacts on the region. The reputation of events like these draws countless musicians and fans to the city year round. Based on the anecdotal experience of the researcher, everyone in Austin is in a band the same way every waiter in Los Angeles is an actor. The film industry is growing as television shows like *Friday Night Lights* use the city for shooting and the dedicated city film office brings in other film projects. The

city also has a strong performing arts sector stemming from the music scene.

Austin recently opened a large performing arts venue, has an orchestra, ballet

and opera companies. The visual arts environment, though perhaps dwarfed by

the music, film, and performing arts is engaged and motivated to grow. The

Master of Fine Arts program at the University of Texas at Austin is ranked 15th in

the country by US News and World Report (2008). The artists in town tend to be

on the east side of highway 35 and organize the East Austin Studio Tour, a

newer annual event in November which invites the public to exhibitions and

studios of artists in that part of town tied together by a bike tour. The Blanton

Museum of Art at the University of Texas is one of the largest university affiliated

art museums in the country and its major benefactors, the Klein Family frequently

appear on top art collector lists throughout the country (van Ryzin, 2010).

<div align="center">The Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan - 1993</div>

One of Austin's first major cultural plans was completed in 1993. This

plan could be classified as a comprehensive community arts and cultural plan but

it also has elements of an issue-specific cultural plan (Dreeszen, 1993). This

plan also represents a state somewhere between cultural regeneration and

culture *and* regeneration (Evans, 2005). The plan called for integration at the city

level with other development plans but as happens with many cultural plans,

such integration was never completed and so it stands alone. This plan predates

most of the literature on cultural districts and does not explore the neighborhood

interaction the way later cultural plans will, though the plan is implicitly concerned

with the central city of Austin rather than any outlying areas. Based on the

context given in the plan, the City of Austin recognized that it had a thriving arts sector and undertook the plan to make sure that community continued to be served and develop because of its importance to the city economy. The idea of social cohesion is also present in this plan, as it used minority equity as one of its guiding principles. Evaluation of the plan was not mentioned anywhere. The plan called for impact assessment and departmental assessment to better understand the city's cultural sector but no measures for evaluation of the plan itself were ever considered.

The Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan's (ACAP) stated goal was "to create an environment which enables artists and arts organizations to realize fully their potential as contributors to the economic and cultural prosperity of the City of Austin." (City of Austin, 1993, p. 1). This plan made several recommendations around eight areas. These areas are (1) advocacy for the arts, (2) artists and arts organizations, (3) arts education and outreach, (4) economic development, (5) facilities and spaces, (6) funding, (7) minority equity, and (8) public relations/marketing. Within these areas, the plan made thirty-four individual recommendations. The report identified nine principles as guiding its vision for the ACAP: (1) community-wide inclusion, (2) community involvement and consensus, (3) minority equity, (4) artistic diversity, (5) artistic quality, (6) access to the arts, (7) economic equity, (8) education, and (9) need. The vision statement for the plan read "The plan, therefore, should help empower artists of all disciplines as well as the richly diverse cultures of the city thereby positively affecting the quality of life and economic and cultural prosperity." (City of Austin,

1993, p. 5). To understand the needs of the city, the Austin Arts Commission, who spearheaded the plan, did research, fact-finding, and interviews with the community. The report briefly examined the cultural environment of the city, citing statistics on Austin's ranking as a livable city, the artist concentration in Austin, the economic impact of the creative sector, and city owned cultural facilities, as a means of justifying the importance of the cultural sector. ACAP made a few recommendations which do not fall into any of the eight areas. These recommendations included assessing the Cultural Arts Divisions placement within the Parks and Recreation Department and establishing infrastructure to manage the completed plan. Recommendations in the advocacy section included establishing an advocacy coalition and raising community awareness and volunteerism for the arts. Within the arts and artists section, it was recommended that the city establish an arts support office and provide database resources and assistance. The arts education and outreach section included recommendations to develop arts education resources and encourage partnerships. The economic development section mainly called for an economic impact study on the arts in Austin. The recommendations in the facilities category included rewriting the city's current facilities policy, further development of the public art program, creating incentives for private development and to embark on cultural facilities development on its own. This was perhaps the plans most ambitious recommendation. Within the funding category, it was encouraged to establish a grants writer, continue to develop current funding mechanisms, and develop new funding mechanisms. Minority equity includes

recommendations for creating infrastructure to ensure equity and developing

designated funding sources. The recommendations in the public relations and

marketing category included developing designated infrastructure, holding a

major arts event and highlighting the arts through the Sister Cities program.

Following the recommendations, the plan closed with a fiscal impact report

summarizing the recommendations of the plan, delineating who is responsible for

completing them, suggesting when they should be completed, the cost, who will

pay, and the benefit. This report illustrates how far cultural planning processes

have come when viewed side-by-side with the newest, glossy, magazine-like

most recent Austin plan. This plan contains no graphics or pictures and is light

on visionary descriptions of what the city will look like if the plan is carried out,

something that has become de rigueur in cultural plans since this one was

published.

This plan depicted Austin as a city that has been successful at attracting

creatives but that has not been able to keep pace with their needs in terms of

infrastructure and resources. ACAP illustrated a city that is aware of its

community and their needs and a consciousness towards addressing them. In

the years between 1993 and 2006, several smaller plans were completed

including sector economic impact reports and district specific regeneration plans.

In 2006, another comprehensive cultural plan was undertaken, *CreateAustin*.

While this plan is really too new to evaluate using the discussed criteria, it is

interesting to compare the two plans to gain a deeper understanding of the needs

that persisted over the period between the two plans. Exploration of the newest

plan also offers some insight into developments in style and mores of cultural planning.

<div align="center">CreateAustin - 2009</div>

The *CreateAustin* plan can also be classified as a comprehensive community arts and cultural plan with issue-specific and district-specific threads (Dreeszen, 1993). This plan also seeks to develop an art and entertainment-focused district in the downtown area (Galligan, 2008). *CreateAustin* might also be classified as an advocacy and promotion tool designed to convince government and citizens alike that investments in arts and culture will pay dividends to the city (Evans, 2005). Similar to Austin's first plan, this plan also strives to create integrated cultural regeneration but exists outside Austin's other development plans. The city completed this plan to update the previous plan, which was seen as ineffectual (Faires, 2008). In the years since the 1993 plan, Austin was able to maintain its foothold in the new economy but the increasing pressure of the knowledge workers caused Austin to re-assess the needs of its cultural community.

To produce the *CreateAustin* plan, the city incorporated previous research, held meetings organized around different topics, completed surveys, and hired a consulting firm. This plan was more substantial than ACAP and offers much more background, justification and future vision. The plan offered a section on purpose, values and vision, describes the process, gives community context, analyzes strengths and weaknesses, gives recommendations in both long and short terms, and briefly outlines immediate steps toward

<div align="center">53</div>

implementation. The bulk of the report was devoted to the recommendations of the plan, interestingly there were also thirty-four in this plan. The intent of the report was to produce a road map for the city to follow over the next ten years.

The *CreateAustin* leadership council was appointed in 2006. The council was composed of individuals working in the government, the nonprofit arts sector and other community members, totaling 71 members. The leadership council identified three values to guide Austin's cultural plan: inclusion, collaboration and innovation. They identified six priority issues and also convened six task forces around these issues. These also became the categories for the recommendations, they are: (1) support for individual creativity, (2) built environment, (3) creativity and learning, (4) communications and collaborative ventures, (5) financial resources, and (6) cultural infrastructure. The leadership council also developed a vision of what Austin would look like in ten years to guide their recommendations. They enumerated nine different ideals including reinforcing Austin's unique identity, providing a nurturing and conducive environment for individual creativity, increasing physical structures' number and usage, and increasing both public and private support and funding for culture.

To demonstrate the importance of the cultural sector, the plan cited labor and economic impact statistics. The creative sector, due in large part to the thriving music scene in Austin, generates $2.2 billion in economic activity according to the report (CreateAustin Cultural Master Plan, 2009, p. 17). The plan recognized many areas as being part of the "culture of creativity": architecture, arts education, community arts, crafts, culinary arts, dance, design

and graphic arts, gaming and digital media, fashion design, film and video, heritage, landscape architecture, literary arts, music, photography, performance art, recording, slam poetry, theatre, and visual arts. The community context section highlighted certain aspects of the Austin environment such as there is no ethnic majority in the city, that the African-American community is in decline and might be almost nonexistent in the future, and the combination of tech jobs, cultural amenities and green spaces have made Austin a poster city for the new economy. There are also challenges to the community. As its reputation as a livable city grows, so do population and housing prices. The reputation for live music also eclipses the other arts sectors in the city. The music scene itself is also threatened by increasing real estate prices, both in the commercial and residential markets. Arts education and community arts activities are underrepresented in the city, especially among the ethnic populations. The city's cultural workers are not professionalized since they have few professional development opportunities and no advanced educational opportunities within the city. This is also related to the philanthropic environment in the city. The culture of giving is underdeveloped perhaps in part because of the fundraising skills of the city's cultural workers but also because as a very young, nonnative population; Austin does not have a private giving tradition established. These factors have created a stunted cultural infrastructure environment; Austin does not have any cultural organizations with yearly budgets over $5 million and only 22 with budgets over $250,000 (ibid, p.18).

The recommendations centered on six priority topics identified by the leadership council. The background and observations leading to each recommendation was discussed. For each recommendation, lead implementers, partners, timelines, first steps, models, resources, outcomes, and benefits/rationales were discussed. The first grouping, support for individual creativity, recognized individual creators as the foundation of Austin's creative environment. The goal of this set of recommendations was to develop an environment where individuals can comfortably live, have access to the tools that they need and can concentrate on production of work. The next set of recommendations was around the built environment, this is the longest recommendation section. As Austin is a fast growing and increasingly expensive city, the need for affordable physical structures is huge. The goal here is to ensure that artists have the amenities they need to work and that growth of the city does not damage that. The creativity and learning recommendations focused on sustainability for the Austin creative class. There is some concern that if creative subjects are not addressed in schools and if continuous development opportunities are not offered, the creative workers in Austin will age out. The goal is to expand educational opportunities for children and lifelong learners. The next set of recommendations was centered on communications and collaborative ventures. This section has to do with increasing the public value of the arts among Austin residents and improving its national reputation to continue to draw tourism dollars. Financial resource recommendations focus on developing the philanthropic community in Austin to make it more financially

sustainable. The final section of recommendations concentrated on the cultural infrastructure. Boosting the infrastructure ensures Austin will be able to manage its cultural resources into the future.

The recommendations given are numerous and somewhat interconnected. In the executive summary of the report, ten recommendations are chosen as "big ideas" that emerged. These ten recommendations will now be briefly considered. (1) The establishment of the leadership task force was seen as the most important first step for the planning process. (2) The formation of a community-based Creative Alliance was an important enough recommendation that it shows up in both the individual creativity and communication and collaboration sections. (3) Creation of a city department of arts and culture is another recommendation by the plan. (4) The plan calls for a public service campaign to raise public value of the arts in the city. (5) It also calls for the city to reach out to schools and universities in the area. Because of the aforementioned philanthropic environment in Austin, (6) a campaign to raise private sector support, both on the individual and corporate levels, is also called for. (7) Increasing business and technical services and (8) developing education opportunities speak to the desire to increase lifelong learning and appreciation for the arts. (9) Encouraging neighborhood-based cultural development hopes to capitalize on self-organized cultural districts as well as address concerns of the minority populations in the city. (10) Developing affordable cultural and live/work spaces again speaks to the changing demographics of Austin threatening the artistic community.

The final section in the plan was called Next Steps. The first steps that

should be taken by the stakeholders were outlined within each of the

recommendations. The first recommendation was to adopt the plan. The second

step was to reconvene the leadership council to monitor the plan's progress. The

next two steps were basically to implement the plan. They were to form the

Creative Alliance and city department of arts and culture previously mentioned

and to start the marketing and goodwill campaigns previously mentioned. This

plan was endorsed by city council in late June 2010 (Faires, 2010a).

Analyzing the plans using the Cultural Vitality Indicators

The first criterion considered from the Cultural Vitality Indicators was

percentage of artists' jobs to total employment. The first data point was taken

from the Bureau of Labor Statistics classifications on jobs, using the

specifications developed the Cultural Vitality Indicators. Unfortunately, this data

is not available for 1992, the year chosen as a baseline before ACAP was in

place. Using data from 1999 Austin MSA, the percentage of artists' jobs was

0.13%. Researchers caution that this is a difficult statistic to capture as artists

are often employed elsewhere or do not make their primary income from their art

(Markusen et al., 2006). By 2007, the concentration of artists in the workforce

rose to 0.30%.

For the percentage of employment in arts establishments (commercial and

nonprofit) the data point for 1992 was the Travis County Business Patterns, as

discussed in the methodology, MSA data for this period was not available and

the data were categorized using SIC not NAICS. Using this data, art

58

employment accounted for 1.10%. The 1998 and 2007 data points come from

the MSA and use the NAICS system. They are 0.7% and 0.8% respectively.

The number of arts establishments was also collected using these same sources.

In 1992 there were 368 in Travis County. In 1998 there were 402 arts

establishments in the Austin MSA and in 2007 there were 497.

Number of nonprofit art organizations was collected from IRS files by the

National Center for Charitable Statistics. These numbers are collected by

county. Also important to note is that these are based on 990 forms and

organizations with less than $25,000 in receipts do not have to file 990 forms.

For this data point, 1995 was the earliest available year. In 1995, there were 297

nonprofit arts organizations in Travis County, in 1998 the number was 392 and in

2007 it was 510. The event engagement category is also collected by these

same methods. In 1995, there were 6 organizations, in 1998 there were 5 and in

2007 there were 7. Nonprofit art expenses and contributions are also collected

from IRS forms and therefore only capture contributions from individuals who

chose to itemize their returns. As discussed in the methodology, Austin did not

participate in the Americans for the Arts study that captured this data in more

refined detail until 2005. See Table 1 for comparison of all Austin statistics.

Other information about the cultural vitality in Austin can be gleaned from

the planning documents. Austin's focus on creating a livable environment for

artists comes from the recognition of the high concentration of artists there.

Cultural planners may feel that the general public does not grasp the extent of

artists' contributions to the economy based on their 1993 recommendation for an

economic impact study, but this indicates that key stakeholders do recognize the effect this high concentration of artists has on the city. The high concentration of artists could also be related to the grassroots cultural environment Austin seems to have. Many of the small organizations are run by artists who also participate in the programming of the organization such as the Texas Biennial and the East Austin Studio Tour. The reports mention that the community lacks many large cultural institutions and reflects in the recommendations that these institutions are in need of professional leadership, technical support, and development assistance. Austin's art environment is also variegated based on the 2006 plan's inclusion of many categories for the arts including culinary arts and slam poetry. The community in arts other than music may be small but it is very diverse, something the city recognizes in its plans and attempts to make its recommendations accordingly.

The Tier two and three data for Austin is scant. While Austin has used local firms like TXP and EvalArts to complete surveys and reports on the creative sector in the city, there are no reoccurring cultural data available to the public. There are several databases available with information concerning the public art collection and event calendars. The City of Austin's CAD, The Greater Austin Creative Alliance, and Greenlights for Nonprofit Success all currently provide some resources in professional development for artists and cultural workers in the city in response to recommendations in the cultural plans.

Austin	1992	1998	2007
Percentage of artist jobs to total employment	Not Available	0.13%	0.30%
Percentage of employment in arts establishments to total employment	1.10%	0.70%	0.80%
Number of nonprofit art organizations	297 (1995)	334	510
Number of arts establishments	368	402	497
Number of nonprofit event engagement organizations	6 (1995)	5	7
Nonprofit art expenses per capita	Not Available	Not Available	$91.94 (2005)
Nonprofit arts contributions per capita	Not Available	Not Available	$3.13 (2005)

Table 1: Austin Statistics

To complete the evaluation of the cultural plan with the Tier four/ECOC qualitative measurements, interviews with key stakeholders, which are outside the scope of this study, should be undertaken. Gathering this information will give a more complete view of the plan and the planning process. Those instrumental to the creation of the plan should be consulted including Cookie Ruiz, the Leadership Council Working Chair; Vincent Kitch, the Cultural Arts Program Manager; selected members of the Leadership Council; and representatives from each of the task forces. There would be benefit in also

interviewing key members of the city government including the mayor, Lee Leffingwell and Marc Ott, the city manager.

<center>Case Analysis: Columbus, Ohio</center>

<center>The City of Columbus</center>

The population of Columbus, Ohio was about 750,000 with a MSA of about 1.8 million people in 2008. The city was founded in 1812 and became the capital of Ohio in 1816, when other highly populated cities in Ohio like Toledo, Cleveland and Cincinnati desired a central location for the government seat. The city of Columbus is also the seat to Franklin County's government. The Ohio State University, one of the nation's largest universities, was founded in Columbus in 1870. The ethnic mix of Columbus' population tracks closely with the US population. The city has a large Somalian population as well as a large gay population. Columbus has a high concentration of headquarters of Fortune 100 companies in sectors such as education, insurance, banking, fashion, defense, and health care. Companies headquartered in Columbus include Limited Brands and Abercrombie and Fitch, fashion companies; Nationwide Insurance, an insurance and financial institution; American Electric Power, an energy company; chemical companies such as Scotts and Hexion; and CardinalHealth, a healthcare services company. Columbus is located in central Ohio on the Scioto and Olentangy rivers. The city has a typical Midwestern climate of hot, humid summers and cold, dry winters.

Columbus' cultural community is as diverse as its ethnic community. The city is home to several notable traditional "high" arts companies like a symphony

<center>62</center>

orchestra and choir, a ballet company and school, an opera company, and many

theatre companies. The city is home to the Newport which bills itself as the

longest continuously operating rock and roll venue in the United States

(PromoWest, n.d.). The city is also recognized for its burgeoning rap scene and

a well established metal and hard core scene. Columbus has a highly engaged

and motivated group of visual artists organized in collectives like Couchfire and

Wild Goose Creative, who are undertaking adventurous projects like the

conversion of a former Wonderbread factory into a mixed use arts studio, retail,

entertainment, and restaurant space in central Columbus. The Ohio State

University is ranked 18th by US World and Report for its MFA program (2008).

The city also draws many undergraduate art students to the Columbus College of

Art and Design. The city is well known for the Columbus Arts Festival, presented

in June each year along with many other craft fairs and festivals that take place

in Columbus. Columbus is a "city of districts" (Americans for the Arts, 2008) and

the types of districts factor heavily into its cultural planning, in many cases the

districts having their own cultural planning agendas. One of the most famous

and well developed (along with German Village) is the Short North. The Short

North is comprised of creative businesses, galleries, and restaurants and bars

which all cooperate to be open late on the first Saturday of the month, called

Gallery Hop, drawing thousands of visitors to the area. Gallery Hop is the

"badge" of the Short North and a paragon for the creative economy (Americans

for the Arts, 2008).

Columbus has been "planning to plan" (Lawson, 2006 quoted in Wray) for some time. The city began its cultural planning in 2003 with a White Paper series completed by The Ohio State University's Fisher College of Business and the Columbus Partnership. The cultural plans generated by the city of Columbus and interested city organizations have included feasibility studies for artist live/work spaces and assessments of the city's cultural industries. The city has yet to develop a comprehensive cultural plan although one is expected within the next two years. To understand the cultural planning process in Columbus, this study will focus on the significant preliminary studies that have been done and the blueprint for the cultural plan that the city hopes to complete. The city's process so far has been cumulative with each successive report addressing the recommendations and findings of the previous reports, therefore the most comprehensive and recent reports will be considered at length.

Columbus preplanning

Two of the most comprehensive preliminary reports are *The Creative Economy: Leveraging the Arts, Culture and Creative Community for a Stronger Columbus* completed by the Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee in 2007 and *Creative Columbus* published in 2009 as a collaborative project between Columbus College of Art and Design, The Columbus Foundation, Compete Columbus, Franklin County Commissioners, Greater Columbus Arts Council, The Ohio State University and Community Research Partners. Each report offers background and insight that are meant to inform the city's future cultural plan though neither is a cultural plan strictly speaking.

The Creative Economy is most aptly described as an advocacy and promotion report (Evans, 2005). As was the case with Austin, these plans strive to be a plan for culture *and* regeneration but are not fully integrated into the other city planning processes (ibid). In fact, *Columbus 2020!* a regional economic development plan that was released in the summer of 2010, says in effect that there are others working on the area of culture and it intends to leave them to that (Columbus 2020, 2010). *The Creative Economy* outlined three objectives for the report: to re-examine how the arts and cultural policy serve the community, to understand the creative sector, and to develop a new policy vision. This report set up a concept called the triple bottom line, similar to the three pillars of sustainability (Hawkes, 2001), this concept is an expansion of the triple bottom line in use by corporate and environmental sustainability models. This triple bottom line for the creative sector is formed around creative vitality, financial sustainability and public value. The report found that these three components are necessary for a thriving creative sector. The report looked closely at the previous research done in Columbus and other model cities to inform its framework and recommendations. The particular ecology of Columbus was examined as a way to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the community. These assets include a consortium of the largest cultural organizations in the city, a network of suburban arts councils, and a strong foundation of art education. The report examined the economic "drivers" of the city including being the seat of State, County and Local government, Experience Columbus (the tourism office), and active economic development offices. The

report fused these pieces and resources together to provide an informed approach to cultural planning. The report justified the role of arts and culture in economic terms and seeks to make that clear to city planners and citizens. The report advocated using resources like the city infrastructure, existing resources and a growing creative scene to leverage more resources and policies to nurture the environment. The report offered next steps around the topics of leadership, financial capital, creative capital and visibility.   While the primary purpose of this document was to provide a solid foundation for a comprehensive cultural plan, it has some functionality as a cultural plan itself.   The report makes recommendations, sets timelines for them, considers resources, and names the responsible parties, all things a strong cultural plan must also do.

Creative Columbus was an exhaustive report detailing the results of a community wide needs assessment administered as an online survey, interviews and focus groups. The results of this survey illustrated the cultural environment that Columbus has through the eyes of its citizens. This report provided further justification of the need for a comprehensive city cultural plan to address the city's needs as well as foster the desired economic fringe benefits. This report built on the *Creative Economy* report by focusing on one area identified in that report, the creative cluster. The report set its definition of the creative economy and used that definition to explore the Central Ohio creative industries and individual creative talent and the needs of those groups. The report used this information to uncover strengths and weakness that tend to reflect each other and demonstrate the importance of a city's national reputation to its cultural

environment. Similar to the Austin community's needs, the report called for a better resource or clearinghouse for information. Another principle concern this report unearthed is the need for services to self-employed or underemployed artists such as health insurance and retirement planning. Citing Columbus' deficit in funding sources, the report also called for more sources of financial support.

Columbus' Cultural Plan Blueprint - 2009

Columbus is prepared for its cultural planning process. The city even has a website called ColumbusCulturalPlan.com, though it has been dormant for some time and the plan is about a year overdue at this point. The group charged with the creation of the cultural plan is through the city Mayor's office and is called the Greater Columbus Creative Cultural Commission. As of January 2009, the group has a strategy in place for undertaking the cultural plan called *A Cultural Plan Blueprint*. This strategy serves as a skeleton of the Columbus cultural plan that will later be fleshed out. The plan cited the previous research including the report by the Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee. This main goal of the Columbus cultural plan was to make the city competitive economically. This plan identified three areas to form the future plan around: artists and the creative economy, audience development and community engagement, and resources and funding.

Under artists and the creative economy, the report breaks down four categories: anchor organizations, independent artists, student artists, and the creative class. Independent artists, it should be noted includes both self-

employed professional artists and avocational artists. For each one of these areas, the report addressed them in terms of assets and gaps. For anchor organizations, the major issue was a deficit in leadership. To remedy this, the plan suggests developing arts management talent and solutions and encourages collaboration to work as efficiently as possible. For independent artists, the report found that there is a rich environment and talent but poor support systems. To remedy this it suggested developing more affordable live/work space, more grants and technical resources. Under the student artist section, the report found there is a lack of connection between the large student population and the interested community, resulting in heavy out-migration for college educated individuals. Solutions to this included raising the profile of the Columbus cultural environment and job placement assistance. The report found that the contribution that the creative sector makes to the economy is still undervalued in Columbus. To correct this perception, the plan advocated more demonstrative research and stronger connections between artists and the business community.

In the audience development and community engagement category, the report found a total of eight areas in need of address, the first five under audience development, and the last three under community engagement: (1) community leadership, (2) arts education, (3) marketing and communication, (4) easy access, (5) an iconic destination, (6) cultural experiences, (7) public art, and (8) heritage and preservation. Community leadership is lacking in connecting the arts leaders and volunteerism in the city with the arts. The arts education category addressed the discrepancy between the top-ranked post-secondary art

education programs and the lack of K-12 art programs in the city. The report

called for marketing and communications efforts to be more collaborative and

wide-spread. Easy access to the arts addressed problems with city infrastructure

like transportation and ticket prices. Becoming an iconic destination for the arts

was suggested by using existing models to develop a new cultural facility and

district. The cultural experiences section called for making sure citizens feel safe

at the city's large number of festivals. The report called for expansion of the

city's public art program. To address heritage and preservation the report called

for a city museum and preservation of city history that is endangered due to

development.

Resources and funding was divided into issues of operational costs,

growth and expansion and facilities. Operational costs are currently not allowing

the generation any surplus for the city's major cultural organizations resulting in

flat growth. To grow, the city needs to diversify funding sources from the current

bed-tax model. A new fund or endowment should be created. Columbus has

adequate cultural facilities but should strive to develop new world class facilities.

This section called for the Greater Columbus Arts Council (GCAC) to step into a

new more central role acting as a liaison for funding and policies to cut down on

duplication and raise efficiency to free more resources for area cultural

organizations.

This plan offered three steps for getting started. First, these findings

should be brought to community art leaders for support and input. The other two

steps can be pursued simultaneously. GCAC should be prepared to evolve into

the proposed role and consultants with expertise in cultural planning should be recruited to work on the process and develop resources for it.

<div align="center">Developing the Columbus Cultural Plan</div>

Columbus also enlisted WolfBrown, a consulting firm, to undertake sustainability analysis and other research in preparation for its cultural plan. The report that was generated included a synthesis of the previous reports, including those mentioned, review of data from other sources, including the Americans for the Arts (AFTA) study used for data analysis in this study, and interview data.

The first part of the report was a financial analysis of the Columbus creative sector based on the work done in the Arts and Economic Prosperity reports of AFTA, updating the information with the help of GCAC. The major finding of this part of the report was that when taken in aggregate, the cultural sector in Columbus is operating at a chronic deficit. In response to this environment, organizations are cutting expenditures in staffing and programming.

In the second part of the report, the previous research on cultural plans was considered, pointing out that the challenge in this area is to develop priorities among the recommendations that have already been put forth. The report identified four guiding principles: (1) contributing to Columbus' competitiveness, (2) aligning with broad community goals, (3) pursuing partnerships, and (4) achieving further efficiency and right-sizing (right-sizing refers to the ability of the sector to respond to community demand). The report also developed four community goals using these principles: (1) foster economic development, (2) enhance branding and marketing, (3) attract, develop, and retain a twenty-first

century workforce, and (4) promote efficiency and effectiveness. This section of the report points out that Columbus already has many achievements around strategic partnerships and consolidation of services and encourages more developments in these areas.

The third section of the report builds on these guiding principles and goals and focuses on how to turn those goals into actions. This section takes the four previously stated goals and offers solutions and steps to achieving those solutions. These action items include increasing funding to the city's cultural sector, integrate cultural marketing with city marketing, increasing arts education in school and community settings, and completing further research to better understand the sector.

The next section of the report details securing resources for the sector and the planning process. The report identifies short, medium and long term funding goals and details how they should be allocated and possible strategies for securing them. The final section of the plan offers a six month timeline of next steps. The report underscores the need to have community leadership backing the cultural plan to make it successful.

GCAC has also contracted with another firm to continue sustainability research, with the primary concern of understanding the changing needs of the cultural sector (Lawson, personal communication, July 2010). This future research would also analyze GCAC's position in the community and its capacity to take on a new role should the anticipated change in funding mechanisms

happen. This research is also intended to help the sector understand more areas where efficiency can be improved through strategic partnerships.

Analyzing the plans using the Cultural Vitality Indicators

For Columbus, the years circa 1998 and 2007 are considered. Since Columbus does not have an official plan yet, this is the first step in an ongoing process of evaluation. Establishing the statistics for these years will allow Columbus to benchmark the progress of its future cultural plan. The first criterion considered from the Cultural Vitality Indicators was percentage of artists' jobs to total employment. The first data point was taken from the Bureau of Labor statistics classifications on jobs, using the specifications developed the Cultural Vitality Indicators. In 1998, artists' jobs accounted for 0.12% of the total employment in the MSA. In 2007, artists' jobs accounted for 0.18% of the total employment.

The percentage of employment in arts establishments (commercial and nonprofit) fell from 0.67% in 1998 to 0.57% in 2007. These data were both gathered using the MSA and NAICS systems. The number of arts establishments was also collected using these same sources. In 1998 there were 392 arts establishments in the Columbus MSA and in 2007 there were 375.

As previously mentioned, the number of nonprofit art organizations were collected from IRS files by the National Center for Charitable Statistics. These numbers were collected by county. Also important to note again is that these are based on 990 forms and organizations with less than $25,000 in receipts are not required to file 990 forms. In 1998, there were 392 nonprofit arts organizations in

72

Franklin County, in 2007 the number was 375. The event engagement category

was also collected by these same methods. In 1998 and 2007 there were 18

nonprofit event organizations in Franklin County. See Table 2 for comparison of

all Columbus statistics.

Columbus	1998	2007
Percentage of artist jobs to total employment	0.12%	0.18%
Percentage of employment in arts establishments to total employment	0.67%	0.57%
Number of nonprofit art organizations	392	473
Number of arts establishments	392	375
Number of nonprofit event engagement organizations	18	18
Nonprofit art expenses per capita	$66.06 (2000)	$87.58 (2005)
Nonprofit arts contributions per capita	$2.80 (2000)	$3.95 (2005)

Table 2: Columbus Statistics

There are several Tier two and three data that the Columbus community

has available. The Cultural Vitality Indicators report mentions a study of arts

instruction per week maintained by the Ohio Department of Education and

reported by the Ohio Arts Council (Jackson et al., 2006). GCAC maintains

databases of grants for artists and arts education resources. Community

organizations like the Ohio Arts League have databases of arts opportunities,

workshops and critiques. Columbus Underground, a local news website, offers a

calendar of cultural events.

To round out the evaluation of the forthcoming Columbus Cultural Plan,

interviews with key stakeholders should also be carried out. It remains to be

seen who will be most involved with the planning process. Most likely, interviews

should include the chair of the planning committee, any city council members

with a high degree of involvement, members of the Columbus Cultural

Leadership Consortium, representatives from The Ohio State University, and the

mayor.

Summary

Cities employ a variety of theories and strategies to differentiate

themselves in the global economy. Cultural plans are being developed by cities

as one of these strategies. The plans represent an investment of time and

resources for a city and as such their effectiveness should be carefully

considered. Because of conflicting information or criteria in the literature, it can

be difficult to evaluate a cultural plan. By developing a set of simple

measurements vetted by the literature, this study looked at the results of cultural

plans on their communities and established a baseline for evaluating future plans

or the continued impact of an established cultural plan.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the twenty-first century's increasingly globalized environment, locales have to find a way to make themselves stand out. Cities want to attract the talent, tax revenues, and tourists that will keep their cities growing and producing. Especially in the last ten years, developing a cultural plan to cultivate the "creative city" has been a popular method of addressing these concerns. City planners are eager to employ this strategy but the evaluation of these plans has not quite caught up. To address this issue, this thesis examined the literature on the subject and developed a method of evaluating cultural plans based on that literature in an attempt to discover the best criteria for evaluation. This thesis then applied that method to two case studies. To establish a baseline, data was collected prior to the implementation of the cultural plan, when available, and then analyzed data from a period of over five to ten years. Addressing calls in the literature for more longitudinal studies, this study focused on cities individually but some comparison can also yield enlightening information.

Austin, Texas

The case of Austin, Texas presents as a city that in reputation has been successful at attaining recognition as a creative city. The city first adopted a cultural plan in 1993 to address the cultural needs of the community and to continue growing the knowledge economy that was boosted by the tech sector there and developed a comprehensive update to that plan in 2006. Comparison

of these two plans shows areas of improvement, those that are still in need of address, and the new concerns that have cropped up in the 13 years between them. The ACAP plan mainly addressed finance, impact recognition and capital asset creation. Similar to the way many cultural plans are started, the group executing the report took stock of the Austin environment. The researchers found that Austin had a high concentration of artists and developed a plan that would allow them to keep working and contributing to the city. The ACAP plan is most concerned with addressing problems or deficiencies in the Austin creative sector rather than capitalizing on the assets the city currently has. The Austin Chronicle, an alternative weekly paper, with a dedicated arts reporter who has also been very active in the latest cultural planning process, has reported on the city's cultural plan. According to his reports and observations, the 1993 ACAP was not seen as a success, pointing out that the plan relied too heavily on the city to do most of the work (Faires, 2008).

Evaluating the progress of the 1993 plan using the Cultural Vitality Indicators was challenging because of the lack of data within comparable terms. There was a drop in percentage of employment in arts organizations between 1992 and 1998, but it is difficult to say if that was due to the ACAP plan or the large discrepancy in the data source. Between 1995 and 1998 there was an increase in the number of nonprofit arts organizations, and an even larger increase in 2007. This could indicate a cultural environment where individuals felt encouraged to start a nonprofit because of the support of the community as well as Austin's growing entrepreneurial culture. Over the period of 1992 to

2007, there was also growth in the number of arts establishments which includes

arts businesses. This could demonstrate an influx of professionals working in the

arts, perhaps from local higher education programs. Over the given period, the

event engagement in Austin has remained stable. One of the goals of Austin's

earlier plan was to create a large cultural event, the community has been able to

do this with the arts festival and keep it running for a number of years.

Therefore, this plan has demonstrated some progress towards achieving its

goals as measured by the Cultural Vitality Indicators.

There have been increases in the artists in the workforce and numbers of

nonprofit organizations that indicate an environment which artists are still

attracted to and able to work successfully within but the recommendations of the

CreateAustin plan demonstrate recognition of trouble ahead. ACAP was not at

all concerned with quality of life issues for artists in the city, where the later plan

shows much more concern about resources, housing, and finances for artists.

As Austin has grown rapidly in the last ten years, the problem of affordable

artists' housing has become more pressing. This was not an issue that was

addressed in the ACAP plan, indicating that artists are increasingly being priced

out of the city, more so than in the early 1990s. If this continues to be the case,

the city will likely see some attrition in its artist growth which could affect all the

other measures negatively impacting the Austin cultural environment. Less

artistic workers will probably translate to less or smaller nonprofit arts

organizations offering less programs and services for cultural participation.

Physical capital considerations have shifted as there have been a number of physical improvements in the city with the creation of the Mexican American Cultural Center, the Long Center for the Performing Arts, the Visual Arts Center at University of Texas at Austin, and the expansions of the Blanton Museum and the Arthouse at the Jones Center but the infrastructure to run these organizations continues to be a problem. Based on the new recommendations and community context, the City of Austin still needs to work on improving infrastructure and access to smaller exhibition facilities to serve start-ups, independent artists and to serve the entrepreneurial culture that Austin possesses.

There has been some response to ACAP recommendations. Art City Austin, the city arts festival that has been taking place for 60 years, has been growing yearly since 2000 when it moved downtown filling the need for the city recommended arts event. The festival is also the presenter for the TOGS (temporary outdoor gallery space) competition, an international architecture competition, expanding the notoriety of the event. In the early 2000s, there was a major reorganization among city government including the ACAP recommendation to assess the place of the Cultural Arts Division (CAD) in the Parks and Recreation department. CAD was moved to the newly created Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services Office. The management of the city owned cultural facilities remained, however, with the Parks and Rec department, another move is something that is addressed in *CreateAustin*. The city re-examined the facilities policies and eased tensions that contributing to building and expanding facilities like those mentioned above in response to

ACAP recommendations. On the recommendation of the report the funding

mechanism for the Art in Public Places program has also changed. The report

also called for economic impact studies to be completed, in the time since that

recommendation was made the city has had the overall creative sector evaluated

as well as individual sectors such as music, film, and interactive. Other

independent bodies have also contributed to this research such as the yearly

evaluation of the economic impact of the SXSW conference. The calls in ACAP

for economic impact studies and program evaluation of CAD are the only

mentions of evaluation in the plan. The plan does not call for its own impact to

be monitored and makes no provisions for such evaluation.

The concerns raised about the deficit in the infrastructure in Austin's 1993

cultural plan were not resolved and the issue was even more present in the later

plan. Funding the creative sector was also still an issue between the two plans,

though funding for nonprofit entities is probably always going to be a priority in

cultural plans because the arts tend to be underfunded nationally. Additionally,

the funding landscape underwent many changes in the early 1990s that might

account for the continued concern about support. Physical environment

continues to be an issue for the city between the two plans. The city undertook

major changes in the execution of its cultural plan from the first plan to the next.

The second plan was put in the hands of the stakeholders rather than left for the

city to implement. Learning from what were perceived as previous failures, the

CreateAustin plan was undertaken with much larger-scale community

involvement (Faires, 2008). Using more community input ensures that the

community is more strongly connected to the recommendations of the plan and will take some ownership of its implementation. Allowing neighborhoods to take control of their own development fosters the creation of natural districts that can help to address minority equity issues, preserve heritage and are possibly more sustainable than artificially created districts (Strom, 2003). This plan had entered the implementation phase before it was even approved by city council because citizens moved forward with the creation of the Greater Austin Creative Alliance. The creation of a creative alliance to provide support, training, and resources for city artists is one of the recommendations made by the plan. This is similar to a recommendation in the 1993 plan for an arts advocacy coalition. There are several more recommendations that appear similar to recommendations in the earlier plan indicating that either no efforts were made because ACAP was not implemented effectively or that the efforts made did not address the issue. Both plans call for increased technical assistance for artists including matching partnerships, job databases, resource databases, and grant assistance. While it was suggested that this be done by a community partnership early on, none was established in ACAP the way it has been in *CreateAustin*. But though the Greater Austin Creative Alliance was actually established, a step in the right direction, it has remained relatively static over the year investigating this study. The organization was created through a repurposing of an existing organization, the Austin Circle of Theaters, with no additional staff or resources from the city. The impact or sustainability of this organization now trying to fulfill both missions without additional resources seems negligible.

The expansion of the Art in Public Places (AIPP) program was something else that cropped up in both plans. The reappearance of this recommendation seems to be strategic rather than because it failed the first time. On the contrary, it was the successful expansion of the program from the 1993 recommendation that warranted the further expansion (Faires, 2009). Other recommendations that appear in both plans are expanding art education partnerships and engaging in a public relations and marketing campaign for the arts. These two recommendations especially indicate that the audience development might also be a challenge for the city and an underlying fear that while there is a high concentration of artists in the city now, they might age out of the population eventually.

The cultural planners behind *CreateAustin* seemed to have learned something from the failures of ACAP. Besides being developed with a lot more community input than ACAP, the leadership council is also continuing to meet with citizens and develop resources for the continued implementation of the plan. Evaluation using cultural vitality indicators like this study is also an explicit recommendation of this plan, though provisions for actually carrying it out are not well formed. Other recommendations do not seem to fit well with the community. The recommendation to build another major cultural facility when the current facilities are already undercapitalized is the most ill aligned of these recommendations. Director of the Blanton Museum of Art Ned Rifkin spoke to Austin American Statesmen arts reporter Jeanne Claire van Ryzin in the summer of 2010 about raising the profile of the Blanton as a first class arts destination

(van Ryzin, 2010). Over the last year the museum has experienced no growth in visitor numbers, has had to increase admission prices and has taken across the board budget cuts along with all other state institutions. The Austin Museum of Art has had plans for several years to move to a new facility, yet it still occupies its temporary location in downtown Austin while a sustainable alternative is developed. As previously mentioned, the city has very few large cultural institutions. The more prudent recommendation would be to foster the current cultural institutions in Austin, giving the community a chance to grow into the capacity that has been developed rather than undertaking an ambitious project that might fall flat.

Other recommendations, though seemingly well thought out and more efficient, face a challenge in the political environment. There are still inroads yet to be made to carry out these recommendations of the plan (Faires, 2010b). The arts sector in the city is still bristling at integrating politically at the local level. The plan recommends a unified department of culture, something that the City Music Office is hesitant to commit to (Dunbar, 2009). As long as efforts remain split between the Cultural Arts Division, the Parks and Recreation Office, and the City Music Office resources and policy efforts are hampered.

Austin seems to be the quintessential city of the new economy, it has been able to develop this sector through a combination of economic development incentives, reputation building campaigns, and other policy interventions. In building the new economy, Austin has also brought into relief the problems that come from this type of development, problems like social inequality and

challenges to the philanthropic sector. Using its cultural plan to address these problems has had mixed results. In some ways, Austin has demonstrated measures of success, for instance expanding its cultural facilities, but in comparing itself to other cities such as Paris, one wonders what community the cultural planners think it is serving. Yet other recommendations, such as fostering neighborhood development, demonstrate an understanding of the organic part of the process of cultural planning. Cultural planners in Austin have to make sure they are operating with their community in mind and work towards goals which are best for Austin, not necessarily something that has worked in an entirely different community and cultural environment. Austin has demonstrated itself to be a city with an exceedingly entrepreneurial culture, something the city should focus on developing to have the best chance of hanging onto its foothold as the quintessential new city.

Columbus, Ohio

Columbus, Ohio is poised to begin its cultural planning process, this study is meant to establish a baseline for evaluating its cultural plan in the future. Between 1998 and 2007 most of the city's Cultural Vitality Indicators have remained relatively stable. This could be an indication of a city that has a somewhat stagnant cultural environment or that it is unable to grow due to infrastructure and financial considerations. These statistics could also indicate a city that has reached the growth potential it can achieve on its own and is in need of a policy intervention like a cultural plan to further stimulate it. The city only saw very slight growth in its concentration of artists over the given time period.

There was some reduction in concentration of employment in arts establishments indicating while the workforce is growing, artists' employment is not. The city saw some growth nonprofit arts organizations but lost some arts establishments overall which could indicate the needs of the commercial arts sector in the city are not being met. The contributions and expenses for its arts organizations are stable but research has shown that they are below national averages (Creative Columbus, 2009). Columbus has strong charitable giving in other sectors. In 1994, Columbus was ranked as the third best city in terms of philanthropy over all sectors (Chronicle of Philanthropy, 1994), so it is somewhat troubling that arts and culture giving is so far behind. While Columbus is growing, it is growing low-wage jobs faster than those in other sectors (Columbus 2020, 2010). If Columbus wants to take advantage of the new economy, now seems like an opportune moment to introduce a cultural plan to produce growth in its cultural environment.

Interviews conducted during the Columbus preplanning phase reveal some of the community is engaged and motivated to make a positive difference in its cultural environment, mostly those working in the creative industries. The city needs to put forth some leadership and impetus to mobilize this body of people and encourage larger bodies of the community to be involved. People in the creative sector at the grassroots level like independent professional and student artists have been involved in the information gathering process. The survey that was completed by Creative Columbus received 277 responses from students, the largest responding category (Creative Columbus, 2009). The

business community was the least responsive, receiving only 38 responses, a less than 1% response rate in that category (ibid). The case of Austin, as well as other research by Markusen and Gadwa, Jackson et al., ECOTEC and Dreeszen indicates that community participation is crucial to successful and thorough implementation. Columbus can learn many things from Austin, as the city is already aware (Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee, 2007). Austin has a motivated and engaged group of stakeholders that are driving the implementation of the plan. Preliminary research indicates Columbus also has an engaged cultural community, it will probably be important to the realization of the cultural plan to make sure that community stays connected to the process. The challenge to Columbus is getting the participation of the business and larger community. The planning documents indicate some awareness of this issue but little suggestion for how to approach it.

The European Capital of Culture model attributes some of its success to the community involvement in the plan and the built-in evaluation requirements (ECOC, 2009). As has also been demonstrated in Austin, community involvement is essential in making sure the goals align properly with the community needs. The most recent Columbus reports explain an intent to use "right sizing" to guide its recommendations. This indicates the city is keen to develop a plan that fits with community needs and does not bother with recommendations that might garner national or international attention, but will be useless to a community that cannot or does not want to engage with them.

A challenge to city cultural plans seems to be deciding how to best use and modify its current assets. Cities that have a major cultural foothold, such as Austin's in the music industry, are also challenged by the size of those assets distorting their original appeal. Gallery Hop is an asset in Columbus that should be considered carefully in its cultural plan as a model or strategy. As Columbus is a town with a lot of festivals, the celebratory nature of this sort of event seems to appeal to the demographic of the city. The other side of this type of cultural event though, and something that seems to be occurring in the Short North already, is the "happening" aspect of the event is eclipsing the cultural aspect of the event. While it is difficult to navigate the sidewalks during Gallery Hop, most other days of the month the Short North is relatively quiet. The area's continued expansion of the retail environment has resulted in the attrition of the gallery space. There is a possibility that rather than being an arts and entertainment district, the area will lose the arts part all together, perhaps melding with the nearby Arena district. Though the galleries stay open late on the first Saturday of the month in the Short North, they are only open during the day otherwise, which means they are not capitalizing on the foot traffic in the evenings or the people that may wander in while they wait for a table at a local restaurant. The galleries in the area could be capitalizing on both instrumental economic benefits and intrinsic social benefits by aligning with the changing usage of the neighborhood. The challenge in pointing to a model like this, one that has demonstrated success, is to make sure it still fits with the needs of the community and will produce the desired outcomes even over time.

Based on *A Cultural Plan Blueprint*, Columbus' goals for its cultural plan are more explicitly economic than some other plans. This makes evaluation of the economic impacts that much more important to this plan, the goal is to make Columbus a "magnet creative city."   Table 3 shows the overarching goals and goal areas of the ECOC, Austin, and Columbus cultural plans. By considering these plans side-by-side, some goal displacement can be seen. Columbus is in danger of expecting its cultural plan to address mostly economic goals, something that has been warned against in the literature (Stewart, 2008). Columbus should consider more closely working with groups like Columbus 2020!, an economic development initiative, to achieve these kinds of goals. In general it is probably advisable for cultural planners to work more closely with other facets of city development to achieve the goals and impacts they desire and to produce the elusive "culture *and* regeneration" (Evans, 2005). The cultural blueprint the city has put forward makes no mention of the intrinsic value of a vibrant cultural environment; it only mentions it in terms of economic development. In some cases the goal and the proposed solutions do seem well aligned. For example, the city of Columbus has a large talent pool because of the many universities it is home to but many of these students leave the community after graduation, a phenomenon named "brain drain" by the community, which affects every sector. In the way of recommendations, the blueprint suggests that the creation of new work could be an effective solution, providing incentive for artists to stay while having the fringe benefit of building the city's cultural asset collection. Cultural planners also perceive a deficit in the

public value of the arts despite the economic impact studies that have been completed; they call for reaching out to the business community and more art education as an audience development tool.

In one of the more perplexing connections, the group recognizes the city's district development approaches as a unique and useful asset but hopes to somehow leverage that into a single cultural destination. This is an instance where it does not seem to take the needs of the community and the negative ramifications of a recommendation into full account. The report suggests the new City Center park in downtown Columbus as this cultural destination, it must be considered that a large cultural facility in the city would place strain on infrastructure and financial resources that the report itself recognizes as already thin. The cultural planners have evaluated the creative community and while they appear most interested in its economic impact, it is still not clear what is the best use of other assets. For instance, funding issues are addressed in this report, they will probably continue to appear as previously discussed, but previous research has documented Columbus' higher than average commitment to volunteerism. While volunteerism is not a substitution for capital, Columbus' cultural plan should investigate whether this volunteer culture can be leveraged to address some of the financial gap.

Plan	ECOC	ACAP	CreateAustin	Columbus Blueprint
Overall Goal	To highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share, as well as to promote greater mutual acquaintance between European citizens	To create an environment which enables artists and arts organizations to realize fully their potential as contributors to the economic and cultural prosperity of the City of Austin	To identify Austin's creative assets and challenges, define goals, and establish recommendations to invigorate Austin's "culture of creativity" to the year 2017	To help Columbus become an increasingly competitive destination – one that's home to world-class arts and cultural experiences and primed for economic expansion and greater quality of life
Goal Areas	Highlight artistic movements specific to area	Advocacy for the arts	Support for individual creativity	Artists and the creative economy
	Promote events highlighting culture from other places	Artists and arts organizations	Built environment	Audience development and community engagement
	To support and develop creative work	Arts education and outreach	Creativity and learning	Resources and funding
	Have social impact by encouraging large scale participation	Economic development	Communications and collaborative ventures	
	Employ all forms of multimedia for widest participation	Facilities and spaces	Financial resources	
	Promote dialogue between European Cultures	Funding	Cultural infrastructure	
		Minority equity		

Table 3: Plan Goal Areas

So far cultural planners in Columbus have worked closely with key stakeholders in the city's cultural institutions, the government and The Ohio State University. A large public survey about the cultural environment was undertaken but more community involvement will be necessary for a successful cultural plan. The reports thus far have mentioned the importance of the student populations and how to keep them in the community after graduation, that group should be given ample opportunity to participate in the cultural planning process to determine what they need to stay in Columbus. Since independent artists are not organized into any particular captive audience, finding ways to reach them and incorporate their input might also be a challenge but one that will pay dividends. Seeking the input of grassroots community members, it has been demonstrated, will ensure the plan has the infrastructure it needs to be implemented and that its goals align best with the community.

Columbus has the opportunity right now to develop a strong cultural plan based on research and the examples that other cities have provided. One of the challenges in cultural planning is developing a plan with recommendations that reflect the needs of the community based on using its assets efficiently and innovatively, not just doing what is easiest. While plans that call for a new world renowned facility may be flashy and impressive, they should be undertaken very carefully. Mega-art cities like New York and San Francisco might be able to draw tourists to facilities of that caliber but they also have countless other appeals, these kinds of developments are probably more the exception than the rule. Cities are better off gaining the trust of their community by developing a plan that

is sensitive and reasonable, and one that can actually be realized. Developing such a plan will go a lot farther with encouraging community involvement when its goals and recommendations actually make a positive, noticeable, timely impact on the community. Columbus has already created mistrust within the interested community by failing to deliver a cultural plan in the timeline originally specified (Sheban, 2009). The "planning to plan" stage has lasted a long time at this point and represents a significant investment of resources. Columbus needs to work on delivering and implementing its plan rather than getting mired in the preparation phase. Columbus has found that it has many assets and resources that could translate into the type of city envisioned by cultural planners but must proceed carefully to realize that vision.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

Studying factors of the economy can be challenging, especially when looking at the economic effect of something tenuously related like culture. There are many factors that can affect the US economy. During the period over the consideration of this study, especially the last couple of years, the US has been in the midst of one of the worst recessions in history. Not only has this probably had an effect on the most recent data, it will continue to impact employment and business statistics. If there are factors that can be applied to standardize economic impacts over time, they are outside the ken of the researcher. Consideration of a cultural plan's effect on economic factors has to be taken with some reservations. Using the Cultural Vitality Indicators as described in this thesis is meant to be a way to consider only the economic factors that are most

<div align="center">91</div>

likely to be affected by a cultural plan rather than the whole economy of a city. There were several unanticipated limitations with this data. Austin did not participate in the study which gathered charitable statistics data prior to 2005. The lack of comparable data from prior to 1998 is a major problem for this study. To address this concern, 1998 data was examined in Austin to compare to 2007 data. This cannot be used as a substitute for data prior to enacting ACAP in 1993, but what is available still allows for a comparison over time. The city of Columbus has not yet produced a cultural plan but the data amassed can be used to inform the cultural planning process and evaluate it in the future. Qualitative data was gathered from news sources to contextualize the perceived success of the plans but further interview data would be most useful.

<center>Recommendations for further research</center>

The intention of this thesis is to provide a preliminary application of an instrument to evaluate cultural plans. When Columbus' plan is finished and implemented, the research completed here can serve as a baseline to the future measurements to evaluate the impact of its cultural plan. Hopefully, this research will also encourage other researchers in other cities to evaluate their own cultural plans. More research on cultural plans as a policy intervention is definitely warranted. As the popularity of cultural planning continues to grow, there will be more opportunity to study the plans and more data points to analyze. With greater understanding of the subject more sophisticated evaluation methods can be employed. To complete this study, interviews with the key planners named in Chapter Four should be completed. Evaluation of

cultural planning should be further nurtured and investigated. As more cities undertake cultural planning, it is important to understand how they can best be applied for the best possible results. This understanding will come with evaluation of the plans by types of plan, prior economic and city environments, and over time.

Conclusion

Understanding the cultural planning process is much more complex than was anticipated before undertaking this study. Completing a literature review has demonstrated that there are only a handful of researchers working on the subject and that the subject matter is evolving much faster than the scholarship. While cities are increasingly interested in developing cultural plans, there seems to be some misunderstanding about what they can achieve and when they are most useful. This study was undertaken as a way to address those issues and be a bridge between research and practice in cultural planning. Evaluation of a planning strategy can be difficult. The process is affected by many outside sources which cannot always be factored into the results of a study. Data is not always available from government sources and collecting data specifically for a study has a whole host of other challenges. This does not mean that no evaluation should be attempted. As evaluators work in the field, data sources may improve and researchers will gain a clearer perspective about what factors should be mitigated. Transferring policy from the European Capitals of Culture program, citizens should insist that more stringent evaluation measures are built into public planning processes as a matter of government accountability. This

would help with expectations as well as data collection. As the research field is deepened, more advanced analysis would be enlightening. But preliminary studies such as this one should be undertaken for that to happen. Studying the cultural planning process has been very enlightening about what communities want out of their cultural environments, what city governments expect from their investments in culture and the ongoing needs of the cultural communities. Continuing research in this field will hopefully yield more effective cultural plans that will in turn produce richer, more vibrant cultural environment in a multitude of American cities.

Reference

Americans for the Arts. (2003). *Arts and economic prosperity II.* Washington, DC: Author.

Americans for the Arts. (2007). *Arts and economic prosperity III: The economic impact of nonprofit and arts organization and their audiences.* Washington, DC: Author.

Bartik, T.J. and Bingham, R.D. (1997). Can economic development programs be evaluated? *Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper 95-29.*

Chronicle of Philanthropy. (1994). *Chronicle of Philanthropy* Vol. 11.

City of Austin. (1993). *Austin Comprehensive Arts Plan.* Austin, TX: Author.

City of Austin. (2009). *CreateAustin cultural master plan.* Austin, TX: Author.

Clark, S. & Robinson, A. (2003). Arts and culture: a report for the Columbus Partnership. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Fisher College of Business

Columbus 2020. (2010). *Columbus2020!: The region's economic development plan.* Columbus, OH: Author.

Creative Columbus. (2009). *Creative Columbus.* Columbus, OH: Author.

Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee. (2007). *The Creative Economy.* Columbus, OH: Author.

Donegan, M., Drucker, J., Goldstein, H., Lowe, N., and Malizia, E. (2008). Which indicators explain metropolitan economic performance best? *Journal of the American Planning Association, 74*(2). 180-195.

Dreeszen, C. (1998). *Community cultural planning: a guidebook for community leaders.* Washington, DC: Americans for the Arts.

Dunbar, W. (2009, May 22). Back to the drawing board. *The Austin Chronicle.*

Dywer, M.C., (2008). *Communicating Value: Re-framing arts and culture data.* Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research.

Dywer, M.C. and Frankel, S., (2003). *Policy partners: Making the case for state investment in culture*. Philadelphia: The Pew Charitable Trust.

ECOTEC. (2009). Ex-Post evaluation of 2007 and 2008 European Capitals of Culture final report. Birmingham, UK: Author.

Evans, G. (2001). *Cultural planning: an urban renaissance?* London: Routledge.

Evans, G. (2005). Measure for measure: Evaluating the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration. *Urban Studies, 42*(5/6). 959-983.

Faires, R. (2010, July 2a). Council to creatives: It's a plan! *The Austin Chronicle*.

Faires, R. (2010, June 18b). CreateAustin Cultural Master Plan. *The Austin Chronicle*.

Faires, R. (2009, Septetmber 25). Plan, be. *The Austin Chronicle*.

Faires, R. (2008, March 7). Shape of things to come. *The Austin Chronicle*.

Gadwa, A. (2009). Evaluating the impacts of Artspace Project's developments: A roadmap for moving forward. Master's paper. University of Minnesota.

Galligan, A. (2008). The evolution of arts and cultural districts. In Cherbo, J.M., Stewart, R.A., and Wyszomirski, M.J. (Eds.), *Understanding the arts and creative sector in the United States* (pp. 129-142). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Greater Columbus Creative Cultural Commission. (2010). *A cultural plan blueprint*. Columbus, OH: Author.

Greyhill Advisors. (2009). *SxSW 09: Economic impact analysis*. Austin, TX: Author.

Griffiths, R. (2006). City/culture discourses: Evidence from the competition to select the European Capital of Culture 2008. *European Planning Studies, 14*(4). 415-430.

Grodach, C., and Loukaitou-Sideris, A., (2007). Cultural development strategies and urban revitalization: A survey of US cities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy 13*(4). 349-370.

Hawkes, J. (2001). *The fourth pillar of sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*. Melbourne: Cultural Development Network.

Hospers, G. and Pen, C. (2008). A view on creative cities beyond the hype. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 17*(4). 259-270.

Hoyman, M. & Faricy, C. (2009). It takes a village: A test of the creative class, social capital, and human capital theories. *Urban Affairs Review, 44*(3). 311-333.

Jackson, M.R., Herranz, J., & Kabwas-Green, F., (2003). *Art and culture in communities: A framework for measurement.* Policy Brief No. 1 of the Culture, Creativity, and Communities Program. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Jackson, M. R., Kabwasa-Green, F., & Herranz, J. (2006). *Cultural vitality in communities: Interpretation and indicators.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Knack, R. E. (2008). Got culture? *Planning*. 38-41.

Lim, H. (1993). Cultural strategies for revitalizing the city: a review and evaluation. *Regional Studies, 27*(6). 589-594.

Markusen, A. & Gadwa, A. (2009). Arts and culture in urban or regional planning: a review and research agenda. *Journal of Planning Education and Research 29* (3). 379-391.

Markusen, A., Gilmore, S., Johnson, A., Levi, T., Martinez, A. (2006). *Crossover: How Artists Build Careers Across Commercial, Nonprofit and Community Work.* Minneapolis, MN: The Arts Economy Initiative.

McCarthy, K.F., Heneghan Ondaatje E., and Novak, J.L. (2007). *Arts and culture in the metropolis: strategies for sustainability.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

National Center for Charitable Statistics. (n.d.). *Table Wizards.* Retrieved June 23, 2010, from http://www.nccsdataweb.urban.org/tablewiz/tw_bmf.php

National Governors Association. (2008.) *Arts and the economy: Using arts and culture to stimulate state economic development.* Washington, DC: Author.

Palmer-Rae Associates. (2004). *European Cities and Capitals of Culture.* Brussels: Author.

Phythian-Adams, S.L., Sapsford, D., & Southern, A. (2008). *Impacts 08: Considering the economic impacts of the Liverpool European Capital of Culture.* University of Liverpool: Author.

PromoWest. (n.d.). *Newport Music Hall history*. Retrieved July 23, 2010, from
     http://www.promowestlive.com/

Sheban, J. (2009, September 20). 'The moment for action': Strategic plan
     expected soon. *The Columbus Dispatch*.

Sterngold, A. (2004). Do economic impact studies misrepresent the benefits of
     arts and cultural organizations? *The Journal of Arts Management, Law
     and Society, 34*(3). 166-187.

Stewart, R.A. (2008). The arts and artist in urban revitalization. In Cherbo, J.M.,
     Stewart, R.A., and Wyszomirski, M.J. (Eds.), *Understanding the arts and
     creative sector in the United States* (pp. 105-128). New Brunswick, NJ:
     Rutgers University Press.

Strom, E. (2002). Converting pork into porcelain: Cultural institutions and
     downtown development. *Urban Affairs Review 38,* (3). 3-21.

Strom, E. (2003). Cultural policy as development policy: Evidence from the
     United States. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 9*(3). 247-263.

Texas Perspectives. (2001). The role of music in the Austin economy. Austin,
     TX: Author.

Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
     Press.

Throsby, D. (2004). Assessing the impacts of a cultural industry. *Journal of Arts
     Management, Law and Society, 34*(3). 188-204.

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Censtats Database: MSA Business Patterns*.
     Retrieved June 23, 2010 from http://censtats.census.gov/.

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). Annual Estimates of the Population of Metropolitan
     and Micropolitan Statistical Areas: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2009. Retrieved
     June 23, 2010, from http://www.census.gov.

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). Annual Estimates of the Population of Metropolitan
     and Micropolitan Statistical Areas: April 1, 1990 to July 1, 1999. Retrieved
     June 23, 2010, from http://www.census.gov.

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *1990 US Census*. Retrieved June 23, 2010, from
     http://www.census.gov.

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *1992 Economic Census Area Profile.* Retrieved June 23, 2010, from http://www.census.gov.

US News and World Report. (2008). *Rankings: Fine arts graduate schools*. Retrieved July 27, 2010 from http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-fine-arts-schools/rankings

van Ryzin, J. C. (2010, July 10). Blanton gears up for a higher profile. *The Austin American-Statesman*.

Wray, J. (2006, July). Creative Columbus briefed on Weird Austin. *German Village Gazette*.

Zimmerman, J. (2008). From brew town to cool town: Neoliberalism and the creative city development strategy in Milwaukee. *Cities, 25*. 230-242.

Appendix A: ECOC Evaluation Questions

Relevance

EQ 1: What was the main motivation behind the city bidding to become a European Capital of Culture?

EQ 2: What was the process of determining objectives? Was there a process of consultation in each city to define aims and objectives?

EQ 3: What were the objectives of the city in being an ECOC? (refer to list in intervention logic) What was the relative importance of each objective?

EQ 4: Have any specific objectives of the cultural year been related to social impacts?

EQ 5: In this connection, did the objectives of the year include reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled people and minorities?

EQ 6: To what extent have the specific themes/orientations of the cultural programme proved to be relevant to the objectives defined?

EQ 7: To what extent were the objectives consistent with the Decision and with the ECOC's own application?(special focus on the European dimension)

EQ 8: To what extent were the activities consistent with the ECOC's own objectives, with the ECOC's application and with the Decision? (special focus on the European dimension)

EQ 9: How was the European dimension reflected by the themes put forward by the events and in terms of cooperation at European level? How did the Capitals of Culture seek to make the European dimension visible?

EQ 10: As far as the conclusions made for the 4 cities allow it, to what extent have the general, specific and operational objectives of the Community Action for the European Capital of Culture have been proved relevant to Article 151 of the EC Treaty?

EQ 11: To what extent have the general, specific and operational objectives of the 2007 and 2008 European Capital of Culture events proved relevant to the Community Action for the European Capital of Culture?

EQ 12: As far as the conclusions made for the 4 cities allows it, to what extent has the European Capital of Culture action proved to be complementary to other Community initiatives in the field of culture?

Efficiency

EQ 13: How have the organisational models of the formal governing Board and operational structures played a role in the European Capital of Culture? What role have the Board and operational structures played inthe European Capital of Culture's implementation? At what stage were these structures established?

EQ 14: Who chaired the Board and what was his/her experience? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the Board and operational structure used and personnel involved?

EQ 15: Has an artistic director been included into the operational structure and how was he/she appointed? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the artistic director and personnel involved?

EQ 16: What was the process of designing the programme?

EQ 17: How were activities selected and implemented?

EQ 18: How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs?

EQ 19: To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy been successful in/contributed to the promotion of city image/profile, promotion of Capital of Culture programme, awareness raising of the European dimension, promotion of all events and attractions in the city?

EQ 20: To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy successfully reached the communication's target groups at local, regional, national, European and international levels?

EQ 21: What was the process of securing the financial inputs?

EQ 22: What was the total amount of resources used for each European Capital of Culture? What was the final financial out-turn of the year?

EQ 23: What were the sources of financing and the respective importance of their contribution to the total?

EQ 24: To what extent were the inputs consistent with the Decision and with the application? (special focus on the European dimension)

EQ 25: What was the total expenditure strictly for the programme of events?

EQ 26: What proportion of expenditure was used for infrastructure (cultural and tourism infrastructure, including renovation)?

EQ 27: Was the total size of the budget sufficient for reaching a critical mass in terms of impacts? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding? Could the same results have been achieved if the structure of resources and their respective importance was different?

EQ 28: To what extent have the human resources deployed for preparation and implementation of the action been commensurate with its intended outputs and outcomes?

EQ 29: Could the use of other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided greater cost- effectiveness? As a result, could the total budget for the action be considered appropriate and proportional to what the action set out to achieve?

EQ 30: To what extent have the mechanisms applied by the Commission for selecting the European Capital of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring mechanisms influenced the results of the action?

Effectiveness

EQ 31: Provide typology of outputs, results and possible impacts of the action at different levels (European, national, regional etc.)

EQ 32: How did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the title year? (explore role of Board, Chair, Artistic Director, decision-making, political challenges, etc.)

EQ 33: What quantitative indicators (number of visitors, overnight stays, cultural participation of people, etc.) of the social and tourist impact of the event have been gathered by the ECOC?

EQ 34: To what extent did the ECOC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city and as set out in the application (refer to list in the intervention logic)?

EQ 35: To what extent have the events been successful in attaining the objectives set (general, specific and operational) and in achieving the intended results as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)?

EQ 36: To what extent have the events been successful in attaining the objectives set (general, specific and operational) and in achieving the intended results as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)?

EQ 37: To what extent have the ECOC been successful in achieving the intended impacts as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)?

EQ 38: To what extent have specific objectives related to social impacts been met?

EQ 39: To what extent were the objectives related to reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled and minorities, met?

EQ 40: What were the most significant economic outcomes of the Capital of Culture experience?

EQ 41: What have been the impacts of the event on regional development?

EQ 42: Can impacts on tourism be identified? What was the total number of visitors (from abroad and from the country) to the Capital: before the cultural year during the cultural year, after the cultural year?

EQ 43: Are there any instances where the events have exceeded initial expectations? What positive effects has this had?

EQ 44:Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the action?

EQ 45: To what extent has the implementation of the action contributed to the achievement of the objectives of Article 151 of the EC Treaty?

EQ 46: As far as the conclusions made for the 4 cities allow, what is the Community added value of the European Capital of Culture?

Sustainability

EQ 47:What lessons can be learnt in terms of how to deliver ECOC effectively which might have wider applicability to future ECOC?

EQ 48: Which of the current activities or elements of the action are likely to continue and in which form after the Community support is withdrawn?

EQ 49: Has any provision been made to continue and follow up the cultural programme of the year after the closure?

EQ 50: How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the title year?

EQ 51: What will be the role of the operational structure after the end of the European Capital of Culture year and how will the organisational structure change?

EQ 52: What has been the contribution of the ECOC to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term)

EQ 53: What are the likely impacts of the action on the long term cultural development of the city?

EQ 54: What are the likely impacts of the action on the long term social development of the city?

EQ 55: What are the likely impacts of the action on the long term urban development of the city?

EQ 56: What lessons have been learnt from the ECOC in terms of achieving sustainable effects that might be of general applicability to future ECOC?