
National Arts and Culture Alliance - NACA

C/- CCDNSW

PO Box 3307

Rhodes Waterside Shopping Centre

Rhodes NSW 2138

info@naca.org.auwww.naca.org.au**Ms. Jennifer Bott**

CEO - Australia Council

PO Box 788

Strawberry Hills NSW 2012.

cc David Gonski
cc Terrey Arcus
cc Karilyn Brown
cc Lisa Colley

Dear Jennifer

We are writing to provide Council and the Planning for the Future Taskforce (PFTF) with feedback and comment on the current restructure process, and in particular the revised model for the Establishment of Community Partnerships Section¹.

We are pleased to report that in general terms we feel that relations between the community cultural development sector and Council are now beginning to normalise. In the vast majority of the submissions for the March 31st consultation deadline that have been forwarded to us there is a sense of relief, if not satisfaction, that it now appears that the Australia Council has decided to:

- Undertake a consultative and research based process through the Scoping Study;
- Commit to an evaluation of the restructure;
- Continue Community Cultural Development programs for the whole of 2005; and, to preserve the Community Cultural Development budget for at least two financial years.

In essence this reflects the requests that many in the community cultural development and broader arts and cultural sectors have put to Council. There is a growing confidence and trust that the sector is being listened to by Council, and that the new timelines and terms of reference can provide real opportunities to move forward together and achieve better cultural development outcomes. We take this opportunity to acknowledge the significant shift in approach by Council and the PFTF, and also the support and hard work under difficult circumstances of Council staff - especially the CCDB staff and the Community Partnerships Working Group.

NACA has had only limited opportunity to prepare this submission in time to meet Council's consultation deadlines. We are concerned that effective, broader consultation with the sector has not been possible, limiting the scope and detail of our input in some areas at this stage. However, we are pleased to note Council's

¹ We would like to note that NACA does not necessarily endorse the name Community Partnerships and also note that this name is not necessarily cast in stone from the Council's point of view either. We are confident that scoping study will reveal a name for this new entity which illuminates the scope of its work. However, in the interests of clarity and consistency we will use the name in references to the new section of Council in this submission.

recent assurance that “*the planned governance and management structure (for the new Community Partnerships Section) is quite flexible and can accommodate the various strategic options that might unfold*”² through the Community Partnerships Scoping Study. We look forward to playing an active role in developing and delivering the Community Partnerships Scoping Study. We also look forward to a productive, ongoing dialogue with Council, both in regard to its support for community based arts and cultural programs and initiatives as well as Council’s broader goals and objectives.

In order to give greater purchase to the transparency needed for effective consultation we seek the Australia Council’s commitment to posting our response, and those of others, on the Australia Council website. We would also appreciate the Council posting information on how the submissions it receives will inform any reworking of the proposed model.

Many thanks again for the opportunity to contribute to these important processes.

Yours sincerely,

Graham Pitts
Interim Chairperson
National Arts and Culture Alliance - NACA.

² http://www.ozco.gov.au/news_and_hot_topics/news/planned_community_partnerships_scoping_study/

Introducing NACA

We would like to begin by formally introducing the National Arts and Culture Alliance (NACA) to the Australia Council. NACA is a national coalition of individuals, organisations, agencies and community groups involved in what the Council refers to as “community cultural development, community arts, arts in a community context, and community-based art”. NACA has formed in recent months to provide coordination at national level for community cultural development sectors’ responses to the current Council restructure process. The Alliance has already developed a significant national membership. This includes artists, community cultural development practitioners, organisations, partners from both regional and urban centres in each state and territory, local government and a wide range of communities of interest. The Alliance is currently developing a web presence (www.naca.org.au), and will formally launch the site in the near future.

NACA’s formation, and its active role in disseminating information, stimulating debate and negotiating directly with Council regarding the current restructure process, has received wide spread endorsement from arts and cultural sector meetings across the country. NACA has liaised closely with a wide range other peak arts and cultural organisations including ArtsPeak, Arts Access Australia and the Community Cultural Development Board (CCDB). The Alliance’s medium to long-term objectives and structure are still in the formative stages, but it is clear that with the appropriate support and resourcing, NACA has the potential to play a critical role in sector development and leadership into the future.

Planning for the Future – Council’s Core funding issues

NACA is alarmed by the growing concern within government, the media, the arts and cultural industries and the broader community regarding the future credibility of the Council as the Government’s major policy advisor and support agency for the arts particularly in the light of the reported unilateral interventions by the Federal Government in the arts industry³. Whilst we recognise that the intent of the current restructure is to help position the Council more strategically, particularly in relation to government policies and priorities, we are concerned that the Council’s chronic core funding issues will undermine this effort. We urge Council to actively enlist the advice and support of key industry service groups to assist in developing an effective industry-wide campaign to deal with this situation as soon as possible. In particular we recommend that Council provide the necessary support (including travel and secretariat assistance) to enable the critical analysis and advice provided by ArtsPeak to continue. NACA is also looking forward to playing a role in mobilising support for Council, and promoting the case for growth in core funding levels.

Developing a Community Partnerships Strategic Framework

In broad terms NACA concurs with the analysis of the Community Partnerships policy objectives outlined by the CCDB. However, we feel the current objectives fail to adequately encapsulate or reflect the breadth, complexity and potential of the Community Partnerships Section, especially in terms of the proposed role for Community Partnerships in coordinating non-arts, whole of government and international activities. We also endorse the analysis provided by the Queensland Community Cultural Development Sector working group who suggest that some of the proposed policy objectives will conflict if the current Community Partnerships

³ a recent example of the media analysis of the situation.
http://www.theadvertiser.news.com.au/common/story_page/0,5936,12684253%255E23672,00.html

model was to be implemented⁴. We recommend that Council continue to work closely with the sector to revise and update these objectives as part of a strategic framework in the lead up to the Community Partnerships Scoping Study. We recommend that this strategic framework be developed by the reference group for the Study.

As identified in the opportunities section of the proposed model for the establishment of the Community Partnerships Section (A.3.1) "*Council currently has no one clear policy and program framework to effectively support the extraordinary breadth of arts and cultural practices in this area*". Perhaps because a policy framework does not yet exist it is difficult to properly assess the proposed model for the Community Partnerships section, or test the value of the proposed Community Partnerships – Policy Objectives as outlined in A.3.3.

NACA acknowledges that there are different methods for approaching the complex task ahead in establishing the new Community Partnerships Section. We understand that Council's current approach is to develop a set of agreed policy objectives for the Community Partnerships Section and to use these objectives as the platform to test proposed models for the implementation. Whilst we see value in this approach we are also concerned that for many in our sector it remains unclear how several of the current policy objectives have been developed, and how they relate to the broader Community Partnerships entity.

To this end it would be useful as part of the preliminary stages of the Scoping Study, for a draft strategic framework to be developed in association with the reference group for the Study. By this we mean a policy level overview of how it is proposed that the various areas of expertise to be incorporated under the Community Partnerships umbrella (as outlined in section A.3.6.1⁵) will interrelate. Specifically, enunciation of the proposed relationships between key terms and areas of practice including community cultural development, community arts, community engagement, arts in the community, audience development, regional arts, arts and disability etc, is critical. The draft strategic framework needs to be positioned in broad terms and identify the proposed limits to the role and capacities of the Community Partnerships section: Firstly, which activities, within the broad rubric of community culture, does the Council consider can not be supported through Community Partnerships, and secondly, how does Council see Community Partnerships linking to and engaging with external agencies, programs and services that do and will provide that support. With a strategic framework we can have confidence that the extraordinarily broad range of practitioners, organisations and communities who are directly affected by the axing of the CCDB and the establishment of the Community Partnerships section will be able to establish whether they do or don't fit in the plans for the new Community Partnerships section.

Cross Council Partnerships - Devolving CCD funds to the Artform Boards

NACA endorses and reiterates the views of a number of other submissions that directly oppose the proposal to deliver Community Cultural Development project grant programs via the Inter-Arts Office and the Artform Boards beyond 2005. We recommend that this proposal be scrapped once and for all from this and all future

⁴ For example, the first Policy Objective of *growing a strong (er) community cultural development sector* conflicts with the way the model proposes achieving the second objective of *greater involvement of the Artform boards in CCD* – by running CCD grant programs through the artform boards.

⁵ We note that Arts and Disability is an omission from the current list

models for the Community Partnerships section. It runs counter to Council's own strategic imperative and rationale for a restructure that argues the need to gather Council's various community programs and resources within the Community Partnerships Section to "*enable them to cooperate with each other and achieve a more significant impact*". We strongly recommend that within the new Community Partnerships model community cultural development funds are fully consolidated under the management and peer based assessment and decision making power of the new Community Partnerships section, and we advise Council that the continued good faith and support of NACA and the sector is likely to be conditional on this action.

NACA does however strongly support Council's objective to generate greater involvement in and support for community cultural development and other forms of community cultural practice across all artform boards. We believe there are good models for achieving the desired results in this area without further diluting the capacities and resources of the community cultural development sector. One alternative approach for example, would be for artform boards to make bids (on a dollar for dollar basis) for a pool of Community Cultural Development project money managed by Community Partnerships for projects that meet established Community Partnerships and Community Cultural Development strategic priorities and criteria. Representatives from the relevant artform board panels could join the Community Partnerships committee in the assessment process so the expertise and strategic focus are enhanced rather than dissipated in the assessment and decision making process. Outcomes could be benchmarked to monitor the impact of this strategy on the take up, investment and successful delivery of Community Cultural Development/Community Partnerships projects in particular artform boards. Further, NACA recommends that the most effective methods for achieving greater cross Council engagement with community cultural development be included within the terms of reference of the Scoping Study and that organisations and artists involved in other artforms be included in the consultation process.

Partnering Beyond Council

In regard to external cross-sectoral alliances and "whole of government" approaches, we wanted to briefly reiterate that the community cultural development, new media and other sectors have been successfully implementing these partnership programs for many years, and existing best practice examples should be promoted by Council as part of the briefing and background materials provided to inform participants in the Community Partnerships Scoping Study. Equally though we acknowledge the need to develop a more systematic approach to this critical work, and to improve the sustainability of outcomes. NACA shares the aim of the Australia Council to improve Council's capacity to engage in and deliver cross sectoral alliances and its aim to leverage non arts resources. NACA also requests that the Scoping Study include in its terms of reference the development of models which clearly position the Australia Council as the *enabler*, and the arts and cultural sector as the *implementers* as the basis of a strategic and on going collaboration.

Identity and Infrastructure for the CCD sector

We begin this section by endorsing the analysis and recommendations regarding the immediate future of the CCD Board, and in particular the Board's proposal that it may be better to extend the current CCDB members until the end of the year to undertake assessment for the 2005 advertised CCD grant rounds. We agree with the board's position that this assists with consistency of approach for existing CCD commitments

during a period of transition. We also support the Board's proposal that the scoping study should be undertaken with the involvement of the current board members to harness expertise and knowledge.

We want to raise again with Council some points for discussion that we envisage will now carry over into the Scoping Study concerning the implications for the community cultural development sector of Council's decision to axe the Community Cultural Development Board.

In our analysis the Australia Council is guided by a range of objectives which include the aim to lead and support the integration of cultural development into the broad fabric of Australian life and to encourage community, government and private sector agencies to foster cultural development as essential to their place in civil society, as well as assisting communities to realise their own cultural development objectives.

Our analysis leads us to the view that to achieve these objectives the Australia Council aims to nurture a vital and robust community cultural infrastructure. This will lead to increased resources for communities to engage in their own forms of intellectual and artistic production and generate nationally significant programs that demonstrate how essential cultural development is to Australian life. A more robust infrastructure will also foster greater collaborations between artists and cultural organisations and government, community and private sector agencies. This could stimulate analysis and promotion of effective cultural development methods and thus become more central to national artistic and cultural debate.

Over the last three decades the Community Cultural Development Board has developed into a national lead agency for the community cultural development sector. As argued previously, cutting the Board undermines the identity and infrastructure base of the sector nationally, and in many ways internationally. It has played a vital role driving policy development, coordinating activity and setting priorities across the country. The Board's significance beyond Council is far greater than that of other artform boards within their respective sectors, and this unique situation needs to be carefully considered by Council.

We are pleased to note a number of additional references in the new Community Partnerships model, especially the acknowledgment that *growing a strong community cultural development sector is critical to achieving the Australia Council's vision*, and Council's commitment to *continued support for Community Cultural Development as a practice and a process*. These assurances are vital given that as of July it is proposed that the sector will be without this critical national infrastructure.

We are concerned that these statements are somewhat undercut by the rationale for change as articulated by Council⁶, and the way in which that rationale is then articulated in the current model. The rationale for change relates that:

Having created this section (Community Partnerships) to pull together regional, education and youth initiatives, the question arose of how it should interact with the existing Community Cultural Development Board (CCDB). It is wrong to assert, as some have done, that the Future Planning Task Force made its decisions without an understanding of the work of the CCDB. The Task Force consists of Council members who understand very well the workings of the organisation, including its strengths and its weaknesses. The Task Force was aware of the successes of the Board, of the nature of Community Cultural Development practice and of the risks in removing the

⁶ http://www.ozco.gov.au/news_and_hot_topics/news/future_planning_information/the_rationale_for_change/

status of Community Cultural Development as a board with its own budget focused on Community Cultural Development practice.

But the Task Force took the view that the sort of expertise developed by Community Cultural Development practitioners, and within the CCDB, and the success of the CCDB in forming partnerships with communities and other bodies, could be best utilised where it was most needed: in informing and supporting the new Community Partnerships section, and the community activities of the Council's artform boards.

Our aim is to see Community Cultural Development skills and expertise employed more broadly, and in a wider range of situations, with potential for increased funding to activities that can demonstrate that they are having impact for Australians and for Australian art.

Whilst NACA supports the proposition that Community Cultural Development skills and expertise can and should play an important role in supporting the work of the new Community Partnerships section, it is a significant concern that there is no acknowledgement in the rationale of the value of community cultural development practice for its own sake, or an understanding that the sector requires the support of effective national infrastructure to sustain and enable it to play this role, and other roles into the future. Under this rationale for change community cultural development is being positioned as a set of tools and resources for Council to use to strategically to leverage non-arts dollars to meet its commitments and to improve the skills and expertise of other areas of Council (artform boards, AMD, arts and education etc) in partnership development and collaboration both internally and externally.

This is a common experience for community cultural development. The sector is all too familiar with the pattern of funding partners adopting the processes, programs and strategies of community cultural development under another name, but then failing to support the growth and development of the sector itself. Whilst this has been manageable with non-arts partners and state based arts funding agencies, it is not manageable when the national lead agency weakens the sector's national standing, compromises its cultural capital and impairs its capacity to grow and develop.

When Council's **rationale for change** regarding community cultural development is then applied to an analysis of the current Community Partnerships model as articulated in sections A.3.1 and A.3.2 (background and opportunities) it reads like this:

- Council needs money. It has failed to grow core funding and needs to free up resources to meet the increasing costs of the artform boards, which on the whole are unable to generate significant non-arts funding. Delivering the Community Engagement activities of the Arts and Marketing Development Division is a significant core expense under the current structure. Council sees an opportunity **to increase non-arts support for arts in the community from government, non-government and private sources**, but it needs CCD expertise to do it.
- Council realises that it **has not always taken advantage of the experience of community cultural development sector** as a means of **realising stronger community engagement strategies** (i.e. generating money to support Audience and Market Development Programs and improving the linkages between Council's community engagement activities, and the artform boards).
- Council intends to use its **resources (CCD) to leverage increased investment from community sustainability and community building programs across all levels of government**. *The aim is for the current (CCD) money to attract more non-arts money*

to support arts in the community.

- To do this properly Council **needs a more flexible and strategic manner in which to support arts in the community and CCD**. It dissolves the CCD Board and dilutes peer assessment processes, putting significant strategic decision-making powers in the hands of executive staff.
- Council also lacks the **policy and program framework to effectively support the extraordinary breadth of arts and cultural practices in this area** so it establishes the new Community Partnerships section.

Our aim in providing Council with this analysis is to emphasise the importance of national infrastructure and identity to the community cultural development sector and to reiterate the belief that still, at this stage, there is little in the proposed model that will fill the gap when the Community Cultural Development Board is dissolved. We are more confident that, in the new spirit of cooperation and flexibility, that these issues can be properly dealt through the scoping study.

Arts and Disability

NACA also endorses the repeated calls from a wide range of leading national cultural networks and agencies for the Australia Council to respond to the current lack of engagement with the Arts and Disability Sector, both within the proposed models for the Community Partnerships section and more broadly within Council. NACA is surprised that this pressing issue has not already been dealt with, and we strongly recommend that Council address the absence of a current disability action plan immediately. Given that the disability sector represents up to one in five Australians this issue is a pressing concern for the whole arts and cultural industry, and Council cannot reasonably defer action any longer. NACA endorses the wide-ranging recommendations put forward by Arts Access Australia and will continue to liaise with AAA and monitor the progress of Council in meeting the cultural needs and interests of the disability sector, both as an integral part of the CCD sector and the emerging Community Partnership section, as well as within Council more broadly.

Research, policy and strategy

NACA is pleased by the Council's recent statements regarding the importance and centrality it places on research, policy and strategy and how the three are intrinsically linked. These elements also provide the drivers for responsiveness, trend identification and innovation across an organisation. From our perspective, effective and on-going research, policy and strategy development and implementation by the Australia Council are crucial to the arts and cultural sector generally.

Research, policy and strategy priorities are often stimulated and identified by those operating on the ground. In NACA's view it is crucial that there are mechanisms in place to allow for the field to enter into research partnerships with the Australia Council and other agencies such as universities and private institutes.

As the current Australia Council model stands we consider that there is a need to revisit the structure and perhaps identify other organisational synergies and efficiencies by keeping policy, research and strategy in one section and not divided across divisions.

There may be some merit in considering alternative models such as placing policy, research and strategy in the same section as the community partnership section

which already is proposed to include arts education, youth arts and so on - and establishing a separate division.

NACA would request that while the Australia Council may make in principle decisions at its April meeting, that the final internal structure be determined after the completion of the Scoping Study period and use this period to further test the proposed structures against the objectives.

Scoping Study

As mentioned above, NACA considers the Scoping Study as the key opportunity to ensure that we have an outcome which strengthens the Australia Council and the arts and cultural sectors generally. We have also made recommendations regarding the terms of reference and these are repeated below:

- *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study enunciate the proposed relationships between key areas of practice including community cultural development, community arts, community engagement, arts in the community, audience development, regional arts, arts and disability.*
- *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study identifies the proposed limits to the role and capacities of the Community Partnerships section: which activities, within the broad rubric of community culture will and will not be supported through Community Partnerships.*
- *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study identifies how Community Partnerships will link to and engage with external agencies, programs and services.*
- *NACA recommends that the Australia Council ensure that the scoping study has within its terms of reference discussion regarding the underlying objectives that have driven the Australia Council's restructure and the outputs it aims to achieve.*
- *NACA recommends that Council continue to work closely with the sector to revise and update these objectives as part of a strategic framework in the lead up to the Community Partnerships Scoping Study. We recommend that this strategic framework be developed by the reference group for the Study.*
- *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study identify the most effective methods for achieving greater cross-Council engagement with community cultural development and that organisations and artists involved in other artforms be included in the consultation process.*
- *NACA recommends that the scoping study include in its terms of reference the development of models which clearly position the Australia Council as the enabler, and the arts and cultural sector as the implementers as the basis of a strategic and on going collaboration.*
- *NACA recommends that the scoping study reference group include at least one member of the current CCD Board to be nominated by the Board itself.*

- *NACA recommends that the scoping study reference group works with Council representatives in determining the terms of reference and methodology of the exercise.*
- *NACA recommends that the reference group endorses the final recommendations to Council.*
- *NACA recommends that a minimum of 4 recognised CCD field representatives sit on the reference committee.*
- *NACA recommends that there be a stated commitment from Council to ensure the necessary resources are available for the second phase of implementation, post review.*

We welcome the Australia Council's commitment to including community cultural development representatives on the reference committee of the Scoping Study and have them involved in formulating the terms of reference and recommendations.

NACA would propose that the scoping study include a range of forums in regional and metropolitan areas across the country and that these as well as the final report be facilitated by an independent consultant who is mutually agreed upon by the Australia Council and representatives of the sector.

NACA also endorses the following analysis and recommendations put forward by the CCDB:

It is critical that Council makes a strong commitment that any future changes to the operational structure and support for ccd within Council, are made in response to the findings of this review/scoping study and that funds and human resources are made available to fulfil these findings.

A more substantial explanation of the review/scoping study and in particular the role of the steering committee in determining the terms of reference, and in the ratification of any recommendations that will proceed to Council from the review is required.

The commitment to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the Community Partnerships model and progress is endorsed by the CCD Board. The Board does not endorse an evaluation framework that is 'based on advice from the Director of CP and the CP committee' as an effective model. The CCD Board believes that an external consultant with extensive ccd experience should undertake this process and that is imperative that clear KPI's be established to track against.

- *That an external consultant with extensive ccd experience be engaged to undertake an evaluation of Community Partnerships and ccd in the second half of 2006.*
- *That KPI's for Community Partnerships section be established by the end of August 2005*

Conclusion

NACA looks forward to reviewing the outcomes of the April Council meeting and seeing how the recommendations and comments that have been presented by many

practitioners have influenced the next phase.

NACA restates that the crucial element to the way forward is the scoping study period and associated consultation processes. We are prepared to provide our expertise to the Australia Council to ensure that the process is based on best practice models and leads to positive outcomes for everyone involved – especially Australian communities.

SUMMARY OF NACA RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE AUSTRALIA COUNCIL

1. Council post the submissions it receives in relation to its restructure on its website and publicly sets out how the submissions it receives will be incorporated and inform any reworking of the proposed model.
2. Council actively enlists the advice and support of key industry service groups to assist in developing an effective industry-wide campaign to deal with the future financial viability of the Council.
3. Council provide support to enable the critical analysis and advice provided by ArtsPeak to continue.
4. Council commits to workshop policy objectives for Community Partnerships with the field.
5. In the lead up to the Scoping Study, Council provides a draft policy framework which presents and overview of how it is proposed that the various areas of expertise to be incorporated under the Community Partnerships umbrella (as outlined in section A.3.6.17) will interrelate. Specifically, the proposed relationships between key terms and areas of practice including CCD, Community Arts, Community Engagement, arts in the community, audience development, regional arts, arts and disability etc.
6. Council continue to work closely with the sector to revise and update these objectives in the lead up to the Community Partnerships scoping study.
7. NACA directly oppose the proposal to deliver CCD project grant programs via the Inter-Arts Office and the Artform Boards beyond 2005.
8. CCD funds are fully consolidated under the management and peer based assessment and decision making power of the new Community Partnerships section
9. Artform boards bid for a pool of Council's strategic initiative money for projects that meet established Community Partnerships or CCD strategic priorities and criteria.
10. NACA endorses the wide-ranging recommendations put forward by Arts Access Australia
11. Effective methods for achieving greater cross Council engagement with ccd be included within the terms of reference of the scoping study and that organisations and artists involved in other artforms be included in the consultation process.
12. NACA recommend that proper attention be paid to the reality of the different cultures which operate in ccd and the other artform Boards, and the need for cultural change.
13. NACA recommends that the scoping study include in its terms of reference the development of models that clearly position the Australia Council as the *enabler*, and

the arts and cultural sector as the *implementers* as the basis of a strategic and on going collaboration between Council and the sector.

14. Extend the current CCDB members until the end of the year to undertake assessment for the 2005 advertised ccd grant rounds.
15. Scoping study should be undertaken with the involvement of the current CCD Board members to harness expertise and knowledge.
16. Council acknowledge the value of CCD practice for its own sake, and that the sector requires the support of effective national infrastructure to sustain and enable it to play this role, and other roles into the future
17. Council address the absence of a current disability action plan immediately.
18. The Scoping Study includes a range of forums in regional and metropolitan areas across the country and that these as well as the final report be facilitated by an independent consultant who is mutually agreed upon by the Australia Council and representatives of the sector.
19. The terms of reference for the scoping study be developed as soon as possible, and that they clearly delineate between areas where the scoping study can and will influence the future structure of Community Partnerships, and the areas that are deemed non-negotiable.
20. The final internal structure should be determined after the scoping study, and at that stage the Council make a resource commitment to implement the recommendations as part of the 05/06 budget cycle.
21. With specific regard to the scoping study:
 - *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study enunciate the proposed relationships between key areas of practice including community cultural development, community arts, community engagement, arts in the community, audience development, regional arts, arts and disability.*
 - *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study identifies the proposed limits to the role and capacities of the Community Partnerships section: which activities, within the broad rubric of community culture will and will not be supported through Community Partnerships.*
 - *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study identifies how Community Partnerships will link to and engage with external agencies, programs and services.*
 - *NACA recommends that the Australia Council ensure that the scoping study has within its terms of reference discussion regarding the underlying objectives that have driven the Australia Council's restructure and the outputs it aims to achieve.*
 - *NACA recommends that Council continue to work closely with the sector to revise and update these objectives as part of a strategic framework in the lead up to the Community Partnerships Scoping Study. We recommend that this strategic framework be developed by the reference group for the Study.*

- *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study identify the most effective methods for achieving greater cross-Council engagement with community cultural development and that organisations and artists involved in other artforms be included in the consultation process.*
- *NACA recommends that the Scoping Study include in its terms of reference the development of models which clearly position the Australia Council as the enabler, and the arts and cultural sector as the implementers as the basis of a strategic and on going collaboration.*
- *NACA recommends that the scoping study reference group include at least one member of the current CCD Board to be nominated by the Board itself.*
- *NACA recommends that the scoping study reference group works with Council representatives in determining the terms of reference and methodology of the exercise.*
- *NACA recommends that the reference group endorses the final recommendations to Council.*
- *NACA recommends that a minimum of 4 recognised CCD field representatives sit on the reference committee.*
- *NACA recommends that there be a stated commitment from Council to ensure the necessary resources are available for the second phase of implementation, post review.*