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# Introduction

Consultations took place across Saskatchewan from December 2024 to May 2025. The goal was to collect feedback from people and organizations for the Funding Program Renewal Project. Reports now summarize these different views and give ideas to improve SaskCulture’s programs and funding. The focus is on making culture more inclusive, diverse, fair, and accessible, and on supporting Truth and Reconciliation.

Ivy + Dean Consulting talked with arts, culture, and heritage groups from disabilities and 2SLGBTQIA+ communities. They also spoke with Eligible Cultural Organizations. Common Ground and AML Consulting also talked to other arts, culture and heritage groups, as well as Communities of Interest, and Districts. They included Indigenous, ethnocultural, multicultural, newcomer, rural, and northern communities and leaders.

These reports are posted on SaskCulture’s website. Highlights were shared with members at SaskCulture’s AGM & Member Consultation session in June 2025.

Thank you to everyone who joined SaskCulture’s AGM and consultation sessions on June 20, 2025, at the Conexus Arts Centre or online. We value your involvement and ideas.

The day started with remarks from Elder Judy Pelly. Then, Flo Frank from Common Ground presented findings from their report. After this, people split into small groups for roundtable talks about the main points. Everyone had a break for lunch and time to visit. In the afternoon, Risa Payant and Jacq Brasseur from Ivy + Dean shared findings from their work. After the presentation, there was a second round of table talks. SaskCulture CEO Dean Kush finished this part of the day with closing remarks. Next, the AGM business part of the day was done. The day ended with a party for the Creative Kids program anniversary.

Thank you to Elder Judy Pelly for starting and ending the day. Thank you also to members, guests, SaskCulture staff, and the board. Your feedback helped start good conversations and gave ideas from many cultural groups and leaders about the reports.

Everyone’s ideas helped confirm the project’s results and brought up new points. These points will help SaskCulture keep making culture more fair, open, and welcoming for everyone in Saskatchewan. Thank you for helping with this work.

# Facilitated Table Discussions

Consultants shared their findings at the 2025 Annual General Meeting. Members gave feedback during table talks, both in person and online. Board members and SaskCulture staff listened and took notes from each group.

Notes from these talks can be found in **Appendix A.**

Table talk questions used for both consultation reports and were:

**Question 1:** What was surprising about the consultation findings?

**Question 2:** What aspects of the report resonated most with your experience and/or work you do?

**Question 3:** How do you think SaskCulture should move forward, considering the consulting’s findings?

**Question 4**: How can your organization help move the priorities forward?

# Key Themes

All comments were checked and grouped by theme. The data is organized to show how often each theme appeared. The most common themes from the table talks were:

* Getting more young people involved
* Helping people and groups learn new skills and grow
* Making funding easier to get and to use
* Making sure everyone feels welcome and included
* Working together with other groups and partners
* Sharing information clearly
* Finding better ways to check if things are working
* Being more active in small towns and northern areas

# Groups in Attendance

Azerbaijani Cultural Association of Regina

Canadian Heritage

CARFAC Sask

City of Yorkton

Conseil Culturel Fransaskois

Dance Saskatchewan

Daughters of Africa Resources Center

Heritage Saskatchewan

Karen Henders Consulting

Lakeland District SCR District

Listen to Dis’ Community Arts Organization

Ministry of Park, Culture and Sport

Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan

Museum Association of Saskatchewan

New Dance Horizons

Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils

Parkland Valley SCR District

Prairie Central SCR District

Remai Modern

Rivers West SCR District

Saskatchewan Archeological Society

Saskatchewan Arts Alliance

Saskatchewan Association of International Languages

Saskatchewan Band Association

Saskatchewan Book Awards Inc

Saskatchewan Choral Federation

Saskatchewan Council for Archives & Archivists

Saskatchewan Cultural Exchange Society

Saskatchewan Drama Association

Saskatchewan Elocution and Debate Assoc.

Saskatchewan Genealogical Society

Saskatchewan German Council

Saskatchewan History and Folklore

Saskatchewan Literacy Network

Saskatchewan Music Educators Association

Saskatchewan Music Festival Association

Saskatchewan Writers’ Guild

SaskOrchestra

South East SCR District

South West SCR District

Theatre Saskatchewan Inc.

Ukrainian Canadian Congress-SPC

# Next Steps

SaskCulture will use what was learned in Phases One and Two of the Funding Program Renewal project. This information will help the Board of Directors plan the next strategy for 2026 and beyond.

* Share the AGM feedback report and notes with everyone involved to keep things clear and make sure everyone is on the same page.
* Look at all the recommendations from Phase One and Phase Two, check which ones are already being worked on, and see how much progress has been made.
* Go through the recommendations and member feedback to figure out which ones are most important.
* Support open communication and regular updates so everyone stays focused and moving forward.
* More meetings and a review of the Annual Global Funding program will take place over the next 3 to 4 years.

# Common Ground/ AML Consulting Report

## Surprising Elements and Reflections

* + Youth experience stood out. Young people want to be part of things, but many cannot commit to giving their time for a long time. Youth leadership needs more support. It may be best to get youth help with activities before they join boards.
	+ Young people feel worried and stressed, which is seen in more youth who are from ethnocultural backgrounds. Racism and other barriers make this worse.
	+ There are still “silos” in the sector. This happens in part due to staff leaving and loss of knowledge.
	+ More TRC (Truth and Reconciliation Commission) education is still needed, even after years of work.
	+ Many people shared that they were surprised that some people do not know where their funding comes from. The funding system is confusing.
	+ The report showed that people already knew what was presented. The sector is ready to make big changes, even if it is hard for boards.
	+ Focusing on youth and including people from the North was seen as a good thing.
	+ Many people felt confused about who could be a member or why they would want to be a member, especially in smaller or new groups.
	+ People said it would help if it was clear to see what “culture” means to SaskCulture
	+ The work of Communities of Interest (COIs) was noted.
	+ Some groups knew more about the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) than others.
	+ People want better support, training, and funding to prevent staff burnout and support for future planning.
	+ There was a big push for leadership that includes everyone, especially youth and people from groups who are often left out. People want youth and others to be involved in real ways, not just for show.
	+ Some want to see a province-wide network for culture, so everyone can share tools and ideas. Better communication, including using social media, and training to build skills were also recommended.
	+ People said building trust, good relationships, and taking time to reflect are needed to make changes, especially for decolonization and making things fair for all.
* Members said they are ready to help SaskCulture with its goals.

## Capacity and Funding Concerns

* Funding rules make it hard for small groups to use good ideas.
* Too much paperwork adds extra work.
* More money for staff can help groups keep people and run programs better.
* Many groups do not have enough volunteers or lose staff too often, which slows down progress.
* Groups need clear help on ways to use IDEA and TRC values.
* Towns and villages need special support to learn about TRC and get more people involved.
* Saskatchewan’s funding system, with lotteries and SaskCulture, is special and should be celebrated.

## Recommendations and Moving Forward

* SaskCulture should explain its role as a funder, resource, and helper. It needs to share information clearly.
* Plans should be set with community input and clear steps.
* Groups (ECOs and other groups) should work together more, with SaskCulture helping connect them.
* Youth should get more chances to lead and learn, like province-wide events and mentorships.
* Help with training and shared office help will make things easier for small groups.
* Make sure everyone feels welcome and included, and give time for real changes.
* Visit more towns and villages and go to events. Attend district events and programs.
* Measure success by sharing real stories about impact, not just by numbers.
* Help boards have a mix of people and plan for new leaders to keep groups healthy.

# Ivy + Dean Consultation Report

## Surprising Elements and Challenges

* Some groups, like 2SLGBTQ+ and Disabled cultural communities, were hard to reach. There was some pushback and some groups said they did not think they were seen as part of culture.
* Many were confused about what SaskCulture means by “culture” and who can get funding. Some members did not know about certain grants.
* The report showed that people from marginalized groups had different experiences than other groups had with SaskCulture.
* Some people worried about being included just to check a box, instead of being truly valued. Groups also said it will be hard to represent so many different people.
* Some members did not want change or felt uneasy about hiring or including specific groups. Not sure how to do that.
* The report said people need more learning and awareness about these communities.

People also said that including everyone is hard, and groups have limits on what they can do.

## Strong Links to Real-Life Experience

* The findings showed that including everyone is still hard when it comes to programs, money, and how groups work together.
* People said changes need to be real and not just for show.
* Disability and queer groups are diverse, a person cannot be asked to speak for everyone.
* How grants are given needs to change so groups can keep doing their work for a long time. Grants should be created with groups not for just them.
* The way groups report their work takes a lot of time, and telling stories might be a better way to show what they have done.
* Getting young people involved and making sure new leaders are ready for the future is important.
* Building real trust and learning more about each other is key.
* In rural areas, it is harder for people to join programs, so special care is needed there.

## Moving Forward with Inclusion

* SaskCulture needs to explain its goals in a way everyone understands and focus on building trust with groups who have been left out.
* It's important to hire or work with people who know about 2SLGBTQ+ and disability issues, so these communities get the support they need.
* Setting up meetings and events to help groups and people to learn from each other.
* Funding should be flexible, and groups should have a say in how decisions are made to make things fairer.
* Working with other groups like SK Arts and Creative Sask to not copy the same work
* Sometimes tough choices have to be made, like changing where money goes or combining groups, to make sure everyone gets help.
* Taking small steps and being a good ally can make a big difference.
* Districts are important for supporting these changes, especially in rural areas.
* Providing clear information, training, and sharing resources will help groups to include more people and ideas.
* Many members want to help with these changes, but they need clear direction and support from SaskCulture to do it well.

# Themes

This chart shows the main topics people talked about at the 2025 SaskCulture Member Consultations. It covers what matters most, including getting youth involved, making things more welcoming for everyone, better funding, building skills, improving communication, and making sure everyone knows their role in Saskatchewan’s cultural community.

## Getting more young people involved

There were 35 comments about the need to create leaders in the cultural sector and ways to do that and help new cultural workers as well. People talked about the mental health and wellbeing of youth.

Many think it’s important to include young people, by having leadership conferences and setting up mentorships. This idea shows how important it is for youth to take part in cultural activities and in leadership, so the sector can grow in the future.

## Helping people and groups learn new skills and grow

A total of 64 comments talked about the need for groups to build more skills and have resources before they can take on more work. People also talked about what training is available now and what new learning is needed. Some said it’s important to get more education about TRC (Truth and Reconciliation Commission) and IDEA (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Accessibility) topics.

Many members liked the idea of offering programs to help groups build their skills or share admin support, especially to help smaller groups with their workload. This goal is about making sure groups have the help and tools they need to run smoothly and meet their goals.

## Making funding easier to get and to use

A total of 50 comments mentioned the need for long-term flexible funding. People also said there should be more types of funding. Some were worried about where this money will come from. Right now, the amount of funding available is not growing.

## Making sure everyone feels welcome and included

Thirty-nine comments said it is important to connect with people and groups from marginalized communities. They also said there should be clear ways for these groups to become leaders. People talked about how SaskCulture and other groups can help.

Many agreed that real inclusion takes time and work. It should not be just for show. This idea says it is important to truly involve marginalized groups and build trust through honest relationships.

## Working together with other groups and partners

Twenty-eight people said it would help to work together more in the cultural sector.

Members liked the idea of more teamwork between Eligible Cultural Organizations (ECOs) and Districts. They said SaskCulture should help groups connect and share what they know. This idea is about working together and building strong partnerships in the sector.

## Sharing information clearly

Twenty-eight people said it would help to work together more in the cultural sector.

Members liked the idea of more teamwork between Eligible Cultural Organizations (ECOs) and Districts. They said SaskCulture should help groups connect and share what they know. This idea is about working together and building strong partnerships in the sector.

## Finding better ways to check if things are working

Many people want to change how success is measured. Instead of only counting numbers, they think it’s important to share real stories that show the impact of programs. Seventeen people talked about this. They said using personal stories can help show how cultural programs make a difference.

## Being more active in small towns and northern areas

Many people agreed that it’s important to be more active in rural and northern communities, suggesting that SaskCulture staff attend Districts and local events could help build awareness and trust. Twelve people specifically supported the idea of making sure these communities are included and get support in cultural activities.

## Conclusion

Most people at the SaskCulture Annual General Meeting agreed with the recommendations and findings in the report. Many said they weren’t surprised by what they heard—instead, they felt the report was honest and clear, and they were glad to see the issues addressed openly. Some also commented that the cultural sector seems ready to try new things and make big changes, and they hope these changes will happen.

# Appendix A:

### Common Ground/ AML Consulting Notes

**1. What was surprising about the Consulting’s findings?**

* Seems on Point.
* But the YOUTH resume experience was a stand-out, I haven’t thought about approaching it that way. Youth want to belong, but time-wise they are more restrictive than adults.
* Capacity- how do you get them to come out? Make it urgent enough to gain their attention- Rare thing to find- long term volunteer commitment from youth
* But we do have younger people on our board.
* Ethnocultural teens: we’ve had a lot of call about young people, teenagers to 20s, suffering anxiety, stress... Yes, they want jobs, but the crisis young kids face in finding themselves. Racism, and other barriers they experience, it is exacerbating. We need other funding to see what we can do.
* Silos -Still hearing the word silos is a little disheartening, have been hearing that word for a long time. Why is it up to a funder to connect us (SB note: this is a District perspective).
* Some say silos are still a relevant term, potential caused by staff turnover, institutional memory loss
* Some said SaskCulture appears to want to facilitate best practices and want to be a resource for organizations but sometimes fall short. One had administration questions for SaskCulture that SaskCulture could not provide much expertise on, so the member organization felt siloed as in where do they turn for practical help, and also that SaskCulture being a resource may not be fully working/realized.
* Others at the table feel supported by SaskCulture. Members can also reach out to other members for practical advice.
* Cultural advocacy through storytelling
* Concerns about capacity to do this work.
* TRC education- Surprised that TRC education still needs support after this many years. At this point isn’t the onus on the orgs, public. Assumed that we were beyond grass roots education
* Can be a way for SaskCulture to engage ECO, members, cultural orgs etc… You could build something with members that bring people together, Cross organization youth engagement.
* We did do a 3 week session- anti racism course, and married it with leadership training, We took them through what a leader can be.
* Resume building was surprising.
* Nothing really surprising, except maybe the straight forwardness and candor of what was shared.
* Validating systematic proof.
* I wasn’t expecting so much focus on youth, but good to see.
* Additional comment: Need to expand admin support-
* Affirms - nothing surprising.
* People don’t know where their funding is from initially surprised, but then not once I thought about it. – Lotteries system is widespread and accessible through many points.
	+ People new in the non-profit sector or new to Saskatchewan – easy to confuse.
	+ Note: a complex system, and difficult to recognize the root of the money. – unique system but challenging to understand. SKARTs funding – lotteries, but SaskCulture.
	+ SaskCulture asks that Lotteries be recognized, so people don’t know its through SaskCulture.
* Sector is willing to make bold changes and moves. Hope it follows through.
* Perhaps the status quo has to change, which will be hard for folks (board will have to make hard decisions
* Board members - Encourage people to think of bold decision makers and get in touch with the nomination committee
* Hard to hear, but good. The findings reflected my (an ECO) inside thoughts. If we could make these shifts it would benefit all organizations.
* Nothing else surprising.
* The findings reflected what folks wanted to hear. It is in line with expectations. The findings already reflect what they do - they are not alone. Feel better knowing they are not the only one
* Surprising: Youth leadership roles – surprising – want to take charge, but there’s a big gap. What is the youth's age? How did they define youth? What are the parameters? Age 28, 20s not being available to participate fully – not as committed. – Maybe start with activity involvement before the board.
* Pleasantly surprised by the focus on youth and how strongly that came through in the recommendations. Feeling that that focus is important and reflects what they’ve heard from youth in their lives. Youth want a voice. The desire for true collaboration and engagement that came up in the report. Hard to do sometimes when focusing on youth makes others feel like they are not included. But engaging youth is needed for the future of the sector (volunteerism). And it can’t be through tokenism, but actual inclusion
* The recommendations around Northern inclusion - felt this was already a focus of SaskCulture’s.
* Information about SaskCulture’s sectoral leadership – SaskCulture used to be the sectoral leader, lots of leadership in coordinating gatherings and organizations, in partnership facilitation, and there used to be opportunities for ECOs to meet with a variety of communities. SaskCulture shouldn’t be the one doing it, they should be helping build capacity in the ECOs and of cultural practitioners. SaskCulture used to help ECOs gain knowledge who would then help transfer this knowledge to their members.
* Surprising but not – see SaskCulture as an umbrella organization, perhaps those consulted don’t totally understand how umbrella orgs work, and that is maybe why some recommendations came forward in the consultations.
* Good to see gaps are being recognized now. Advocacy used to be important to SWas surprised to see that newcomers are missing from this report altogether. Growth of the province dependent on newcomer participation
* Not very surprised by any of the findings
* Lots of arts organizations that still aren’t sure what SaskCulture does, unfathomable that still the case, but in that world everyday
* Surprising the number don’t know if members or not
* Confusion about who can be a member
* Were many of those organizations small or just beginning – hence confusion, as established groups should really know the funders in the landscape
* Larger centres – see the SaskCulture banners around, maybe not so much in smaller communities?
* Don’t have dedicated people in community that see themselves as working in culture
* Definition of “culture” can be confusing – just working and doing good in community, not necessarily see as cultural work
* All depends on who responded
* Communities are separating out art/culture/sport/rec, etc – just community building
* Arbitrary distinctions as to what counts or doesn’t – so creates not sure of what is defined as culture
* Crosses boundaries – not put activities in separate buckets
* Appreciated recognition of role of COIs in recommendations
* Levels of understanding of TRC between “mainstream” and ethnocultural” groups
* Good job of capturing of the information and there is nothing overly surprising. Now what that this has been captured?
* Appreciated findings come with recommendations.
* Most of this discussion focused on the confusion surrounding membership. Wondered if there was a membership orientation to understand the different membership categories (i.e. affiliated membership with certain rights but not voting privileges). Shared their example of membership between their organization and other organizations (LAR?).
* not much was surprising, but in fact validated much of what they were already feeling.
* liked to hear that SaskCulture should get out into communities outside Regina/Saskatoon
* wasn’t surprised to hear many findings but recommendations regarding work on anti-racism would be valued
* groups are scared to do anti-racism work wrong. There’s a want to do something but still not sure how. They don’t want to create more harm.
* Not surprised by any of the responses. Everything was expected.
* Was interested by the youth leadership
* Youth means under 40 (to the group at the table)
* There are a lot of challenges with younger leadership and engaging with the younger groups.
* SaskCulture should be the facilitator, and not the doer
* Impressed with the turnover time of the consultation.
* Smaller organizations may not know that they qualify for SaskCulture grants, but staff was very helpful.

**2. What aspects of the report resonated most with your experience and/or work you do?**

* TRC education -TRC discussion continued into what resonated most.
	+ Education may be there but people/orgs need help implementing it - action, that is how education gets implemented.
	+ Potential disconnect of TRC education and rural communities.
	+ What is the community asking for, what is the funder asking for, what is our organization asking for.
	+ Some groups are afraid of getting things like TRC wrong, so they are hesitant to begin. Rural communities can be slower to pick up.
* Youth- Partnership investment, youth want advancement that was exciting. Youth are looking for concrete skills and practical practice.
* Young people design, manage and implement project- (participatory)- they don’t want to be told what to do- when adults design projects, youth aren’t interested. You have the table (youth), what do you want to do? Get buy in through leadership.
* Emphasize what skills you bring to the table, and what you want to come and learn-
* Applies to other marginalized groups- get better results (participatory leadership)
* Funding levels, burn out of staff, get money , do x number of workshops, pay people, end up with no money for overhead, mayor juggling act to stretch dollars, people are busy (young- kids, activities etc)
* Anti-Racism, Anti-Oppression, Decolonization work is needed
* Ethnocultural communities are most aware of TRC
* Treaty focus needed– beyond reconciliation
* Need to develop a sector-wide network to foster leadership and integrate youth
	+ Organizations mentoring other organizations – coordination for this needs to be done – SaskCulture in a good position
		- * Similar to CARFAC Mentorship program
			* New MAS mentorship-micro
	+ Need money to have paid positions…we need to move beyond volunteer leaders.
		- Also recognize we need both volunteers and staff
		- Recognize that in certain communities’ volunteers need compensation so volunteering does not cost them and also recognizing their lived experience.
* The way that we report needs some change. Takes a lot of money / time. Currently very time consuming.
* Demographics are not one size fits all – hard to meet all the targets. Are you going to penalized if you don’t meet all the target
* Really liked the comments on youth and youth engagement. Youth want to work in these cultural positions. There are student summer works grants, but eligibility ends and finding a permanent full-time position is incredibly difficult.
* Succession planning – people retiring, but youth maybe going to work in other sectors
* Communities of Interest – maybe need a CoI for youth, for Indigenous?
* Lack of volunteers: aging Eds – aging volunteers – relate to the Festivals being lost due to volunteers not being available. Not attracting new people or younger individuals. It's much harder for smaller communities, since young people are moving out. Drive and expectation – how do you get them on board?
* Turnover of staff: Programs are not being developed over the years – they get started, but then they are abandoned.
* Launch a provincial cultural network: Share tools with one another. Folks have been talking about this.
* That funding is essential but inflexible. There are so many good ideas, but small organizations can’t give all the time to do the background admin work of getting the funding, or they won’t have time to make an impact.
* Operational funding for the core necessities, enough funds to pay people fairly and competitively to improve retention, is very needed. It would be transformational.
	+ If there was a way for orgs to share and afford admin staff, communications staff, etc., it would actually let people have time to do the work. Something like an admin, IT, and comms staff accessible to all members, in a hub of some sort. Some groups do this by sharing an office with another organization, which can be challenging but very helpful.
* In general, people are curious to see how SaskCulture addresses, responds to these recommendations. Even if SaskCulture can’t do everything right away, it’s important to see how they work towards it.
* Capacity as major issue for those consulted.
* RE: embedding of IDEA and TRC – this is an expectation of funded organizations and it has never been clear how to do it and how this is measured. What are the expectations? Expectations should be clearly spelled out.
* What if ECO membership doesn’t take up the opportunities to make connections with Indigenous communities? ECOs are trying to reach their members with tools and info and encouragement. Members are not open to it. Have more capacity building to help them learn how to make organic connections with Indigenous communities.
* Educational side of it. When SaskCulture used to have its annual gathering – it was open to members of SaskCulture member organizations. This was helpful in terms of reaching more people from the cultural community to “come spend a day learning” and hear more about TRC and IDEA directly from SaskCulture.
* SaskCulture should enhance collaboration opportunities between different members. Have members / ECOs learn from each other.
* Need for young people to have work and opportunities and professionalization of the sector
* Not as a side hobby – need for emerging professionals to have employment
* Aging infrastructure and changing communities, capacity – all one and same issue
* Support for emerging into the workforce
* Struggle to onboard boards – maybe wasn’t covered in the presentation – volunteering has changed so much – need more support for bringing people into volunteer roles that they are interested in/prepared to be a part – more volunteer roles beyond just the board; tokenistic view – just pulling people in to satisfy check-box – but it is more important that look at what involvement people have within the programming/good work organization is doing – see benefits right away – what interests them most first, already working several jobs – hard to serve on boards too
* SaskCulture is mostly doing really good stuff; consultation can be critical, but does have a high standing with those it serves
* Appreciate the funding model in province, it is unique, need to communicate that more both the model and the appreciation; lots do get operational funding
* Funding model gives flexibility, contrasting with other provinces
* The recommendation for long-term funding – 3 year term is nice but still short. In order to design impact for programs, there is a need for funding. Process for developing an application for long term funding. They do ‘count their blessings’ because funding support has been retained, but they want to increase membership and reach. Seeing increased demand but no increase in funding – how to manage priorities with increased costs.
* Funding also impacts succession planning. The cost of living is increasing but wages aren’t increasing – a challenge to recruit.
* Advocacy – a lot of their members are newcomers, and their work contributes to newcomer retention.
* we can’t push workshops where they’re not wanted
* Need to build our relationships first (We need to drink tea together)
* Districts have the ability to build relationships
* Rural communities have little knowledge of calls to action (where do we start) SaskCulture can take role to identify specific actions related to our mission.
* resonated that recommendations identified rural communities needs for support.
* how do we bring things that work in Saskatoon/Regina into our more rural centres
* when we do things well, even with small numbers, it spurs growth. There’s a long tail to impact.
* meaningful small connections build a strong foundation
* barn quilt painting (story of deaf lady who happened to be around event, who came in to event by invitation but thought cost was a barrier. Bonnie saw a chance for inclusion, but realized that design of event may have not considered barriers at the outset)
* Evaluation as storytelling (a positive text message response to an event is better than counting #’s and surveys)
* Learning about funding programs resonated and the youth
* Youth have lost their connection to their heritage and are distanced and not interested in their heritage there needs to be more engaging with them
* If there is a bridge between cross cultural groups to help grow youth and show there are others who engage with their own cultures.
* Pretty clear about eligible membership and funding programs
* Found the application challenging because it was first time but they got a lot of support which made it easier to fill out. Can seem very daunting to new applicants

**3. How do you think SaskCulture should move forward considering the Consulting’s findings?**

* Compile all this info. It honestly needs to be winnowed down into a key areas (Strat plan), The bigger ECO’s voice can help get the word out. We reach a lot of members across the province. But there is confusion with ECO members who aren’t sure about being SaskCulture members (members via ECO membership or need a separate membership with SaskCulture directly?)
* TRC criteria in grant application is there. It is not that you’re not communicating, but needs to be better channels for it. There is a competition aspect, - we all feel in competition with each other, so we need to share despite that competition and do things together.
* Have resources on the website- here’s the people you can call for help – grant writing etc…. It continues to build and expand what you already have. ECO’s can help!
* Communications hard- groups don’t always read, more transparency- want to see/know,
* We (ECO’S) live inside the online grant platform. We see it all the time, but not sure how others experience it.
* AGF
* How does SaskCulture see itself – as a funder, as a resource?
* SaskCulture is attempting to do programming that some orgs are also doing, some overlap.
* SaskCulture needs to define its role so there is not confusion between org roles, SaskCulture roles. Often SaskCulture gets information from the community and doesn’t share the findings – where does this information go?
* Are SaskCulture looking for community consultations on how to move ahead or is SaskCulture going to do this on its own and tell the orgs its decisions
* DEI- gender equity etc… we decided “RDEI”- (Reconciliation, Diversity, Equity, Inclusions), to remind ourselves
* SaskCulture take a leadership role to bring the sector together-
	+ Bring SkArts, Creative Sask etc.- they should make sure they are at the table- like today where are they…and where were they at SAA conference.
	+ Tri-Globals should also be at the table -bring them on the journey (District role in this as well)
* SaskCulture could do more to implement-be strategic about the pace in which they are attempting to shift culture-
* Relational and building trust- if this isn’t keeping pace with practices needed to implement the change- Need to sit with the discomfort and do the work.
* Can’t just be implemented. Time for reflection is needed for real change. Time and space is needed. If it is fast and furious, people will not keep up. - tokenistic
* i.e-decolonization need time to reflect and engage, and try things – some will fail and need further reflection.
* Our role (organization) is to help move forward-ongoing- continual
* Evaluation – play a role in building sector evaluation –
* Within the Globals, SaskCulture is underfunded – what can they do?
* Think about the priorities – there is a lot there – how many can you do right now to make an impact, even if it is small? The sooner the better. Set priorities based on the recommendations and have a corresponding plan.
* Address the need for better communication. Things are not permeating out from the bubble. Recognize that what you know and understand is not necessarily what others are getting, hearing. A more robust social media presence would be helpful. Something like takeovers with other members to give them a platform, etc. The current SaskCulture communications model is very old, focused on sending people to the website or to Engage (print). Learn from young people about social media.
* Offer Capacity building program, there used to be one.
* The youth focused recommendations – youth seem to be less and less involved. Involving youth helps evolve the work.
* Not clear how – SaskCulture should redefine role as leader, toward a knowledge hub. All orgs can contribute by sharing, work together on a mechanism to involve youth.
* Mentorship and and opportunities to gather would be important as organized by SaskCulture.
* SaskCulture need to go back to being the funds manager, and the facilitator of best practices. Facilitator of relationships. Let orgs who are cultural practitioners do what they do best
* Need time to digest this report; just came out, wasn’t clear on the AGM notice – should have been blasted out; not enough time to read it
* Is everyone who participated listed? Should be
* SaskCulture needs to reach out to its partners/COIs more to find out about partnerships already doing
* Youth leadership – province wide youth leadership conference to promote and teach how to be come leaders.
* How can we make these big concepts and recommendations smaller and more relatable
* Come to communities. Districts host events to connect us and bring awareness. It’s appreciated when SaskCulture attends to share its story.
* Peer lead groups
* Consultations
* Staff capacity building, more expansion and support for staff in order to get around the province and visit everyone
* Build short term and long term (years) plan to see what SaskCulture is focusing on
* Consolation on how everything will be implemented.
* Have volunteers who focus on the implementation
* A Youth engagement, some kind of scheme to get them here

4. **How can your organization help move the priorities forward?**

* Depends partly on what SaskCulture decides the priorities are. There is a lot to consider from the consultation.
* How flexible is SaskCulture in looking at its own internal operations, staffing, etc.. How deep is this review going, there has been a reluctance to defund organizations for instance (ie. certain museums), is this being considered?
* Re: participatory grantmaking, very specific example with some frustration
* One org had participatory grantmaking (read: their board consisted of people from their applicant pool and made the member funding decisions) 15 years ago. SaskCulture told the org they needed a jury/assessor funding model, and now ironically SaskCulture is interested in participatory grantmaking.
* The jury model lead to assessors making funding decisions that did not align with organization’s strategy/goals so they created a meaningful, weighted rubric (ie. rural member funding % is higher than urban; certain events get priority, professional grant writers are not rewarded, etc.). But the rubric needs to be somewhat forced onto a jury.
* Assist with the pillars – coalition. – needs to occur together.
* See us (membership) as experts and that we can support others.
* Have some work to do as a board. Need to look at membership structure, allocation of funds. More discussions. At the end of one strategic plan and heading into another (SaskCulture board member)
* Succession planning – how can SaskCulture help support groups with it?
* Need understand how I can replace myself. There is no proper way to prepare someone for the ED role. Need serious look at succession planning.
* Want to take part in this change momentum (what is outlined in these reports. It’s an opportunity change the relationship with SaskCulture to being more of a partner, not just a beneficiary.
* IDEA/TRC is non-existent in some organizations. Some need to find out how to work around that – connect to people that can help them achieve this – hard for some orgs to make those connections. That way, the orgs can move to the IDEA and TRC lens – they are connecting way more to the ethno groups.
* Programs
* People said: If you ask us, tap us to help with something, we’ll be happy to. Just ask, because we don’t get asked.
* Need to take back to our organizations, have discussions, and come back to SaskCulture with it
* Are already a number of things we are doing. We need to tell SaskCulture more about
* Can help with connecting youth to participate in conference (i.e. through their language school attendees)
* What is being done with the recommendations? They should be accepted. Looking at the recommendations, diversity is a natural for SAIL so they shouldn’t have to be speaking to or addressing it. We teach over 30 languages; our organization is going to take on one of those recommendations i.e. rural SK – have a really tough time reaching rural so allocate more points there for their application (talking here about AGF application). They can’t reach all of the province – there isn’t a) demand or if there is it isn’t large enough.
* Do respect the TRC recommendations but SAIL is already wrestling with their own identity so to address TRC doesn’t resonate with them. People accessing their organization and feeling their own discrimination.
* Back to the membership confusion - SaskCulture produce something to all new members – message (i.e. video etc.) that explains everything about SaskCulture membership.
* idea for the 7 districts to identify 7 calls to action and work monthly towards them (and share their progress with each other).
* Come to barn quilt painting event, so SaskCulture can connect with community members
* Coffee and connections in towns. Letting people know we’re here (did session with CARFAC and SAA – in Silton) having ECOs present when we’re in community.
* Building cross-sector understanding (sport / hockey /museums in same room).
* Districts have a capacity to initiate stronger partnerships (outside of strictly cultural groups)
* Volunteering and getting involved with the changes.
* More participation and reconciliation and partnerships (finding new ones)
* As important as it is to understand Treaties, is to also understand the Indian Act and how divisive it was and the policies that came out of it – segregations, one set culture progress and evolve and keeping another culture down; what should be the future of the Indian Act? No one wants to touch it, despite how much change is needed – amended in past without consultation with Indigenous people; geographic locations play a big role – north vs south – farmers/farmland – land generational wealth, then have run down reserves in the middle of these established communities, then vs Northern resources, technology, yet still keep on with traditions

### **I**vy + Dean Consulting Notes

1. **What was surprising about the Consulting’s findings? (or interesting)**
* That the consultants had trouble engaging with the groups. That groups felt that SaskCulture was not the group for them.
* That people did a lot of work to see how they fit into SaskCulture’s funding programs, but then turned out they weren’t eligible for the funding.
* Disability communities describing themselves as a culture was new to some. Not the definition of culture that our members are used to hearing. What is the criteria that SaskCulture uses to define culture?
* Difficult to support the additional needs of a deaf person for instance who may need a sign language interpreter.
* Re: SaskCulture’s website etc. We have specific grants for say MIF, therefore multicultural communities feel included and that SaskCulture welcomes their culture/their applications. The 2SLLGBTQ+ community, coming to SaskCulture’s website would see that there is no specific resource, no specific grant to meet their needs, so they will assume they are not included, why would they inquire further?
* A cultural group vs a cultural activity - which gets support?
* Non-cultural org doing culture vs cultural org
* Surprised that the ivy + dean report (difficulty engaging, SaskCulture is doing a poor job) contradicted Flo’s report findings.
* Nothing surprising/but validating.
* The understanding of diversity – how some thought it was about artistic practice.
* Minimal participation – some surprise but not for others at the table. A community gathering would have been a better choice. How we come together to gather and share stories is just as important as why.
* Renumeration needed to be more. Participation needs to lead to change.
* What is SaskCulture using as a definition for 2SLGBTQIA+ or Disabilities Culture
* Parallels and language between the two reports.
* Depending on which SaskCulture staff member, how the experience went.
* Affirms – nothing surprising
* Sector is willing to make bold changes and moves. Hope it follows through.
* Perhaps the status quo has to change, which will be hard for folks (board will have to make hard decisions
* Board members - Encourage people to think of bold decision makers and get in touch with nomination committee
* Hard to hear, but good. The findings reflected my (an ECO)inside thoughts. If we could make these shifts it would benefit all organizations.
* Part of this work. Not surprised. Said some of these things.
* SaskCulture staff: Surprised about the staffing comments. SaskCulture is diverse. People are not aware. Do people need to know or share that? 2SLGBTQ+ People may feel bad if they feel they are not represented. How do you know if people don’t tell you? Would you ask? Perhaps people in the community feel they are not represented because they are unaware, but how do you make them aware? Put it on the website? No. And you can’t ask during the hiring process.
* Programs: Some groups are having trouble applying for funding? Everyone is.
* Focus on what SaskCulture funds: Is it the People vs their Programs – the groups just need to know that.
* Nothing surprising. Especially since this report focused on marginalized groups; it’s not surprising that they would have that feedback.
* The perspective that you don’t have to be everything to everyone. That resonated, especially since SaskCulture potentially doesn’t need to reach some grassroots groups since ECOs are already doing that work — SaskCulture would be better off supporting the ECOs in doing that work than seeing it as a separate thing.
* The self-identification aspect. You can’t ask that.
* Pleasantly surprised to see that this was a focus of the consultation at all, especially with the current political climate being more critical of this type of work.
* Given that this set of consultations was aimed at 2SLGBTQ and Disabled communities and ECOs, it was surprising to see less content for ECOs than 2SLGBTQ & Disabled communities. Felt the report did not spend enough time considering the ECOs.
* That a lot of this hasn’t already been done by SaskCulture (because inclusion is being asked of ECOs).
* //while the table loosely agrees that ongoing education is important, much debate is had over “we can’t expect everyone to know everything about everyone else”//
* That 2SLGBTQ and Disabled communities have not found SaskCulture yet – surprised at resistance to engage with consultations.
* -Surprised that these groups are not feeling represented by SaskCulture.
* //there are some conversations and questions about what is Disability culture or 2SLGBTQ culture//
* The expectations of ECO membership vs expectations of SaskCulture – these can be at odds
* Not really surprised about the findings, it is a newer aspect of today’s modern culture, technology – people becoming more aware of these groups
* Quite familiar while scanning it
* Not surprising – community asked to discuss and did it very well, findings were what would have predicted
* Not unfamiliar
* Surprising that suggested some of more well-funded organizations be defunded for equity – might make more sense to think about why those haven’t received yet
* Rob rich/feed poor not make for a healthy sector
* (driven by these groups coming to SaskCulture and complaining not being represented)
* Yes, need to be seen as deserving funding-understanding they are distinct cultures, but don’t know if there is no new funding coming in, where that will come to – concerns about the call to redistribute funding
* Organizations being asked to be more inclusive and responsive – Indigenous – need to do so with these groups as well, recognizing another constituency of who we serve
* Understand culture around trans rights/LGBT – is newer
* Need time to read the report and digest before can speak on behalf of staff/board; can only speak on own first impressions
* Some have to drag boards into these times; need time to talk about it with boards
* It is difficult to think of 2SLGBTQIA+ as separate – aren’t they a subset of existing organization (i.e. sure there are individuals in those organizations). One of the board members disclosed their son is gay as was a previous ECO employee. Regarding the recommendation to hire people of specific backgrounds – isn’t that discriminatory? (Staff note – shared that no, hiring from under-represented groups is not discriminatory more on this below). Found this one tough ‘ to wrap their head around’ – did acknowledge their ignorance but really didn’t feel that this applied to them as an organization.
* VERY TARGETED GROUP to get those responses. Very singular questions to those communities. There are other diverse groups who may not have been seen (multi-cultural. Some groups were left out – but person didn’t identify which groups those were)
* getting people together post-project to share what they’ve done as a form of reporting
* surprising to hear that there were few respondents
* Surprising that it was a downer presentation. LGBTQ community has generally been positive in their interactions with Districts, but perhaps when they get hit, they are hit harder so they spoke with that voice to consultants
* was eye opening as a “you don’t know what you don’t know” (referenced Listen to Dis’ as a success, is there something similar for districts are 2SLGBTQIA+)
* NOTHING ABOUT US WITHOUT US really resonates
* people in community are overtaxed stressed trying to find presenters, leaders, etc.
* What was surprising about consultants findings?
* nothing was surprised, but interesting.
* Wording needs to be specific to the people using it. Certain words can be used within a culture but others outside the culture should not use those words.
* it’s a power dynamic and interesting
* Who we serve can get muddy sometimes. Compartmentation could occur to groups to help with reporting on different aspects.
* Can’t be everything to everybody and then not serving anybody in the process.
* Working together with groups to see different perspectives and further advance sections as everyone does things different.
* Partnerships can be challenging as one group has to foot the bill and what group does most of the work.
* Everyone wants to do it but don’t know how to do it.
* Where does the money come from to fund this?

2. **What aspects of the report resonated most with your experience and/or the work you do?**

* There are certain things we can do and others we can’t.
* Nursing home that offers a cultural program for socially isolated seniors, concerts, etc. (This kind of compromise or criteria ambiguity was allowed during special times like COVID but not any longer?)
* This is going to be hard work for SaskCulture to wrap its head around and also for SaskCulture’s membership.
* SaskCulture’s membership is diverse and representative, but the culture of these particular identities is not represented.
* The whole report resonates with all of us, do not envy the challenge of figuring out what this will look like moving forward.
* Moving beyond symbolic- need substantive policy change.
* Disability & Queer community/culture is so broad, and it feels like there is an expectation that one speaks for all and that cannot happen. Helping people understand the breadth of disability culture is impossible from one individual or organization.
* Lived experience does not mean full understanding of the systemic issues. You need living experience plus knowledge of the system.
* How do we grow the funding pot? We need more money and a shift to operational funding versus project. The work we do takes years…not one year or one project.
* Tokenistic positions on board need to be addressed (multi/ Indigenous/ etc…create space for authentic engagement
	+ Community of interest-relationship – could fill/support the board…rather than relying on having expertise of one person on the board. Two-way communication.
	+ Call for nominations- but basically everyone in the room can’t run for a position. Why can’t direct stakeholders be at the table.
* Flexible funding- should be what orgs need/want to do rather than what SaskCulture creates as a funding program.
	+ Participatory grantmaking is essential
* Frustrating but understand the need to decolonize but still needing to work within the structure of the non-profit act ….but there is other ways that you can do things that are legal and fall within the non-profit act that align with decolonization.
* The way that we report needs some change (ECO). Takes a lot of money / time. Currently very time consuming.
* Demographics are not one size fits all – hard to meet all the targets. Are you going to penalized if you don’t meet all the target
* Really liked the comments on youth and youth engagement. Youth want to work in these cultural positions. There are student summer works grants, but eligibility ends and finding a permanent full-time position is incredibly difficult.
* Succession planning – people retiring, but youth maybe going to work in other sectors
* Communities of Interest – maybe need a CoI for youth, for Indigenous?
* Surprised with the amount of negative feedback – made me think about my organization. Maybe what I’m doing in my organization isn’t effective and I should be working with groups who are doing it well
* In the Common Ground report, SaskCulture was encouraged to take more of a leadership role, the Ivy + Dean report doesn’t seem to be the same – there was a message that SaskCulture needs to follow more
* Never going to please everyone, but try your best to aim for understanding - where everyone understands and is understanding of compromises. It’s a hard job that SaskCulture has.
* A thorough definition of culture already exists, but it’s obviously not getting out to folks. People may not all be thinking of culture in the same way. Be clear about what fits and what doesn’t fit.
* Maybe demographics of participants are changing. Haven’t done a good job of reaching out to newcomers and young people (ECO)
* Really well known amongst those we’ve already served, but maybe not to the wider cultural network
* Need to recognize that disability culture is a culture.
* Listen to Dis was recognized by Queen City Pride
* There is a need for underfunded groups to be able to access operational funding.
* Lots of work to be done to bridge between organizations to make culture more accessible to everyone
* Working in a rural community is tough, especially trying to do work in these areas. It’s an uphill battle and can lead to burn out
* Lots of people want to participate in cultural activity, but may not be able to access the spaces, or not may not feel welcome or included
* With barriers, there’s opportunities to improve
* SaskCulture could create a master connection list for people in the province who want to connect
* How can we get people involved, what skills can the different organizations share. Lots of people want to do the work and participate, but not connected
* If what we’re doing isn’t relevant anymore, what do people want to participate in now, especially young people.
* Clear expectations on IDEA and Indigenous: not ticked in the box. Resources for groups. Not just on the website. Having conversations.
* Evaluation isn’t just about the numbers. The testimonials are what people want. People want to hear stories. (Advocacy video) especially with social media. Got great responses from doing things differently. Adapting to new trends – not just numbers. No to surveys. Stories over numbers. Try dropping the stats and going for stories. Try the stories out for the lottery indicators. Changing the whole evaluation process.
* How about when you work with kids?
* The idea that you have to be honest about the scope of your mandate. That’s something some ECOs have also had to navigate.
* There needs to be better assistance in helping organizations integrate IDEA into who they are and how they function, not as a separate thing. A change of mentality. Sometimes it requires changing some attitudes in the Board.
* The need for training. It takes a lot of training to get an organization on the same page to make changes. It’d be helpful to have SaskCulture support access to training and facilitators. Through funding or even something like the Lifecycles consultant directory (people at the table did not know about the directory and were happy to hear about it. Then noted SaskCulture should do a better job of promoting resources that only exist on the website. Maybe through email blasts). And guidance on things like how to approach an Elder.
* Ongoing education is important (more access for people to learn).
* The information related to evaluation and depth of experience or impact. Speaking about depth of experience and impact in reporting vs volume of participants. There could be development work done around narrative based evaluation – this could be very important.
* Husband thought was doing a review of lottery funding, not about Saskculture specific – has accessed other pools of lottery funding – needed more education for the “outer groups” who were not familiar with SaskCulture; may have skewed results
* Amplifying voices already have, similar to what seeing in Heritage sector, rather than trying to redo it
* Admission/assertion that there is individual cultures in those communities; attest that they are culturally different than mainstream cultures, need to understand and wrap head around it
* See far-right - prevent cultural transmission – in education policies not teach children…so this is recognizing that there is a “culture” to be suppressed
* Museums – have done a lot of work and education around equity – surprised to hear…
* Recognize that it is perception within arts community
* Lots of these groups do participate in museums – would like to have more data
* Recognize it is a small group consulted
* Need to do more advertising about what are doing, have accomplished
* Celebrate what we have done/are doing
* Too humble!
* A lot of questions about what is unique about these groups that doesn’t fall under other groups? Feel that they are already serving these groups by serving their membership – they are non-discriminatory and don’t ask these questions on their membership application. Wondered about why some didn’t want to participate in the study and expressed that it might have been fear.
* Great that SaskCulture has shifted funding (Small Grant Accessibility Program, Building Arts Equity, Accessibility Fund)
* Good response on Culture Days HUB funding that wasn’t driven by receipts, but more on follow up impact.
* 3 or 4 communities couldn’t find leaders to do presentations due to overburdened people already doing this work and not being available
* greater flexibility around dates (not having to do projects on National Indigenous days to be a priority for funding?)
* Counting heads in a room isn’t an accurate measure of success/impact
* How do we employ someone that represents every single marginalized group (especially in small communities)
* Districts would appreciate financial support to do more of things like they did with Listen to Dis’
* Table representatives felt disconnected from communities that spoke up (white settler/able/cis who don’t have community relationships with 2SLBTQIA+).
* Was a real sense of not knowing who these groups are and how they have felt left out (sense of sadness about their exclusion and challenges they face)

**3. How do you think SaskCulture should move forward, considering the Consulting’s findings?**

* Sport is easy -there’s the Olympics and the Paralympics; but recreation and culture are so broad, that how do you define who is a culture.
* What are SaskCulture’s goals if a goal is that people feel a part of their community and that people see their identity being celebrated. It may be up to the community to how they want to be represented.
* Does an org like Pride Humboldt want to be seen as eligible for funding? Or do they want orgs/SaskCulture to have representation in their efforts?
* SaskCulture needs to decide, nobody else can decide. Or we represent Saskatchewan people, somewhat “public” money, should SK people decide?
* Then they need to be seen as eligible for all the other things too.
* SaskCulture has a blueprint for this already, they have done it with TRC. SaskCulture is good about making partnerships.
* Relationship building, - broken trust takes longer to rebuild a relationship-
* Not be afraid to review and acknowledge the history of past to help understand how to better educate internally and move forward with the communities.
* First speaking with SaskCulture – argued that disability is not a culture and didn’t receive funding. If you don’t face that then we can’t move forward.
* Benefit from realizing that 25% or (1 in 3) of population is part of disabled community and therefore part of the population that is/needs to be served.
* Many are no visibly identified.
* We all want to live in communities and work with organizations where we can be our authentic selves.
* Prioritize – same as the first. Step-by-step process
* Ongoing education and sharing with others so they can share with their members.
* Establish funding
* Someone on staff who is focused on 2SLGBTQ+ and disability – if not on staff, maybe a consultant that groups can access. Understand the unique needs of groups. We can’t be lumped together.
* Some orgs are doing something already with the disability group: Summer camps for the CNIB youth. It is not one-size-fits-all.
* Number Four recommendations: How do you do that?
	+ Underpinning is building authentic relationships then engage in how to move forward.
* The findings should be approached with an inside to outside approach — starting with capacitation at SaskCulture, internally, and then to Eligible Cultural Organizations.
* There are many findings. SaskCulture needs to identify priorities to start the work.
* SaskCulture needs to determine what they consider as cultural practices, so ECOs and the rest can follow suit. We need to see and understand our biases in that area to be able to work against them.
* Museums have a lot of hesitancy around this kind of work because of a fear of making mistakes. SaskCulture can be that support to help organizations act and move forward. SaskCulture can be the leader in providing that kind of support to those that want to do better. They can model by doing the work.
* As the sectoral leader, SaskCulture can organize gatherings for members to meet and network and actually have these conversations. ECOs may find opportunity in gathering to build relationships with target communities out of this. SaskCulture as facilitator of relationships.
* Ensure there is lived experience in the assessor pool to help ensure that all cultural communities get to be evaluated by their peers.
* Would be fun to look back at how SaskCulture operated 20 years ago to now – celebrate those changes
* This doesn’t apply to us, serve ‘language’ where there is no such distinctions so it doesn’t resonate with them. Asked if applications need to have check-boxes with projects falling under headings (i.e. 2SLGBTQIA+) so they can be streamed to correct program/support?
* Work with districts who really need support to fill this void (where anti-trans and homophobic beliefs exist). This was identified as a need not only for SaskCulture but also SaskSport and SPRA
* Need to take it back and prioritize.
* The cost of it
* Start smaller in the beginning and grow from there
* Joining with other groups to implement change example: walk in the parade together.
* Once SaskCulture gets educated on the cultures then other groups will grow and educate as well
* A lot of small groups need help to step up into the space
* SaskCulture should hold a space for someone to step up in that position in each area that remains open until the group fills it.
* Someone may say they do stand for it but don’t stand for that group as a whole thinks
* Language matters
* Allow a space to allow people to be who they are.
* We need a model or a pilot program to follow.
* Need a lot more connection, trust and relationship

**4. How can your organization help move the priorities forward?**

* There’s nothing that members can do, sort of, as some of the members’ membership does not have many of representation of people it’s going to be up to SaskCulture to sort this out.
* My table was mostly we are open to everyone. We don’t really know how to move forward because we don’t understand what SaskCulture is asking of us. Board representation? Outreach? Accessible programming?
* Board representation-tokenistic
* Making sure we are bringing intersectional responses into the conversation/room (space that we can help in)- SaskCulture needs to do this and members can help with this.
* i.e.-MCOS – pride and prejudice workshops.
* This should be part of conversations and board/ (SAA board bylaw – intersectionality) staff compositions. Authentic reflection of the community, intentionally seeking voices on the board.
* Because it doesn’t resonate with them, they don’t feel they can help. Asked why, SaskCulture was only promoting these two groups (2SLGBTQIA+ and Disability) in regard to IDEA. Also asked why SaskCulture is doing this – who is asking for this? (Tomasin note – shared that this is the focus of this report and SaskCulture has done work with other equity denied groups such as Indigenous, newcomer, ethnocultural but that these were two groups who haven’t been included before – shared that this is coming from membership/board and part of ongoing IDEA work SaskCulture has been focusing on for past several years). Noted these two groups can be invisible so how can you say you’re not promoting it?
* Recommendation #6 – this could really hurt the organizations that are losing funds, can SaskCulture use unutilized or underutilized funds instead? Existing organizations might cease to exist “there’s always a winner and a loser and you hate for there to be a loser”. What is the request for this program - $50 000? 1Million? Is it to be one time funding or ongoing funding ?
* Recommendation #7 – this is a tough one – who is responsible for ensuring authenticity? What is meant by authenticity? What are the indicators? How can you be accountable to expectations?
* Recommendation 8 - # of people participating is very easy and quantitative; who’s to judge? Reached 1000 people but only had 40 people with greater impact; age old academic debate; quality versus quantity
* At the end of the discussion, they wanted to make a note about salaries for ECO’s and the discrepancy between their salaries and those at SaskCulture. SaskCulture administration has grown while funding has remained stagnant. Creates a challenge for ECO’s to recruit staff and replace ED’s with experience.
* Understanding that it is reflective, not representative. One person does not speak for all.
* What about the organizations that are already offering opportunities and work hard to ensure they are accessible/supportive & open - but do not know how to ensure the underserved communities know about them or how to connect? I fear we are trying to add and do more, instead of connecting what already exists.
* Look at facilitating ways for organizations to connect – existing orgs connecting with the organizations who are already serving these communities well
* Need more relationship building with communities. Risa mentioned group homes where cultural activities are taking place. We haven’t historically been connected to these organizations, but there’s opportunities there for engagement
* Barrier of trust – what are some trust buildings activities that we can engage in (i.e. ECOs). Lots of ways of going about trust building. Speakers at the AGM last year – CAMP – building trust in communities. You could really feel the passion and authenticity, and they had the funds to build those relationships in communities.
* One person can’t do all of this work. That goes back to looking at the organization – it’s a real challenge with 1 staff member and volunteer run board. Trying, but falls short. Trying to do it authentically, but that’s where the burnout comes in
* Need to find ways to share resources – finite funds. And look for where there are overlaps and duplications
* Need to also look at the overlaps of the funders – SaskCulture and SK Arts – not just the smaller organizations (SAA was also mentioned).
* Communicate with groups (and provide resources) on how to implement this, and then it can be passed on to members.
* Asking for a structure – a framework. The criteria are too broad. A framework that has examples will help determine the criteria.
* Gathering the stories and sharing them on the application makes it simple and easy to upload videos, not just links.
* Others: Would like to see how many people participate in Culture and in Sport – maybe that will help with the Lotteries.
* There’s plenty ECOs can do, but, like discussed before, sometimes it’s not in the scope of what they can do. So it’s helpful to have funding specifically for groups that are doing that work. But other people at the table also highlighted that maybe ECOs would be best positioned to do some of that work and help build understanding.
* Committing to going through a learning process about these communities and going to any available training opportunities.
* Keep it in mind, at the forefront, thinking about how it can be worked into everyone’s individual mandate.
* Can there be opportunities to work with other organizations and have conversations about application of 2SLGBTQ and Disability inclusion? It currently seems tied to personal experience and not everyone has that personal experience.
* 2SLGBTQ and Disability inclusion is not a conversation that usually comes up at the board table – there is discussion about whether or not this is relevant to board business.
* Organizations do not want to be tokenistic.
* ECOs could be partnering with groups who focus more on these cultural communities. There could be funding explicitly for the exploration part of partnerships. Orgs as all underfunded, with limited capacity, is there way to encourage these connections through a specific funding program? Especially important when attempting to form partnerships with orgs that have even less access to funding.
* ECOs can currently share resources right now. People power.
* Genuine, collaborative relationship building takes a long time. It’s scary to try to articulate this in a funding report. SaskCulture- transparency around, do they look at reports over a long time to get a real understanding of organizational health and progress, or do they just view the most recent report?
* ECOs could develop and operate specific programming related to 2SLGBTQ or Disabled communities.
* ECOs are generally not sure of where to look for resource people in seeking out learnings on Disabled communities and cultures.
* Need to handle rural infrastructure challenges thoughtfully. As provincial orgs, there is a need to include rural communities in terms of hosting events, but doing so may mean that there are not as many accessible venues or spaces available, compared to larger urban locations.
* Lots of focus on what SaskCulture should do, but responsibility for communities/organizations to do this work – with access and supports to do so
* Want to be part of the solution moving forward
* Need to move together in partnership; SaskCulture needs to support but the organizations need to do the work to move forward; not one without the other
* Has to be holistic – not focus on just a “pet project” need to weave together intersectionality as part of all funding
* Make room for organizations dedicated to disability/queer arts – they already have the expertise – amplify what already doing
* Is this doing to result in a re-evaluation of who is on the Minister’s list -will it expand the Eco list – need to be willing to make decisions that won’t be super popular all the time;
* Necessary to defund those satisfied with the status quo
* Is SaskCulture looking internally like they are asking others to do – on how spending funding – to SaskCulture’s own operations –
* (Yvonne – lottery funds overall status quo/decreasing – only so much can expect people to buy tickets)
* Is there a dip due to high living costs? Or could go other way? Sales increase in hard time?
* Take a hard look at who not serving – are there sectors of cultural activity that are being overserved or overlapping mandates –